VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

July 10, 2013

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose
Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.’s and MISO Transmission Owners’ Compliance Filing for Order No. 1000, Regarding Interregional Transmission Project Coordination and Cost Allocation with the Southeastern Regional Transmission Planning Region
Docket No. ER13-___-000

Dear Secretary Bose:

Pursuant to section 206 of the Federal Power Act (“FPA”), 16 U.S.C. § 824e, and Order Nos. 1000, 1000-A, and 1000-B of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC” or “Commission”), the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (“MISO”) respectfully submits this compliance filing proposing revisions to MISO’s Open Access Transmission, Energy and Operating Reserve Markets Tariff (“Tariff”) to address the interregional coordination and cost allocation requirements of Order No. 1000. MISO is submitting amendments to its Tariff and the Commission jurisdictional transmission providers enrolled in the Southeastern Regional Transmission Planning region (referred to herein as the “Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors” or “SERTP”) are separately submitting related amendments to their tariffs. The proposed tariff revisions are essentially identical, subject to mere differences in perspective (i.e., MISO’s applicable Tariff provisions refers to it as the Transmission Provider, and to SERTP by name; and conversely, the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ tariff provisions refer to SERTP as the Transmission Provider, and to MISO by name), the designation of relevant Attachments, and section number cross-references.

1 Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation by Transmission Owning and Operating Public Utilities, Order No. 1000, 136 FERC ¶ 61,051 (2011), order on reh’g, Order No. 1000-A, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 (2012), order on reh’g and clarification, Order No. 1000-B, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 (2012) (hereinafter also collectively referred to as “Order No. 1000,” unless otherwise indicated by the text or the context).
3 Southern Company (“Southern”), Louisville Gas and Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company (“LG&E/KU”), and Ohio Valley Electric Corporation (“OVEC”) are currently the only Commission jurisdictional entities enrolled in the SERTP region.
MISO requests that the revisions proposed in this filing become effective on January 1, 2015.

I. Background

A. Interregional Coordination and Cost Allocation Requirements of Order No. 1000

Order No. 1000 amended the regional transmission planning and cost allocation requirements of Order No. 890 by imposing a number of requirements regarding new transmission facilities selected in a regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation; and the interregional coordination, and cost allocation, of transmission facilities that involve interregional benefits. The Commission required jurisdictional transmission providers to make compliance filings concerning Order No. 1000’s regional planning and cost allocation requirements, and its interregional coordination and cost allocation requirements, respectively.

The original due date for compliance filings for regional requirements was extended to October 25, 2012; and the due date for compliance filings for interregional requirements was extended to July 10, 2013. As a Regional Transmission Organization (“RTO”), MISO submitted on October 25, 2012, its Order No. 1000 regional compliance filing, which in large part was conditionally accepted by the Commission on March 22, 2013. The March 22 Order also accepted MISO’s proposal in Docket No. ER13-186-000 to remove, effective June 1, 2013, the regional cost allocation for MISO’s Baseline Reliability Projects (“BRPs”).

The present filing addresses Order No. 1000’s interregional coordination and cost allocation requirements as between MISO and the SERTP region. MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have agreed upon the interregional compliance proposal described herein. This proposal is reflected both in MISO’s current filing and in the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ concurrent interregional compliance filings.

---

5 Order No. 1000 at P 393-404, 415-21, 435-50, 454-55, 458, 465-67, 475-81; Order No. 1000-A at P 500-05, 509-12, 518-22; Order No. 1000-B at P 64.
6 Order No. 1000 at P 578-84, et seq.; Order No. 1000-A at P 634, et seq.; Order No. 1000-B at P 72.
8 Notice Granting an Extension of Time to Submit Interregional Compliance Filings dated February 26, 2013 in Docket No. RM10-23-000.
10 Id. at P 518-29.
B. No Existing MISO-SERTP Arrangements

There is no Joint Operating Agreement between the MISO and SERTP regions. Accordingly, parallel revisions are proposed for the MISO Tariff and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors tariffs.

II. Development of Compliance Filing Through Stakeholder Processes of MISO and SERTP

As required by Order No. 1000, MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors worked with stakeholders through their regional transmission planning processes to develop the same language to be included in each public utility transmission provider’s OATT that describes the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation procedures between the two regions.11

A. MISO Stakeholder Discussions

MISO held the following interregional workshops to discuss the SERTP-specific interregional coordination and cost allocation efforts with stakeholders:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Primary Discussion Items</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/18/2013</td>
<td>Review of SERTP Order 1000 Regional Proposal Review of MISO-SERTP Interregional Proposal:</td>
<td>Carmel, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interregional Coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transparency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data Exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/28/2013</td>
<td>Discussion Re MISO-SERTP Order 1000 Interregional Filing Options</td>
<td>Conference Call and WebEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review MISO-SERTP Order 1000 Interregional Tariff Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/2013</td>
<td>Discussion Re MISO-SERTP Order 1000 Interregional Filing Approach</td>
<td>Conference Call and WebEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review MISO-SERTP Order 1000 Interregional Tariff Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Order No. 1000 at P 475. As explained below, MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have proposed parallel tariff revisions to their respective tariffs.

12 MISO’s website provides a list of stakeholder meetings at the hyperlink below:
https://www.misoenergy.org/WhatWeDo/StrategicInitiatives/Pages/FERCOOrder1000.aspx
In addition to the above workshops, MISO provided its stakeholders with regular updates regarding the MISO-SERTP Order No. 1000 interregional compliance filing as listed in the attached exhibit at Tab C.

B. SERTP Stakeholder Discussions

SERTP also engaged its stakeholders in discussions related to compliance with the interregional requirements of Order No. 1000.

III. Discussion Of The MISO And Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors Proposal For Complying With Order No. 1000’s Interregional Requirements For Neighboring Transmission Planning Regions

The interregional cost allocation approach agreed upon between MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors involves essentially the same general framework that the latter have agreed upon with their four other neighboring transmission planning regions. MISO’s understanding is that, in light of such commonality of approach to cost allocation, the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ interregional compliance filing will use a common description of their interregional cost allocation proposals with their five neighboring transmission regions, including MISO. To facilitate the Commission’s consideration, MISO will adopt in Part III.A of this filing substantially the same language (with minor adjustments to reflect that the discussion is being provided from MISO’s perspective) that the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have indicated they intend to use in their interregional compliance filing to describe their interregional cost allocation proposal. MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have also agreed to use substantially the same language in describing their interregional coordination arrangements, which MISO discusses in Part III.B of this transmittal letter.

A. The Agreed-Upon Methodology For Interregional Cost Allocation Purposes Based On Avoided Project Costs

1. General Description Of MISO’s And The Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ Agreed Upon Cost Methodology

Order No. 1000 requires each public utility transmission provider within a region to develop a method or set of methods for allocating the costs of new interregional transmission facilities that two (or more) neighboring transmission planning regions determine resolve the needs of each region more efficiently or cost-effectively than the construction of separate regional transmission facilities.\(^\text{13}\) An interregional transmission facility is defined as one located in two or more transmission planning regions.\(^\text{14}\) Order No. 1000 requires that public utility transmission providers in each of the neighboring transmission planning regions have a common method or methods for allocating the cost of new interregional transmission facilities among the

\(^{13}\) Order No. 1000 at P 482.

\(^{14}\) Id.
beneficiaries of such facilities in the two neighboring regions in which the facility is located.\textsuperscript{15} An interregional transmission facility must be selected in both of the relevant regional transmission planning processes for purposes of cost allocation in order to be eligible for interregional cost allocation.\textsuperscript{16} Finally, the agreed-upon interregional cost allocation methodology must satisfy six cost allocation principles adopted in the Order.\textsuperscript{17}

MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ avoided cost methodology presented herein satisfies these requirements. Pursuant to Order No. 1000’s requirements, MISO’s and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ proposal requires that the project be located in both the MISO and the SERTP regions, and interconnected with one or more transmission providers, owners, and/or sponsors within each of their regions. Consistent with Order No. 1000, the proposal requires that the interregional project must be proposed (and ultimately selected for purposes of regional cost allocation) in both neighboring regions where it would be located, in addition to meeting certain prerequisites that the projects and developers must satisfy (\textit{i.e.}, the qualification criteria and submittal requirements for each of the pertinent regions).

The primary purpose of the MISO and Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ interregional cost allocation methodology is to provide a means to allocate an interregional project’s costs between the regions where it would be located. In general, the proposed avoided cost methodology involves the calculation of the total avoided cost benefits for both regions. In determining this interregional total, both regions would calculate the cost of all the regional transmission projects identified in their respective regional plans that would be displaced by the proposed interregional transmission project. Stated differently, the benefits of an interregional project would be the cost savings received by displacing the higher-cost regionally-planned transmission project(s) in both regions with a more efficient and/or cost effective proposed interregional project(s) that addresses regional needs previously intended to be addressed by the displaced project(s). MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors who have their regional transmission projects displaced by the proposed interregional project, and thereby would receive costs savings, would be the beneficiaries themselves or would benefit on behalf of their customers.

The proposed interregional project’s costs would then be allocated between the regions on a \textit{pro rata} basis based upon the ratio of each region’s displaced/avoided costs compared to the total displaced/avoided costs for both regions where the facility would be located. Allocation within each region is not addressed by this joint proposal, other than to indicate that further cost allocation within the region is left to the respective regional planning processes. Importantly, given the iterative nature of transmission planning and the fact that for most of these types of significant, regional and interregional projects there is a fair amount of lead time prior to parties committing to a project, the proposal provides that the allocation will be based upon the most recent regional benefits calculation performed prior to the project being selected for regional cost allocation processes in the pertinent regional plans.

\textsuperscript{15} Id. at P 578.
\textsuperscript{16} Id. at P 582.
\textsuperscript{17} Id. at P 603.
The transmission project for interregional cost allocation will be included in the regional transmission plans after each region has performed all evaluations included in their respective regional processes, along with all requisite approvals and, if applicable, agreements being obtained from the regional processes necessary for the project to be included in the affected regional transmission plans. The interregional proposal further provides that once selected, the interregional project may be removed from the affected region’s plans if it fails to meet requisite project milestones, if it is removed pursuant to the regional reevaluation procedures, or if the project is removed from the neighboring region’s regional plan for purposes of cost allocation.

2. The Agreed Upon Methodology Satisfies Order No. 1000’s Interregional Cost Allocation Principles

The methodology agreed upon by MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors satisfies Order No. 1000’s six interregional cost allocation principles.\(^{18}\)

a. Principle One: Allocation Commensurate With Estimated Benefits

The agreed upon methodology would allocate the costs of interregional projects in proportion to the quantifiable benefits of avoided/displaced transmission. Utilizing this metric satisfies the requirement that costs must be allocated in a manner roughly commensurate with the estimated benefits to each region (Cost Allocation Principle 1),\(^ {19}\) because the costs are allocated in proportion to the quantifiable benefits of avoided/displaced transmission. In the context of cost allocation within a planning region, the Commission has found that a cost allocation that includes avoided costs “could be a reasonable approach for allocating costs in a manner that is roughly commensurate with benefits.”\(^ {20}\) The Commission specifically approved an avoided cost approach for allocating the cost of reliability projects within a region, finding that it “reasonably captures the benefits of such projects.”\(^ {21}\) Moreover, the Commission has not made a determination concerning the sole use of the avoided cost method in the context of interregional cost allocation. Further, the agreed upon avoided project cost approach proposed for interregional cost allocation is consistent with the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsor’s regional compliance filings, which employ an avoided cost methodology as the cost allocation metric for regional cost allocation, and are still pending before the Commission.

---

\(^{18}\) Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1 provides that costs are to be allocated roughly commensurate with benefits; Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 2 provides that there will be no involuntary cost allocation to non-beneficiaries; Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3 provides that if a benefit-to-cost ratio is used, it may not include a ratio exceeding 1.25 absent Commission approval; Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4 provides that costs for an interregional transmission facility must be assigned only to transmission planning regions in which the transmission facility is located unless those outside voluntarily assume cost responsibility; Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 5 requires a transparent method for determining benefits and identifying beneficiaries, and allocating costs; and Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 allows for different cost allocation methods for different types of facilities. See Order No. 1000, P 603, et seq.

\(^{19}\) Id. at P 622.


\(^{21}\) Pub. Serv. Co. of Colo., 142 FERC ¶ 61,206 at P 312.
Utilizing an avoided/displaced cost allocation metric facilitates the comparison of the costs of an interregional project with a project(s) which has already been determined to provide benefits to the planning region. Therefore, replacing an already identified regional project with a comparable, or more cost efficient, interregional project ensures that the cost and benefits are roughly commensurate in a manner that identifies cost-effective and efficient solutions to address transmission needs.

Moreover, notwithstanding regional cost allocation approaches, an avoided cost approach to interregional cost allocation is particularly appropriate in light of the purpose of interregional coordination under Order No. 1000. As the Commission explained in Order No. 1000-A, its interregional coordination reforms do not require the establishment of interregional planning processes to develop integrated interregional plans, but rather call upon public utility transmission providers to consider “whether the local and regional transmission planning processes result in transmission plans that meet local and regional transmission needs more efficiently and cost-effectively, after considering opportunities for collaborating with public utility transmission providers in neighboring transmission planning regions.” Since the purpose of interregional coordination is thus to determine whether an interregional project might displace one or more projects included in regional or local transmission plans, the cost of the displaced projects represents a reasonable measure of the benefits of the interregional project for cost allocation purposes.

Measuring the benefits of interregional transmission projects for cost allocation purposes through the avoided cost/displaced project approach is also appropriate in light of the ability of each region to decline to select an interregional project in its regional plan for cost allocation purposes if the project is not cost-effective for that region. Allocating an interregional project’s cost in proportion to the costs of the regional project or projects that it would displace takes into account the voluntary nature of interregional coordination and results in a close “alignment of transmission planning and cost allocation,” which was a “central underpinning” of the Commission’s interregional coordination reforms.

b. Principle Two and Principle Four: No Involuntary Allocation To A Region That Does Not Benefit Or In Which A Facility Is Not Located

The avoided cost approach complies with Cost Allocation Principle 2 and Cost Allocation Principle 4 because only a transmission provider or transmission owner in the

---

22 Order No. 1000-A at P 511. See also No. 1000 at P 368 (The Commission explained that it was requiring further reforms in interregional coordination because, in the absence of coordination between regions, transmission providers “may be unable to identify more efficient and cost-effective solutions to the individual needs identified in their respective regional and local planning processes, potentially including interregional transmission facilities.”).
23 MISO’s understanding is that the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors will include in their interregional compliance filings further justification for the agreed upon avoided project cost methodology based on Order No. 1000 at P 401.
24 See Order No. 1000-A at P 512. This ability is an outgrowth of the requirement that an interregional project be selected for interregional cost allocation in the regional plans of the affected regions. Id. at P 509.
25 Order No. 1000 at P 582.
26 Id. at P 637.
regions in which the facility would be located that avoids transmission costs would be allocated the cost of the regional project.

MISO further notes that, pursuant to Order No. 1000-A, any MISO Transmission Owner that withdraws from MISO will remain responsible for its share of the cost of any Interregional Project that is an MEP approved by MISO’s Board of Directors before the effective date of such Transmission Owner’s withdrawal, even if no portion of the MEP is located in the transmission planning area to which the Transmission Owner will transfer.

c. Principle Three: Benefit-To-Cost Ratio Threshold

The avoided cost proposal also satisfies Cost Allocation Principle 3 because as discussed in detail below, MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have agreed upon tariff language requiring that for a transmission project to be eligible for Interregional CAP within the MISO and SERTP regions, the project should have a combined benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.25 or higher. In addition, MISO’s Market Efficiency Projects (“MEPs”), the project category that MISO will rely on for evaluating and approving interregional projects, uses a benefit-to-cost ratio threshold of 1.25 or greater, which is consistent with Order No. 1000.

While not specifically on point, it also bears noting that the avoided cost approach provides that proposed interregional cost allocation projects must be accepted in the respective regional processes. This requirement means that, if a regional process requires a benefit-to-cost ratio threshold (such as MISO’s 1.25 threshold for MEPs), the portion of the project allocated to such region would be required to satisfy such a threshold, which is also independently required to meet Order No. 1000’s limitations on any regional benefit-to-cost ratio threshold.

d. Principle Five: Transparency

Since the benefits that form the basis of cost allocation under the avoided cost approach are readily quantifiable, the cost allocation method and data requirements for determining benefits and identifying beneficiaries would be transparent, satisfying Cost Allocation Principle 5. Moreover, there would be sufficient documentation to allow stakeholders to determine how the cost allocation method was applied to a proposed facility.

---

27 Id. at P 657.
28 Order No. 1000-A at P 714.
29 See MISO’s Transmission Owners Agreement (Article Five, Section II); MISO’s Tariff, Attachment FF (section III.A.2.f).
30 Order No. 1000 at P 646.
31 Id. at P 668.
e. **Principle Six: Flexibility To Use Single Or Multiple Methodologies For Different Projects**

Finally, with regard to Cost Allocation Principle 6, this straightforward approach would apply to all types of transmission facilities proposed for Interregional CAP.

**B. MISO And The Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ Agreed-Upon OATT Language To Address Order No. 1000’s Interregional Requirements**

MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have agreed to a common approach and parallel tariff language in their respective OATTs to satisfy Order No. 1000’s interregional coordination and cost allocation requirements for their collective seam (the “MISO-SERTP Joint Proposal”). For MISO, this MISO-SERTP Joint Proposal tariff language is found in proposed Section X of Attachment FF of MISO’s OATT. For the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors, this parallel tariff language for the MISO-SERTP Joint Proposal is included in their respective OATTs.

In addition to adopting parallel OATT language, in an effort to facilitate the Commission’s review of this filing and that being contemporaneously filed by the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors, MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have coordinated to develop this Section IIIC so as to include parallel language in their respective transmittal letters’ discussions of their agreed-upon approach to addressing interregional coordination and cost allocation in their respective tariffs.

For ease of reference, the following discussion tracks the tariff language that is being adopted in MISO’s and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ respective OATTs.

**1. Section X: Preamble/Introduction**

MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have introductory discussions at the beginning of their respective presentations of the MISO-SERTP Joint Proposal that differ somewhat, but that basically state that MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors engage in interregional coordination and cost allocation. In MISO, this information is in the introductory paragraph of Section X of Attachment FF. With regard to the differences, MISO’s understanding is that the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors have adopted language in their introductory materials from the *pro forma* tariff language provided in Order No. 1000-A. For purposes of clarity, the introductory materials in both MISO’s OATT and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ OATT include language identifying what is meant by references to the

---

32 *Id.* at P 685.
33 MISO’s understanding is that for Duke, the implementing tariff language is found at Attachment N-1 MISO of Duke’s Joint OATT; for LG&E/KU, the implementing tariff language is found at Appendix 7 to Attachment K of LG&E/KU’s OATT; for OVEC, the implementing tariff language is found at Attachment M-2 of OVEC’s OATT; and for Southern Companies, the implementing tariff language is found at Attachment K-5, “Interregional Transmission Coordination Between the SERTP and MISO Regions,” of Southern Companies’ OATT.
regional transmission planning processes and regional transmission plans: namely, the regional processes and plans of MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors required by Order No. 1000.


With regard to interregional transmission coordination, Order No. 1000 states that the purpose of these requirements is to “obligate public utility transmission providers to identify and jointly evaluate interregional transmission facilities that may more efficiently or cost-effectively address the individual needs identified in their respective local and regional transmission planning processes.”

Order No. 1000 requires the public utility transmission providers in neighboring regions to engage in “joint evaluation” of proposed interregional projects and establishes “data exchange” and “transparency” requirements. These requirements, as addressed in the MISO-SERTP Joint Proposal, are captured in proposed Sections X.A through X.C and X.E of MISO’s Attachment FF.

a. Section X.A: Interregional Coordination In General

Concerning interregional coordination in general, the MISO-SERTP Joint Proposal provides at Section X.A.1 of MISO’s Attachment FF that they will meet no less than once per year to facilitate the interregional coordination procedures. Section X.A.2 provides for posting on the regions’ respective websites of information on interregional coordination, including information related to their interregional cost allocation procedures, links to where stakeholders can register in the respective regional processes, and status reports of interregional transmission projects that have been selected for Interregional CAP for purposes of the MISO and SERTP planning regions.

b. Section X.B: Model And Data Exchange

Order No. 1000 requires the adoption of interregional procedures that provide for the exchange of data and information at least once a year so that neighboring regions are aware of and are able to utilize each other’s plans, including underlying assumptions and analysis. In accordance with these requirements, Section X.B of MISO’s Attachment FF generally provides for the exchange, on at least an annual basis, of the power-flow models and associated data used in the regional planning processes, along with additional transmission-based models and data as necessary and requested. These materials will be posted upon each region’s website, consistent with applicable confidential and CEII protections, along with then-current iterations of local and regional transmission plans.

34 Order No. 1000 at P 393.
35 See e.g., id. at P 435.
36 Id. at P 454.
37 Id. at P 458.
38 Id. at P 454.
c. Section X.C: Identification And Joint Evaluation

Order No. 1000 requires the development of procedures for the joint evaluation of proposed interregional facilities so as to provide “greater certainty that the transmission facilities in each regional transmission plan are the more efficient and cost-effective solutions to meet the region’s needs.” Section X.C.1 of MISO’s Attachment FF generally provides that the public utility transmission providers in the regions will, at least biennially, review one another’s regional transmission plans, and if potentially more efficient and cost-effective interregional projects are identified through this review, then they will engage in joint evaluation of such projects. Furthermore, Section X.C.2 provides that this joint evaluation also may be triggered by stakeholders and transmission developers identifying potential interregional projects. Section X.C.3 provides that the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors and MISO will evaluate, through their respective regional processes, whether a proposed interregional project would be a more efficient and cost effective project than regional projects. As for Order No. 1000’s requirement that the parallel language include a description of the types of analysis that the regions will undertake when evaluating interregional projects, Section X.C.3 specifies that the evaluation procedures for interregional projects will be the same as the procedures used for the evaluation of regional projects pursuant to the respective regional transmission planning processes. Section X.C.4 addresses the timing of the coordination on review of proposed interregional transmission projects and provides that the regions will exchange status updates for new interregional transmission project proposals, as needed.

Order No. 1000 also directs that neighboring regions are to exert some effort “to harmonize differences in the data, models, assumptions, planning horizons, and criteria used to study a proposed transmission project.” Consistent with that requirement, Section X.C.5 also generally provides that the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors and the neighboring region will coordinate assumptions, models, and data used in joint evaluations, as necessary.

d. Sections X.A.2 And X.E: Transparency

Order No. 1000’s transparency mandate includes the requirement that a website or email list be maintained for the communication of information related to interregional transmission coordination procedures. That requirement is satisfied by the website posting requirements established in the above-described Section X.A.2 of MISO’s Attachment FF. In addition, as required by Order No. 1000, Section X.E provides that stakeholders will have an opportunity during MISO and the SERTP’s respective regional processes to provide input and feedback related to interregional facilities under consideration. Section X.E.2 also provides that status updates of proposed interregional projects will be provided to stakeholders during those regional processes.

39 Id. at P 435.
40 Id. at P 437.
41 Id. at P 345.
42 Id. at P 465.
3. Section X.D: Cost Allocation

Section X.D of MISO’s Attachment FF details the mechanics of the MISO-SERTP Joint Proposal for interregional cost allocation. As explained herein, the avoided cost allocation methodology fully complies with Order No. 1000’s interregional cost allocation requirements. MISO and the SERTP Jurisdictional Sponsors note that the agreed to approach to interregional cost allocation represents an important first-step between two neighboring transmission planning regions that historically have not had cost allocation agreements. Moreover, MISO and the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors note that they will continue to explore the development of (or the potential for) additional cost allocation methodologies that might also prove suitable and will make appropriate filings with the Commission should such efforts result in the identification of other suitable methodologies.

The MISO-SERTP Joint Proposal specifies at Section X.D.1.a of MISO’s Attachment FF the avoided cost allocation methodology criteria that must be met for an interregional project to be considered for purposes of cost allocation between the MISO and SERTP regions. The proposed project must be located in and interconnect to the two regions and must satisfy the project criteria within each region’s regional process. The latter condition reflects Order No. 1000’s requirement that interregional projects selected for cost allocation be selected in each region’s regional transmission planning process for purposes of cost allocation. In addition, Section X.D.1.a.ii provides that the transmission project proposed for Interregional CAP must satisfy a benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.25 or higher to the combined MISO and SERTP regions. This benefit-to-cost ratio is consistent with Order No. 1000’s Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3, which provides that “such a threshold may not include a ratio of benefits to costs that exceeds 1.25.” Importantly, case-by-case flexibility is provided at Section X.D.1.b should an interregional proposal not satisfy all of the criteria, provided that (among other things) the project meets the threshold criteria for a project to be included in at least one of the region’s regional transmission planning process. Section X.D.1.c provides that the project must be proposed for purposes of cost allocation in both regional transmission planning processes pursuant to the respective project submittal requirements.

Section X.D.2 documents the procedures for calculating the interregional project benefits to each region that will be used in determining the cost allocation between the MISO and SERTP regions. At a high level, Section X.D.2 provides that the costs of an interregional project selected by the two regions for purposes of interregional cost allocation will be divided between the two regions based on the ratio of each region’s benefits to the sum of the benefits identified for both regions. Section X.D.2.a provides that each region will determine whether projects in their respective regional plans would be displaced by the proposed interregional project, with Section X.D.2.b providing that each region will then calculate its benefit based upon the transmission costs that would be avoided due to its regional transmission projects being displaced by the proposed interregional project. Importantly, the benefit in Section X.D.2 is

43 See supra Section III.A.
44 Order No. 1000 at P 436.
45 Id. at P 646.
specific to only the interregional cost allocation between the MISO and SERTP for an interregional project located within both regions and is not intended to be the equivalent of any benefit calculation at purely the regional level, as the regional cost allocations may provide for other or perhaps more detailed considerations.

Section X.D.3 provides for the calculation of an interregional benefit-to-cost ratio, by dividing the summation of the present value of the avoided regional projects costs of both the MISO and SERTP by the present value of the proposed interregional transmission project’s costs.

Order No. 1000 provides that for an interregional project to be selected for Interregional CAP, it must first be selected for regional cost allocation purposes in the pertinent regions. Consistent with this requirement, Section X.D.4 provides that an interregional project proposed for Interregional CAP in both regions will be included in their respective regional plans essentially once it has been so selected through the regional planning processes for both the MISO and SERTP. Once so selected for both regional cost allocation purposes and Interregional CAP, Section X.D.5 provides that the costs of an interregional project selected by the two regions for purposes of interregional cost allocation will be divided between the two regions based on the ratio of each region’s avoided cost benefits to the sum of the benefits identified for both regions as calculated in Section X.D.2. Costs allocated to a region will then be further allocated within the region based upon its regional processes.

Consistent with Order No. 1000’s holdings regarding project milestones, Section X.D.6 provides for MISO, the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors that are allocated costs of a project for Interregional CAP, and the developer to establish project milestones, with the project potentially being removed from the regional plans should such milestones not be met. One of the milestones referenced is for the execution of a mutually agreeable contract between MISO, the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors that are allocated costs of a project for Interregional CAP, and the project developer. In particular, Section X.D.7 identifies some of the terms and conditions that such a contract would need to address. In this regard, this proposal is different than the contractual-related requirement the Commission addressed in South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., 143 FERC ¶ 61,058 (2013) (“SCE&G”), where the Commission required the adoption of a pro forma contract. Specifically, while the SCE&G order involved instances where a contract was required for a project selected for purposes of cost allocation, the contract referenced in Section X.D.7 is only one of the many different milestones that would need to be achieved in accordance with the milestone provisions in Section X.D.6. Accordingly, the contract referenced in Section X.D.7 is merely an acknowledgement of some of the implementation steps required in order to move the project from “selected for purposes of cost allocation” to actually being constructed. Any requirement to develop pro forma language, as the Commission required in the SCE&G order, would be inappropriate and premature for such a proposed milestone. Indeed, it would be dramatically premature, at this stage, to require the public utility transmission providers in separate (but neighboring) regions to have to develop a single, pro forma contract.
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that could apply to any and all projects that could be selected between the two regions for purposes of cost allocation, as the specific provisions of any contract would necessarily have to be developed with an eye towards the specific project at issue and specific considerations for each region.

Lastly, Section X.D.8 provides that a transmission project selected for Interregional CAP may be removed from the regional transmission plans if the developer fails to meet developmental deadlines or if the project is otherwise removed from a regional transmission plan pursuant to that region’s regional transmission planning process.

IV. Supporting Documents

In addition to this Transmittal Letter, the following documents are being submitted with this filing:

Tab A – Redlined Version of Tariff Sheets
Tab B – Clean Version of Tariff Sheets
Tab C – Table of MISO’s Order No. 1000 Interregional Stakeholder Meetings

V. Proposed Effective Date And Request For Extended Comment Period

A. Requested Effective Date

In their respective Order No. 1000 interregional compliance filings being submitted concurrent with the instant filing, MISO understands that the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors are requesting an effective date of January 1, 2015 for the interregional coordination and cost allocation procedures proposed with their neighboring transmission planning regions, i.e., one transmission planning cycle subsequent to their regional planning processes becoming effective. The Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors assume that their regional planning proposals will become effective January 1, 2014, meaning that they expect their interregional proposals to become effective January 1, 2015. As such, given the concurrent and joint nature of the MISO and Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors’ interregional coordination and cost allocation proposal as discussed herein, MISO similarly requests that the Tariff revisions proposed in this filing become effective on January 1, 2015.

B. Request For Extended Comment Period

In addition, the MISO respectfully requests that the Commission provide an extended period for parties to file comments on this filing until September 9, 2013. Given the complexity, extent, and importance of the changes proposed to MISO’s Tariff (and the changes MISO understands will be concurrently proposed to the tariffs of the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors),

47 MISO has highlighted in yellow the language that is currently pending before the Commission in separate, unrelated dockets.
MISO believes an extended comment period is appropriate to permit all interested parties adequate opportunity to analyze and submit comments on the proposed changes to MISO’s Tariff (as well as the changes MISO understands will be concurrently proposed to the tariffs of the Jurisdictional SERTP Sponsors).

VI. Correspondence And Communications

Correspondence and communications with respect to this filing should be sent to the following persons, who shall also be authorized to receive notice in this docket:

Matthew R. Dorsett*  
Attorney  
Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.  
P.O. Box 4202  
Carmel, IN 46082-4202  
Telephone: 317-249-5299  
Fax: 317-249-5912  
mdorsett@misoenergy.org

Daniel M. Malabonga*  
Sejal C. Shah  
Venable LLP  
575 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202-344-4508  
Fax: 202-344-8300  
dmmalabonga@venable.com

*Person authorized to receive official service.

VII. Notice And Service

MISO notes that it has served a copy of this filing electronically, including attachments, upon all persons listed on the Commission’s service list for the above-referenced proceeding, Tariff Customers, MISO Members, Member representatives of Transmission Owners and Non-Transmission Owners, MISO Advisory Committee participants, as well as all state commissions within the Region, and the Organization of MISO States. In addition, the filing has been posted at https://www.midwestiso.org/Library/FERCFilingsOrders/Pages/FERCFilings.aspx, on MISO’s website, for other interested parties in this matter.
VIII. Conclusion

MISO respectfully requests that the Commission accept this filing, and the proposed revisions to MISO’s Tariff as compliant with the interregional coordination and cost allocation requirements of Order Nos. 1000, 1000-A, and 1000-B, as discussed above.

Sincerely,

/s/ Matthew R. Dorsett
Matthew R. Dorsett
Attorney
Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.

/s/ Daniel M. Malabonga
Daniel M. Malabonga
Sejal C. Shah
Venable LLP

Attorneys for MISO
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Redlined Tariff Sheets
ATTACHMENT FF Transmission Expansion Planning Protocol

Version: 13.12.0.0 Effective: 6/1/2015

ATTACHMENT FF

TRANSMISSION EXPANSION PLANNING PROTOCOL

I. Transmission Expansion Plan - Purpose and Scope, Definition and Role of OMS Committee: This Attachment FF describes the process to be used by the Transmission Provider to develop the MISO Transmission Expansion Plan (“MTEP”), subject to review and approval by the Transmission Provider Board. The provisions of this Attachment FF are consistent with the applicable provisions of Appendix B of the ISO Agreement and this Tariff. For purposes of this Attachment FF, all references to Transmission Owner(s) will include ITC(s). The costs incurred by the Transmission Provider in the performance of data collection, analyses and review, and in the development of the MTEP report, costs incurred under Section I.B of this Attachment FF, and costs incurred under Section I.C of this Attachment FF shall be recovered from all Transmission Customers under Schedule 10 of the Tariff.

A. Enrollment Process: The MTEP is developed to facilitate the timely and orderly expansion of and/or modification to the Transmission System to maintain reliability, promote efficiency in bulk power markets and facilitate compliance with applicable Federal and state laws, regulatory mandates and regulatory obligations. Any transmission provider that wishes to enroll in the Transmission Provider planning process for purposes of Order No. 1000 compliance must become a Transmission Owner, by signing the ISO Agreement, and by, within a reasonable period of time: (1) turning over functional control of its transmission facilities to the Transmission Provider; and (2) taking service under this Tariff for all its load that is physically located within the geographic area comprising the Transmission System. All Transmission
Owners enrolled in the Transmission Provider’s transmission planning region are listed in either
(1) Attachment FF-4 of this Tariff, for Transmission Owners without a separately filed local
planning process or (2) Attachment FF-5 of this Tariff, for Transmission Owners with a
separately filed local planning process.

B. **OMS Committee Input to MTEP Process:** To the extent not otherwise
specifically addressed in other portions of this Attachment FF, with respect to the MTEP process,
the OMS Committee may provide input to the Transmission Provider planning staff and the
System Planning Committee of the Transmission Provider Board, as appropriate, regarding the
following:

1. At the start of a planning cycle, the OMS Committee may suggest to the
   Transmission Provider Board modifications to the Transmission Provider’s
   planning principles and planning objectives for that planning cycle;

2. At the start of a planning cycle, the OMS Committee may suggest additional
   scope elements in the MTEP;

3. Modeling inputs or assumptions used in the development of the MTEP and related
   appropriate cost/benefit analyses with respect to certain projects that are not
   proposed strictly for reliability; and

4. Concerns about general or specific issues with the MTEP process as they arise
   during the planning year.

Furthermore, at the end of the MTEP development process, but before the MTEP is submitted to
the Transmission Provider Board for its review, the OMS Committee may submit a
reconsideration request to the Transmission Provider planning staff, which shall respond prior to
submitting the final MTEP report to the Transmission Provider Board. This reconsideration request can be made only with respect to Network Upgrades eligible to receive regional cost allocation under Attachment FF if such projects: (1) will be recommended to the Transmission Provider Board for MTEP Appendix A approval, but have not been considered through the complete MTEP process or (2) will have a change in project cost of twenty-five percent (25%) or greater between the final Subregional Planning Meeting in the current planning year and the project being submitted to the Transmission Provider Board for approval. The Transmission Provider shall consider such a reconsideration request only if it is endorsed by the OMS acting by a vote of sixty-six percent (66%) or more of the OMS members.

At the end of each MTEP cycle, the OMS Committee may submit its assessment of the MTEP process to the Planning Advisory Committee, Transmission Provider, and the System Planning Committee of the Transmission Provider Board. Upon receipt of any such assessment from the OMS Committee, the Transmission Provider planning staff shall provide an appropriate response in a reasonably timely manner.

The manner in which the OMS Committee shall provide its assessment shall be set forth in the Transmission Planning Business Practices Manual procedures. The general procedures adopted with respect to the OMS Committee input into the MTEP shall remain unchanged until June 1, 2015, unless otherwise mutually agreed to by the Transmission Provider and the OMS Committee. Changes to the Transmission Planning Business Practices Manual procedures which describe OMS Committee input into the MTEP process may not be adopted with less than sixty (60) days’ notice to the OMS Committee unless the OMS Committee consents to such earlier
adoption. At the end of the two year period the Transmission Provider, the OMS, and other stakeholders will assess the success of the input procedures and provide suggestions for improvement.

C. Development of the MTEP: The Transmission Provider, working in collaboration with representatives of the Transmission Owners, OMS, and the Planning Advisory Committee, shall develop the MTEP, consistent with Good Utility Practice and taking into consideration long-range planning horizons, as appropriate. The Transmission Provider shall develop the MTEP for expected use patterns and analyze the performance of the Transmission System in meeting both reliability needs and the needs of the competitive bulk power market, under a wide variety of contingency conditions. The MTEP will give full consideration to the needs of all Market Participants, will include consideration of demand-side options, and will identify expansions or enhancements needed to i) support competition and efficiency in bulk power markets; ii) comply with Applicable Laws and Regulations; and iii) maintain reliability. This analysis and planning process shall integrate into the development of the MTEP among other things:

(i) the Transmission Issues identified from Facilities Studies carried out in connection with specific transmission service requests; (ii) Transmission Issues associated with generator interconnection service; (iii) the Transmission Issues, including proposed transmission projects, identified by the Transmission Owners in connection with their planning analyses in accordance with local planning process described in Section I.B.1.a to this Attachment FF and the coordination processes of Section I.B.1.b., or developed by Transmission Owners utilizing their own FERC-approved local transmission planning process described in Section I.B.2, as applicable, to provide reliable power supply to their
connected load customers and to expand trading opportunities, better integrate the grid and alleviate congestion; (iv) the transmission planning obligations of a Transmission Owner, imposed by federal or state law(s) or regulatory authorities, which can no longer be performed solely by the Transmission Owner following transfer of functional control of its transmission facilities to the Transmission Provider; (v) plans and analyses developed by the Transmission Provider to provide for a reliable Transmission System and to expand trading opportunities, better integrate the grid and alleviate congestion; (vi) the identification, evaluation, and analysis of expansions to enable the Transmission System to fully support the simultaneous feasibility of all State 1A ARRs; (vii) the inputs provided by the Planning Advisory Committee; (viii) the inputs, if any, provided by the state and local regulatory authorities having jurisdiction over any of the Transmission Owners; and (ix) the inputs of the OMS Committee.

1. Planning Cycle and Milestones: The ISO Agreement requires that a regional transmission plan be developed biennially or more frequently. An MTEP planning cycle is established for each calendar year. The development of the MTEP for a planning cycle with a given calendar year designation begins on June 1 of the year prior to the MTEP calendar year designation and ends with the approval of the final MTEP report by the Transmission Provider Board. This approval typically occurs at the Transmission Provider Board Meeting in December of the MTEP designated year. For example, the development of the MTEP14 transmission plan will commence on June 1 of 2013 and typically end with approval in December 2014. The development of the MTEP will follow specified process steps that are detailed, including process diagrams, in the Transmission Provider’s Transmission Planning Business Practices Manual (“TPBPM”).
The TPBPM shall be posted on the website of the Transmission Provider.

a. Planning Functions: The planning process includes the following functions which are described in detail in the TPBPM:

i. Model Development;

ii. Generator Interconnection Planning;

iii. Transmission Service Planning;

iv. Cyclical Regional Expansion Planning activities;

v. Coordinated System Plans with other RTOs/regions;

vi. System Support Resource (“SSR”) Studies for unit decommissioning;

vii. Transmission-to-Transmission Interconnections;

viii. Load Interconnections; and

ix. Focus Studies. These are studies initiated during the cyclical baseline planning process that cannot be delayed until the next planning cycle (for example, NERC/FERC directives, or near-term critical operational issues).

Each of these planning functions may develop system expansions that are taken into consideration in developing the entirety of the MTEP.

b. Planning Cycle: The regional planning process is performed through a continuous series of planning cycles, with each cycle typically addressing Transmission Issues through a rolling planning horizon. Each cycle commences with regional model development, and identification of potential expansions from the local planning processes of the Transmission Owners, and concludes with recommendations to the Transmission
Provider Board of Directors of recommended solutions to identified Transmission Issues. Transmission Owner plans developed through local planning processes described in Section I.B.1.a are included in the beginning of each regional planning cycle as potential alternatives to local Transmission Issues identified by the Transmission Owners. The regional planning process evaluates, with stakeholder input throughout the cycle, the local plans of the Transmission Owners, as one input to the development of the regional plan. Key milestones in the typical MTEP development process are listed below and requirements and timelines for data submittal, review, and comment at each of these milestone points are described in the TPBPM:

i. Model development;

ii. Testing models against applicable planning criteria;

iii. Development of possible solutions to identified Transmission Issues;

iv. Selection of preferred solution;

v. Determination of funding and cost responsibility; and

vi. Monitoring progress on solution implementation.

The Transmission Provider shall address each of these milestones throughout the planning cycle through Sub-regional Planning Meetings, Planning Subcommittee and Planning Advisory Committee meetings.

2. Stakeholders Input in Planning Process: The Transmission Provider shall facilitate discussions with its Transmission Customers, Transmission Owners, OMS Committee, and other stakeholders about the Transmission Issues and solutions involving both transferred and non-transferred facilities, as described in Section I.B.1 of this
Attachment FF.
These discussions will take place at Sub-regional Planning Meetings and at regularly scheduled meetings of the Transmission Provider’s Planning Subcommittee, at locations provided by the Transmission Provider and with communication capabilities for those participants unable to have in person representation at these meetings. Once the MTEP report for a specific planning cycle has been completed but prior to recommendation to the Transmission Provider Board for approval, the Transmission Provider shall seek feedback on the proposed MTEP, including Network Upgrades recommended for approval, from the Transmission Provider’s stakeholders and the OMS Committee.

a. Planning Advisory Committee (“PAC”): The Planning Advisory Committee is a standing committee reporting to the Transmission Provider’s Advisory Committee, and functions subject to the Stakeholder Governance Guide developed by the Stakeholder Governance Working Group, as approved by the Advisory Committee. The PAC is responsible for addressing planning policy issues of importance to stakeholders and within the responsibilities of the Transmission Provider. The PAC charter is maintained on the Transmission Provider’s website.

b. Planning Subcommittee (“PS”): The Planning Subcommittee is a standing stakeholder-chaired subcommittee of the Planning Advisory Committee, and functions subject to the Stakeholder Governance Guide developed by the Stakeholder Governance Working Group, as approved by the Advisory Committee. Planning Subcommittee membership is open to interested parties, including, but not limited to: transmission delivery service and interconnection
service customers, marketers, developers, Transmission Owners, state and local regulatory authorities, federal regulatory staff, other Market Participants, and all interested parties. The charter for the committee is developed by stakeholders and is maintained on the Transmission Provider’s website. The Transmission Provider will seek guidance from Transmission Owners, state and local regulatory authorities, and other stakeholders through the Planning Subcommittee and/or the Planning Advisory Committee prior to the beginning of each new planning cycle. Guidance will include the scope of planning studies to be undertaken, the development of future scenarios to be modeled and analyzed in long-term planning studies, and the development of suitable models and assumptions to support such studies. The Transmission Provider will also seek guidance from Transmission Owners, state and local regulatory authorities, and other stakeholders through the Planning Subcommittee and/or the Planning Advisory Committee prior to implementing changes or revisions to the scope, models, and assumptions during the planning cycle. The Planning Subcommittee and/or the Planning Advisory Committee may form working groups at the discretion of stakeholders to perform specific tasks supporting the planning processes, such as model development and detail review of study results and draft plan reports.

c. Sub-regional Planning Meetings (“SPMs”): The Transmission Provider shall utilize SPMs to provide opportunity for Transmission Owners, state and local regulatory authorities, and other stakeholders to provide input to the planning process, and to carry out the tasks of coordinating transmission plans among the Transmission Owners. Input and planned coordination may occur
through the use of existing sub-regional planning groups (“SPGs”) where they exist, or through the establishment of new sub-regional meeting forums. One or more SPMs will be used or established for each of the four regional Planning Sub-regions of the Transmission Provider. Planning Sub-regions shall be defined based upon the Transmission Provider Planning Sub-regions: West, Central, South, and East as defined in Attachment FF-3.

i) SPM Participants: Participants at an SPM will consist of representatives of the Transmission Owners operating within the associated Planning Sub-region that integrate their local planning processes with the regional process, representatives from state and local regulatory authorities, and any other parties interested in or impacted by the planning process. For those Transmission Owners engaged in local planning under their own FERC approved local planning processes, such Transmission Owners shall participate in the SPM in order to coordinate their planning activities.

Neighboring transmission-owning utilities and regulatory participants are eligible and encouraged to participate in the SPM to promote joint planning between the Transmission Provider and neighboring transmission systems.

ii) SPM Guidelines. The Sub-regional Planning Meeting participants shall:

(a) Make recommendations for a coordinated sub-regional Plan, after considering sub-regional and regional needs and
alternatives, for the ensuing ten years, for all transmission facilities in the sub-region;

(b) Review and comment on proposed Transmission Owners plans identified in local planning processes described in Section I.B.1.a. of this Attachment FF, for additions and modifications to the sub-regional transmission system, as potential solutions to identify Transmission Issues and review the transmission plans developed by those Transmission Owners that have their own FERC-approved local planning process (described in Section I.B.2) to ensure coordination of the projects set forth in such plans with the potential regional planning solutions developed in the SPM process consistent with the requirements of Appendix B of the Transmission Owners’ Agreement;

(c) Form technical study task forces as required to carry out the sub-regional planning responsibilities;

(d) Encourage non-Transmission Provider member participation to improve understanding by the SPM participants, the Planning Subcommittee, and the Transmission Provider staff of facility changes outside the Transmission Provider Region to ensure the impact of such changes are considered in the planning studies;

(f) Promote other stakeholder (i.e., environmental agencies, and load and generation developers) involvement in development
of the sub-regional plans.

(g) Recommend to the Planning Subcommittee proposed sub-regional plans to be included in the MTEP. In addition, the transmission projects developed by any Transmission Owner or Owners utilizing the provisions of their own FERC-approved local planning process shall be submitted for inclusion in the regional MTEP after being evaluated by the Transmission Provider in the regional evaluation of SPMs in accordance with Appendix B of the Transmission Owners’ Agreement in determining the Transmission Provider’s recommendation for inclusion in the MTEP.

(h) Reflect, as desired, minority opinions to the Transmission Provider or the Planning Subcommittee.

i) SPM Frequency, Location and Agenda: SPMs should meet at least two times per year or as otherwise provided for in the TPBPM, to provide input in the planning process, review plans and recommend changes, if any, needed to address stakeholder needs and to coordinate proposed plans.

Meetings involving CEII or confidential materials shall be handled under Section I.A.12 of this Attachment FF.

3. Meeting Notifications: Notice shall be provided by way of email exploder lists distribution by the Transmission Provider of all SPMs, Planning Subcommittee, and Planning Advisory Committee meetings. These email exploder lists are established and
maintained by the Transmission Provider and it is the responsibility of stakeholders to have registered as described on the Transmission Provider website. Meeting dates, times, locations, and materials will also be posted on the meeting calendar page of the Transmission Provider’s website. Meeting notification guidelines are set forth in the stakeholder developed Stakeholder Governance Guidelines.

4. Other Meeting Schedules: Planning Subcommittee meetings are regularly scheduled meetings that occur no less than bimonthly. Annual meeting schedules and objectives are developed at the December meeting each year for the subsequent year. Planning Advisory Committee meetings are scheduled as per the PAC Charter.

5. Planning Criteria: The Transmission Provider shall evaluate the system to address Transmission Issues in a manner consistent with the ISO Agreement and this Attachment FF. Projects included in the MTEP may be based upon any applicable planning criteria, including accepted NERC reliability standards and reliability standards adopted by Regional Entities, local planning reliability or economic planning criteria of the Transmission Owner, or required by State or local authorities, and any economic or other planning criteria or metrics defined in this Attachment FF. Transmission Owners are required to annually provide updated copies of local planning criteria for posting on the Transmission Provider’s website.

The Transmission Provider will post on its website an explanation of which transmission needs driven by public policy requirements will be evaluated for potential solutions in the local or regional transmission planning process, as well as an explanation of why other suggested potential transmission needs will not be evaluated.

6. Planning Analysis Methods: Planning analyses performed by the Transmission
Provider will test the Transmission System under a wide variety of conditions as described in Section II and using standard industry applications to model steady state power flow, angular and voltage stability, short-circuit, and economic parameters, as determined appropriate by the Transmission Provider to be compliant with applicable criteria and this Tariff.

7. Planning Models: The Transmission Provider shall collaborate with Transmission Owners, other transmission providers, Transmission Customers, and other stakeholders to develop appropriate planning models that reflect expected system conditions for the planning horizon. The planning models shall reflect the projected Load growth of existing Network Customers and other transmission service and interconnection commitments. The models shall include any transmission projects identified in Service Agreements or Interconnection Agreements that are entered into in association with requests for transmission delivery service or interconnection service, as determined in Facilities Studies associated with such requests. Load forecasts applied to models will consider the forecast Load of Network Customers reported to the Transmission Provider in accordance with the requirements of Module B and RAR of this Tariff, and the Business Practices Manuals of the Transmission Provider. Models will be posted on an FTP site maintained by the Transmission Provider and accessible to stakeholders with security measures as provided for in the TPBPM. The Transmission Provider will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to review and comment on the posted models before commencing planning studies.

The schedules for such reviews are maintained in the TPBPM. Stakeholders shall be afforded opportunities to provide input on Load projections from Tariff reporting
requirements or from Transmission Owner forecasts. After the base line forecast and
model are established, the Transmission Provider and/or Transmission Owners may
adjust the forecast as necessary on an ad hoc basis throughout the planning year to
address customer requests for new Load interconnections arising from on-going dialogue
with existing and prospective customers.

8. Planning Assumptions: Each MTEP report shall list in detail the planning
assumptions upon which the analyses are based. In general, planning analyses will be
based on the following:

a. Planning Horizons: The MTEP will identify Transmission Issues for a
minimum planning horizon of five years and a maximum planning horizon of
twenty years.

b. Load: Load demand will generally be modeled by the Transmission
Provider as the most probable ("50/50") coincident Load projection for each
Transmission Owner’s service territory, for the season under study. Specific
studies may model alternative Load probabilities or peak Load for areas within a
Transmission Owner’s service territory as dictated by operational and planning
experience and/or local planning criteria, but in any case shall be treated
consistently in the planning for native Load and transmission access requests.

c. Generation: Planning models of five years or longer will model
generation, taking into consideration applicable planning reserve requirements,
that are: (i) existing and expected to be in existence in the planning horizon; (ii)
not existing but with executed interconnection agreements; and (iii) additional
generation as determined with stakeholder input, as necessary to adequately and
efficiently meet demand forecasted through the planning horizon and to facilitate compliance with statutory or regulatory mandates. The Transmission Provider shall apply a scenario analysis to determine alternative future generation portfolio possibilities.

Generation portfolio development for planning model purposes will be developed with input from the Planning Advisory Committee and its subcommittees, working groups, and task forces. Point-To-Point Transmission Service and Network Integration Transmission Service customers will have an opportunity to guide new generation portfolio development that is reflective of customer future resource plans.

d. Demand Response Resources: Planning solutions will be based upon the best available information regarding the expected amount and location of Load that can be effectively and efficiently reduced by demand response or energy efficiency programs, as well as the amount of behind-the-meter generation that can reliably be expected to produce Energy that could impact planning solutions. The Transmission Provider shall perform and report on sensitivity analyses that indicate the effectiveness of potential demand response as alternative planning solutions, to the extent that appropriate methodology for such analyses is developed with stakeholders and documented in the TPBPM.

e. Topology: Each planning study will use the best known topology based upon the most recently approved MTEP. Planning studies will include all projects approved by the Transmission Provider Board, and shall identify, as appropriate, and as detailed in the TPBPM, any system needs already identified in
the most recent approved MTEP.

9. Evaluation of Alternatives: When the planning analyses, based on the foregoing principles, identifies Transmission Issues, the Transmission Provider will consider the inputs from stakeholders derived from the SPM processes, the inputs from the Planning Subcommittee and the Planning Advisory Committee, the plans of any Transmission Owner with its own FERC-approved local planning process, and the MTEP aggregate system analyses against applicable planning criteria, in determining the solutions to be included in the MTEP and recommended to the Transmission Provider Board for implementation.

10. Facility Design: Facility design and system configuration (such as conductor sizes, transformer design, bus configuration, protection schemes) are selected by the Transmission Owner, and must be consistently applied by the Transmission Owner for comparable system service conditions. Comparable application of system design does not preclude the consideration or selection of advanced or alternative transmission technology. For New Transmission Facilities associated with Open Transmission Projects, the Transmission Provider may provide limitations or requirements regarding facility design when necessary due to a planning driver or to ensure compatibility with existing transmission facilities to which the New Transmission Facilities will interconnect as further described in Section VIII.D of this Attachment FF.

11. Status of Recommended Facilities: Upon solicitation from the Transmission Provider and upon reaching pre-designated milestones in the project implementation process, the responsible Transmission Owner or Selected Transmission Developer shall report the status of all projects recommended for implementation in the MTEP. Status
reports shall, at a minimum, include: (i) changes to the schedule and to the estimated project cost; (ii) an explanation of the causes of, or reasons for, any such changes; and (iii) changes in project status (i.e., under construction, in service, or withdrawn). The Transmission Provider shall report such progress to the Transmission Provider Board on a quarterly basis, or as otherwise directed by the Transmission Provider Board.

Status of Developer Qualifications: Upon solicitation from the Transmission Provider and upon reaching pre-designated milestones in the project implementation process, Selected Transmission Developers shall report the following: (i) changes to the developer qualifications, as defined in the Binding Proposal Agreement, including changes in the developer constructing the project; (ii) an explanation of the causes of, or reasons for, such changes; and (iii) an assessment of the impact of the changes on the project. The Transmission Provider shall report such changes and any impact to the Transmission Provider Board on a quarterly basis, or as otherwise directed by the Transmission Provider Board.

12. Treatment of Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (“CEII”) and Confidential Data: The Transmission Provider shall utilize a Non-Disclosure and Confidentiality Agreement (“NDA”) to address sharing of CEII transmission planning information. FTP sites containing such information will require such agreements to be executed in order to obtain access to those sites. Stakeholder meetings at which CEII may be available shall be noticed to email exploders and shall require execution of NDAs prior to participation in such meetings. In the alternative, such meetings will be structured to have separate discussion of issues involving CEII data only with participants that agree to execute the NDA. Confidential information related to economic (e.g., congestion) studies, as well as
CEII, is clearly sensitive information which must remain confidential. The Transmission Provider shall use generic, publicly available, cost information from industry sources in the economic studies to prevent the accidental release of confidential information. This approach will promote an open planning process because the results of economic studies are available to all interested parties.

13. Resolution of Stakeholder Input: The Transmission Provider shall solicit input and comments from all stakeholders, including Transmission Owners, during and after stakeholder planning meetings, and will use reasonable efforts to reply to comments that the Transmission Provider does not elect to implement, together with reasons for such actions. The Transmission Provider shall develop a process for the documentation and resolution of stakeholder issues raised in the planning process, including but not limited to issues related to planning criteria.

14. Dispute resolution: Consistent with Attachment HH of this Tariff, the Transmission Provider shall resolve disputes concerning MTEP issues. The first step will be for designated representatives of the affected parties to work together to resolve the relevant issues in a manner that is acceptable to all parties. If that step is unsuccessful, each affected party shall designate an officer who shall review disputes involving them that their designated representatives are unable to resolve. The applicable officers of the parties involved in such dispute shall work together to resolve the disputes so referred in a manner that meets the interests of such parties, either until such agreement is reached, or until an impasse is declared by any party to such dispute. If such officers are unable to satisfactorily resolve the issues, the matter shall be referred to mediation. Parties that are not satisfied with the dispute resolution procedures may only file a complaint with the
Commission during the negotiation or mediation steps.

If a matter remains unresolved, the affected parties may pursue arbitration.

D. **Project Coordination:** In the course of the MTEP process, the Transmission Provider shall seek out opportunities to coordinate or consolidate, where possible, individually defined transmission projects into more comprehensive cost-effective developments subject to the limitations imposed by prior commitments and lead-time constraints. The Transmission Provider shall coordinate with Transmission Owners, and shall consider the input from the SPMs, Planning Subcommittee, and Planning Advisory Committee to develop expansion plans to meet the needs of the system. This multi-party collaborative process will allow for all projects with regional and inter-regional impact to be analyzed for their combined effects on the Transmission System. Moreover, this collaborative process is designed to ensure that the MTEP address Transmission Issues within the applicable planning horizon in the most efficient and cost effective manner, while giving consideration to the inputs from all stakeholders. In addition to the requirements of this Attachment FF, there may be state or local procedural requirements applicable to the planning or siting of transmission facilities by the Transmission Owners. A current list of those requirements can be found on the Transmission Provider’s website.

1. **Transmission Owners Electing to Integrate their Local Planning Processes into the Transmission Provider’s Processes:** Some Transmission Owners have agreed to integrate internal planning process with the Transmission Provider’s open and coordinated planning processes for all of their transmission facilities to comply with Order 890 Planning Principles instead of filing a separate Attachment K. Through this election, the local planning for all transmission facilities of these Transmission Owners, regardless of whether the facilities are ultimately transferred to the functional control of the
Transmission Provider, shall be integrated with and included in the regional planning processes of the Transmission Provider. These regional planning processes, as provided for in this Attachment FF and in additional detail in the TPBPM, ensure that the planning decisions for all such facilities are made in an open and transparent environment. This planning environment provides opportunity for input from, and review by, stakeholders of the Open Access Transmission Tariff services throughout the planning process, and is in accordance with the Planning Principles of the Order 890 Final Rule. The open and transparent planning provisions of this Attachment FF shall not preclude interaction between stakeholders and Transmission Owners prior to the submittal of proposed projects to the regional planning process.

Transmission Owners integrating local planning processes into the regional planning processes are listed in Attachment FF-4. Such Transmission Owners shall be responsible for providing the Transmission Provider with sufficient information regarding all planning activities to enable the Transmission Provider to adequately review and incorporate all of the Transmission Owner’s transmission facilities into the regional planning process of the Transmission Provider, as described in Sections I.B.1.a. and I.B.1.b. of this Attachment FF.

The foregoing Transmission Owners will utilize the planning stakeholder forums of the Transmission Provider to demonstrate the need for, identify the alternatives to, and report the status of non-transferred transmission facilities using the same open, transparent and coordinated planning process provided by the Transmission Provider for transferred facilities as described in this Attachment FF.

a. Local Planning Processes of Transmission Owners: In accordance with
the ISO Agreement, each Transmission Owner engages in local system planning in order to carry out its responsibility for meeting its respective transmission needs in collaboration with the Transmission Provider subject to the requirements of applicable state law or regulatory authority. In meeting its responsibilities under the ISO Agreement, the Transmission Owners may, as appropriate, develop and propose plans involving modifications to any of the Transmission Owner’s transmission facilities which are part of the Transmission System. The Transmission Owners shall include the following specific local planning steps in order to develop plans for potential inclusion in the regional plan, in accordance with the annual regional planning process as described in Section I.B.1.b. of this Attachment FF, and in accordance with the regional planning principles of Section I.A of this Attachment. In addition to the local planning steps below, Transmission Owners shall adhere to any applicable state or local regulatory planning processes.

i. Define local study area and study horizon;

ii. Develop appropriate power system models;
   a) Utilize existing NERC or Transmission Provider cases to model external systems;
   b) Insert detailed model of Transmission Owner system if required;
   c) Insert updated detailed models of neighboring system models if required; and
   d) Verify model topology and generation.

iii. Update loads (spatial and magnitude) in study area;
   a) Review historical MW and MVAR data to develop growth trends;
b) Obtain Load forecasts from customers in study area; and
c) Obtain input from local distribution planners in the study area.

iv. Perform contingency analysis using applicable Transmission Owner planning criteria;
v. Identify any violations to planning criteria for each of study period;
vi. Develop alternative solutions to the criteria violations and test against the planning criteria;

a) Obtain cost estimates for each alternative and perform economic analyses; and
b) Determine non-cost attributes of each alternative such as operating flexibility, robustness, among others.

vii. Select alternative based on cost and non-cost attributes;
viii. Submit proposed solution and list of alternatives and assumptions to the Transmission Provider;

ix. Participate in stakeholder evaluations and discussions as a part of annual regional plan development process;
x. Perform additional analysis as required based on feedback from stakeholder groups (SPM/PS) in the regional planning process;

xi. Submit results of additional analysis (if performed) to the Transmission Provider for further discussion with stakeholders (SPM/PS);
xii. Consider regional planning process results, including stakeholder feedback on needs, proposed solutions, and alternatives, in determining whether or not to proceed with implementation of Transmission Owner proposed expansions; and
xiii. Post the planning criteria and assumptions, and power flow models used in development of each Transmission Owner’s current local planning proposal in accordance with Section I.B.1.b below. To the extent that the Transmission Owner uses the MISO MTEP models in developing its list of newly proposed projects, the Transmission Owner shall indicate as per Section I.B.1.b. below, the associated MTEP model used.

The Transmission Provider will maintain a link to applicable MTEP models on its website together with instructions for accessing such models consistent with CEII criteria and suitable non-disclosure agreements. In the event that the Transmission Owner applies its own power flow models in developing its proposed local plans, the Transmission Owner shall provide such models to the Transmission Provider for posting, or shall provide to the Transmission Provider a link to the location of such Transmission Owner model(s) and to instructions for accessing such models consistent with the Transmission Owner’s CEII and non-disclosure requirements. Transmission Provider shall post on its website links to such postings on Transmission Owner’s website.

b. Integration of Local Planning Processes of Transmission Owners: Transmission Owners listed on Attachment FF-4 as integrating local planning processes with those of the Transmission Provider, shall integrate proposals for transmission expansions into the regional planning process as follows. Each Transmission Owner shall submit its proposals for transmission plans to the Transmission Provider prior to the start of each regional planning cycle. Each Transmission Owner’s local plan, which consists of a list of proposed projects, shall be made available on the Transmission Provider’s website for
review by the PAC, the PS, and the SPM participants, subject to CEII and the confidentiality provisions in this Attachment FF. Such local plans shall be posted by September 15 each year in order to provide time for written comments by stakeholders.

In addition to the list of proposed projects, each Transmission Owner submitting newly proposed projects by September 15 in any MTEP annual cycle shall provide to the Transmission Provider by June 1 of the same year identification of any MISO base power flow model used by the Transmission Owner in support of the identification of the list of proposed projects to be subsequently posted in September, or in the event that the Transmission Owner uses a non-MISO base power flow model in support of the identification of the list of proposed projects the Transmission Owner shall provide to the Transmission Provider such base power flow model or a link to the power flow model and assumptions used.

Each Transmission Owner’s local planning model and associated assumptions shall be accessible on or through a link on the Transmission Provider’s website for review, subject to CEII and the confidentiality provisions in this Attachment FF and consistent with section I.B.1.a. In the event that the Transmission Owner uses a non-MISO base power flow model, the Transmission Owner shall provide for posting updates if there are significant changes in the model by July 15, August 15, and September 15 of each year.

Comments by stakeholders on the local planning models and assumptions that are provided to the Transmission Provider SPM Planning Contact by July 1, or August 1 or September 1 with respect to updates, shall be forwarded to the applicable Transmission Owner by July 8, August 8, or September 8, respectively. The Transmission Provider shall address any unresolved stakeholder issues through the SPM process.
Each Transmission Owner shall also provide to the Transmission Provider by June 1 of each year any updates to the posted transmission planning criteria, or a notification that the posted documents have not changed. In the event a Transmission Owner has additional significant updates to the posted transmission planning criteria, the Transmission Owner shall provide such updates for posting by July 15, August 15, and September 15 of each year.

The Transmission Provider shall post on its website the lists of newly proposed projects, criteria and assumptions, and supporting base power flow models or links to supporting base power flow models, as provided by the Transmission Owners. Initial comments by stakeholders to the proposed projects should be provided to the Transmission Provider SPM Planning Contact 45 days after the posting of local plans otherwise comments may be made pursuant to Section I.A.2.c.ii. The Transmission Provider SPM Planning Contact shall be identified on the Transmission Provider’s web site page devoted to Expansion Planning. The Transmission Provider shall provide to the applicable Transmission Owner within five working days of receipt, a copy of all stakeholder comments received within 45 days of the posted information regarding Transmission Owner planning criteria and assumptions, models applied, and list of proposed projects. The Transmission Provider shall address any unresolved stakeholder issues through the SPM process. Each Transmission Owner must participate in SPMs in the respective Planning sub-region as indicated in the Transmission Providers meeting schedule. Such SPMs shall provide input to and review of the results of the needs assessments and adequacy of plans proposed by the Transmission Owners, or by stakeholders to the planning process, or by the Transmission Provider, to best meet the needs of the sub-
region.

Transmission Owners identified in Attachment FF-4, must submit to the Transmission Provider, on an annual basis and at a time to be determined by the Transmission Provider, which shall be prior to the beginning of each regional planning cycle, all proposed transmission plans for both transferred and non-transferred transmission facilities. The submitted projects of such Transmission Owners shall be considered potential alternatives to system needs identified, and as such must be submitted when initially identified as a potential system solution, in order to permit the evaluation of such projects along with other potential alternatives that may be proposed by stakeholders or the Transmission Provider, in the SPM processes. Such alternatives may include transmission, generation, and demand-side resources. The Transmission Provider will review and evaluate such alternatives on a comparable basis and select the most appropriate solution. Comparability includes the ability of the Transmission Provider to obtain contractual assurances that the selected solution will be implemented by the required in-service dates. Contractual commitments associated with the construction of an MTEP Appendix A approved project by MISO Transmission Owner(s) and/or Selected Transmission Developer(s) are provided for by the ISO Agreement, this Tariff, and the Binding Proposal Agreement.

Contractual commitments associated with generation solutions require that a generator interconnection agreement be filed with the Commission pursuant to Attachment X of this Tariff by the time the alternative transmission solution would need to be committed to in order to ensure installation on the required need date. Contractual commitments associated with demand-side resource solutions require demonstration to the
Transmission Provider of an executed contract between LSE and End-Use Customers. Such demand-side contracts must be in place by the time that the transmission solution would otherwise need to be committed to in order to ensure a timely solution to the identified planning need, and must be of a sufficient duration such that a reliable solution can be assured through the planning horizon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section VII of the ISO Agreement regarding the Transmission Provider review of Transmission Owner plans, no proposed project of a Transmission Owner that has elected to integrate their local planning processes into the Transmission Provider’s processes, as indicated on Attachment FF-4, shall be recommended in the MTEP for implementation until completion of the annual needs analysis carried out in the annual MTEP cycle, as described in Section I. A. of this Attachment FF, except as provided for in Section I.B.1.c. of this Attachment FF.

c. Out-of-Cycle Review of Transmission Owner Plans: In the event that a Transmission Owner determines that system conditions warrant the urgent development of system enhancements that would be jeopardized unless the Transmission Provider performs an expedited review of the impacts of the project, Transmission Provider shall use a streamlined approval process for reviewing and approving projects proposed by the Transmission Owners so that decisions will be provided to the Owner within thirty (30) days of the projects submittal to the MISO unless a longer review period is mutually agreed upon.

2. Transmission Owners Filing Separate Attachment K: Some Transmission Owners as listed on the last page of Attachment FF-4 have developed individual open, local planning processes for their facilities, that comply with the Planning Principles of the Order 890 Final
Rule. These Transmission Owners have an Attachment K that describes how the Transmission Owner will comply with the Order No. 890 Planning Principles for all transmission facilities that they plan for, regardless of whether those facilities are ultimately transferred to the functional control of the Transmission Provider. With the exception of Sections I.B.1.a and I.B.1.b., the provisions of this Attachment FF remain applicable to all Transmission Owners notwithstanding the filing by any Transmission Owner of an Attachment K pursuant to the Order 890 Final Rule.

E. Joint Regional Planning Coordination: The MTEP shall be developed in accordance with the principles of interregional coordination through collaboration with representatives from adjacent transmission providers, their designated regional planning organizations, or regional transmission organizations, as provided for in this Attachment FF, or as otherwise provided for in existing joint agreements between the Transmission Provider and other regional entities that engage in planning activities. The Transmission Provider has joint operating and coordination agreements with MAPPCOR, as contractor for Mid-Continent Area Power Pool (“MAPP”), the PJM Interconnection (“PJM”), Southwest Power Pool (“SPP”), Tennessee Valley Authority (“TVA”), and Manitoba Hydro (Manitoba). Because TVA is non-jurisdictional, that agreement has not been submitted for Commission approval, but is available on the Transmission Provider’s public website.

1. Initial Contact: The Transmission Provider will initiate a meeting with representatives of adjacent transmission providers, their designated regional planning organizations, or regional transmission organizations with which existing joint agreements are not already established with the Transmission Provider (“Regional Planning Coordination Entities” or “RPCEs”), in order to establish a Joint Planning Committee.
2. Joint Planning Committee. The Transmission Provider shall offer to form a Joint Planning Committee ("JPC") with the RPCE. The JPC shall be comprised of representatives of the Transmission Provider and the RPCE in numbers and functions to be identified from time to time. The JPC may combine with or participate in similarly established joint planning committees amongst multiple RPCEs or established under joint agreements to which the Transmission Provider is a signatory, for the purpose of providing for broader and more effective inter-regional planning coordination. The JPC shall have a Chairman. The Chairman shall be responsible for: the scheduling of meetings; the preparation of agendas for meetings; the production of minutes of meetings; and for chairing JPC meetings. The Chairmanship shall rotate amongst the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs on a mutually agreed to schedule, with each party responsible for the Chairmanship for no more than one planning study cycle in succession. The JPC shall coordinate planning of the systems of the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs, including the following:

a. Coordinate the development of common power system analysis models to perform coordinated system planning studies including power flow analyses and stability analyses. For studies of interconnections in close electrical proximity at the boundaries among the systems of the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs the JPC or its designated working group will coordinate the performance of a detailed review of the appropriateness of applicable power system models.

b. Conduct, on a regular basis, a Coordinated Regional Transmission Planning Study (CRTPS), as set forth in Section 8.3.4.

c. Coordinate planning activities under this Section 8, including the exchange of
data and developing necessary report and study protocols.

d. Maintain an Internet site and e-mail or other electronic lists for the communication of information related to the coordinated planning process. Such sites and lists may be integrated with those existing for the purpose of communicating the open and transparent planning processes of the Transmission Provider.

e. Meet at least semi-annually to review and coordinate transmission planning activities.

f. Establish working groups as necessary to address specific issues, such as the review and development of the regional plans of the RPCE and the Transmission Provider, and localized seams issues.

g. Establish a schedule for the rotation of responsibility for data management, coordination of analysis activities, report preparation, and other activities.

3. Data and Information Exchange. The Transmission Provider shall make available to each RPCE the following planning data and information. Unless otherwise indicated, such data and information shall be provided annually. The Transmission Provider shall provide such data in accordance with the applicable CEII policy, and maintain data and information received from each RPCE in accordance with their applicable confidentiality policies.

a. Data required for the development of power flow cases, and stability cases, incorporating up to a ten year load forecasts as may be requested, including all critical assumptions that are used in the development of these cases.

b. Fully detailed planning models (up to the next ten (10) years as requested) on an annual basis and updates as necessary to perform coordinated studies that reflect system enhancement changes or other changes.
The regional plan documents, any long-term or short-term reliability assessment documents, and any operating assessment reports produced by the Transmission Provider and the RPCE.

d. The status of expansion studies, system impact studies and generation interconnection studies, such that the Transmission Provider and the RPCE have knowledge that a commitment has been made to a system enhancement as a result of any such studies.

e. Transmission system maps for the Transmission Provider and the RPCE bulk transmission systems and lower voltage transmission system maps that are relevant to the coordination of planning between or among the systems.

f. Contingency lists for use in load flow and stability analyses, including lists of all contingency events required by applicable NERC or Regional Entity planning standards, as well as breaker diagrams for the portions of the Transmission Provider and the RPCE transmission systems that are relevant to the coordination of planning between or among the systems. Breaker diagrams to be provided on an as requested basis.

g. The timing of each planned enhancement, including estimated completion dates, and indications of the likelihood that a system enhancement will be completed and whether the system enhancement should be included in system expansion studies, system impact studies and generation interconnection studies, and as requested the status of related applications for regulatory approval. This information shall be provided at the completion of each planning cycle of the Transmission Provider, and more frequently as necessary to indicate changes in status that may be important to the RPCE system.

h. Quarterly identification of interconnection requests that have been received and
any long-term firm transmission services that have been approved, that may impact the operation of the Transmission Provider or the RPCE system.

i. Quarterly, the status of all interconnection requests that have been identified.

j. Information regarding long-term firm transmission services on all interfaces relevant to the coordination of planning between or among the systems.

k. Load flow data initially will be exchanged in PSS/E format. To the extent practical, the maintenance and exchange of power system modeling data will be implemented through databases. When feasible, transmission maps and breaker diagrams will be provided in an electronic format agreed upon by the Transmission Provider and the RPCE. Formats for the exchange of other data will be agreed upon by the Transmission Provider and the RPCE.

4. Coordinated System Planning. The Transmission Provider shall agree to coordinate with the RPCEs studies required to assure the reliable, efficient, and effective operation of the transmission system. Results of such coordinated studies will be included in the Coordinated System Plan. The Transmission Provider shall agree to conduct with the RPCEs such coordinated planning as set forth below

a. Single Entity Planning. The Transmission Provider shall engage in such transmission planning activities, including expansion plans, system impact studies, and generator interconnection studies, as necessary to fulfill its obligations under the Tariff. Such planning shall conform to applicable reliability requirements of NERC, applicable regional reliability councils, and any successor organizations thereto. Such planning shall also conform to any and all applicable requirements of Federal or State regulatory authorities. The Transmission Provider will prepare a regional
transmission planning report that documents the procedures, methodologies, and business rules utilized in preparing and completing the report. The Transmission Provider shall agree to share the transmission planning reports and assessments with each RPCE, as well as any information that arises in the performance of its individual planning activities as is necessary or appropriate for effective coordination among the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs on an ongoing basis. The Transmission Provider shall provide such information to the RPCEs in accordance with the applicable CEII policy and shall maintain such information received from the RPCEs in accordance with their applicable confidentiality policies.

b. Analysis of Interconnection Requests. In accordance with the procedures under which the Transmission Provider provides interconnection service, the Transmission Provider will agree to coordinate with each RPCE the conduct of any studies required in determining the impact of a request for generator or merchant transmission interconnection. Results of such coordinated studies will be included in the impacts reported to the interconnection customers as appropriate. Coordination of studies shall include the following:

i. When the Transmission Provider receives a request under its interconnection procedures for interconnection, it will determine whether the interconnection potentially impacts the system of a RPCE. In that event, the Transmission Provider will notify the RPCE and convey the information provided in the interconnection queue posting. The Transmission Provider will provide the study agreement to the interconnection customer in accordance with applicable procedures.
ii. If the RPCE determines that it may be materially impacted by an interconnection on the Transmission Provider System, the RPCE may request participation in the applicable interconnection studies. The Transmission Provider will coordinate with the RPCE with respect to the nature of studies to be performed to test the impacts of the interconnection on the RPCE System, and who will perform the studies. The Transmission Provider will strive to minimize the costs associated with the coordinated study process undertaken by agreement with the RPCE.

iii. Any coordinated studies associated with requests for interconnection to the Transmission Provider’s system will be performed in accordance with the study timeline requirements and scope of the applicable generation interconnection procedures of the Transmission Provider.

iv. The RPCE may participate in the coordinated study either by taking responsibility for performance of studies of its system, if deemed reasonable by the Transmission Provider, or by providing input to the studies to be performed by the Transmission Provider. The study cost estimates indicated in the study agreement between the Transmission Provider and the interconnection customer, will reflect the costs, and the associated roles of the study participants including the RPCE. The Transmission Provider will review the cost estimates and scope submitted by all participants for reasonableness, based on expected levels of participation, and responsibilities in the study. If the RPCE agrees to perform any aspects of the study, the RPCE must comply with the
timelines and schedule of the Transmission Provider’s interconnection procedures.

v. The Transmission Provider will collect from the interconnection customer the costs incurred by the RPCE associated with the performance of such studies and forward collected amounts, no later than thirty (30) days after receipt thereof, to the RPCE. Upon the reasonable request of the RPCE, the Transmission Provider will make their books and records available to the requestor pertaining to such requests for collection and receipt of collected amounts.

vi. The Transmission Provider will report the combined list of any transmission infrastructure improvements on either the RPCE and/or the Transmission Provider’s system required as a result of the proposed interconnection.

vii. Construction and cost responsibility associated with any transmission infrastructure improvements required as a result of the proposed interconnection shall be accomplished under the terms of the applicable OATT, Transmission Service Guidelines, controlling agreements, and consistent with applicable Federal or State regulatory policy and applicable law.

viii. Each transmission provider will maintain separate interconnection queues. The JPC will maintain a composite listing of interconnection requests for all interconnection projects that have been identified as potentially impacting the systems of the Transmission Provider and coordinating
RPCEs. The JPC will post this listing on the Internet site maintained for
the communication of information related to the coordinated system
planning process.

c. Analysis of Long-Term Firm Transmission Service Requests. In accordance with
applicable procedures under which the Transmission Provider provides long-term firm
transmission service, the Transmission Provider will coordinate the conduct of any
studies required to determine the impact of a request for such service. Results of such
coordinated studies will be included in the impacts reported to the transmission service
customers as appropriate. Coordination of studies will include the following:

i. The Transmission Provider will coordinate the calculation of ATC values
associated with the service, based on contingencies on their systems that
may be impacted by the granting of the service.

ii. When the Transmission Provider receives a request for long-term firm
transmission service, it will determine whether the request potentially
impacts the system of the RPCE. If the Transmission Provider determines
that the RPCE system is potentially impacted, and that the RPCE would
not receive a transmission service request to complete the service path, the
transmission provider will notify the RPCE and convey the information
provided in the posting.

iii. If the RPCE determines that its system may be materially impacted by
granting the service, it may contact the Transmission Provider and request
participation in the applicable studies. The Transmission Provider will
coordinate with the RPCE with respect to the nature of studies to be
performed to test the impacts of the requested service on the RPCE system, and will strive to minimize the costs associated with the coordinated study process. The JPC will develop screening procedures to assist in the identification of service requests that may impact systems of the JPC members other than the transmission provider receiving the request.

iv. Any coordinated studies for request on the transmission Provider’s system will be performed in accordance with the study timeline and scope requirements of the applicable transmission service procedures of the Transmission Provider.

v. The RPCE may participate in the coordinated study either by taking responsibility for performance of studies of its system, if deemed reasonable by the Transmission Provider or by providing input to the studies to be performed by the Transmission Provider. The study cost estimates indicated in the study agreement between the Transmission Provider and the transmission service customer will reflect the costs and the associated roles of the study participants. The Transmission Provider will review the cost estimates and scope submitted by all participants for reasonableness, based on expected levels of participation and responsibilities in the study.

vi. The Transmission Provider will collect from the transmission service customer, and forward to the RPCE, the costs incurred by the RPCE with the performance of such studies.
vii. The Transmission Provider receiving the request will identify any transmission infrastructure improvements required as a result of the transmission service request.

viii. Construction and cost responsibility associated with any transmission infrastructure improvements required as a result of the transmission service request shall be accomplished under the terms of the applicable OATT, Transmission Service Guidelines, controlling agreements, and consistent with applicable Federal or State regulatory policy and applicable law.

d. Coordinated Regional Transmission Planning Study: The Transmission Provider agrees to participate in the conduct of a periodic Coordinated Regional Transmission Planning Study (CRTPS). The CRTPS shall have as input the results of ongoing analyses of requests for interconnection and ongoing analyses of requests for long-term firm transmission service. The Parties shall coordinate in the analyses of these ongoing service requests in accordance with Sections 8.3.2 and 8.3.3. The results of the CRTPS shall be an integral part of the expansion plans of each Party. Construction of upgrades on the Transmission System of the Transmission Provider that are identified as necessary in the CRTSP shall be under the terms of the Owners Agreement of the Transmission Provider, applicable to the construction of upgrades identified in the expansion planning process. Coordination of studies required for the development of the Coordinated System Plan will include the following:

i. Every three years, the Transmission Provider shall participate in the performance of a CRTPS. Sensitivity analyses will be performed, as
required, during the off years based on a review by the JPC of discrete reliability problems or operability issues that arise due to changing system conditions.

ii. The CRTPS shall identify all reliability and expansion issues, and shall propose potential resolutions to be considered by The Transmission Provider and the coordinating RPCEs.

iii. As a result of participation in the CRTPS, except as provided for in Section II. A. 1., the Transmission Provider is not obligated in any way to construct, finance, operate, or otherwise support any transmission infrastructure improvements or other transmission-related projects identified in the CRTPS. Any decision to proceed with any transmission infrastructure improvements or other transmission-related projects identified in the CRTPS shall be based on the applicable reliability, operational and economic planning criteria established for the Transmission Provider as applicable to the development of the MTEP and set forth in this Attachment FF.

iv. As a result of participation in the CRTPS, the RPCEs are not entitled to any rights to financial compensation due to the impact of the transmission plans of the Transmission Provider upon the RPCE system, including but not limited to its decisions whether or not to construct any transmission infrastructure improvements or other transmission-related projects identified in the CRTPS.

v. The JPC will develop the scope and procedure for the CRTPS. The scope
of the CRTPSs performed over time will include evaluations of the transmission systems against reliability criteria, operational performance criteria, and economic performance criteria applicable to the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs.

vi. In the conduct of the CRTPS, the Transmission Provider and the coordinating RPCEs will use planning models that are developed in accordance with the procedures to be established by the JPC. Exchange of power flow models will be in a format that is acceptable to the coordinating parties.

vii. Stakeholder Review Processes. The Transmission Provider, in coordination with coordinating RPCEs shall review the scope and results of the CRTPS with impacted stakeholders, and shall modify the study scope as deemed appropriate by the Transmission Provider in agreement with the coordinating RPCEs, after receiving stakeholder input. Such reviews will utilize the existing planning stakeholder forums of the coordinating parties including as applicable joint Sub Regional Planning Meetings.

II. Development Process for MTEP Projects: The Transmission Provider will develop the MTEP biennially or more frequently. The MTEP will identify expansion projects for inclusion in the MTEP according to the factors set forth in Appendix B of the ISO Agreement and Section I.A. of this Attachment FF. For purposes of assigning cost responsibility, expansion projects in the MTEP shall be categorized pursuant to the following criteria.

A. Reliability Needs: Reliability projects are identified either in the periodically
performed Baseline Reliability Study, or in Facilities Studies associated with the request processes for new transmission access. Transmission access includes requests for both new transmission delivery service and new generation interconnection service.

1. **Baseline Reliability Projects:** Baseline Reliability Projects are Network Upgrades identified in the base case as required to ensure that the Transmission System is in compliance with applicable national Electric Reliability Organization (“ERO”) reliability standards and reliability standards adopted by Regional Reliability Organizations and applicable within the Transmission Provider Region. Baseline Reliability Projects include projects that are needed to maintain reliability while accommodating the ongoing needs of existing Market Participants and Transmission Customers. Baseline Reliability Projects may consist of a number of individual facilities that in the judgment of the Transmission Provider constitute a single project for cost allocation purposes. The Transmission Provider shall collaborate with Transmission Owning members, other transmission providers, Transmission Customers, and other stakeholders to develop appropriate planning models that reflect expected system conditions for the planning horizon. The planning models shall reflect the projected load growth of existing network customers and other transmission service and interconnection commitments, and shall include any transmission projects identified in Service Agreements or interconnection agreements that are entered into in association with requests for transmission delivery service or transmission interconnection service, as determined in Facilities Studies associated with such requests. The Transmission Provider shall test the MTEP for
adequacy and security based on commonly applicable national Electric Reliability Organization (“ERO”) standards, and under likely and possible dispatch patterns of actual and projected Generation Resources within the Transmission System and of external resources, including dispatch reflective of Long-Term Transmission Rights of Transmission Customers, and shall produce an efficient expansion plan that includes all Baseline Reliability Projects determined by the Transmission Provider to be necessary through the planning horizon of the MTEP. The Transmission Provider shall obtain the approval of the Transmission Provider Board, as set forth in Section VI, for each MTEP published.

2. New Transmission Access Projects: New Transmission Access Projects are defined for the purposes of Attachment FF as Network Upgrades identified in Facilities Studies and agreements pursuant to requests for transmission delivery service or transmission interconnection service under the Tariff. New Transmission Access Projects include projects that are needed to maintain reliability while accommodating the incremental needs associated with requests for new transmission or interconnection service, as determined in Facilities Studies associated with such requests. New Transmission Access Projects may consist of a number of individual facilities, which in the judgment of the Transmission Provider constitute a single project for cost allocation purposes. New Transmission Access Projects are either Generation Interconnection Projects or Transmission Delivery Service Projects as defined in Sections II.A.2.a. and II.A.2.b. The Transmission Provider shall consider the Baseline Reliability Projects already determined to be needed in the most current MTEP, as well as
any other base-case needs not associated with the request for new service that may be identified during the impact study process when determining the need for New Transmission Access Projects. Any identified base-case needs determined in the impact study process that are not a part of the Baseline Reliability Projects already identified in the most current MTEP shall become new Baseline Reliability Projects and shall be included in the next MTEP. New Transmission Access Projects identified in Facilities Studies and agreements pursuant to requests for transmission delivery service or transmission interconnection service under this Tariff shall be included in the next MTEP.

a. Generation Interconnection Projects: Generation Interconnection Projects are New Transmission Access Projects that are associated with interconnection of new, or increase in generating capacity of existing, generation under Attachments X to this Tariff.

b. Transmission Delivery Service Projects: Transmission Delivery Service Projects are New Transmission Access Projects that are needed to provide for requests for new Point-To-Point Transmission Service, or requests under Module B of the Tariff for Network Service or a new designation of a Network Resource(s).

B. Market Efficiency Projects: Market Efficiency Projects are Network Upgrades: (i) that are proposed by the Transmission Provider, Transmission Owner(s), ITC(s), Market Participant(s), or regulatory authorities; (ii) that are found to be eligible for inclusion in the MTEP or are approved pursuant to Appendix B, Section VII of the ISO Agreement after June 16, 2005, applying the factors set forth in Section I.A. of this Attachment FF; (iii) that have a Project
Cost of $5 million or more; (iv) that involve facilities with voltages of 345 kV or higher\(^1\); and that may include any lower voltage facilities of 100kV or above that collectively constitute less than fifty percent (50%) of the combined project cost, and without which the 345 kV or higher facilities could not deliver sufficient benefit to meet the required benefit-to-cost ratio threshold for the project as established in Section II.B.1.e, or that otherwise are needed to relieve applicable reliability criteria violations that are projected to occur as a direct result of the development of the 345 kV or higher facilities of the project; (v) that are not determined to be Multi Value Projects; and (vi) that are found to have regional benefits under the criteria set forth in Section II.B.1 of this Attachment FF.

1. Criteria to Determine Whether a Project Should be Included as a Market Efficiency Project: The Transmission Provider shall employ multiple future scenarios and multi-year analysis including sensitivity analyses guided by input from the Planning Advisory Committee to evaluate the anticipated benefits of a proposed Market Efficiency Project in order to determine if such a project meets the criteria for inclusion in the regional plan as a Market Efficiency Project eligible for regional cost sharing. Sensitivity analyses shall include, among other factors, consideration of: (i) variations in amount, type, and location of future generation supplies as dictated by future scenarios developed with stakeholder input and guidance; (ii) alternative transmission proposals; (iii) impacts of variations in load growth; and (iv) effects of demand response resources on transmission benefits.

\(^1\) Transformer voltage is defined by the voltage of the low-side of the transformer for these purposes.
The Transmission Provider shall perform this inclusion analysis as follows:

a. The Transmission Provider shall utilize a weighted futures, no loss (“WFNL”) metric to analyze the anticipated annual economic benefits of construction of a proposed Market Efficiency Project to Transmission Customers in each of the Local Resource Zones, as defined in Attachment WW, based upon adjusted production cost (“APC”) savings. APC savings will be calculated as the difference in total production cost of the Resources in each Local Resource Zone adjusted for import costs and export revenues with and without the proposed Market Efficiency Project as part of the Transmission System. The WFNL metric for each Local Resource Zone shall be calculated using the weighted APC savings determined for each future scenario included in the analysis.

i. The WFNL metric shall utilize the future scenarios determined and identified by the Transmission Provider through the planning process, with input from all stakeholders. The weights applied to the results of each future scenario shall also be determined by the Transmission Provider with input from all stakeholders.

b. Project benefit evaluations will include benefits for the first 20 years of project life after the projected in-service date, with a maximum planning horizon of 25 years from the approval year. The annual benefit for a proposed Market Efficiency Project shall be determined as the sum of the WFNL values for each Local Resource Zone, as defined in Attachment WW. The total project benefit shall be determined by calculating the present value of annual benefits for the multiple year scenarios and multi-year evaluations.
c. The costs applied in the benefit to cost ratio shall be the present value, over the same period for which the project benefits are determined, of the annual Network Upgrade Charges for the project as determined in accordance with the formula in Attachment GG.

d. The present value calculation for both the annual benefits and annual costs will apply a discount rate representing the after-tax weighted average cost of capital of the Transmission Owners that make up the Transmission Provider Transmission System.

e. The Transmission Provider shall employ a benefit to cost ratio test to evaluate a proposed Market Efficiency Project. Only projects that meet a benefit to cost ratio of 1.25 or greater shall be included in the MTEP as a Market Efficiency Project and be eligible for regional cost sharing.

f. The benefits of the project used to determine the associated cost allocations as a percentage of project cost shall be determined one time at the time that the project is presented to the Transmission Provider Board for approval. Estimated Project Cost will be used to estimate the benefit to cost ratio and the eligibility for cost sharing at the time of project approval. To the extent that the Commission approves the collection of costs in rates for Construction Work in Progress (“CWIP”) for a constructing Transmission Owner, costs will be allocated and collected prior to completion of the project.

g. The aforementioned Market Efficiency Project inclusion criteria shall be used for the exclusive purpose of determining whether projects are eligible for regional cost sharing in accordance with Section III.A.2.f below. These criteria shall not affect the existing criteria set forth in Appendix B of the ISO Agreement for determining whether projects are eligible for inclusion in the MTEP. Moreover, the costs of projects included in the MTEP,
but not eligible for regional cost sharing, shall continue to be eligible for inclusion in the calculation of Transmission Owner revenue requirements under Attachment O of this Tariff.

C. **Multi Value Projects:** A Multi Value Project is one or more Network Upgrades that address a common set of Transmission Issues and satisfy the conditions listed in Sections II.C.1, II.C.2., and II.C.3 of Attachment FF. All Network Upgrades associated with a Multi Value Project including any lower voltage facilities that may be needed to relieve applicable reliability criteria violations that are projected to occur as a direct result of the development of the Multi Value Project; may be cost shared per Section III.A.2.g of Attachment FF except for i) any Network Upgrade cost associated with constructing an underground or underwater transmission line above and beyond the cost of a feasible alternative overhead transmission line that provides comparable regional benefits, and ii) any DC transmission line and associated terminal equipment when scheduling and dispatch of the DC transmission line is not turned over to the Transmission Provider's markets, real-time control of the DC transmission line is not turned over to the Transmission Provider's automatic generation control system and/or the DC transmission line is operated in a manner that requires specific users to subscribe for DC transmission service.

1. A Multi Value Project must be evaluated as part of a Portfolio of projects, as designated in the transmission expansion planning process, whose benefits are spread broadly across the footprint.

2. A Multi Value Project must meet one of the three criteria outlined below:
   a. Criterion 1. A Multi Value Project must be developed through the transmission expansion planning process for the purpose of enabling the Transmission System to reliably and economically deliver energy in support
of documented energy policy mandates or laws that have been enacted or adopted through state or federal legislation or regulatory requirement that directly or indirectly govern the minimum or maximum amount of energy that can be generated by specific types of generation. The MVP must be shown to enable the transmission system to deliver such energy in a manner that is more reliable and/or more economic than it otherwise would be without the transmission upgrade.

b. Criterion 2. A Multi Value Project must provide multiple types of economic value across multiple pricing zones with a Total MVP Benefit-to-Cost ratio of 1.0 or higher where the Total MVP Benefit-to-Cost ratio is described in Section II.C.7 of this Attachment FF. The reduction of production costs and the associated reduction of LMPs resulting from a transmission congestion relief project are not additive and are considered a single type of economic value.

c. Criterion 3. A Multi Value Project must address at least one Transmission Issue associated with a projected violation of a NERC or Regional Entity standard and at least one economic-based Transmission Issue that provides economic value across multiple pricing zones. The project must generate total financially quantifiable benefits, including quantifiable reliability benefits, in excess of the total project costs based on the definition of financial benefits and Project Costs provided in Section II.C.7 of Attachment FF.

3. All of the following conditions must be satisfied in order for a project to be
classified as a Multi Value Project:

a. Facilities associated with the transmission project must not be in service, under construction, or approved for construction by the Transmission Provider Board prior to July 16, 2010 or the date a Transmission Owner becomes a signatory member of the ISO Agreement, whichever is later. This section II.C.3.a shall not preclude the Multi Value Project classification of an Open Transmission Project that makes a Selected Transmission Developer eligible to become a Transmission Owner.

b. The transmission project must be evaluated through the Transmission Provider's transmission planning process and approved for construction by the Transmission Provider Board prior to the start of construction, where construction does not include preliminary site and route selection activities.

c. The transmission project must not contain any transmission facilities listed in Attachment FF-1 of this Tariff.

d. The total capital cost of the transmission project must be greater than or equal to $20,000,000.00.

e. The transmission project must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the construction or improvement of transmission facilities operating at voltages above 100 kV. A transformer is considered to operate above 100 kV when at least two sets of transformer terminals operate at voltages above 100 kV.

f. Network Upgrades driven solely by an Interconnection Request, as defined in Attachment X of the Tariff, or a Transmission Service request will not be considered Multi Value Projects.
4. Any transmission project that qualifies as a Multi-Value Project shall be classified as an MVP irrespective of whether such project is also a Baseline Reliability Project and/or Market Efficiency Project.

5. The specific types of economic value provided by a Multi Value Project include the following:
   
a. Production cost savings where production costs include generator startup, hourly generator no-load, generator energy and generator Operating Reserve costs. Production cost savings can be realized through reductions in both transmission congestion and transmission energy losses. Productions cost savings can also be realized through reductions in Operating Reserve requirements within Reserve Zones and, in some cases, reductions in overall Operating Reserve requirements for the Transmission Provider.
   
b. Capacity losses savings where capacity losses represent the amount of capacity required to serve transmission losses during the system peak hour including associated planning reserve.
   
c. Capacity savings due to reductions in the overall Planning Reserve Margins resulting from transmission expansion.
   
d. Long-term cost savings realized by Transmission Customers by accelerating a long-term project start date in lieu of implementing a short-term project in the interim and/or long-term cost savings realized by Transmission Customers by deferring or eliminating the need to perform one or more projects in the future.
e. Any other financially quantifiable benefit to Transmission Customers resulting from an enhancement to the Transmission System and related to the provisions of Transmission Service.

6. Any project to facilitate like-for-like capital replacements of plant originally installed as part of a Multi Value Project where replacement is due to aging, failure, damage or relocation requirements where such replacement is not the result of negligence by the constructing Transmission Owner will be treated as a Multi Value Project. The minimum project cost limitation for Multi Value Projects described in Section II.C.3.d of Attachment FF will not apply to the like for-like capital replacement projects described in this Section.

7. The following Total MVP Benefit-to-Cost Ratio will be applied to any Multi Value Project justified solely on the basis of Sections II.C.2.b or II.C.2.c of this Attachment FF to ensure such project qualifies as a Multi Value Project:

   \[
   \text{Total MVP Benefit-to-Cost Ratio} = \frac{\text{financial benefits}}{\text{Project Costs}}.
   \]

   For the purpose of this calculation, Financial Benefits will be set equal to the present value of all financially quantifiable benefits provided by the project projected for the first 20 years of the project's life and Project Costs will be set equal to the present value of the annual revenue requirements projected for the first 20 years of the project's life.

8. The aforementioned Multi Value Project inclusion criteria shall be used for the exclusive purpose of determining whether projects are eligible for regional cost sharing in accordance with Section III.A.2.g below. These criteria shall not affect the existing criteria set forth in Appendix B of the ISO Agreement for determining
whether projects are eligible for inclusion in the MTEP. Moreover, the costs of projects included in the MTEP, but not eligible for regional cost sharing, shall continue to be eligible for inclusion in the calculation of Transmission Owner revenue requirements under Attachment O of this Tariff.

### III. Designation of Cost Responsibility for MTEP Projects:

Based on the planning analysis performed by the Transmission Provider, which shall take into consideration all appropriate input from Market Participants or external entities, including, but not limited to, any indications of a willingness to bear cost responsibility for an enhancement or expansion, the recommended MTEP shall, for any enhancement or expansion that is included in the plan, designate: (i) the Market Participant(s) in one or more pricing zones that will bear cost responsibility for such enhancement or expansion, as and to the extent provided by any applicable provision of the Tariff, including Attachments N, X, or any applicable cost allocation method ordered by the Commission; or, (ii) in the event and to the extent that no provision of the Tariff so assigns cost responsibility, the Market Participant(s) or Transmission Customer(s) in one or more pricing zones from which the cost of such enhancements or expansions shall be recovered through charges established pursuant to Attachment GG of this Tariff, or as otherwise provided for under this Attachment FF.

Any designation under clause (ii) of the preceding sentence shall be determined as provided for in Section III.A and III.B of this Attachment FF. For all such designations, the Transmission Provider shall calculate the cost allocation impacts to each pricing zone. The results will be reviewed for unintended consequences by the Transmission Provider and the Tariff Working Group and any such identified consequences shall be reported to the Planning Advisory Committee, and the OMS.
A. Allocation of Costs Within the Transmission Provider Region

1. Default Cost Allocation: Except as otherwise provided for in this Attachment FF, or by any other applicable provision of this Tariff and consistent with the ISO Agreement, the responsibility for Network Upgrades included in the approved MTEP will be addressed in accordance with the provisions of the ISO Agreement.

2. Cost Allocation: The Transmission Provider will designate and assign cost responsibility on a regional, and sub-regional basis for Network Upgrades identified in the MTEP subject to the grand-fathered project provisions of Section III.A.2.b.
   
a. Market Participant’s Option to Fund: Notwithstanding the Transmission Provider’s assignment of cost responsibility for a project included in the MTEP, one or more Market Participants may elect to assume cost responsibility for any or all costs of a Network Upgrade that is included in the MTEP. Provided however, in the event the Market Participant is also a Transmission Owner such election of the option to fund must be made on a consistent, non-discriminatory basis.

b. Grandfathered Projects: The cost allocation provisions of this Attachment FF shall not be applicable to transmission projects identified in Attachment FF-1, which is based on the list of projects designated as Planned Projects in the MTEP approved by the Transmission Provider Board on June 16, 2005 (MTEP 05) and some additions of proposed projects that the Transmission Provider has determined to be in the advanced stages of planning.
c. Baseline Reliability Projects: Costs of Baseline Reliability Projects shall be recovered pursuant to Attachment O of this Tariff by the Transmission Owner(s) and/or ITC(s) developing such projects, subject to the requirements of the ISO Agreement.

d. Generation Interconnection Projects: Costs of Generation Interconnection Projects that are not determined by the Transmission Provider to be Baseline Reliability Projects, Market Efficiency Projects, or Multi-Value Projects, and the Network Upgrade costs associated with advancing a Baseline Reliability Project, Market Efficiency Project, or Multi-Value Project associated with a generator interconnection will be paid for by the Interconnection Customer(s) in accordance with Attachment X.

For Generator Interconnection Projects interconnecting to the American Transmission Company LLC transmission system, such costs will be subject to the provision of Attachment FF – ATCLLC.

1) For Network Upgrades to facilities in voltage classes at or above 345 kV, the Interconnection Customer shall be repaid 10 percent of the costs of the Generation Interconnection Project funded by the Interconnection Customer once Commercial Operation is achieved. The Transmission Owner(s) constructing the Generation Interconnection Project will repay 10% of the Generation
Interconnection Project costs associated with Network Upgrade facilities in a voltage class of 345 kV or greater to the Interconnection Customer under repayment terms consistent with the schedules and other terms of Attachment X.

The 10% of the Project Cost associated with Network Upgrade facilities of voltage class 345 kV or above and repaid to the Interconnection Customer shall be allocated on a system-wide basis and recovered pursuant to Attachment GG of this Tariff.

2) An Interconnection Customer may be required to contribute to the cost of Shared Network Upgrades, as defined in Attachment X to the Tariff, that are funded by another Interconnection Customer as a Generator Interconnection Project pursuant to Attachment X.

Each Interconnection Customer with one or more Shared Network Upgrade(s) identified in Appendix A of its Generator Interconnection Agreement shall make a one-time payment under Schedule 26-B to the Transmission Provider in accordance with the terms in the Generator Interconnection Agreement. The one-time payment will reflect the cost of the Shared Network Upgrade assigned to the Interconnection Customer as determined by the
Transmission Provider.

All revenue collected by the Transmission Provider through Schedule 26-B shall be distributed to the appropriate Interconnection Customer(s).

3) The Interconnection Customer shall be entitled, pursuant to Section 46 of this Tariff, to any Financial Transmission Rights or other rights to the extent provided for under this Tariff, for any Network Upgrade costs funded by or charged to the Interconnection Customer and not subject to repayment under the provisions of this Section III.A.2.d. In the event that a Generator Interconnection Project defers or displaces a Baseline Reliability Project, the costs of the Generator Interconnection Project up to the costs of the deferred or displaced Baseline Reliability Project shall be allocated consistent with the cost allocation for the Baseline Reliability Project.

4) International Transmission/Michigan Electric Transmission Company/ITC Midwest LLC:

(a) For those Generation Interconnection Projects for which International Transmission Company, Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC, or ITC Midwest LLC (“International” or “METC” or “ITC Midwest”) as Transmission Owners will be a signatory to the
interconnection agreement under the terms of Attachment X of this Tariff or any successor provision of the Tariff executed by the parties after the effective date of this Attachment FF. Section III.A.2.d.4, this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4 shall apply, except that, where ITC Midwest is the Transmission Owner, the Interconnection Customer may elect to have another approved methodology under Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d apply.

(b) Generation Interconnection Projects: The cost of Network Upgrades for Generation Interconnection Projects that are not determined by the Transmission Provider to be Baseline Reliability Projects shall be reimbursed by the Transmission Owner as provided in this Section III.A.2.d.4. All costs of Network Upgrades for Generation Interconnection Projects will initially be paid by the Interconnection Customer in accordance with the terms of the Interconnection Agreement entered into pursuant to Attachment X of this Tariff. To the extent the Interconnection Customer demonstrates at the time of Commercial Operation of the Generating Facility one of the following:

   i. Generating Facility has been designated as a Network Resource in accordance with the
ii. Contractual commitment has been entered into with a Network Customer for capacity, or in the case of an Intermittent Resource, for energy, from the Generating Facility for a period of one (1) year or longer.

The Interconnection Customer will receive up to one hundred percent (100%) reimbursement of reimbursable costs within ninety (90) days of the Commercial Operation Date, such reimbursement prorated by the percentage of the Generating Facility capacity or annual available energy output contracted for and as demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Transmission Provider.

If the Interconnection Customer is unable to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Transmission Provider at the time of Commercial Operation of the Generating Facility that the Generating Facility has met the repayment obligations set forth in Attachment FF Sections III.A.2.d.4.b.i. or III.A.2.d.4.b.ii. the Interconnection Customer shall be directly assigned 100% of the costs of the Generation Interconnection Project. The Transmission Owner may effect this direct assignment of costs by either foregoing any repayment of costs funded by the
Interconnection Customer, or by electing to repay 100% of the costs under repayment terms consistent with the schedules and other terms of Attachment X.

The Interconnection Customer shall be entitled, pursuant to Section 46 of this Tariff, to any Financial Transmission Rights or other rights to the extent provided for under this Tariff, for any Network Upgrade costs funded by or charged to the Interconnection Customer and not subject to repayment under the provisions of this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4. In the event that a Generation Interconnection Project defers or displaces a Baseline Reliability Project, the costs of the Generation Interconnection Project up to the costs of the deferred or displaced Baseline Reliability Project shall be allocated consistent with the cost allocation for the Baseline Reliability Project.

(c) For all amounts to be reimbursed by a Transmission Owner to an Interconnection Customer in accordance with this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4, the Transmission Owner will reimburse the sums received from the Interconnection Customer in cash together with any applicable interest, in accordance with the terms of the Interconnection Agreement.
(d) Allocation of Generation Interconnection

Reimbursement. For all amounts reimbursed by a Transmission Owner to an Interconnection Customer under this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4, the reimbursement will be allocated as follows:

i. Projects of Voltage Below 345 kV: 50% of the applicable Project Cost for Generation Interconnection Projects with a voltage class below 345 kV shall be allocated on a sub-regional basis to all Transmission Customers in designated pricing zones. The designated pricing zones and the sub-regional allocation of the Project Cost shall be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with a Line Outage Distribution Factor Table (“LODF Table”) developed by the Transmission Provider which is similar in form to that attached hereto as Attachment FF-2. The LODF Table is based on Transmission System topology and Line-Outage Distribution Factors associated with the project under consideration and is used to determine the pricing zones to be included.
in the sub-regional allocation of the Project Cost. The percentage of the sub-regional allocation assigned to each designated pricing zone shall be determined based on the relative share between pricing zones of the sum of the absolute value of the product of the Line-Outage Distribution Factor on each Branch Facility in a pricing zone and the length in miles of the Branch Facility.

The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the reimbursement will not be subject to any regional or sub-regional cost allocation, but will be recovered by that Transmission Owner under its Attachment O transmission rate formula under this Tariff.

ii. Projects of Voltage 345 kV and Higher:

10% of the applicable Project Cost for Generation Interconnection Projects with a voltage class of 345 kV or higher shall be allocated on a system-wide basis to all Transmission Customers and recovered through a system-wide rate. The remaining 40% of the applicable Project Cost for
Generation Interconnection Projects with a voltage class of 345 kV or higher shall be allocated on a sub-regional basis to all Transmission Customers in designated pricing zones. The designated pricing zones and the sub-regional allocation of the Project Cost shall be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with a Line Outage Distribution Factor Table (“LODF Table”) developed by the Transmission Provider similar in form to that attached hereto as Attachment FF-2.

The LODF Table is based on Transmission System topology and Line-Outage Distribution Factors associated with the project under consideration and is used to determine the pricing zones to be included in the sub-regional allocation of the Project Cost. The percentage of the sub-regional allocation assigned to each designated pricing zone shall be determined based on the relative share between pricing zones of the sum of the absolute value of the product
of the Line-Outage Distribution Factor on each Branch Facility in a pricing zone and the length in miles of the Branch Facility.

The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the reimbursement will not be subject to any regional or sub-regional cost allocation, but will be recovered by that Transmission Owner under its Attachment O transmission rate formula under this Tariff.

e. Transmission Delivery Service Projects: Costs of Transmission Delivery Service Projects shall be assigned and recovered in accordance with Attachment N of this Tariff.

f. Market Efficiency Projects: Costs of Market Efficiency Projects shall be allocated as follows:

i) Twenty percent (20%) of the Project Cost of the Market Efficiency Project shall be allocated on a system-wide basis to all Transmission Customers and recovered through a system-wide rate.

ii) Eighty percent (80%) of the costs of the Market Efficiency Projects shall be allocated to all Transmission Customers in each of the Local Resource Zones, as defined in Attachment WW. The cost allocated to each Local Resource Zone shall
be based on the relative benefit determined for each Local Resource Zone that has a positive present value of annual benefits over the evaluation period using the methodology for project benefit determination of Section II.B.1.

iii) Excessive Funding or Requirements: The Transmission Provider shall seek to identify and manage the development of, as a part of the planning process for Market Efficiency Projects, portfolios of projects that tend to provide benefits throughout each Local Resource Zone, as defined in Attachment WW, over the planning horizon. The Transmission Provider shall analyze on an annual basis whether the project portfolios developed in accordance with this goal and the criteria in Section III. A.2.f unintentionally result in unjust or unreasonable annual capital funding requirements for any Transmission Owner or rate increases for Transmission Customers in designated pricing zones; or otherwise result in undue discrimination between the Transmission Customers, Transmission Owners, or any Market Participants; any such identified consequences shall be reported to the Planning Advisory Committee and to the Organization of MISO States. After discussing such assessments with the aforementioned stakeholder bodies, and taking into consideration the cumulative experience in
applying this Attachment FF, the Transmission Provider will make a determination as to whether Tariff modifications are required, and if so file such modifications.

g. Multi Value Projects: Costs of Multi Value Projects will be allocated as follows:
i) One-hundred percent (100%) of the annual revenue requirements of the Multi Value Projects shall be allocated on a system-wide basis to Transmission Customers that withdraw energy, including External Transactions sinking outside the Transmission Provider's region, and recovered through an MVP Usage Charge pursuant to Attachment MM.

h. Treatment of Projects that meet both Baseline Reliability Project Criteria and/or New Transmission Access Project Criteria, and the Market Efficiency Project Criteria: If the Transmission Provider determines that a project designated as a Market Efficiency Project also meets the criteria to be designated as a Baseline Reliability Project and/or a New Transmission Access Project, the cost of such project shall be allocated in accordance with the Market Efficiency Project allocation procedures.

i. Other Projects: Unless otherwise agreed upon pursuant to Section III.A.2.a. of this Attachment FF, the costs of Network Upgrades that are included in the MTEP, but do not qualify as
Baseline Reliability Projects, New Transmission Access Projects, Market Efficiency Projects or Multi-Value Projects, shall be eligible for recovery pursuant to Attachment O of this Tariff by the Transmission Owner(s) and/or ITC(s) paying the costs of such project, subject to the requirements of the ISO Agreement.

j. Withdrawal from MISO: A Transmission Owner that withdraws from the MISO as a Transmission Owner shall remain responsible for all financial obligations incurred pursuant to this Attachment FF while a Member of the MISO and payments applicable to time periods prior to the effective date of such withdrawal shall be honored by the MISO and the withdrawing Member.

k. New Transmission Owners: A new Transmission Owner joining the MISO will be responsible for the following financial obligations:

a. New Transmission Owners will not be responsible for any portion of Baseline Reliability Projects, Generator Interconnection Projects, Transmission Delivery Service Projects, or Market Efficiency Projects that were approved prior to their entry date.

b. For Multi-Value Projects approved prior to the new Transmission Owner’s entry date, the load interconnected to the Transmission Owner’s Transmission System will be responsible for one-hundred percent (100%) of the MVP
usage charge described in Attachment MM for the years following the Transmission Owner’s entry date applied to the Monthly Net Actual Energy Withdrawals for Load interconnected to the Transmission Owner’s Transmission System.

1. Only a Transmission Owner shall be authorized to construct and/or own transmission facilities associated with a Baseline Reliability Project, Market Efficiency Project and/or Multi Value Project. For projects jointly developed between Transmission Owners and other parties the portion constructed and owned by a Transmission Owner may qualify as a Baseline Reliability Project, Market Efficiency Project and/or Multi Value Project.

IV. Merchant Transmission Project Data Requirements: A proposed merchant transmission developer assumes all financial risk and funding requirements for developing its transmission project(s) and constructing the proposed transmission facility(ies). In order for a proposed merchant transmission developer’s facility to be interconnected to the Transmission System, it is first necessary for the impacted Transmission Owner and the Transmission Provider to analyze the reliability and operational impact of the proposed new merchant transmission facility(ies) on the Transmission System to determine if the new merchant transmission facilities can be reliably supported by the Transmission System, and if not, what Network Upgrades funded by the merchant transmission developer would be required to reliably support the proposed merchant transmission facility(ies). In order to perform the required reliability and
operational analyses, the merchant transmission developer must provide the following data to the Transmission Provider:

(1) Each transmission circuit and substation, including new facilities, associated with the merchant transmission proposal;

(2) Nominal operating voltage level in kV and voltage characteristics (i.e., AC or DC) for each transmission circuit associated with the merchant transmission proposal;

(3) Typical and maximum MW power flow schedules, in each direction, for all proposed DC transmission circuits associated with the merchant transmission proposal;

(4) Normal and emergency summer and winter load ratings for each transmission circuit associated with the merchant transmission proposal;

(5) Maximum allowable positive sequence impedance for each AC transmission circuit associated with the merchant transmission proposal, when applicable;

(6) List of all transmission buses associated with the merchant transmission proposal, including nominal operating voltage level in kV, voltage characteristics, and terminating transmission branches and shunts;

(7) Proposed substation one-line diagrams for all new substations associated with the merchant transmission proposal, including circuit breaker and bus configuration details;

(8) Load ratings, winding connections, impedances, tap data, and any other relevant information for load carrying equipment and facilities associated with the merchant transmission proposal, as applicable;

(9) Modeling files to model proposed facilities and relevant new contingencies in power flow, stability, short-circuit and other relevant study models; and

(10) Any other data determined pertinent to the study by the Transmission Provider
and/or interconnecting Transmission Owners for the specific merchant transmission facility proposal.

V. Designation of Entities to Construct, Implement, Own, Operate, Maintain, Repair, Restore, and/or Finance MTEP Projects: With the exception of Open Transmission Projects, for each project included in the recommended MTEP Appendix A and prior to approval by the Transmission Provider Board, the plan shall designate one or more Transmission Owners to construct, own, operate, maintain, repair, restore, and finance the recommended project, based on the planning analysis performed by the Transmission Provider and based on other input from participants, including, but not limited to, any indications of a willingness to bear cost responsibility for the project; and applicable provisions of the ISO Agreement. Regarding Open Transmission Projects, upon the determination of the Selected Transmission Developer for such projects, as set forth in Section VIII of this Attachment FF, the Transmission Provider shall update the approved MTEP Appendix A by identifying the Selected Transmission Developer for each Open Transmission Project. Should the facilities from such Open Transmission Projects not be approved by state regulatory authorities as New Transmission Facilities, but instead as upgrades to existing transmission facilities, as defined in Section VIII.C of this Attachment FF, the Transmission Provider shall update MTEP Appendix A by designating the appropriate Transmission Owner(s) to construct, own, operate, maintain, repair, restore, and finance such facilities in accordance with the ISO Agreement.

VI. Implementation of the MTEP:

A. If the Transmission Provider and any Transmission Owner’s planning representatives, or other designated entity(ies), cannot reach agreement on any element of the MTEP, the dispute may be resolved through the dispute resolution procedures provided in the
Tariff, or in any applicable joint operating agreement, or by the Commission or state regulatory authorities, where appropriate. The MTEP shall have as one of its goals the satisfaction of all regulatory requirements as specified in Appendix B or Article IV, Section I, Paragraph C of the ISO Agreement.

B. The Transmission Provider shall present the MTEP, along with a summary of relevant alternative projects that were not selected, to the Transmission Provider Board for approval on a biennial basis, or more frequently if needed. The proposed MTEP shall include specific projects already approved as a result of the Transmission Provider entering into Service Agreements with Transmission Customers where such agreements provide for identification of needed transmission construction, timetable, cost, and Transmission Owner or other parties’ construction responsibilities.

C. Approval of the MTEP by the Transmission Provider Board certifies it as the Transmission Provider plan for meeting the transmission needs of all stakeholders subject to any required approvals by federal or state regulatory authorities. The Transmission Provider shall provide a copy of the MTEP to all applicable federal and state regulatory authorities. The affected Transmission Owner(s), Selected Transmission Developer(s), or other designated entity(ies), shall make a good faith effort to design, certify, and build the designated facilities to fulfill the approved MTEP. However, in the event that an MTEP Appendix A project approved by the Transmission Provider Board or the selection of the Selected Transmission Developer is being challenged through the dispute resolution procedures under this Tariff or in court proceedings, the obligation of the Transmission Owners, or other designated entity(ies), to build that specific project (subject to required approvals) is waived until the approved project emerges from the dispute resolution procedures. The Transmission Provider Board shall allow the
Transmission Owners, or other designated entity(ies), to optimize the final design of specific facilities and their in-service dates if necessary to accommodate changing conditions, provided that such changes comport with the approved MTEP and provided that any such changes are accepted by the Transmission Provider through the reevaluation process described in Section VI of this Attachment FF, as necessary. Any disagreements concerning such matters shall be subject to the dispute resolution procedures of this Tariff.

D. The Transmission Provider shall assist the affected Owner(s), Selected Transmission Developer(s), or other designated entity(ies), in justifying the need for, and obtaining certification of, any facilities required by the approved MTEP by preparing and presenting testimony in any proceedings before state or federal courts, regulatory authorities, or other agencies as may be required. The Transmission Provider shall publish annually, and distribute to all Members and all appropriate state regulatory authorities, a five-to-ten-year planning report of forecasted transmission requirements. Annual reports and planning reports shall be available to the general public upon request.

VII. Multi-Value Project Costs and Benefits Review and Reporting

A. Frequency and Reporting of Multi-Value Project Review: Every three (3) years, as provided below and in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning, the Transmission Provider shall conduct a review of the cumulative costs and benefits associated with MVPs, and shall disseminate the results of such reviews to its stakeholders. The Transmission Provider shall use the review process and results to identify potential modifications to the MVP methodology and its implementation for projects to be approved at a future date.

1. Triennial Full MVP Review: Beginning with the MTEP for 2014 (“MTEP 14”),
and every third year thereafter, the Transmission Provider shall conduct a full MVP review, as provided in section VII.B of this Attachment FF.

2. Annual Limited MVP Review: Beginning with the MTEP for 2015 (“MTEP 15”), and each year thereafter when there is no full MVP review, the Transmission Provider shall conduct a limited MVP review, as provided in section VII.C of this Attachment FF.

3. Calculation of Costs and Benefits: The reviews shall calculate costs and benefits on a forward-looking basis over both twenty (20)-year and forty (40)-year periods. The costs calculation shall use updated project costs and in-service dates provided in the latest MTEP quarterly status report, and the benefits calculation shall use updated future scenarios from the latest MTEP planning cycle. The results of the costs and benefits calculation shall be provided for each Local Resource Zone as defined in RAR. If the Local Resource Zones as defined in accordance with RAR are modified, the Transmission Provider, working with stakeholders, may define different Local Resource Zones for purposes of reporting the results of the review. The definition of different Local Resource Zones in connection with reporting the results of the review will be detailed in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning.

4. Dissemination of the Results of the Full and Limited MVP Reviews: Within a reasonable time after completion of each MVP review, the Transmission Provider shall disseminate the results of and supporting analysis for the MVP review through: (a) publication in the MTEP; (b) posting on the appropriate section of the Transmission Provider’s public website; and (c) presentation to the
appropriate stakeholder committees.

B. **Scope of Full Multi-Value Project Review:** Each full MVP review shall at a minimum include the following:

1. **Quantitative Benefits:** Analysis of the quantifiable economic benefits resulting from the addition of MVPs, including, but not limited to:
   - **Congestion and Fuel Savings:** Savings from increased access to lower cost Resources;
   - **Decreased Operating Reserves:** Savings associated with lower Operating Reserve requirements;
   - **Decreased System Planning Reserve Margin:** Savings associated with deferred generation investment due to a reduction in the system-wide Planning Reserve Margin; and
   - **Decreased Transmission Line Losses:** Savings associated with deferred generation investment due to a reduction in the Capacity required to serve transmission losses during peak hours, to the extent that MVPs reduce such losses.

2. **Public Policy and Other Qualitative Benefits:** Analysis of the public policy and other qualitative benefits accruing from MVPs, such as newly interconnected wind units; and an increase in the percentage of the Transmission Provider's Energy needs being supplied by wind and/or other renewable resources, and wind curtailments.

3. **Historical Data:** Provision, beginning with the MTEP for 2017 (“MTEP 17”), and based on the historical data available to the Transmission Provider for the five (5)
prior years, of information on certain additional market trend metrics including, but not limited to:

a. Congestion costs;
b. Energy prices;
c. Fuel costs;
d. Planning Reserve Margin requirements;
e. Number of newly interconnected Resources, by Resource type; and
f. The share of the Transmission Provider’s Energy supplied, by Resource type.

C. Scope of Limited Multi-Value Project Review: Each limited MVP review shall at a minimum include the items described in Sections VII.B.1.a and VII.B.3 of this Attachment FF, based on the latest available data for the current year, in preparation for the next full MVP review.

VIII. Transmission Developer Selection

A. State or Local Rights of First Refusal. The Transmission Provider shall comply with any Applicable Laws and Regulations granting a right of first refusal to a Transmission Owner. The Transmission Owner will be assigned any transmission project within the scope, and in accordance with the terms, of any Applicable Laws and Regulations granting such a right of first refusal. These Applicable Laws and Regulations include, but are not limited to, those granting a right of first refusal to the incumbent Transmission Owner(s) or governing the use of existing developed and undeveloped right of way held by an incumbent utility.

B. State Selection of Qualified Transmission Developers. In the absence of any Applicable Laws and Regulations granting a right of first refusal, a state with the authority to do
so may elect to determine the Selected Transmission Developer(s) from the Qualified Transmission Developers who have submitted Transmission Proposals for any Open Transmission Projects, or portion of such Open Transmission Projects that are physically located within such state’s boundaries, in accordance with applicable state criteria and procedures. Prior to the Transmission Provider Board’s approval of Open Transmission Project(s) for inclusion in Appendix A of the MTEP, states may identify any potential Open Transmission Projects within its state boundaries for which it will determine the Selected Transmission Developer. States that elect to determine the Selected Transmission Developer may request additional state-specific data or qualification criteria related to the specific potential Open Transmission Project(s), for which the state has indicated that it will determine the Selected Transmission Developer to be included in the corresponding Transmission Proposal Request(s) prior to the Transmission Provider Board’s approval of potential Open Transmission Project(s) for inclusion in Appendix A of the MTEP.

Upon receipt of a New Transmission Proposal, the Transmission Provider will review the New Transmission Proposal to ensure all qualifications and requirements from the Transmission Proposal Request, including state-specific qualifications, have been satisfied. Should the New Transmission Proposal not satisfy one or more of the requirements or qualifications outlined in this Tariff and/or specified in the Transmission Proposal Request, the Transmission Provider will notify the New Transmission Proposal Applicant and initiate a Cure Period as described in Section VIII.F of this Tariff. Within five (5) business days following the completion of this Cure Period, Transmission Provider will submit all applicable New Transmission Proposals, including any whose deficiencies have been cured, to the appropriate state(s) for their consideration, subject to execution of appropriate Non-Disclosure Agreements.
If, for any reason, a state is unable or declines to determine the Selected Transmission Developer within the time period defined in Section VIII.G, the Transmission Provider will assume responsibility for determining the Selected Transmission Developer. In this event, the Transmission Provider will, pursuant to the evaluation process outlined in Section VIII.G of this Attachment FF: i) evaluate each New Transmission Proposal submitted by a Qualified Transmission Developer; ii) select one of the New Transmission Proposals for implementation and; iii) post the Selected Transmission Developer on its website within 180 calendar days of the notification from a state that it is unable or declines to select a developer, or the lapse of the 180 calendar day timeframe defined in Section VIII.G of this Attachment FF, not to exceed 450 calendar days from posting of the Transmission Proposal Request.

C. **Upgrades to Existing Transmission Facilities.** A Transmission Owner shall have the right to develop, own and operate any upgrade to a transmission facility owned by the Transmission Owner, in accordance with this Tariff and the ISO Agreement.

1.1 **Upgrades to Existing Transmission Lines.** Upgrades to existing transmission line facilities include any expansion, replacement or modification, for any purpose, made to existing transmission line facilities that are classified as transmission plant and owned by one or more Transmission Owners, for reasons including, but not limited to:

(a) increasing the load capability of the transmission line or an associated circuit;

(b) increasing the nominal operating voltage of the transmission line or an associated circuit;

(c) installing additional plant on an existing overhead or underground
transmission line facility, such as, but not limited to:

i. plant associated with an additional circuit installed on spare structure positions;

ii. additional structures to increase a sag limit or for other purposes;

iii. a sectionalizing switch installed on an existing transmission line circuit regardless of whether or not it is installed on an existing structure; and

iv. any other plant additions to existing transmission line facilities.

(d) relocating the existing transmission line, or any portion thereof, for any purpose;

(e) replacing an entire existing transmission line facility with a new transmission line facility on the same right-of-way or on a different right-of-way if the replacement is driven by a relocation request or requirement;

(f) replacing one or more existing components of any existing transmission line facility, such as, but not limited to:

i. replacing existing conductors with higher capacity conductors or better performing conductors;

ii. replacing single-circuit structures with multi circuit structures;

iii. replacing insulators rated at a specific voltage with insulators rated at a higher voltage;

iv. replacing aging or defective components associated with the existing transmission line;

(g) improving the performance or characteristics of the existing transmission
line for any reason;

(h) converting an existing overhead transmission line to an underground transmission line on the same right-of-way and/or converting an existing underground transmission line to an overhead transmission on the same right-of-way;

(i) improving land and land rights booked under the Commission’s Uniform System of Accounts, Account Nos. 105, 350, and/or 380; or

(j) any other modifications to existing transmission facilities.

1.1.1 Combination of Upgrades and New Facilities. If a proposed transmission project includes a combination of new transmission line sections and upgrades to existing transmission line sections, and the new transmission line sections are less than twenty (20) contiguous miles in total length, construction of the new transmission line sections will be considered a transmission upgrade for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal. In either event, upgrades made to the existing transmission line sections will be considered transmission upgrades for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal.

1.2 Upgrades to Existing Substations. Upgrades to existing substations include any expansions, replacements or modifications made, in part or in whole, to any existing substation or portion thereof that is owned by one or more Transmission Owners, and where some or all of the plant within the existing substation is classified as transmission plant. These upgrades include, but are not limited to:
(a) replacing facilities and/or equipment within an existing substation footprint;

(b) installing additional plant within an existing substation footprint;

(c) modifying facilities and/or equipment within an existing substation footprint;

(d) expanding an existing substation footprint within the existing substation site boundaries and installing additional plant within the expanded area; and

(e) acquiring additional land adjacent to or near the existing substation in conjunction with installation of additional plant within the boundaries of this additional land, including facilities to interconnect such plant to the existing substation plant.

1.2.1 Construction of a new substation facility at the common junction point(s) of a transmission line containing more than two terminals or along an existing two terminal transmission line, where such transmission line facilities are owned by an incumbent Transmission Owner, for the purpose of implementing: i) transmission line protection system upgrades; ii) improving operational flexibility; iii) improving customer service reliability indices (e.g., reducing SAIFI, CAIDI, SAIDI, etc.); iv) increasing the load capability of the transmission line; v) improving transmission voltages and reactive power management; vi) mitigating the economic and/or reliability impact of contingencies; and vii) any other purpose other than facilitating the interconnection of a New Transmission Line Facility will be considered a transmission upgrade for the purpose of
retaining a right of first refusal. Furthermore, construction of a new substation for the purpose of interconnecting two or more existing transmission circuits where all such existing transmission circuits are owned by incumbent Transmission Owner(s) will be considered a transmission upgrade for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal. Examples of newly constructed substations that will be considered transmission upgrades for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal include, but are not limited to, i) circuit breaker substations installed along an existing two-terminal transmission line to improve operational flexibility or customer service reliability via automatic sectionalizing; ii) series capacitor substations installed within an existing transmission line to increase load capability; iii) circuit breaker switching substations installed at the common junction point of a three-terminal line to improve loading and protection capabilities of protective relay systems; and iv) newly constructed switching substation to interconnect two existing transmission circuits at the point where they physically cross each other where such existing transmission circuits are owned by the same Transmission Owner. Examples of new substation facilities that would not be considered transmission upgrades for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal include, but are not limited to, i) a New Substation Facility proposed to interconnect three New Transmission Line Facilities; ii) a New Substation Facility proposed to facilitate connecting a 345 kV New Transmission Line Facility to the midpoint of an existing 345 kV transmission circuit owned by an incumbent Transmission Owner; and iii) a 765-345 kV New Substation Facility constructed to interconnect a 765 kV New Transmission Line Facility
with an existing double circuit 345 kV transmission line, where such 345 kV double circuit transmission line is owned by incumbent Transmission Owner(s).

D. Data Submission

1. Determination of Projects Not Subject to a Right of First Refusal.

Upon the Transmission Provider Board’s approval of transmission projects for inclusion in Appendix A of the MTEP, the Transmission Provider will develop a separate Transmission Proposal Request for each Open Transmission Project. These Transmission Proposal Request(s) will be posted on the Transmission Provider website within thirty (30) calendar days of the date the Transmission Provider Board approved the Open Transmission Project for inclusion in Appendix A of the MTEP.

2. Transmission Proposal Requests

   a. Transmission Proposal Request Deposit. The New Transmission Proposal Applicant will submit a deposit per proposal equal to one percent (1%) of the projected project cost, not to exceed $500,000. The Transmission Provider shall track all time and expenses specifically associated with the evaluation process identified in this Section VIII of Attachment FF and the Transmission Proposal Request deposits will be applied to the cost of evaluating the New Transmission Proposals. Any remaining funds shall be refundable on a pro rata basis to each New Transmission Proposal Applicant within thirty (30) days following the designation of the Selected Transmission Developer. No interest will be paid on any deposit funds held by the Transmission Provider during this
b. **Minimum Contents of Transmission Proposal Requests.** The Transmission Proposal Request will specify i) each New Transmission Line Facility and/or each New Substation Facility associated with the Open Transmission Project that should be included in the New Transmission Proposal; ii) the date by which the New Transmission Proposal must be submitted to the Transmission Provider, which shall not exceed 180 calendar days from the posting of the Transmission Proposal Request; and iii) a list of the current transmission facility interconnection standards and requirements established by the Transmission Owner(s) to which the New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities will interconnect.

i. Furthermore, where it involves one or more New Transmission Line Facilities, the Transmission Proposal Request will specify for each New Transmission Line Facility, at a minimum:

1. Expected in-service date;
2. Implementation schedule indicating the required steps to develop and construct the Open Transmission Project, including, but not limited to, all required regulatory approvals;
3. Nominal operating voltage level in kV and voltage characteristics (i.e., three-phase AC, bipolar DC,
etc.) for each transmission circuit;

(4) Terminating substations and buses for each transmission circuit;

(5) Minimum required normal and emergency load ratings for both summer and winter seasons for each transmission circuit; and

(6) Maximum allowable positive sequence impedance for each transmission circuit when determined applicable by planning studies performed by the Transmission Provider.

ii. Where it involves one or more New Substation Facilities, the Transmission Proposal Request will specify for each New Substation Facility, at a minimum, the following information:

(1) Expected in-service date;

(2) Implementation schedule indicating the required steps to develop and construct the Open Transmission Project, including, but not limited to, all required regulatory approvals;

(3) List of all transmission buses within the New Substation Facility, including nominal operating voltage level in kV and voltage characteristics;

(4) List of all major equipment and facilities within the
New Substation Facility and associated terminating buses including power transformers, voltage regulators, phase angle regulators, series reactors, series capacitors, shunt reactors, shunt capacitors, static VAR compensators, DC converters, transmission line circuit terminals, generator terminals, and loads;

(5) Limitations on and/or requirements for bus configurations when determined applicable by planning studies performed by the Transmission Provider including required load ratings of circuit breakers, disconnects, bus sections and other load carrying equipment under alternative bus configurations;

(6) Required load ratings for all load carrying equipment and facilities identified in item (4) above;

(7) Winding connection and tap requirements for power transformers, voltage regulators, phase angle regulators and load tap changers when determined necessary by planning studies performed by the Transmission Provider;

(8) Impedance requirements for power transformers, phase angle regulators, series reactors and series
capacitors when determined necessary by planning studies performed by the Transmission Provider; and

(9) Limitations on and/or requirements for protection systems when determined applicable by a planning driver or Applicable Reliability Standard or in order to ensure a compatible interconnection with existing protection systems associated with existing transmission facilities to which the New Transmission Facilities will interconnect.

c. Other Requirements of Transmission Proposal Requests. The Transmission Provider reserves the right to specify in Transmission Proposal Requests, if deemed necessary and/or appropriate, additional information for any specific New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities.

3. Contents of New Transmission Proposals. New Transmission Proposal Applicants that submit a New Transmission Proposal in response to a Transmission Proposal Request must submit all data required by the Transmission Proposal Request, including, but not limited to:

(1) Documentation of satisfaction of general requirements for Qualified Transmission Developers;

(2) Cost estimate data for each proposed New Transmission Line Facility and/or New Substation Facility;
(3) Reasonably descriptive facility design proposals for each New Substation Facility and/or New Transmission Line Facility included in the Open Transmission Project;

(4) Documentation of project implementation capabilities;

(5) Documentation of operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities;

(6) Modeling data files for all proposed New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities included in the Open Transmission Project; and

(7) Descriptions of relevant partnerships or agreements (if applicable).

4. **General Requirements for Qualified Transmission Developers.** The general requirements applicable to Qualified Transmission Developers include, but are not limited to:

   (1) Agreement to execute the ISO Agreement if designated as the Selected Transmission Developer in the evaluation process to develop, own and operate New Substation Facilities and/or New Transmission Line Facilities after the facilities have been constructed but prior to energization of such New Transmission Facilities, unless New Transmission Proposal Applicant is already a Transmission Owner;

   (2) Agreement to comply with all Applicable Laws and Regulations, codes, and standards governing the engineering, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of transmission facilities including, but not limited to, federal laws, state laws, local laws, state and local building codes, federal
regulatory requirements, state and local regulatory requirements, state and local licensing authorities, the National Electric Safety Code, the National Electric Code, Applicable Reliability Standards, and Good Utility Practice;

(3) Agreement to register with NERC as the transmission owner (TO), transmission operator (TOP) and transmission planner (TP), as defined by NERC, for all transmission facilities which the Selected Transmission Developer will own that are to be part of the Transmission System;

(4) Agreement to either i) contract with the interconnecting Local Balancing Authority (LBA) to include the New Transmission Facilities within the boundaries of the LBA and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Transmission Provider and per agreement by the LBA that applicable LBA-related tasks associated with the proposed New Transmission Facilities that are delegated to an LBA by the Balancing Authority Agreement will be carried out either by the LBA or the Selected Transmission Developer; or ii) execute the Balancing Authority Agreement, register with NERC as a Balancing Authority (BA), and be designated as the Local Balancing Authority for the proposed New Transmission Facilities, unless the New Transmission Proposal Applicant is already registered with NERC as a BA and designated as an LBA for one or more of the existing facilities that interconnect directly with the New Transmission Facilities associated with the Open Transmission Project in question;
(5) Agreement to comply with the FERC Form 715 Part 4 TRPC, Transmission Planning Criteria and Guidelines on file with FERC and established by each incumbent Transmission Owner whose existing transmission facilities will interconnect directly with the New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities;

(6) Agreement to comply with current requirements and standards regarding the interconnection of transmission facilities published by each Transmission Owner to which New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities will interconnect including, but not limited to, those standards and requirements required for compliance with the applicable NERC Facilities Design, Connections, and Maintenance (“FAC”) reliability standards; and

(7) Submission of a business plan outlining the strategy and process to obtain project financing and/or credit rating information applicable to the entity’s organization from Standard and Poor’s, Moody’s, or Fitch.

5. **Cost Estimates.** Proposed cost estimate data must be based on the reasonably descriptive facility design proposals submitted in the New Transmission Proposal and will include, at a minimum:

(1) Estimated project cost for each proposed New Transmission Line Facility and/or New Substation Facility; and

(2) Estimated annual revenue requirements for the first 40 years the facilities included in the New Transmission Proposal will be in service.
6. **Reasonably Descriptive Facility Design Proposals.** Reasonably descriptive facility design proposals must be submitted for each New Transmission Line Facility and/or New Substation Facility included in the Open Transmission Project. Reasonably descriptive facility design proposals represent descriptions of the core attributes and features of a design, not the detailed engineering and design calculations and documents.

a. **Reasonably Descriptive Facility Design Proposals for New Transmission Facilities.** For each New Transmission Line Facility, reasonably descriptive facility design proposals must include, at a minimum:

   (1) Estimated length of New Transmission Line Facility in miles and basis for estimate;

   (2) Proposed conductor type, size, and, if applicable, bundling configuration;

   (3) Proposed default or typical structure design attribute(s) (e.g., steel vs. wood vs. aluminum vs. concrete, monopole vs. H-frame vs. lattice, single circuit vs. double circuit, self-supporting vs. guyed, structural calculation assumptions, etc.) to be used for tangent, running angle, in-line dead-end, and angle dead-end structures when feasible and/or for the majority of the New Transmission Line Facility;

   (4) Estimated positive sequence line impedance and pi-equivalent shunt susceptance;
(5) Calculated normal and emergency seasonal thermal loading ratings, including basis for calculations;

(6) Proposed type of lightning protection system to be used when feasible and/or for the majority of the New Transmission Line Facility (e.g., shield wires vs. surge arresters, etc.) and key attributes (e.g., shielding angle, arrester location and type, etc.);

(7) Proposed grounding method to be used when feasible and/or for the majority of the New Transmission Line Facility (e.g., ground rods only, counterpoise, etc.) and key attributes (e.g., targeted structure footing grounding resistance, etc.);

(8) Proposed method to address or mitigate adverse impacts of galloping conductors and/or Aeolian vibration, if any (e.g., Stockbridge dampers, special conductors, etc.);

(9) Continuous rating of any load carrying switchgear installed on the New Transmission Line Facility; and

(10) Assumed communications systems to be used for the New Transmission Line Facility to facilitate protective relaying (e.g., fiber optic, power line carrier, microwave, etc.).

b. **Reasonably Descriptive Facility Design Proposals for New Substation Facilities.** For New Substation Facilities, reasonably descriptive facility design proposals must include, at a minimum:

(1) Detailed one-line diagram;
(2) Proposed protection systems including protection schemes, any anticipated interaction with existing/other facilities and conceptual protection system design (including backup protection systems, if applicable). Remote system monitoring capability shall be described with major features listed (redundancy, monitored parameters, etc.);

(3) Detailed specifications for proposed power transformers;

(4) Description of other substation equipment items, including load ratings, voltage ratings, fault interrupting ratings, tap data, and impedances as applicable, where other substation equipment includes, but is not limited to, bus sections, circuit breakers, circuit switchers, switches, disconnects, regulating transformers, station service transformers, series and shunt capacitors, series and shunt reactors, static VAR compensators, DC conversion equipment, instrument transformers (metering and relaying), wave traps, and surge arresters;

(5) Proposed line terminal ratings and basis for calculation, including limiting element;

(6) Basis for load rating calculations on any equipment where nameplate continuous ratings are not used; and

(7) Description of the communication system for remote monitoring, control and data acquisition facilities, including monitoring and control points.
Any specific Transmission Proposal Request may require submission of additional facility design data when deemed necessary by the Transmission Provider. Any New Transmission Proposal may also include additional facility data, including but not limited to, optional facility design data listed in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning, which may be considered by the Transmission Provider in the evaluation and selection of New Transmission Proposals.

7. **Project Implementation Capabilities.** Documentation of project implementation capabilities required in a New Transmission Proposal must include documented processes and methods to be used by the entity to perform:

(1) Project management;

(2) Routing evaluation studies for New Transmission Line Facilities, if applicable;

(3) Site evaluation studies for New Substation Facilities, if applicable;

(4) Regulatory permitting;

(5) Right-of-way acquisition for New Transmission Line Facilities, if applicable;

(6) Land acquisition for New Substation Facilities, if applicable;

(7) Engineering and surveying required for New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities;
(8) Material procurement for New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities;

(9) Construction of New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities; and

(10) Commissioning of New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities.

Any specific Transmission Proposal Request may require submission of additional data related to the policies, processes, methods, capabilities, experience, and past performance of New Transmission Proposal Applicants regarding project implementation when deemed necessary by the Transmission Provider.

Any New Transmission Proposal may also include additional information regarding project implementation capabilities, including but not limited to, existing capabilities and past experience regarding project implementation, which may be considered by the Transmission Provider in the evaluation and selection of New Transmission Proposals.


Documentation of operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities required in a New Transmission Proposal must include documented processes and methods to be used by the New Transmission Proposal Applicant to perform the following as applicable depending on types of facilities included in the Open Transmission Project:

(1) Forced outage response for transmission line circuits;
(2) Forced outage response for substations;
(3) Switching for transmission line circuits;
(4) Switching for substations;
(5) Transmission line emergency repair;
(6) Substation emergency repair and testing;
(7) Transmission line preventative and/or predictive maintenance, including vegetation management;
(8) Substation preventative and/or predictive maintenance including equipment testing;
(9) Maintenance and management of spare parts, spare structures, and/or spare equipment inventories for substations and/or transmission lines, as applicable, including description of any agreements to share spare equipment, spare parts, and/or spare structures with other transmission entities;
(10) Real-time operations monitoring and control capabilities, if the Open Transmission Project contains one or more New Substation Facilities; and
(11) Major facility replacements or rebuilds required as a result of catastrophic destruction or natural aging through normal wear and tear, including financial strategy to facilitate timely replacements and/or rebuilds.

Any specific Transmission Proposal Request may require submission of additional data related to the policies, processes, methods, capabilities, experience, and past performance of entities regarding operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement when deemed necessary by the Transmission Provider.
Additional information regarding operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities may also be included in any New Transmission Proposal, including but not limited to, existing capabilities and past experience regarding operations, maintenance, repair and replacement, which may be considered by the Transmission Provider in the evaluation and selection of New Transmission Proposals.

9. **Transmission Provider Planning Process Participation Documentation.**

While not required, should a New Transmission Proposal Applicant participate in the Transmission Provider planning process and desire to have such participation considered in the evaluation as described in Section VII.G of this Attachment FF, the New Transmission Proposal Applicant should include in its New Transmission Proposal documentation regarding relevant planning studies performed by the New Transmission Proposal Applicant and results supplied to the Transmission Provider planning process, as well as documentation on past transmission project ideas submitted by the New Transmission Proposal Applicant to the Transmission Provider to address the same Transmission Issues being addressed by the Open Transmission Project for which the New Transmission Proposal is being submitted.

10. **Modeling Data.** Modeling data files submitted with the New Transmission Proposal must meet the requirements outlined in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning, including, at a minimum, data files necessary:

(1) To model New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities in power flow and short-circuit models and
(2) To model new contingencies associated with New Transmission Lines Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities.

11. **Period for Submission of New Transmission Proposals.** New Transmission Proposals must be submitted within 180 calendar days from the date the Transmission Proposal Request is posted, or within the time period specified in the Transmission Proposal Request, whichever comes first. If the due date falls on a federal holiday, Saturday, or Sunday, the New Transmission Proposals will be due on the next business day. Two copies of the New Transmission Proposal in hard copy form must be delivered to the address specified in the Transmission Proposal Request no later than 5:00 PM EPT on the due date and one electronic copy of the New Transmission Proposal must be e-mailed to the e-mail address specified in the Transmission Proposal Request no later than 5:00 PM EPT on the due date. Any inquiries by New Transmission Proposal Applicants regarding a Transmission Proposal Request prior to submission of a New Transmission Proposal should be made directly with the contacts listed in the Transmission Proposal Request and not to the interconnecting incumbent Transmission Owners.

12. **Additional Data Requests.** If, during the evaluation of New Transmission Proposals, the Transmission Provider determines that additional information is required to evaluate the Qualified Transmission Developers, the Transmission Provider will request, in writing, the additional data from all Qualified Transmission Developers, along with the timeframe that this data must be submitted within. If the additional data is not submitted within the specified timeframe, the New Transmission Proposal will not be evaluated or considered.
further. This timeframe will not be less than ten (10) business days from when the Transmission Provider issues the additional data request. This data request will not extend the evaluation timeframe defined in Section VIII.G.

13. **Confidential Treatment of New Transmission Proposals.** All information submitted with the New Transmission Proposal will be considered Confidential Information and will not be publicly posted or shared with any individual, except employees of the Transmission Provider, applicable state parties who have elected to choose the Selected Transmission developers, as specified in Section VIII.A of this Attachment FF, and/or contractors of the Transmission Provider that have executed an appropriate non-disclosure agreement.

E. **Developer Qualifications.** Any New Transmission Proposal Applicant may submit a New Transmission Proposal, but must meet the minimum qualifications required for a Qualified Transmission Developer in order for the Transmission Provider to accept and consider the New Transmission Proposal. A New Transmission Proposal Applicant must either be a Transmission Owner as defined in this Tariff or a Non-owner Member as defined in the ISO Agreement at the time the Transmission Proposal Request is posted, and must maintain such status throughout the entire process of evaluation and selection of New Transmission Proposals and project implementation, provided that a Non-owner Member must become a Transmission Owner. To be eligible to be considered a Qualified Transmission Developer, a New Transmission Proposal Applicant that submits a New Transmission Proposal must include therein all the agreements specified in Section VIII.D of this Attachment FF. Furthermore, a New Transmission Proposal Applicant will not be considered a Qualified Transmission Developer if all required data specified in the Transmission Proposal Request, including, but not
limited to, the required data outlined in Section VIII.D of this Attachment FF, is not included in the New Transmission Proposal as required by Sections VIII.D and VIII.F of this Attachment FF.

F. **Cure Period.** Immediately after the date New Transmission Proposals are due, the Transmission Provider will review each New Transmission Proposal to ensure all qualifications and data requirements have been satisfied by each respective New Transmission Proposal Applicant. Should a New Transmission Proposal fail to satisfy one or more of the qualifications or data requirements specified in this Tariff and/or in the Transmission Proposal Request, the Transmission Provider will, within ten (10) business days, via e-mail notify the submitting New Transmission Proposal Applicant, through the contact person designated in the New Transmission Proposal, of any deficiency, and that New Transmission Proposal Applicant will have a single Cure Period of ten (10) business days from this notice to revise and resubmit the New Transmission Proposal to address the deficiency, except that if the New Transmission Proposal Applicant is neither a Non-owner Member nor a Transmission Owner on the date the Transmission Proposal Request was posted or ceases to become a Non-owner Member or Transmission Owner after the date the Transmission Proposal Request was posted, that New Transmission Proposal Applicant shall not be designated a Qualified Transmission Developer and the New Transmission Proposal will not be evaluated or considered further. If a revised New Transmission Proposal is submitted after the Cure Period has elapsed, or continues to have one or more deficiencies with regard to qualifications or data requirements, the New Transmission Proposal Applicant shall not be designated a Qualified Transmission Provider and the New Transmission Proposal will not be evaluated or considered further. The Transmission
Provider will provide a written explanation identifying why the New Transmission Proposal Applicant has been disqualified.

G. Evaluation

1. **Steps of Evaluation and Selection Process.** Upon receipt of all New Transmission Proposals, sufficient in form and substance, by the due date specified in the Transmission Proposal Request, and upon completion of the process outlined in Section VIII.F of this Attachment FF, notwithstanding the authority of states to elect to choose the Selected Transmission Developer within 360 days of the Transmission Proposal Request, the Transmission Provider will:

   (1) Evaluate each New Transmission Proposal submitted by a Qualified Transmission Developer;

   (2) Select one of the New Transmission Proposals for implementation based on application of the evaluation criteria below; and

   (3) Post the name of the Selected Transmission Developer on its website within 180 calendar days of the due date for the submission of New Transmission Proposals for the selection of the developer either by a competent state regulatory authority that chooses to make the selection, or by the Transmission Provider, or within 450 calendar days from the posting of the Transmission Proposal Request if a state initially elects to perform an evaluation of the New Transmission Proposals submitted for an Open Transmission Project and then the
Transmission Provider assumes responsibility for performing evaluation as outlined in Section VIII.B of this Attachment FF.

2. **General Criteria.** In evaluating each New Transmission Proposal, the Transmission Provider will consider the following general aspects of the proposal:

   1. Cost and reasonably descriptive facility design quality;
   2. Project implementation capabilities;
   3. Operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities; and
   4. Transmission Provider planning process participation.

3. **Cost and Reasonably Descriptive Facility Design.** When considering cost and reasonably descriptive facility design quality, the Transmission Provider shall evaluate, at a minimum:

   1. Estimated project cost for each proposed New Transmission Line Facility and/or New Substation Facility;
   2. Estimated annual revenue requirements for all New Transmission Facilities included in the New Transmission Proposal;
   3. Cost estimate rigor, which shall include financial assumptions and supporting information to clearly demonstrate a thorough analysis in support of the cost estimate;
   4. Reasonably descriptive facility design quality; and
   5. Reasonably descriptive facility design rigor, which shall include facility studies performed and other specific supporting data that
clearly documents and supports consideration and attention given to the proposed reasonably descriptive facility designs.

4. **Project Implementation Capabilities.** When considering project implementation capabilities, the Transmission Provider shall evaluate, at a minimum, existing or planned capabilities and processes regarding:

   (1) Project management;

   (2) Route and site evaluation;

   (3) Land acquisition;

   (4) Engineering and surveying;

   (5) Material procurement;

   (6) Facility construction;

   (7) Final facility commissioning; and

   (8) Previous applicable experience and demonstrated ability.

5. **Operations, Maintenance, Repair, and Replacement Capabilities.**

   When considering operations, maintenance, repair and replacement capabilities, the Transmission Provider shall evaluate, at a minimum, existing or planned capabilities and processes regarding the following, as applicable, based on the types of facilities included in the Transmission Proposal Request:

   (1) Forced outage response;

   (2) Switching;

   (3) Emergency repair and testing;

   (4) Spare parts;
(5) Preventative and/or predictive maintenance and testing;

(6) Real-time operations monitoring and control; and

(7) Major facility replacement capabilities, including ongoing financial capabilities to restore facilities after catastrophic outages.

6. **Transmission Provider Planning Process Participation.** When considering transmission provider planning process participation, the Transmission Provider will consider relevant planning studies conducted by the Qualified Transmission Developer and the associated results supplied to the Transmission Provider planning process, as well as transmission project ideas submitted in the past by the Qualified Transmission Developer as potential solutions to address the same Transmission Issues addressed by the Open Transmission Project.

7. **General Criteria Weighting.** In evaluating each New Transmission Proposal, the Transmission Provider will apply the following weighting to each New Transmission Facility criteria evaluated:

   a. **New Transmission Line Facilities.** The following weights will be applied to New Transmission Line Facility criteria:

      (1) Cost and reasonably descriptive facility design quality: 30%

      (2) Project implementation capabilities: 35%

      (3) Operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities: 30%

      (4) Transmission Provider planning process participations: 5%
b. **New Substation Facilities.** The following weights will be applied to New Substation Facility criteria:

(1) Cost and reasonably descriptive facility design quality: 30%

(2) Project implementation capabilities: 30%

(3) Operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities: 35%

(4) Transmission Provider planning process participations: 5%

8. **Evaluation and Selection.** Specific methods used to evaluate various aspects of a New Transmission Proposal shall be described in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning. This evaluation will be conducted by Transmission Provider planning staff and/or independent consultants competent in the areas of finance, transmission facility design, transmission project implementation, and transmission operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement. The Transmission Provider planning staff, and any independent consultants, will be overseen by an executive oversight committee consisting of three or more executive staff of the Transmission Provider, including at least one officer, and the final designation of the Selected Transmission Developer will rest with this committee. The committee shall possess certain specific expertise necessary for evaluation of New Transmission Proposals, such as, but not limited to, transmission construction, engineering, project management, financing, state regulatory, and operations. Within thirty (30) calendar
days of the designation of the Selected Transmission Developer, the Transmission Provider will provide a report in which it explains the basis for designating the Selected Transmission Developer for each Open Transmission Project. Any disputes regarding the developer selection will be referred to the Dispute Resolution Process under Attachment HH of this Tariff.

The Selected Transmission Developer will assume the responsibility and obligation to construct the facilities it is selected to construct. If the Selected Transmission Developer is financially incapable of carrying out its construction responsibilities, alternate construction arrangements shall be identified. Depending on the specific circumstances, such alternate arrangements shall include solicitation of Transmission Owners to take on financial and/or construction responsibilities. If the delay in construction may adversely affect the Transmission System reliability, the Transmission Provider shall coordinate with and support the affected Transmission Owner(s) regarding any mitigation measures that may be required by Applicable Reliability Standards.

However, in the event that an MTEP Appendix A Open Transmission Project approved by the Transmission Provider Board or selection of the designated Selected Transmission Developer to construct the approved project is being challenged through the Dispute Resolution process under Attachment HH of this Tariff or a court proceeding, the obligation of the Selected Transmission Developer to build the specific Open Transmission
Project (subject to required approvals) is waived until the Open Transmission Project or Selected Transmission Developer emerges from the Dispute Resolution process or court proceedings as an approved project with a Selected Transmission Developer designated to construct, implement, own, operate, maintain, repair, restore, and/or finance the recommended Open Transmission Project.

9. **Recourse if No New Transmission Proposals are Received.** If no New Transmission Proposals are received from Qualified Transmission Developers, the Open Transmission Project will be assigned to the applicable Transmission Owner(s), as defined below:

   (1) Ownership and the responsibility to construct facilities which are connected to a single Transmission Owner’s system belong to that Transmission Owner; (2) Ownership and the responsibilities to construct facilities which are connected between two (2) or more Transmission Owners’ facilities belong equally to each Transmission Owner, unless such Transmission Owners otherwise agree; and (3) Ownership and the responsibility to construct facilities which are connected between a Transmission Owner(s)’ system and a system or systems that are not part of the Transmission Provider belong to such Transmission Owner(s) unless the Transmission Owner(s) and the non-Transmission Provider party or parties otherwise agree.

IX. **Reevaluation.** After Transmission Provider Board MTEP Appendix A approval, certain circumstances or events may significantly affect such an Open Transmission Project in a manner
and to a degree that would require the Transmission Provider to perform Variance Analysis. Such circumstances or events may include, but are not limited to: material schedule delays, cost increases, or changes to the Selected Transmission Developer’s qualifications, as compared to the schedule, cost estimates, and qualifications represented in the New Transmission Project Proposal and/or MTEP Appendix A, as applicable. The Variance Analysis shall consider, among other things: (i) causes of, or reasons for, any such circumstance or event; (ii) impacts, including potential reliability impacts of a delay in the Open Transmission Project, canceling the Open Transmission Project, or replacing the Selected Transmission Developer; (iii) mitigation measures and responsibilities; and (iv) solutions, and the timetable for the implementation of such solutions. This process will begin at assignment of an Open Transmission Project and end when construction begins.

**A. Grounds for Variance Analysis**

The following factors shall trigger the Transmission Provider’s Variance Analysis for an Open Transmission Project. The Variance Analysis will focus on the materiality of the changes identified and determine the need for full reevaluation.

1. **Cost Increases**

   Any project cost increase which reduces the benefit-cost ratio of an economically-driven Open Transmission Project to less than the required benefit-to-cost threshold, as defined in Section II.B.1.e or Section II.C.7 of this Attachment FF of the Tariff.

2. **Schedule Delays**

   A reported or otherwise identified delay of 6 months or more from the in-service date established in MTEP Appendix A and agreed upon in the
accepted New Transmission Proposal and Binding Proposal Agreement of any assigned Open Transmission Project. This analysis may also be based upon failure to obtain necessary regulatory approvals; failure to execute necessary agreements; or failure to take the actions described in the Selected Transmission Developer’s accepted New Transmission Proposal.

3. **Deviation From Selected Transmission Developer Qualifications**

Material changes in the condition and characteristics of the Selected Transmission Developer, as described in its accepted New Transmission Proposal.

Material changes in this subsection may include, but are not limited to, any delegation or assignment not described in the New Transmission Proposal of project responsibilities to another entity, including affiliates, or a partner that is either previously undisclosed, or disclosed but assigned to or designated for different responsibilities or failure to conform to the terms described in the Selected Transmission Developer’s accepted New Transmission Proposal.

**B. Project Reevaluation**

If required by the results of the above-described additional analysis, the Transmission Provider shall perform a reevaluation of the Open Transmission Project and/or Selected Transmission Developer, including, but not limited to:

1. **Cost Increases**

As applicable and necessary based upon the Variance Analysis, the Transmission Provider shall use the Open Transmission Project’s current
cost estimate to perform an analysis and determine if said Open Transmission Project’s currently estimated benefit is sufficient to justify its continued construction.

2. **Schedule Delays**

As necessary based upon the Variance Analysis, the Transmission Provider shall perform an analysis to determine if the delay in the achievement of any significant schedule milestone(s) (including, but not limited to, failure to obtain necessary regulatory approvals) will delay the applicable Open Transmission Project’s in-service date, and if so, whether such delay poses risks of adverse impacts on Transmission System reliability, and what mitigation measures and plan should be implemented.

3. **Deviation From Selected Transmission Developer Qualifications**

As necessary based upon the Variance Analysis, the Transmission Provider shall perform an analysis to determine if the Selected Transmission Developer remains qualified to construct, implement, operate, maintain, and/or restore the Open Transmission Project.

C. **Reevaluation Outcomes**

Based on all the required analysis described in subparagraphs a and b of this section, the Transmission Provider may decide to (i) make no change to the Open Transmission Project; (ii) reassign the Open Transmission Project to a different Qualified Transmission Developer; (iii) cancel the Open Transmission Project (iv) implement a reliability mitigation plan, in coordination with the affected Transmission Owner(s); or (v) such other remedy or solution as may be appropriate under the circumstances,
including a suitable combination of two or more of the foregoing courses of action.

1. **Reassignment**

   If a Selected Transmission Developer is found to no longer be a Qualified Transmission Developer, the applicable Open Transmission Project may be reassigned. Open Transmission Projects will be offered to the applicable Transmission Owner, as defined below:

   (1) Ownership and the responsibility to construct facilities which are connected to a single Transmission Owner’s system belong to that Transmission Owner; (2) Ownership and the responsibilities to construct facilities which are connected between two (2) or more Owners’ facilities belong equally to each Transmission Owner, unless such Transmission Owners otherwise agree; and (3) Ownership and the responsibility to construct facilities which are connected between a Transmission Owner(s)’ system and a system or systems that are not part of the Transmission Provider belong to such Transmission Owner(s) unless the Transmission Owner(s) and the non-Transmission Provider party or parties otherwise agree.

   If the applicable Transmission Owner(s) decline to construct the Open Transmission Project, it will be reassigned, as applicable, through the developer evaluation process, as described in Section VIII.F.

2. **Project Cancellation**

   Following reevaluation, the Transmission Provider may cancel economically-driven Open Transmission Projects if (1) cost increases
reduce the benefit-cost ratio to the point where the currently estimated cost exceed previously defined benefits; and (2) reliability and/or public policy benefits (if any), are insufficient to justify continuation and completion of the project.

3. **Reliability Mitigation Plan**

If the Transmission Provider’s analysis determines that Transmission System reliability may be adversely affected by the delay of an assigned Open Transmission Project, the Transmission Provider shall coordinate with and support the affected Transmission Owner(s) regarding any mitigation measures that may be required by Applicable Reliability Standards. The mitigation measures may include, without limitation, any one or combination of the following components: i) an updated implementation plan of the Selected Transmission Developer to meet the required in-service date; ii) an operating procedure; or iii) an alternative project to mitigate the reliability violation.
X. Interregional Coordination and Cost Allocation with the Southeastern Regional Transmission Planning Region

The public utility transmission providers in the Southeastern Regional Transmission Planning region (“SERTP”) and the Midcontinent Independent System Operator region (“MISO”) shall undertake the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation procedures under Section X of this Attachment FF.

Where the regional transmission planning process is referenced as part of this interregional transmission coordination process the applicable regional transmission planning process for the Transmission Provider is described in Attachment FF; and is described for the SERTP in attachment K of the applicable SERTP transmission provider.

A. Interregional Transmission Coordination

1. Annual Meeting: Representatives of the SERTP, and staff of the Transmission Provider will meet no less than once per year to facilitate the interregional coordination procedures described below (as applicable). Representatives of the SERTP and staff of the Transmission Provider may meet more frequently during the evaluation of interregional transmission project(s) proposed for purposes of interregional cost allocation between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider transmission planning regions.

2. Website Posting of Information on Interregional Coordination: The Transmission Provider shall utilize the regional planning website for communication of information related to these coordinated interregional transmission planning procedures. The Transmission Provider shall coordinate with the SERTP with respect to the posting of materials to the regional planning
website related to the interregional coordination procedures between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider transmission planning regions. The Transmission Provider shall, at a minimum, provide the following on the regional planning website:

a. Interregional coordination and cost allocation procedures between the SERTP and Transmission Provider;

b. Links to where stakeholders can register (if applicable/available) for the stakeholder committees or distribution lists of the SERTP;

c. Documents related to joint evaluation of interregional transmission projects;

and

d. Status report on interregional transmission projects selected for purposes of interregional cost allocation between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider.

B. Model and Data Exchange

At least annually, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP shall exchange their then-current regional transmission plans including power-flow models and associated data used in the regional transmission planning processes to develop such transmission plan(s). This exchange will occur when such data is available in each of the regional transmission planning processes, typically during the first calendar quarter of each year. Additional transmission-based models and data may be exchanged between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider as necessary and if requested. For purposes of their interregional coordination activities, the Transmission Provider and SERTP will exchange only data and models used in the development of their then-current regional
transmission process and plans. This data will be posted on the pertinent regional transmission planning process’ websites, consistent with the posting requirements of the respective regional transmission planning processes, and subject to the applicable treatment of confidential data and Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (CEII). The Transmission Provider shall notify SERTP of such posting.

C. Identification and Joint Evaluation of Proposed Interregional Transmission Projects

1. **Identification of Interregional Transmission Projects:** At least biennially, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP shall meet to review the respective regional transmission plans. Such plans include each region’s transmission needs as prescribed by each region’s planning process. This review shall occur on a mutually agreeable timetable, taking into account each region’s regional transmission planning process timeline. If through this review, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP identify a potential interregional transmission project that may be more efficient or cost-effective than regional transmission projects, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP shall jointly evaluate the potential interregional transmission project pursuant to Section X.C.3.

2. **Identification of Interregional Transmission Projects by Stakeholders:** Stakeholders and transmission developers (pursuant to Section X.D.1) may also propose interregional transmission projects that may be more efficient or cost-effective than regional transmission projects pursuant to the procedures in each region’s regional transmission planning processes.
3. **Evaluation of Interregional Transmission Projects:** The Transmission Provider and the SERTP shall act through their respective regional transmission planning processes in the joint evaluation of potential interregional transmission projects identified pursuant to Sections X.C.1 and X.C.2 to determine whether the inclusion of any potential interregional transmission projects in each region’s regional transmission plan would be more efficient or cost-effective than regional projects. Such analysis shall be consistent with accepted transmission planning practices of the respective regions and the methods utilized to produce each region’s respective regional transmission plan(s).

4. **Review of Proposed Interregional Transmission Projects:** Initial coordination activities regarding potential interregional transmission projects will typically begin during the third quarter of each calendar year. The Transmission Provider and the SERTP will exchange status updates regarding interregional transmission projects that are newly proposed or that are currently under consideration as needed. These status updates will generally include, if applicable: (i) an update of the region’s evaluation of the proposal(s); (ii) the latest calculation of benefits (as identified pursuant to Section X.D.2); and (iii) the anticipated timeline for future assessments.

5. **Coordination of Assumptions Used in Joint Evaluation:** The Transmission Provider and the SERTP will coordinate assumptions and data used in joint evaluations, as necessary, including items such as:

   a. Expected timelines and milestones associated with the joint evaluation;
b. Study assumptions;

c. Models; and

d. benefit calculations (as identified pursuant to Section X.D.2).

D. Interregional Cost Allocation: If an interregional transmission project is proposed for interregional cost allocation purposes (“Interregional CAP”) in the SERTP and the Transmission Provider transmission planning regions, then the following cost allocation and benefits calculations, as identified pursuant to Section X.D.2, shall apply to the project:

1. Interregional Transmission Projects Proposed for Interregional Cost Allocation Purposes:

   a. For a transmission project to be eligible for Interregional CAP within the SERTP and the Transmission Provider, the project must:

      i. Interconnect to the transmission facilities of one or more transmission owners in the SERTP planning region and the transmission facilities of one or more Transmission Owners of the Transmission Provider;

      ii. Have a combined benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.25 or higher to the SERTP and Transmission Provider regions, as calculated in Section X.D.3; and

      iii. Meet the threshold and qualification criteria for transmission projects potentially eligible to be included in the respective regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation in the Transmission Provider, as a Market Efficiency Project, and the
SERTP, pursuant to their respective regional transmission planning processes.

b. On a case-by-case basis, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP may consider an interregional transmission project that does not satisfy all of the criteria specified in this Section X.D.1, but that: (i) meets the threshold criteria for a project proposed to be included in the regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation in only one of the two regions; and (ii) would be interconnected to the transmission facilities of one or more transmission owners in the SERTP planning region and the transmission facilities of one or more Transmission Owners of the Transmission Provider.

c. The transmission project must be proposed for purposes of cost allocation in both the SERTP and the Transmission Provider. The project submittal must satisfy all criteria specified in the respective regional transmission processes, including the respective timeframes for submittals proposed for cost allocation purposes. If a project is proposed by a transmission developer, the transmission developer must also satisfy the qualification criteria specified by each region.
2. Calculation of Benefits for Interregional Transmission Projects Proposed for Interregional Cost Allocation Purposes: The benefits used to establish the allocation of costs of a transmission project proposed for Interregional CAP between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider shall be determined as follows:

a. Each transmission planning region, acting through its regional transmission planning process, will evaluate proposals to determine whether the proposed project(s) addresses transmission needs that are currently being addressed with projects in its regional transmission plan and, if so, which projects in the regional transmission plan could be displaced by the proposed project(s).

b. Based upon its evaluation, each region will quantify its benefits based upon the transmission costs that each region is projected to avoid due to its transmission projects being displaced by the proposed interregional transmission project as follows:

i. for the SERTP, the total avoided costs of projects included in the then-current regional transmission plan that would be displaced if the proposed interregional transmission project was included; and

ii. for the Transmission Provider, the total avoided costs of Market Efficiency Projects identified, but not approved, in the then-current regional transmission plan that would be
displaced if the proposed interregional transmission project was included.

The benefits calculated pursuant to this Section X.D.2 are not necessarily the same as the benefits used for purposes of regional cost allocation.

3. Calculation of Benefit-to-Cost Ratio for an Interregional Transmission Project Proposed for Interregional CAP:

Prior to any regional benefit-to-cost ratio calculation pursuant to either regional transmission planning process, the combined interregional benefit-to-cost ratio, referenced in Section X.D.1.a, shall be calculated for an interregional transmission project proposed for Interregional CAP. Such calculation shall be performed by dividing the sum of the present value of the avoided project cost determined in accordance with Section X.D.2.b.i for the SERTP region and the present value of avoided project cost determined in accordance with Section X.D.2.b.ii for the Transmission Provider region by the present value of the proposed interregional transmission project’s total project cost. The present values used in the cost calculation shall be based on a common date, comparable cost components, and the latest cost estimates used in the evaluation of the interregional transmission project. The combined interregional benefit-to-cost ratio will be assessed in addition to, not in the place of, the SERTP’s and the Transmission Provider’s respective regional benefit-to-cost ratio assessment(s) (if applicable) as specified in the respective regional processes.
4. **Inclusion in Regional Transmission Plans:** An interregional transmission project proposed for Interregional CAP in the transmission planning regions of the SERTP and the Transmission Provider will be included in the respective regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation after:

   a. Each region has performed all evaluations, as prescribed in its regional transmission planning process, necessary for a project to be included in its regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation including any regional benefit-to-cost ratio calculations. Each region shall utilize the benefit calculation(s) as defined in such region’s regional transmission planning process (for purposes of clarity, these benefits are not necessarily the same as the benefits determined pursuant to Section X.D.2). Each region shall utilize the cost calculation(s) as defined in such region’s regional transmission planning process. The anticipated percentage allocation of costs of the interregional transmission project to each region shall be based upon the ratio of the region’s benefits to the sum of the benefits, both as determined pursuant to Section X.D.2, identified for both the SERTP and the Transmission Provider.

   b. Each region has obtained all approvals, as prescribed in its regional process, necessary for a project to be included in the regional transmission plan for purposes of regional cost allocation.

5. **Allocation of Costs Between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider**

   **Regions:** The cost of an interregional transmission project, selected for
purposes of cost allocation in the regional transmission plans of both the SERTP and the Transmission Provider, will be allocated as follows:

a. Each region will be allocated a portion of the interregional transmission project’s costs in proportion to such region’s benefit as calculated pursuant to Section X.D.2 to the sum of the benefits identified for both the SERTP and the Transmission Provider calculated pursuant to Section X.D.2.

i. The benefits used for this determination shall be based upon the benefit calculation most recently performed – pursuant to the method described in Section X.D.2 – before each region included the project in its regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation and as approved by each region.

b. Costs allocated to each region shall be further allocated within each region pursuant to the cost allocation methodology contained in its regional transmission planning process.

6. Milestones of Required Steps Necessary to Maintain Status as Being Selected for Interregional Cost Allocation Purposes: Once selected in the respective regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation, the transmission owners in the SERTP planning region that will be allocated costs of the transmission project, the Transmission Provider, and the transmission developer(s) must mutually agree upon an acceptable development schedule including milestones by which the necessary steps to develop and construct the interregional transmission project must occur. These milestones may include (to the extent not already accomplished) obtaining all necessary
rights-of-way and requisite environmental, state, and other governmental approvals and executing a mutually-agreed upon contract(s) between the applicable transmission owners in the SERTP planning region, the Transmission Provider and the transmission developer. If such critical steps are not met by the specified milestones and then afterwards maintained, then the Transmission Provider and the SERTP may remove the transmission project from the selected category in the regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation.

7. **Interregional Transmission Project Contractual Arrangements:** The contracts referenced in Section X.D.6 will address terms and conditions associated with the development of the proposed interregional transmission project included in the regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation, including but not limited to:

a. Engineering, procurement, construction, maintenance, and operation of the proposed transmission project, including coordination responsibilities of the parties;

b. Emergency restoration and repair;

c. The specific financial terms and specific total amounts to be charged by the transmission developer of the transmission project to each beneficiary, as agreed to by the parties;

d. Creditworthiness and project security requirements;

e. Milestone reporting, including schedule of projected expenditures;

f. Reevaluation of the transmission project; and
g. Non-performance or abandonment.

8. Removal from Regional Transmission Plans: An interregional transmission project may be removed from the SERTP’s or the Transmission Provider’s regional transmission plan(s) for Interregional CAP: (i) if the transmission developer fails to meet developmental milestones; (ii) pursuant to the reevaluation procedures specified in the respective regional transmission planning processes; or (iii) if the project is removed from one of the region’s regional transmission plans pursuant to the requirements of its regional transmission planning process.

a. The Transmission Provider shall notify the SERTP if an interregional transmission project or a portion thereof is likely to be, and/or is actually removed from its regional transmission plan.

E. Transparency

1. Stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide input and feedback within the respective regional transmission planning processes of the SERTP and the Transmission Provider related to interregional transmission projects identified, analysis performed, and any determination/results. Stakeholders may participate in either or both regions’ regional transmission planning processes to provide their input and feedback regarding the interregional coordination between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider.

2. The Transmission Provider shall use the existing planning stakeholder forums, such as the Planning Advisory Committee and Sub-regional
Planning Meetings, to review with stakeholders the interregional activities associated with the SERTP.
TAB B

Clean Tariff Sheets
ATTACHMENT FF Transmission Expansion Planning Protocol

Version: 13.0.0 Effective: 1/1/2015

ATTACHMENT FF

TRANSMISSION EXPANSION PLANNING PROTOCOL

I. Transmission Expansion Plan - Purpose and Scope, Definition and Role of OMS Committee: This Attachment FF describes the process to be used by the Transmission Provider to develop the MISO Transmission Expansion Plan (“MTEP”), subject to review and approval by the Transmission Provider Board. The provisions of this Attachment FF are consistent with the applicable provisions of Appendix B of the ISO Agreement and this Tariff. For purposes of this Attachment FF, all references to Transmission Owner(s) will include ITC(s). The costs incurred by the Transmission Provider in the performance of data collection, analyses and review, and in the development of the MTEP report, costs incurred under Section I.B of this Attachment FF, and costs incurred under Section I.C of this Attachment FF shall be recovered from all Transmission Customers under Schedule 10 of the Tariff.

A. Enrollment Process: The MTEP is developed to facilitate the timely and orderly expansion of and/or modification to the Transmission System to maintain reliability, promote efficiency in bulk power markets and facilitate compliance with applicable Federal and state laws, regulatory mandates and regulatory obligations. Any transmission provider that wishes to enroll in the Transmission Provider planning process for purposes of Order No. 1000 compliance must become a Transmission Owner, by signing the ISO Agreement, and by, within a reasonable period of time: (1) turning over functional control of its transmission facilities to the Transmission Provider; and (2) taking service under this Tariff for all its load that is physically located within the geographic area comprising the Transmission System. All Transmission
Owners enrolled in the Transmission Provider’s transmission planning region are listed in either (1) Attachment FF-4 of this Tariff, for Transmission Owners without a separately filed local planning process or (2) Attachment FF-5 of this Tariff, for Transmission Owners with a separately filed local planning process.

**B. OMS Committee Input to MTEP Process:** To the extent not otherwise specifically addressed in other portions of this Attachment FF, with respect to the MTEP process, the OMS Committee may provide input to the Transmission Provider planning staff and the System Planning Committee of the Transmission Provider Board, as appropriate, regarding the following:

1. At the start of a planning cycle, the OMS Committee may suggest to the Transmission Provider Board modifications to the Transmission Provider’s planning principles and planning objectives for that planning cycle;
2. At the start of a planning cycle, the OMS Committee may suggest additional scope elements in the MTEP;
3. Modeling inputs or assumptions used in the development of the MTEP and related appropriate cost/benefit analyses with respect to certain projects that are not proposed strictly for reliability; and
4. Concerns about general or specific issues with the MTEP process as they arise during the planning year.

Furthermore, at the end of the MTEP development process, but before the MTEP is submitted to the Transmission Provider Board for its review, the OMS Committee may submit a reconsideration request to the Transmission Provider planning staff, which shall respond prior to
submitting the final MTEP report to the Transmission Provider Board. This reconsideration request can be made only with respect to Network Upgrades eligible to receive regional cost allocation under Attachment FF if such projects: (1) will be recommended to the Transmission Provider Board for MTEP Appendix A approval, but have not been considered through the complete MTEP process or (2) will have a change in project cost of twenty-five percent (25%) or greater between the final Subregional Planning Meeting in the current planning year and the project being submitted to the Transmission Provider Board for approval. The Transmission Provider shall consider such a reconsideration request only if it is endorsed by the OMS acting by a vote of sixty-six percent (66%) or more of the OMS members.

At the end of each MTEP cycle, the OMS Committee may submit its assessment of the MTEP process to the Planning Advisory Committee, Transmission Provider, and the System Planning Committee of the Transmission Provider Board. Upon receipt of any such assessment from the OMS Committee, the Transmission Provider planning staff shall provide an appropriate response in a reasonably timely manner.

The manner in which the OMS Committee shall provide its assessment shall be set forth in the Transmission Planning Business Practices Manual procedures. The general procedures adopted with respect to the OMS Committee input into the MTEP shall remain unchanged until June 1, 2015, unless otherwise mutually agreed to by the Transmission Provider and the OMS Committee. Changes to the Transmission Planning Business Practices Manual procedures which describe OMS Committee input into the MTEP process may not be adopted with less than sixty (60) days’ notice to the OMS Committee unless the OMS Committee consents to such earlier
adoption. At the end of the two year period the Transmission Provider, the OMS, and other stakeholders will assess the success of the input procedures and provide suggestions for improvement.

C. Development of the MTEP: The Transmission Provider, working in collaboration with representatives of the Transmission Owners, OMS, and the Planning Advisory Committee, shall develop the MTEP, consistent with Good Utility Practice and taking into consideration long-range planning horizons, as appropriate. The Transmission Provider shall develop the MTEP for expected use patterns and analyze the performance of the Transmission System in meeting both reliability needs and the needs of the competitive bulk power market, under a wide variety of contingency conditions. The MTEP will give full consideration to the needs of all Market Participants, will include consideration of demand-side options, and will identify expansions or enhancements needed to i) support competition and efficiency in bulk power markets; ii) comply with Applicable Laws and Regulations; and iii) maintain reliability. This analysis and planning process shall integrate into the development of the MTEP among other things:

(i) the Transmission Issues identified from Facilities Studies carried out in connection with specific transmission service requests; (ii) Transmission Issues associated with generator interconnection service; (iii) the Transmission Issues, including proposed transmission projects, identified by the Transmission Owners in connection with their planning analyses in accordance with local planning process described in Section I.B.1.a to this Attachment FF and the coordination processes of Section I.B.1.b., or developed by Transmission Owners utilizing their own FERC-approved local transmission planning process described in Section I.B.2, as applicable, to provide reliable power supply to their
connected load customers and to expand trading opportunities, better integrate the grid and alleviate congestion; (iv) the transmission planning obligations of a Transmission Owner, imposed by federal or state law(s) or regulatory authorities, which can no longer be performed solely by the Transmission Owner following transfer of functional control of its transmission facilities to the Transmission Provider; (v) plans and analyses developed by the Transmission Provider to provide for a reliable Transmission System and to expand trading opportunities, better integrate the grid and alleviate congestion; (vi) the identification, evaluation, and analysis of expansions to enable the Transmission System to fully support the simultaneous feasibility of all State 1A ARRs; (vii) the inputs provided by the Planning Advisory Committee; (viii) the inputs, if any, provided by the state and local regulatory authorities having jurisdiction over any of the Transmission Owners; and (ix) the inputs of the OMS Committee.

1. Planning Cycle and Milestones: The ISO Agreement requires that a regional transmission plan be developed biennially or more frequently. An MTEP planning cycle is established for each calendar year. The development of the MTEP for a planning cycle with a given calendar year designation begins on June 1 of the year prior to the MTEP calendar year designation and ends with the approval of the final MTEP report by the Transmission Provider Board. This approval typically occurs at the Transmission Provider Board Meeting in December of the MTEP designated year. For example, the development of the MTEP14 transmission plan will commence on June 1 of 2013 and typically end with approval in December 2014. The development of the MTEP will follow specified process steps that are detailed, including process diagrams, in the Transmission Provider’s Transmission Planning Business Practices Manual (“TPBPM”).
The TPBPM shall be posted on the website of the Transmission Provider.

a. Planning Functions: The planning process includes the following functions which are described in detail in the TPBPM:

i. Model Development;

ii. Generator Interconnection Planning;

iii. Transmission Service Planning;

iv. Cyclical Regional Expansion Planning activities;

v. Coordinated System Plans with other RTOs/regions;

vi. System Support Resource ("SSR") Studies for unit de-commissioning;

vii. Transmission-to-Transmission Interconnections;

viii. Load Interconnections; and

ix. Focus Studies. These are studies initiated during the cyclical baseline planning process that cannot be delayed until the next planning cycle (for example, NERC/FERC directives, or near-term critical operational issues).

Each of these planning functions may develop system expansions that are taken into consideration in developing the entirety of the MTEP.

b. Planning Cycle: The regional planning process is performed through a continuous series of planning cycles, with each cycle typically addressing Transmission Issues through a rolling planning horizon. Each cycle commences with regional model development, and identification of potential expansions from the local planning processes of the Transmission Owners, and concludes with recommendations to the Transmission
Provider Board of Directors of recommended solutions to identified Transmission Issues. Transmission Owner plans developed through local planning processes described in Section I.B.1.a are included in the beginning of each regional planning cycle as potential alternatives to local Transmission Issues identified by the Transmission Owners. The regional planning process evaluates, with stakeholder input throughout the cycle, the local plans of the Transmission Owners, as one input to the development of the regional plan. Key milestones in the typical MTEP development process are listed below and requirements and timelines for data submittal, review, and comment at each of these milestone points are described in the TPBPM:

i. Model development;

ii. Testing models against applicable planning criteria;

iii. Development of possible solutions to identified Transmission Issues;

iv. Selection of preferred solution;

v. Determination of funding and cost responsibility; and

vi. Monitoring progress on solution implementation.

The Transmission Provider shall address each of these milestones throughout the planning cycle through Sub-regional Planning Meetings, Planning Subcommittee and Planning Advisory Committee meetings.

2. Stakeholders Input in Planning Process: The Transmission Provider shall facilitate discussions with its Transmission Customers, Transmission Owners, OMS Committee, and other stakeholders about the Transmission Issues and solutions involving both transferred and non-transferred facilities, as described in Section I.B.1 of this
These discussions will take place at Sub-regional Planning Meetings and at regularly scheduled meetings of the Transmission Provider’s Planning Subcommittee, at locations provided by the Transmission Provider and with communication capabilities for those participants unable to have in person representation at these meetings. Once the MTEP report for a specific planning cycle has been completed but prior to recommendation to the Transmission Provider Board for approval, the Transmission Provider shall seek feedback on the proposed MTEP, including Network Upgrades recommended for approval, from the Transmission Provider’s stakeholders and the OMS Committee.

a. Planning Advisory Committee (“PAC”): The Planning Advisory Committee is a standing committee reporting to the Transmission Provider’s Advisory Committee, and functions subject to the Stakeholder Governance Guide developed by the Stakeholder Governance Working Group, as approved by the Advisory Committee. The PAC is responsible for addressing planning policy issues of importance to stakeholders and within the responsibilities of the Transmission Provider. The PAC charter is maintained on the Transmission Provider’s website.

b. Planning Subcommittee (“PS”): The Planning Subcommittee is a standing stakeholder-chaired subcommittee of the Planning Advisory Committee, and functions subject to the Stakeholder Governance Guide developed by the Stakeholder Governance Working Group, as approved by the Advisory Committee. Planning Subcommittee membership is open to interested parties, including, but not limited to: transmission delivery service and interconnection
service customers, marketers, developers, Transmission Owners, state and local regulatory authorities, federal regulatory staff, other Market Participants, and all interested parties. The charter for the committee is developed by stakeholders and is maintained on the Transmission Provider’s website. The Transmission Provider will seek guidance from Transmission Owners, state and local regulatory authorities, and other stakeholders through the Planning Subcommittee and/or the Planning Advisory Committee prior to the beginning of each new planning cycle. Guidance will include the scope of planning studies to be undertaken, the development of future scenarios to be modeled and analyzed in long-term planning studies, and the development of suitable models and assumptions to support such studies. The Transmission Provider will also seek guidance from Transmission Owners, state and local regulatory authorities, and other stakeholders through the Planning Subcommittee and/or the Planning Advisory Committee prior to implementing changes or revisions to the scope, models, and assumptions during the planning cycle. The Planning Subcommittee and/or the Planning Advisory Committee may form working groups at the discretion of stakeholders to perform specific tasks supporting the planning processes, such as model development and detail review of study results and draft plan reports.

c. Sub-regional Planning Meetings (“SPMs”): The Transmission Provider shall utilize SPMs to provide opportunity for Transmission Owners, state and local regulatory authorities, and other stakeholders to provide input to the planning process, and to carry out the tasks of coordinating transmission plans among the Transmission Owners. Input and planned coordination may occur
through the use of existing sub-regional planning groups (“SPGs”) where they exist, or through the establishment of new sub-regional meeting forums. One or more SPMs will be used or established for each of the four regional Planning Sub-regions of the Transmission Provider. Planning Sub-regions shall be defined based upon the Transmission Provider Planning Sub-regions: West, Central, South, and East as defined in Attachment FF-3.

i) SPM Participants: Participants at an SPM will consist of representatives of the Transmission Owners operating within the associated Planning Sub-region that integrate their local planning processes with the regional process, representatives from state and local regulatory authorities, and any other parties interested in or impacted by the planning process. For those Transmission Owners engaged in local planning under their own FERC approved local planning processes, such Transmission Owners shall participate in the SPM in order to coordinate their planning activities. Neighboring transmission-owning utilities and regulatory participants are eligible and encouraged to participate in the SPM to promote joint planning between the Transmission Provider and neighboring transmission systems.

ii) SPM Guidelines. The Sub-regional Planning Meeting participants shall:

(a) Make recommendations for a coordinated sub-regional Plan, after considering sub-regional and regional needs and
alternatives, for the ensuing ten years, for all transmission facilities in the sub-region;

(b) Review and comment on proposed Transmission Owners plans identified in local planning processes described in Section I.B.1.a. of this Attachment FF, for additions and modifications to the sub-regional transmission system, as potential solutions to identify Transmission Issues and review the transmission plans developed by those Transmission Owners that have their own FERC-approved local planning process (described in Section I.B.2) to ensure coordination of the projects set forth in such plans with the potential regional planning solutions developed in the SPM process consistent with the requirements of Appendix B of the Transmission Owners’ Agreement;

(c) Form technical study task forces as required to carry out the sub-regional planning responsibilities;

(d) Encourage non-Transmission Provider member participation to improve understanding by the SPM participants, the Planning Subcommittee, and the Transmission Provider staff of facility changes outside the Transmission Provider Region to ensure the impact of such changes are considered in the planning studies;

(f) Promote other stakeholder (i.e., environmental agencies, and load and generation developers) involvement in development
of the sub-regional plans.

(g) Recommend to the Planning Subcommittee proposed sub-regional plans to be included in the MTEP. In addition, the transmission projects developed by any Transmission Owner or Owners utilizing the provisions of their own FERC-approved local planning process shall be submitted for inclusion in the regional MTEP after being evaluated by the Transmission Provider in the regional evaluation of SPMs in accordance with Appendix B of the Transmission Owners’ Agreement in determining the Transmission Provider’s recommendation for inclusion in the MTEP.

(h) Reflect, as desired, minority opinions to the Transmission Provider or the Planning Subcommittee.

i) SPM Frequency, Location and Agenda: SPMs should meet at least two times per year or as otherwise provided for in the TPBPM, to provide input in the planning process, review plans and recommend changes, if any, needed to address stakeholder needs and to coordinate proposed plans.

Meetings involving CEII or confidential materials shall be handled under Section I.A.12 of this Attachment FF.

3. Meeting Notifications: Notice shall be provided by way of email exploder lists distribution by the Transmission Provider of all SPMs, Planning Subcommittee, and Planning Advisory Committee meetings. These email exploder lists are established and
maintained by the Transmission Provider and it is the responsibility of stakeholders to have registered as described on the Transmission Provider website. Meeting dates, times, locations, and materials will also be posted on the meeting calendar page of the Transmission Provider’s website. Meeting notification guidelines are set forth in the stakeholder developed Stakeholder Governance Guidelines.

4. Other Meeting Schedules: Planning Subcommittee meetings are regularly scheduled meetings that occur no less than bimonthly. Annual meeting schedules and objectives are developed at the December meeting each year for the subsequent year. Planning Advisory Committee meetings are scheduled as per the PAC Charter.

5. Planning Criteria: The Transmission Provider shall evaluate the system to address Transmission Issues in a manner consistent with the ISO Agreement and this Attachment FF. Projects included in the MTEP may be based upon any applicable planning criteria, including accepted NERC reliability standards and reliability standards adopted by Regional Entities, local planning reliability or economic planning criteria of the Transmission Owner, or required by State or local authorities, and any economic or other planning criteria or metrics defined in this Attachment FF. Transmission Owners are required to annually provide updated copies of local planning criteria for posting on the Transmission Provider’s website.

The Transmission Provider will post on its website an explanation of which transmission needs driven by public policy requirements will be evaluated for potential solutions in the local or regional transmission planning process, as well as an explanation of why other suggested potential transmission needs will not be evaluated.

6. Planning Analysis Methods: Planning analyses performed by the Transmission
Provider will test the Transmission System under a wide variety of conditions as described in Section II and using standard industry applications to model steady state power flow, angular and voltage stability, short-circuit, and economic parameters, as determined appropriate by the Transmission Provider to be compliant with applicable criteria and this Tariff.

7. Planning Models: The Transmission Provider shall collaborate with Transmission Owners, other transmission providers, Transmission Customers, and other stakeholders to develop appropriate planning models that reflect expected system conditions for the planning horizon. The planning models shall reflect the projected Load growth of existing Network Customers and other transmission service and interconnection commitments. The models shall include any transmission projects identified in Service Agreements or Interconnection Agreements that are entered into in association with requests for transmission delivery service or interconnection service, as determined in Facilities Studies associated with such requests. Load forecasts applied to models will consider the forecast Load of Network Customers reported to the Transmission Provider in accordance with the requirements of Module B and RAR of this Tariff, and the Business Practices Manuals of the Transmission Provider. Models will be posted on an FTP site maintained by the Transmission Provider and accessible to stakeholders with security measures as provided for in the TPBPM. The Transmission Provider will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to review and comment on the posted models before commencing planning studies. The schedules for such reviews are maintained in the TPBPM. Stakeholders shall be afforded opportunities to provide input on Load projections from Tariff reporting.
requirements or from Transmission Owner forecasts. After the base line forecast and model are established, the Transmission Provider and/or Transmission Owners may adjust the forecast as necessary on an ad hoc basis throughout the planning year to address customer requests for new Load interconnections arising from on-going dialogue with existing and prospective customers.

8. Planning Assumptions: Each MTEP report shall list in detail the planning assumptions upon which the analyses are based. In general, planning analyses will be based on the following:

a. Planning Horizons: The MTEP will identify Transmission Issues for a minimum planning horizon of five years and a maximum planning horizon of twenty years.

b. Load: Load demand will generally be modeled by the Transmission Provider as the most probable (“50/50”) coincident Load projection for each Transmission Owner’s service territory, for the season under study. Specific studies may model alternative Load probabilities or peak Load for areas within a Transmission Owner’s service territory as dictated by operational and planning experience and/or local planning criteria, but in any case shall be treated consistently in the planning for native Load and transmission access requests.

c. Generation: Planning models of five years or longer will model generation, taking into consideration applicable planning reserve requirements, that are: (i) existing and expected to be in existence in the planning horizon; (ii) not existing but with executed interconnection agreements; and (iii) additional generation as determined with stakeholder input, as necessary to adequately and
efficiently meet demand forecasted through the planning horizon and to facilitate compliance with statutory or regulatory mandates. The Transmission Provider shall apply a scenario analysis to determine alternative future generation portfolio possibilities.

Generation portfolio development for planning model purposes will be developed with input from the Planning Advisory Committee and its subcommittees, working groups, and task forces. Point-To-Point Transmission Service and Network Integration Transmission Service customers will have an opportunity to guide new generation portfolio development that is reflective of customer future resource plans.

d. Demand Response Resources: Planning solutions will be based upon the best available information regarding the expected amount and location of Load that can be effectively and efficiently reduced by demand response or energy efficiency programs, as well as the amount of behind-the-meter generation that can reliably be expected to produce Energy that could impact planning solutions. The Transmission Provider shall perform and report on sensitivity analyses that indicate the effectiveness of potential demand response as alternative planning solutions, to the extent that appropriate methodology for such analyses is developed with stakeholders and documented in the TPBPM.

e. Topology: Each planning study will use the best known topology based upon the most recently approved MTEP. Planning studies will include all projects approved by the Transmission Provider Board, and shall identify, as appropriate, and as detailed in the TPBPM, any system needs already identified in
the most recent approved MTEP.

9. Evaluation of Alternatives: When the planning analyses, based on the foregoing principles, identifies Transmission Issues, the Transmission Provider will consider the inputs from stakeholders derived from the SPM processes, the inputs from the Planning Subcommittee and the Planning Advisory Committee, the plans of any Transmission Owner with its own FERC-approved local planning process, and the MTEP aggregate system analyses against applicable planning criteria, in determining the solutions to be included in the MTEP and recommended to the Transmission Provider Board for implementation.

10. Facility Design: Facility design and system configuration (such as conductor sizes, transformer design, bus configuration, protection schemes) are selected by the Transmission Owner, and must be consistently applied by the Transmission Owner for comparable system service conditions. Comparable application of system design does not preclude the consideration or selection of advanced or alternative transmission technology. For New Transmission Facilities associated with Open Transmission Projects, the Transmission Provider may provide limitations or requirements regarding facility design when necessary due to a planning driver or to ensure compatibility with existing transmission facilities to which the New Transmission Facilities will interconnect as further described in Section VIII.D of this Attachment FF.

11. Status of Recommended Facilities: Upon solicitation from the Transmission Provider and upon reaching pre-designated milestones in the project implementation process, the responsible Transmission Owner or Selected Transmission Developer shall report the status of all projects recommended for implementation in the MTEP. Status
reports shall, at a minimum, include: (i) changes to the schedule and to the estimated project cost; (ii) an explanation of the causes of, or reasons for, any such changes; and (iii) changes in project status (i.e., under construction, in service, or withdrawn). The Transmission Provider shall report such progress to the Transmission Provider Board on a quarterly basis, or as otherwise directed by the Transmission Provider Board.

Status of Developer Qualifications: Upon solicitation from the Transmission Provider and upon reaching pre-designated milestones in the project implementation process, Selected Transmission Developers shall report the following: (i) changes to the developer qualifications, as defined in the Binding Proposal Agreement, including changes in the developer constructing the project; (ii) an explanation of the causes of, or reasons for, such changes; and (iii) an assessment of the impact of the changes on the project. The Transmission Provider shall report such changes and any impact to the Transmission Provider Board on a quarterly basis, or as otherwise directed by the Transmission Provider Board.

12. Treatment of Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (“CEII”) and Confidential Data: The Transmission Provider shall utilize a Non-Disclosure and Confidentiality Agreement (“NDA”) to address sharing of CEII transmission planning information. FTP sites containing such information will require such agreements to be executed in order to obtain access to those sites. Stakeholder meetings at which CEII may be available shall be noticed to email explorers and shall require execution of NDAs prior to participation in such meetings. In the alternative, such meetings will be structured to have separate discussion of issues involving CEII data only with participants that agree to execute the NDA. Confidential information related to economic (e.g., congestion) studies, as well as
CEII, is clearly sensitive information which must remain confidential. The Transmission Provider shall use generic, publicly available, cost information from industry sources in the economic studies to prevent the accidental release of confidential information. This approach will promote an open planning process because the results of economic studies are available to all interested parties.

13. Resolution of Stakeholder Input: The Transmission Provider shall solicit input and comments from all stakeholders, including Transmission Owners, during and after stakeholder planning meetings, and will use reasonable efforts to reply to comments that the Transmission Provider does not elect to implement, together with reasons for such actions. The Transmission Provider shall develop a process for the documentation and resolution of stakeholder issues raised in the planning process, including but not limited to issues related to planning criteria.

14. Dispute resolution: Consistent with Attachment HH of this Tariff, the Transmission Provider shall resolve disputes concerning MTEP issues. The first step will be for designated representatives of the affected parties to work together to resolve the relevant issues in a manner that is acceptable to all parties. If that step is unsuccessful, each affected party shall designate an officer who shall review disputes involving them that their designated representatives are unable to resolve. The applicable officers of the parties involved in such dispute shall work together to resolve the disputes so referred in a manner that meets the interests of such parties, either until such agreement is reached, or until an impasse is declared by any party to such dispute. If such officers are unable to satisfactorily resolve the issues, the matter shall be referred to mediation. Parties that are not satisfied with the dispute resolution procedures may only file a complaint with the
Commission during the negotiation or mediation steps.

If a matter remains unresolved, the affected parties may pursue arbitration.

D. **Project Coordination:** In the course of the MTEP process, the Transmission Provider shall seek out opportunities to coordinate or consolidate, where possible, individually defined transmission projects into more comprehensive cost-effective developments subject to the limitations imposed by prior commitments and lead-time constraints. The Transmission Provider shall coordinate with Transmission Owners, and shall consider the input from the SPMs, Planning Subcommittee, and Planning Advisory Committee to develop expansion plans to meet the needs of the system. This multi-party collaborative process will allow for all projects with regional and inter-regional impact to be analyzed for their combined effects on the Transmission System. Moreover, this collaborative process is designed to ensure that the MTEP address Transmission Issues within the applicable planning horizon in the most efficient and cost effective manner, while giving consideration to the inputs from all stakeholders. In addition to the requirements of this Attachment FF, there may be state or local procedural requirements applicable to the planning or siting of transmission facilities by the Transmission Owners. A current list of those requirements can be found on the Transmission Provider’s website.

1. **Transmission Owners Electing to Integrate their Local Planning Processes into the Transmission Provider’s Processes:** Some Transmission Owners have agreed to integrate internal planning process with the Transmission Provider’s open and coordinated planning processes for all of their transmission facilities to comply with Order 890 Planning Principles instead of filing a separate Attachment K. Through this election, the local planning for all transmission facilities of these Transmission Owners, regardless of whether the facilities are ultimately transferred to the functional control of the
Transmission Provider, shall be integrated with and included in the regional planning processes of the Transmission Provider. These regional planning processes, as provided for in this Attachment FF and in additional detail in the TPBPM, ensure that the planning decisions for all such facilities are made in an open and transparent environment. This planning environment provides opportunity for input from, and review by, stakeholders of the Open Access Transmission Tariff services throughout the planning process, and is in accordance with the Planning Principles of the Order 890 Final Rule. The open and transparent planning provisions of this Attachment FF shall not preclude interaction between stakeholders and Transmission Owners prior to the submittal of proposed projects to the regional planning process.

Transmission Owners integrating local planning processes into the regional planning processes are listed in Attachment FF-4. Such Transmission Owners shall be responsible for providing the Transmission Provider with sufficient information regarding all planning activities to enable the Transmission Provider to adequately review and incorporate all of the Transmission Owner’s transmission facilities into the regional planning process of the Transmission Provider, as described in Sections I.B.1.a. and I.B.1.b. of this Attachment FF.

The foregoing Transmission Owners will utilize the planning stakeholder forums of the Transmission Provider to demonstrate the need for, identify the alternatives to, and report the status of non-transferred transmission facilities using the same open, transparent and coordinated planning process provided by the Transmission Provider for transferred facilities as described in this Attachment FF.

a. Local Planning Processes of Transmission Owners: In accordance with
the ISO Agreement, each Transmission Owner engages in local system planning in order to carry out its responsibility for meeting its respective transmission needs in collaboration with the Transmission Provider subject to the requirements of applicable state law or regulatory authority. In meeting its responsibilities under the ISO Agreement, the Transmission Owners may, as appropriate, develop and propose plans involving modifications to any of the Transmission Owner’s transmission facilities which are part of the Transmission System. The Transmission Owners shall include the following specific local planning steps in order to develop plans for potential inclusion in the regional plan, in accordance with the annual regional planning process as described in Section I.B.1.b. of this Attachment FF, and in accordance with the regional planning principles of Section I.A of this Attachment. In addition to the local planning steps below, Transmission Owners shall adhere to any applicable state or local regulatory planning processes.

i. Define local study area and study horizon;

ii. Develop appropriate power system models;
   a) Utilize existing NERC or Transmission Provider cases to model external systems;
   b) Insert detailed model of Transmission Owner system if required;
   c) Insert updated detailed models of neighboring system models if required; and
   d) Verify model topology and generation.

iii. Update loads (spatial and magnitude) in study area;
   a) Review historical MW and MVAR data to develop growth trends;
b) Obtain Load forecasts from customers in study area; and

c) Obtain input from local distribution planners in the study area.

iv. Perform contingency analysis using applicable Transmission Owner planning criteria;

v. Identify any violations to planning criteria for each of study period;

vi. Develop alternative solutions to the criteria violations and test against the planning criteria;

   a) Obtain cost estimates for each alternative and perform economic analyses; and

   b) Determine non-cost attributes of each alternative such as operating flexibility, robustness, among others.

vii. Select alternative based on cost and non-cost attributes;

viii. Submit proposed solution and list of alternatives and assumptions to the Transmission Provider;

ix. Participate in stakeholder evaluations and discussions as a part of annual regional plan development process;

x. Perform additional analysis as required based on feedback from stakeholder groups (SPM/PS) in the regional planning process;

xi. Submit results of additional analysis (if performed) to the Transmission Provider for further discussion with stakeholders (SPM/PS);

xii. Consider regional planning process results, including stakeholder feedback on needs, proposed solutions, and alternatives, in determining whether or not to proceed with implementation of Transmission Owner proposed expansions; and
xiii. Post the planning criteria and assumptions, and power flow models used in development of each Transmission Owner’s current local planning proposal in accordance with Section I.B.1.b below. To the extent that the Transmission Owner uses the MISO MTEP models in developing its list of newly proposed projects, the Transmission Owner shall indicate as per Section I.B.1.b. below, the associated MTEP model used.

The Transmission Provider will maintain a link to applicable MTEP models on its website together with instructions for accessing such models consistent with CEII criteria and suitable non-disclosure agreements. In the event that the Transmission Owner applies its own power flow models in developing its proposed local plans, the Transmission Owner shall provide such models to the Transmission Provider for posting, or shall provide to the Transmission Provider a link to the location of such Transmission Owner model(s) and to instructions for accessing such models consistent with the Transmission Owner’s CEII and non-disclosure requirements. Transmission Provider shall post on its website links to such postings on Transmission Owner’s website.

b. Integration of Local Planning Processes of Transmission Owners: Transmission Owners listed on Attachment FF-4 as integrating local planning processes with those of the Transmission Provider, shall integrate proposals for transmission expansions into the regional planning process as follows. Each Transmission Owner shall submit its proposals for transmission plans to the Transmission Provider prior to the start of each regional planning cycle. Each Transmission Owner’s local plan, which consists of a list of proposed projects, shall be made available on the Transmission Provider’s website for
review by the PAC, the PS, and the SPM participants, subject to CEII and the confidentiality provisions in this Attachment FF. Such local plans shall be posted by September 15 each year in order to provide time for written comments by stakeholders.

In addition to the list of proposed projects, each Transmission Owner submitting newly proposed projects by September 15 in any MTEP annual cycle shall provide to the Transmission Provider by June 1 of the same year identification of any MISO base power flow model used by the Transmission Owner in support of the identification of the list of proposed projects to be subsequently posted in September, or in the event that the Transmission Owner uses a non-MISO base power flow model in support of the identification of the list of proposed projects the Transmission Owner shall provide to the Transmission Provider such base power flow model or a link to the power flow model and assumptions used.

Each Transmission Owner’s local planning model and associated assumptions shall be accessible on or through a link on the Transmission Provider’s website for review, subject to CEII and the confidentiality provisions in this Attachment FF and consistent with section I.B.1.a. In the event that the Transmission Owner uses a non-MISO base power flow model, the Transmission Owner shall provide for posting updates if there are significant changes in the model by July 15, August 15, and September 15 of each year.

Comments by stakeholders on the local planning models and assumptions that are provided to the Transmission Provider SPM Planning Contact by July 1, or August 1 or September 1 with respect to updates, shall be forwarded to the applicable Transmission Owner by July 8, August 8, or September 8, respectively. The Transmission Provider shall address any unresolved stakeholder issues through the SPM process.
Each Transmission Owner shall also provide to the Transmission Provider by June 1 of each year any updates to the posted transmission planning criteria, or a notification that the posted documents have not changed. In the event a Transmission Owner has additional significant updates to the posted transmission planning criteria, the Transmission Owner shall provide such updates for posting by July 15, August 15, and September 15 of each year.

The Transmission Provider shall post on its website the lists of newly proposed projects, criteria and assumptions, and supporting base power flow models or links to supporting base power flow models, as provided by the Transmission Owners. Initial comments by stakeholders to the proposed projects should be provided to the Transmission Provider SPM Planning Contact 45 days after the posting of local plans otherwise comments may be made pursuant to Section I.A.2.c.ii. The Transmission Provider SPM Planning Contact shall be identified on the Transmission Provider’s web site page devoted to Expansion Planning. The Transmission Provider shall provide to the applicable Transmission Owner within five working days of receipt, a copy of all stakeholder comments received within 45 days of the posted information regarding Transmission Owner planning criteria and assumptions, models applied, and list of proposed projects. The Transmission Provider shall address any unresolved stakeholder issues through the SPM process. Each Transmission Owner must participate in SPMs in the respective Planning sub-region as indicated in the Transmission Providers meeting schedule. Such SPMs shall provide input to and review of the results of the needs assessments and adequacy of plans proposed by the Transmission Owners, or by stakeholders to the planning process, or by the Transmission Provider, to best meet the needs of the sub-
region.

Transmission Owners identified in Attachment FF-4, must submit to the Transmission Provider, on an annual basis and at a time to be determined by the Transmission Provider, which shall be prior to the beginning of each regional planning cycle, all proposed transmission plans for both transferred and non-transferred transmission facilities. The submitted projects of such Transmission Owners shall be considered potential alternatives to system needs identified, and as such must be submitted when initially identified as a potential system solution, in order to permit the evaluation of such projects along with other potential alternatives that may be proposed by stakeholders or the Transmission Provider, in the SPM processes. Such alternatives may include transmission, generation, and demand-side resources. The Transmission Provider will review and evaluate such alternatives on a comparable basis and select the most appropriate solution. Comparability includes the ability of the Transmission Provider to obtain contractual assurances that the selected solution will be implemented by the required in-service dates. Contractual commitments associated with the construction of an MTEP Appendix A approved project by MISO Transmission Owner(s) and/or Selected Transmission Developer(s) are provided for by the ISO Agreement, this Tariff, and the Binding Proposal Agreement.

Contractual commitments associated with generation solutions require that a generator interconnection agreement be filed with the Commission pursuant to Attachment X of this Tariff by the time the alternative transmission solution would need to be committed to in order to ensure installation on the required need date. Contractual commitments associated with demand-side resource solutions require demonstration to the
Transmission Provider of an executed contract between LSE and End-Use Customers. Such demand-side contracts must be in place by the time that the transmission solution would otherwise need to be committed to in order to ensure a timely solution to the identified planning need, and must be of a sufficient duration such that a reliable solution can be assured through the planning horizon. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section VII of the ISO Agreement regarding the Transmission Provider review of Transmission Owner plans, no proposed project of a Transmission Owner that has elected to integrate their local planning processes into the Transmission Provider’s processes, as indicated on Attachment FF-4, shall be recommended in the MTEP for implementation until completion of the annual needs analysis carried out in the annual MTEP cycle, as described in Section I. A. of this Attachment FF, except as provided for in Section I.B.1.c. of this Attachment FF.

c. Out-of-Cycle Review of Transmission Owner Plans: In the event that a Transmission Owner determines that system conditions warrant the urgent development of system enhancements that would be jeopardized unless the Transmission Provider performs an expedited review of the impacts of the project, Transmission Provider shall use a streamlined approval process for reviewing and approving projects proposed by the Transmission Owners so that decisions will be provided to the Owner within thirty (30) days of the projects submittal to the MISO unless a longer review period is mutually agreed upon.

2. Transmission Owners Filing Separate Attachment K: Some Transmission Owners as listed on the last page of Attachment FF-4 have developed individual open, local planning processes for their facilities, that comply with the Planning Principles of the Order 890 Final
Rule. These Transmission Owners have an Attachment K that describes how the Transmission Owner will comply with the Order No. 890 Planning Principles for all transmission facilities that they plan for, regardless of whether those facilities are ultimately transferred to the functional control of the Transmission Provider. With the exception of Sections I.B.1.a and I.B.1.b., the provisions of this Attachment FF remain applicable to all Transmission Owners notwithstanding the filing by any Transmission Owner of an Attachment K pursuant to the Order 890 Final Rule.

E. **Joint Regional Planning Coordination:** The MTEP shall be developed in accordance with the principles of interregional coordination through collaboration with representatives from adjacent transmission providers, their designated regional planning organizations, or regional transmission organizations, as provided for in this Attachment FF, or as otherwise provided for in existing joint agreements between the Transmission Provider and other regional entities that engage in planning activities. The Transmission Provider has joint operating and coordination agreements with MAPPCOR, as contractor for Mid-Continent Area Power Pool (“MAPP”), the PJM Interconnection (“PJM”), Southwest Power Pool (“SPP”), Tennessee Valley Authority (“TVA”), and Manitoba Hydro (Manitoba). Because TVA is non-jurisdictional, that agreement has not been submitted for Commission approval, but is available on the Transmission Provider’s public website.

1. **Initial Contact:** The Transmission Provider will initiate a meeting with representatives of adjacent transmission providers, their designated regional planning organizations, or regional transmission organizations with which existing joint agreements are not already established with the Transmission Provider (“Regional Planning Coordination Entities” or “RPCEs”), in order to establish a Joint Planning Committee.
2. Joint Planning Committee. The Transmission Provider shall offer to form a Joint Planning Committee ("JPC") with the RPCE. The JPC shall be comprised of representatives of the Transmission Provider and the RPCE in numbers and functions to be identified from time to time. The JPC may combine with or participate in similarly established joint planning committees amongst multiple RPCEs or established under joint agreements to which the Transmission Provider is a signatory, for the purpose of providing for broader and more effective inter-regional planning coordination. The JPC shall have a Chairman. The Chairman shall be responsible for: the scheduling of meetings; the preparation of agendas for meetings; the production of minutes of meetings; and for chairing JPC meetings. The Chairmanship shall rotate amongst the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs on a mutually agreed to schedule, with each party responsible for the Chairmanship for no more than one planning study cycle in succession. The JPC shall coordinate planning of the systems of the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs, including the following:

a. Coordinate the development of common power system analysis models to perform coordinated system planning studies including power flow analyses and stability analyses. For studies of interconnections in close electrical proximity at the boundaries among the systems of the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs the JPC or its designated working group will coordinate the performance of a detailed review of the appropriateness of applicable power system models.

b. Conduct, on a regular basis, a Coordinated Regional Transmission Planning Study (CRTPS), as set forth in Section 8.3.4.

c. Coordinate planning activities under this Section 8, including the exchange of
data and developing necessary report and study protocols.

d. Maintain an Internet site and e-mail or other electronic lists for the communication of information related to the coordinated planning process. Such sites and lists may be integrated with those existing for the purpose of communicating the open and transparent planning processes of the Transmission Provider.

e. Meet at least semi-annually to review and coordinate transmission planning activities.

f. Establish working groups as necessary to address specific issues, such as the review and development of the regional plans of the RPCE and the Transmission Provider, and localized seams issues.

g. Establish a schedule for the rotation of responsibility for data management, coordination of analysis activities, report preparation, and other activities.

3. Data and Information Exchange. The Transmission Provider shall make available to each RPCE the following planning data and information. Unless otherwise indicated, such data and information shall be provided annually. The Transmission Provider shall provide such data in accordance with the applicable CEII policy, and maintain data and information received from each RPCE in accordance with their applicable confidentiality policies.

a. Data required for the development of power flow cases, and stability cases, incorporating up to a ten year load forecasts as may be requested, including all critical assumptions that are used in the development of these cases.

b. Fully detailed planning models (up to the next ten (10) years as requested) on an annual basis and updates as necessary to perform coordinated studies that reflect system enhancement changes or other changes.
c. The regional plan documents, any long-term or short-term reliability assessment documents, and any operating assessment reports produced by the Transmission Provider and the RPCE.
d. The status of expansion studies, system impact studies and generation interconnection studies, such that the Transmission Provider and the RPCE have knowledge that a commitment has been made to a system enhancement as a result of any such studies.
e. Transmission system maps for the Transmission Provider and the RPCE bulk transmission systems and lower voltage transmission system maps that are relevant to the coordination of planning between or among the systems.
f. Contingency lists for use in load flow and stability analyses, including lists of all contingency events required by applicable NERC or Regional Entity planning standards, as well as breaker diagrams for the portions of the Transmission Provider and the RPCE transmission systems that are relevant to the coordination of planning between or among the systems. Breaker diagrams to be provided on an as requested basis.
g. The timing of each planned enhancement, including estimated completion dates, and indications of the likelihood that a system enhancement will be completed and whether the system enhancement should be included in system expansion studies, system impact studies and generation interconnection studies, and as requested the status of related applications for regulatory approval. This information shall be provided at the completion of each planning cycle of the Transmission Provider, and more frequently as necessary to indicate changes in status that may be important to the RPCE system.
h. Quarterly identification of interconnection requests that have been received and
any long-term firm transmission services that have been approved, that may impact the operation of the Transmission Provider or the RPCE system.

i. Quarterly, the status of all interconnection requests that have been identified.

j. Information regarding long-term firm transmission services on all interfaces relevant to the coordination of planning between or among the systems.

k. Load flow data initially will be exchanged in PSS/E format. To the extent practical, the maintenance and exchange of power system modeling data will be implemented through databases. When feasible, transmission maps and breaker diagrams will be provided in an electronic format agreed upon by the Transmission Provider and the RPCE. Formats for the exchange of other data will be agreed upon by the Transmission Provider and the RPCE.

4. Coordinated System Planning. The Transmission Provider shall agree to coordinate with the RPCEs studies required to assure the reliable, efficient, and effective operation of the transmission system. Results of such coordinated studies will be included in the Coordinated System Plan. The Transmission Provider shall agree to conduct with the RPCEs such coordinated planning as set forth below

a. Single Entity Planning. The Transmission Provider shall engage in such transmission planning activities, including expansion plans, system impact studies, and generator interconnection studies, as necessary to fulfill its obligations under the Tariff. Such planning shall conform to applicable reliability requirements of NERC, applicable regional reliability councils, and any successor organizations thereto. Such planning shall also conform to any and all applicable requirements of Federal or State regulatory authorities. The Transmission Provider will prepare a regional
transmission planning report that documents the procedures, methodologies, and business rules utilized in preparing and completing the report. The Transmission Provider shall agree to share the transmission planning reports and assessments with each RPCE, as well as any information that arises in the performance of its individual planning activities as is necessary or appropriate for effective coordination among the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs on an ongoing basis. The Transmission Provider shall provide such information to the RPCEs in accordance with the applicable CEII policy and shall maintain such information received from the RPCEs in accordance with their applicable confidentiality policies.

b. Analysis of Interconnection Requests. In accordance with the procedures under which the Transmission Provider provides interconnection service, the Transmission Provider will agree to coordinate with each RPCE the conduct of any studies required in determining the impact of a request for generator or merchant transmission interconnection. Results of such coordinated studies will be included in the impacts reported to the interconnection customers as appropriate. Coordination of studies shall include the following:

i. When the Transmission Provider receives a request under its interconnection procedures for interconnection, it will determine whether the interconnection potentially impacts the system of a RPCE. In that event, the Transmission Provider will notify the RPCE and convey the information provided in the interconnection queue posting. The Transmission Provider will provide the study agreement to the interconnection customer in accordance with applicable procedures.
ii. If the RPCE determines that it may be materially impacted by an interconnection on the Transmission Provider System, the RPCE may request participation in the applicable interconnection studies. The Transmission Provider will coordinate with the RPCE with respect to the nature of studies to be performed to test the impacts of the interconnection on the RPCE System, and who will perform the studies. The Transmission Provider will strive to minimize the costs associated with the coordinated study process undertaken by agreement with the RPCE.

iii. Any coordinated studies associated with requests for interconnection to the Transmission Provider’s system will be performed in accordance with the study timeline requirements and scope of the applicable generation interconnection procedures of the Transmission Provider.

iv. The RPCE may participate in the coordinated study either by taking responsibility for performance of studies of its system, if deemed reasonable by the Transmission Provider, or by providing input to the studies to be performed by the Transmission Provider. The study cost estimates indicated in the study agreement between the Transmission Provider and the interconnection customer, will reflect the costs, and the associated roles of the study participants including the RPCE. The Transmission Provider will review the cost estimates and scope submitted by all participants for reasonableness, based on expected levels of participation, and responsibilities in the study. If the RPCE agrees to perform any aspects of the study, the RPCE must comply with the
timelines and schedule of the Transmission Provider’s interconnection procedures.

v. The Transmission Provider will collect from the interconnection customer the costs incurred by the RPCE associated with the performance of such studies and forward collected amounts, no later than thirty (30) days after receipt thereof, to the RPCE. Upon the reasonable request of the RPCE, the Transmission Provider will make their books and records available to the requestor pertaining to such requests for collection and receipt of collected amounts.

vi. The Transmission Provider will report the combined list of any transmission infrastructure improvements on either the RPCE and/or the Transmission Provider’s system required as a result of the proposed interconnection.

vii. Construction and cost responsibility associated with any transmission infrastructure improvements required as a result of the proposed interconnection shall be accomplished under the terms of the applicable OATT, Transmission Service Guidelines, controlling agreements, and consistent with applicable Federal or State regulatory policy and applicable law.

viii. Each transmission provider will maintain separate interconnection queues. The JPC will maintain a composite listing of interconnection requests for all interconnection projects that have been identified as potentially impacting the systems of the Transmission Provider and coordinating
RPCEs. The JPC will post this listing on the Internet site maintained for
the communication of information related to the coordinated system
planning process.

c. Analysis of Long-Term Firm Transmission Service Requests. In accordance with
applicable procedures under which the Transmission Provider provides long-term firm
transmission service, the Transmission Provider will coordinate the conduct of any
studies required to determine the impact of a request for such service. Results of such
coordinated studies will be included in the impacts reported to the transmission service
customers as appropriate. Coordination of studies will include the following:

i. The Transmission Provider will coordinate the calculation of ATC values
associated with the service, based on contingencies on their systems that
may be impacted by the granting of the service.

ii. When the Transmission Provider receives a request for long-term firm
transmission service, it will determine whether the request potentially
impacts the system of the RPCE. If the Transmission Provider determines
that the RPCE system is potentially impacted, and that the RPCE would
not receive a transmission service request to complete the service path, the
transmission provider will notify the RPCE and convey the information
provided in the posting.

iii. If the RPCE determines that its system may be materially impacted by
granting the service, it may contact the Transmission Provider and request
participation in the applicable studies. The Transmission Provider will
coordinate with the RPCE with respect to the nature of studies to be
performed to test the impacts of the requested service on the RPCE system, and will strive to minimize the costs associated with the coordinated study process. The JPC will develop screening procedures to assist in the identification of service requests that may impact systems of the JPC members other than the transmission provider receiving the request.

iv. Any coordinated studies for request on the transmission Provider’s system will be performed in accordance with the study timeline and scope requirements of the applicable transmission service procedures of the Transmission Provider.

v. The RPCE may participate in the coordinated study either by taking responsibility for performance of studies of its system, if deemed reasonable by the Transmission Provider or by providing input to the studies to be performed by the Transmission Provider. The study cost estimates indicated in the study agreement between the Transmission Provider and the transmission service customer will reflect the costs and the associated roles of the study participants. The Transmission Provider will review the cost estimates and scope submitted by all participants for reasonableness, based on expected levels of participation and responsibilities in the study.

vi. The Transmission Provider will collect from the transmission service customer, and forward to the RPCE, the costs incurred by the RPCE with the performance of such studies.
vii. The Transmission Provider receiving the request will identify any transmission infrastructure improvements required as a result of the transmission service request.

viii. Construction and cost responsibility associated with any transmission infrastructure improvements required as a result of the transmission service request shall be accomplished under the terms of the applicable OATT, Transmission Service Guidelines, controlling agreements, and consistent with applicable Federal or State regulatory policy and applicable law.

d. Coordinated Regional Transmission Planning Study: The Transmission Provider agrees to participate in the conduct of a periodic Coordinated Regional Transmission Planning Study (CRTPS). The CRTPS shall have as input the results of ongoing analyses of requests for interconnection and ongoing analyses of requests for long-term firm transmission service. The Parties shall coordinate in the analyses of these ongoing service requests in accordance with Sections 8.3.2 and 8.3.3. The results of the CRTPS shall be an integral part of the expansion plans of each Party. Construction of upgrades on the Transmission System of the Transmission Provider that are identified as necessary in the CRTSP shall be under the terms of the Owners Agreement of the Transmission Provider, applicable to the construction of upgrades identified in the expansion planning process. Coordination of studies required for the development of the Coordinated System Plan will include the following:

i. Every three years, the Transmission Provider shall participate in the performance of a CRTPS. Sensitivity analyses will be performed, as
required, during the off years based on a review by the JPC of discrete reliability problems or operability issues that arise due to changing system conditions.

ii. The CRTPS shall identify all reliability and expansion issues, and shall propose potential resolutions to be considered by The Transmission Provider and the coordinating RPCEs.

iii. As a result of participation in the CRTPS, except as provided for in Section II. A. 1., the Transmission Provider is not obligated in any way to construct, finance, operate, or otherwise support any transmission infrastructure improvements or other transmission-related projects identified in the CRTPS. Any decision to proceed with any transmission infrastructure improvements or other transmission-related projects identified in the CRTPS shall be based on the applicable reliability, operational and economic planning criteria established for the Transmission Provider as applicable to the development of the MTEP and set forth in this Attachment FF.

iv. As a result of participation in the CRTPS, the RPCEs are not entitled to any rights to financial compensation due to the impact of the transmission plans of the Transmission Provider upon the RPCE system, including but not limited to its decisions whether or not to construct any transmission infrastructure improvements or other transmission-related projects identified in the CRTPS.

v. The JPC will develop the scope and procedure for the CRTPS. The scope
of the CRTPSs performed over time will include evaluations of the transmission systems against reliability criteria, operational performance criteria, and economic performance criteria applicable to the Transmission Provider and the RPCEs.

vi. In the conduct of the CRTPS, the Transmission Provider and the coordinating RPCEs will use planning models that are developed in accordance with the procedures to be established by the JPC. Exchange of power flow models will be in a format that is acceptable to the coordinating parties.

vii. Stakeholder Review Processes. The Transmission Provider, in coordination with coordinating RPCEs shall review the scope and results of the CRTPS with impacted stakeholders, and shall modify the study scope as deemed appropriate by the Transmission Provider in agreement with the coordinating RPCEs, after receiving stakeholder input. Such reviews will utilize the existing planning stakeholder forums of the coordinating parties including as applicable joint Sub Regional Planning Meetings.

II. Development Process for MTEP Projects: The Transmission Provider will develop the MTEP biennially or more frequently. The MTEP will identify expansion projects for inclusion in the MTEP according to the factors set forth in Appendix B of the ISO Agreement and Section I.A. of this Attachment FF. For purposes of assigning cost responsibility, expansion projects in the MTEP shall be categorized pursuant to the following criteria.

A. Reliability Needs: Reliability projects are identified either in the periodically
performed Baseline Reliability Study, or in Facilities Studies associated with the request processes for new transmission access. Transmission access includes requests for both new transmission delivery service and new generation interconnection service.

1. **Baseline Reliability Projects:** Baseline Reliability Projects are Network Upgrades identified in the base case as required to ensure that the Transmission System is in compliance with applicable national Electric Reliability Organization (“ERO”) reliability standards and reliability standards adopted by Regional Reliability Organizations and applicable within the Transmission Provider Region. Baseline Reliability Projects include projects that are needed to maintain reliability while accommodating the ongoing needs of existing Market Participants and Transmission Customers. Baseline Reliability Projects may consist of a number of individual facilities that in the judgment of the Transmission Provider constitute a single project for cost allocation purposes. The Transmission Provider shall collaborate with Transmission Owning members, other transmission providers, Transmission Customers, and other stakeholders to develop appropriate planning models that reflect expected system conditions for the planning horizon. The planning models shall reflect the projected load growth of existing network customers and other transmission service and interconnection commitments, and shall include any transmission projects identified in Service Agreements or interconnection agreements that are entered into in association with requests for transmission delivery service or transmission interconnection service, as determined in Facilities Studies associated with such requests. The Transmission Provider shall test the MTEP for
adequacy and security based on commonly applicable national Electric Reliability Organization (“ERO”) standards, and under likely and possible dispatch patterns of actual and projected Generation Resources within the Transmission System and of external resources, including dispatch reflective of Long-Term Transmission Rights of Transmission Customers, and shall produce an efficient expansion plan that includes all Baseline Reliability Projects determined by the Transmission Provider to be necessary through the planning horizon of the MTEP. The Transmission Provider shall obtain the approval of the Transmission Provider Board, as set forth in Section VI, for each MTEP published.

2. New Transmission Access Projects: New Transmission Access Projects are defined for the purposes of Attachment FF as Network Upgrades identified in Facilities Studies and agreements pursuant to requests for transmission delivery service or transmission interconnection service under the Tariff. New Transmission Access Projects include projects that are needed to maintain reliability while accommodating the incremental needs associated with requests for new transmission or interconnection service, as determined in Facilities Studies associated with such requests. New Transmission Access Projects may consist of a number of individual facilities, which in the judgment of the Transmission Provider constitute a single project for cost allocation purposes. New Transmission Access Projects are either Generation Interconnection Projects or Transmission Delivery Service Projects as defined in Sections II.A.2.a. and II.A.2.b. The Transmission Provider shall consider the Baseline Reliability Projects already determined to be needed in the most current MTEP, as well as
any other base-case needs not associated with the request for new service that may be identified during the impact study process when determining the need for New Transmission Access Projects. Any identified base-case needs determined in the impact study process that are not a part of the Baseline Reliability Projects already identified in the most current MTEP shall become new Baseline Reliability Projects and shall be included in the next MTEP. New Transmission Access Projects identified in Facilities Studies and agreements pursuant to requests for transmission delivery service or transmission interconnection service under this Tariff shall be included in the next MTEP.

a. Generation Interconnection Projects: Generation Interconnection Projects are New Transmission Access Projects that are associated with interconnection of new, or increase in generating capacity of existing, generation under Attachments X to this Tariff.

b. Transmission Delivery Service Projects: Transmission Delivery Service Projects are New Transmission Access Projects that are needed to provide for requests for new Point-To-Point Transmission Service, or requests under Module B of the Tariff for Network Service or a new designation of a Network Resource(s).

B. Market Efficiency Projects: Market Efficiency Projects are Network Upgrades: (i) that are proposed by the Transmission Provider, Transmission Owner(s), ITC(s), Market Participant(s), or regulatory authorities; (ii) that are found to be eligible for inclusion in the MTEP or are approved pursuant to Appendix B, Section VII of the ISO Agreement after June 16, 2005, applying the factors set forth in Section I.A. of this Attachment FF; (iii) that have a Project
Cost of $5 million or more; (iv) that involve facilities with voltages of 345 kV or higher\(^1\); and that may include any lower voltage facilities of 100kV or above that collectively constitute less than fifty percent (50\%) of the combined project cost, and without which the 345 kV or higher facilities could not deliver sufficient benefit to meet the required benefit-to-cost ratio threshold for the project as established in Section II.B.1.e, or that otherwise are needed to relieve applicable reliability criteria violations that are projected to occur as a direct result of the development of the 345 kV or higher facilities of the project; (v) that are not determined to be Multi Value Projects; and (vi) that are found to have regional benefits under the criteria set forth in Section II.B.1 of this Attachment FF.

1. Criteria to Determine Whether a Project Should be Included as a Market Efficiency Project: The Transmission Provider shall employ multiple future scenarios and multi-year analysis including sensitivity analyses guided by input from the Planning Advisory Committee to evaluate the anticipated benefits of a proposed Market Efficiency Project in order to determine if such a project meets the criteria for inclusion in the regional plan as a Market Efficiency Project eligible for regional cost sharing. Sensitivity analyses shall include, among other factors, consideration of: (i) variations in amount, type, and location of future generation supplies as dictated by future scenarios developed with stakeholder input and guidance; (ii) alternative transmission proposals; (iii) impacts of variations in load growth; and (iv) effects of demand response resources on transmission benefits.

\(^1\) Transformer voltage is defined by the voltage of the low-side of the transformer for these purposes.
The Transmission Provider shall perform this inclusion analysis as follows:

a. The Transmission Provider shall utilize a weighted futures, no loss (“WFNL”) metric to analyze the anticipated annual economic benefits of construction of a proposed Market Efficiency Project to Transmission Customers in each of the Local Resource Zones, as defined in Attachment WW, based upon adjusted production cost (“APC”) savings. APC savings will be calculated as the difference in total production cost of the Resources in each Local Resource Zone adjusted for import costs and export revenues with and without the proposed Market Efficiency Project as part of the Transmission System. The WFNL metric for each Local Resource Zone shall be calculated using the weighted APC savings determined for each future scenario included in the analysis.

i. The WFNL metric shall utilize the future scenarios determined and identified by the Transmission Provider through the planning process, with input from all stakeholders. The weights applied to the results of each future scenario shall also be determined by the Transmission Provider with input from all stakeholders.

b. Project benefit evaluations will include benefits for the first 20 years of project life after the projected in-service date, with a maximum planning horizon of 25 years from the approval year. The annual benefit for a proposed Market Efficiency Project shall be determined as the sum of the WFNL values for each Local Resource Zone, as defined in Attachment WW. The total project benefit shall be determined by calculating the present value of annual benefits for the multiple year scenarios and multi-year evaluations.
c. The costs applied in the benefit to cost ratio shall be the present value, over the same period for which the project benefits are determined, of the annual Network Upgrade Charges for the project as determined in accordance with the formula in Attachment GG.

d. The present value calculation for both the annual benefits and annual costs will apply a discount rate representing the after-tax weighted average cost of capital of the Transmission Owners that make up the Transmission Provider Transmission System.

e. The Transmission Provider shall employ a benefit to cost ratio test to evaluate a proposed Market Efficiency Project. Only projects that meet a benefit to cost ratio of 1.25 or greater shall be included in the MTEP as a Market Efficiency Project and be eligible for regional cost sharing.

f. The benefits of the project used to determine the associated cost allocations as a percentage of project cost shall be determined one time at the time that the project is presented to the Transmission Provider Board for approval. Estimated Project Cost will be used to estimate the benefit to cost ratio and the eligibility for cost sharing at the time of project approval. To the extent that the Commission approves the collection of costs in rates for Construction Work in Progress (“CWIP”) for a constructing Transmission Owner, costs will be allocated and collected prior to completion of the project.

g. The aforementioned Market Efficiency Project inclusion criteria shall be used for the exclusive purpose of determining whether projects are eligible for regional cost sharing in accordance with Section III.A.2.f below. These criteria shall not affect the existing criteria set forth in Appendix B of the ISO Agreement for determining whether projects are eligible for inclusion in the MTEP. Moreover, the costs of projects included in the MTEP,
but not eligible for regional cost sharing, shall continue to be eligible for inclusion in the calculation of Transmission Owner revenue requirements under Attachment O of this Tariff.

C. **Multi Value Projects:** A Multi Value Project is one or more Network Upgrades that address a common set of Transmission Issues and satisfy the conditions listed in Sections II.C.1, II.C.2., and II.C.3 of Attachment FF. All Network Upgrades associated with a Multi Value Project including any lower voltage facilities that may be needed to relieve applicable reliability criteria violations that are projected to occur as a direct result of the development of the Multi Value Project; may be cost shared per Section III.A.2.g of Attachment FF except for i) any Network Upgrade cost associated with constructing an underground or underwater transmission line above and beyond the cost of a feasible alternative overhead transmission line that provides comparable regional benefits, and ii) any DC transmission line and associated terminal equipment when scheduling and dispatch of the DC transmission line is not turned over to the Transmission Provider's markets, real-time control of the DC transmission line is not turned over to the Transmission Provider's automatic generation control system and/or the DC transmission line is operated in a manner that requires specific users to subscribe for DC transmission service.

1. A Multi Value Project must be evaluated as part of a Portfolio of projects, as designated in the transmission expansion planning process, whose benefits are spread broadly across the footprint.

2. A Multi Value Project must meet one of the three criteria outlined below:
   a. Criterion 1. A Multi Value Project must be developed through the transmission expansion planning process for the purpose of enabling the Transmission System to reliably and economically deliver energy in support
of documented energy policy mandates or laws that have been enacted or adopted through state or federal legislation or regulatory requirement that directly or indirectly govern the minimum or maximum amount of energy that can be generated by specific types of generation. The MVP must be shown to enable the transmission system to deliver such energy in a manner that is more reliable and/or more economic than it otherwise would be without the transmission upgrade.

b. Criterion 2. A Multi Value Project must provide multiple types of economic value across multiple pricing zones with a Total MVP Benefit-to-Cost ratio of 1.0 or higher where the Total MVP Benefit-to-Cost ratio is described in Section II.C.7 of this Attachment FF. The reduction of production costs and the associated reduction of LMPs resulting from a transmission congestion relief project are not additive and are considered a single type of economic value.

c. Criterion 3. A Multi Value Project must address at least one Transmission Issue associated with a projected violation of a NERC or Regional Entity standard and at least one economic-based Transmission Issue that provides economic value across multiple pricing zones. The project must generate total financially quantifiable benefits, including quantifiable reliability benefits, in excess of the total project costs based on the definition of financial benefits and Project Costs provided in Section II.C.7 of Attachment FF.

3. All of the following conditions must be satisfied in order for a project to be
classified as a Multi Value Project:

a. Facilities associated with the transmission project must not be in service, under construction, or approved for construction by the Transmission Provider Board prior to July 16, 2010 or the date a Transmission Owner becomes a signatory member of the ISO Agreement, whichever is later. This section II.C.3.a shall not preclude the Multi Value Project classification of an Open Transmission Project that makes a Selected Transmission Developer eligible to become a Transmission Owner.

b. The transmission project must be evaluated through the Transmission Provider's transmission planning process and approved for construction by the Transmission Provider Board prior to the start of construction, where construction does not include preliminary site and route selection activities.

c. The transmission project must not contain any transmission facilities listed in Attachment FF-1 of this Tariff.

d. The total capital cost of the transmission project must be greater than or equal to $20,000,000.00.

e. The transmission project must include, but not necessarily be limited to, the construction or improvement of transmission facilities operating at voltages above 100 kV. A transformer is considered to operate above 100 kV when at least two sets of transformer terminals operate at voltages above 100 kV.

f. Network Upgrades driven solely by an Interconnection Request, as defined in Attachment X of the Tariff, or a Transmission Service request will not be considered Multi Value Projects.
4. Any transmission project that qualifies as a Multi-Value Project shall be classified as an MVP irrespective of whether such project is also a Baseline Reliability Project and/or Market Efficiency Project.

5. The specific types of economic value provided by a Multi Value Project include the following:

a. Production cost savings where production costs include generator startup, hourly generator no-load, generator energy and generator Operating Reserve costs. Production cost savings can be realized through reductions in both transmission congestion and transmission energy losses. Productions cost savings can also be realized through reductions in Operating Reserve requirements within Reserve Zones and, in some cases, reductions in overall Operating Reserve requirements for the Transmission Provider.

b. Capacity losses savings where capacity losses represent the amount of capacity required to serve transmission losses during the system peak hour including associated planning reserve.

c. Capacity savings due to reductions in the overall Planning Reserve Margins resulting from transmission expansion.

d. Long-term cost savings realized by Transmission Customers by accelerating a long-term project start date in lieu of implementing a short-term project in the interim and/or long-term cost savings realized by Transmission Customers by deferring or eliminating the need to perform one or more projects in the future.
e. Any other financially quantifiable benefit to Transmission Customers resulting from an enhancement to the Transmission System and related to the provisions of Transmission Service.

6. Any project to facilitate like-for-like capital replacements of plant originally installed as part of a Multi Value Project where replacement is due to aging, failure, damage or relocation requirements where such replacement is not the result of negligence by the constructing Transmission Owner will be treated as a Multi Value Project. The minimum project cost limitation for Multi Value Projects described in Section II.C.3.d of Attachment FF will not apply to the like for- like capital replacement projects described in this Section.

7. The following Total MVP Benefit-to-Cost Ratio will be applied to any Multi Value Project justified solely on the basis of Sections II.C.2.b or II.C.2.c of this Attachment FF to ensure such project qualifies as a Multi Value Project:

\[
\text{Total MVP Benefit-to-Cost Ratio} = \frac{\text{financial benefits}}{\text{Project Costs}}.
\]

For the purpose of this calculation, Financial Benefits will be set equal to the present value of all financially quantifiable benefits provided by the project projected for the first 20 years of the project's life and Project Costs will be set equal to the present value of the annual revenue requirements projected for the first 20 years of the project's life.

8. The aforementioned Multi Value Project inclusion criteria shall be used for the exclusive purpose of determining whether projects are eligible for regional cost sharing in accordance with Section III.A.2.g below. These criteria shall not affect the existing criteria set forth in Appendix B of the ISO Agreement for determining
whether projects are eligible for inclusion in the MTEP. Moreover, the costs of projects included in the MTEP, but not eligible for regional cost sharing, shall continue to be eligible for inclusion in the calculation of Transmission Owner revenue requirements under Attachment O of this Tariff.

III. Designation of Cost Responsibility for MTEP Projects: Based on the planning analysis performed by the Transmission Provider, which shall take into consideration all appropriate input from Market Participants or external entities, including, but not limited to, any indications of a willingness to bear cost responsibility for an enhancement or expansion, the recommended MTEP shall, for any enhancement or expansion that is included in the plan, designate: (i) the Market Participant(s) in one or more pricing zones that will bear cost responsibility for such enhancement or expansion, as and to the extent provided by any applicable provision of the Tariff, including Attachments N, X, or any applicable cost allocation method ordered by the Commission; or, (ii) in the event and to the extent that no provision of the Tariff so assigns cost responsibility, the Market Participant(s) or Transmission Customer(s) in one or more pricing zones from which the cost of such enhancements or expansions shall be recovered through charges established pursuant to Attachment GG of this Tariff, or as otherwise provided for under this Attachment FF.

Any designation under clause (ii) of the preceding sentence shall be determined as provided for in Section III.A and III.B of this Attachment FF. For all such designations, the Transmission Provider shall calculate the cost allocation impacts to each pricing zone. The results will be reviewed for unintended consequences by the Transmission Provider and the Tariff Working Group and any such identified consequences shall be reported to the Planning Advisory Committee, and the OMS.
A. Allocation of Costs Within the Transmission Provider Region

1. Default Cost Allocation: Except as otherwise provided for in this Attachment FF, or by any other applicable provision of this Tariff and consistent with the ISO Agreement, the responsibility for Network Upgrades included in the approved MTEP will be addressed in accordance with the provisions of the ISO Agreement.

2. Cost Allocation: The Transmission Provider will designate and assign cost responsibility on a regional, and sub-regional basis for Network Upgrades identified in the MTEP subject to the grand-fathered project provisions of Section III.A.2.b.

   a. Market Participant’s Option to Fund: Notwithstanding the Transmission Provider’s assignment of cost responsibility for a project included in the MTEP, one or more Market Participants may elect to assume cost responsibility for any or all costs of a Network Upgrade that is included in the MTEP. Provided however, in the event the Market Participant is also a Transmission Owner such election of the option to fund must be made on a consistent, non-discriminatory basis.

   b. Grandfathered Projects: The cost allocation provisions of this Attachment FF shall not be applicable to transmission projects identified in Attachment FF-1, which is based on the list of projects designated as Planned Projects in the MTEP approved by the Transmission Provider Board on June 16, 2005 (MTEP 05) and some additions of proposed projects that the Transmission Provider has determined to be in the advanced stages of planning.
c. Baseline Reliability Projects: Costs of Baseline Reliability Projects shall be recovered pursuant to Attachment O of this Tariff by the Transmission Owner(s) and/or ITC(s) developing such projects, subject to the requirements of the ISO Agreement.

d. Generation Interconnection Projects: Costs of Generation Interconnection Projects that are not determined by the Transmission Provider to be Baseline Reliability Projects, Market Efficiency Projects, or Multi-Value Projects, and the Network Upgrade costs associated with advancing a Baseline Reliability Project, Market Efficiency Project, or Multi-Value Project associated with a generator interconnection will be paid for by the Interconnection Customer(s) in accordance with Attachment X.

For Generator Interconnection Projects interconnecting to the American Transmission Company LLC transmission system, such costs will be subject to the provision of Attachment FF – ATCLLC.

1) For Network Upgrades to facilities in voltage classes at or above 345 kV, the Interconnection Customer shall be repaid 10 percent of the costs of the Generation Interconnection Project funded by the Interconnection Customer once Commercial Operation is achieved. The Transmission Owner(s) constructing the Generation Interconnection Project will repay 10% of the Generation
Interconnection Project costs associated with Network Upgrade facilities in a voltage class of 345 kV or greater to the Interconnection Customer under repayment terms consistent with the schedules and other terms of Attachment X.

The 10% of the Project Cost associated with Network Upgrade facilities of voltage class 345 kV or above and repaid to the Interconnection Customer shall be allocated on a system-wide basis and recovered pursuant to Attachment GG of this Tariff.

2) An Interconnection Customer may be required to contribute to the cost of Shared Network Upgrades, as defined in Attachment X to the Tariff, that are funded by another Interconnection Customer as a Generator Interconnection Project pursuant to Attachment X.

Each Interconnection Customer with one or more Shared Network Upgrade(s) identified in Appendix A of its Generator Interconnection Agreement shall make a one-time payment under Schedule 26-B to the Transmission Provider in accordance with the terms in the Generator Interconnection Agreement. The one-time payment will reflect the cost of the Shared Network Upgrade assigned to the Interconnection Customer as determined by the
Transmission Provider.

All revenue collected by the Transmission Provider through Schedule 26-B shall be distributed to the appropriate Interconnection Customer(s).

3) The Interconnection Customer shall be entitled, pursuant to Section 46 of this Tariff, to any Financial Transmission Rights or other rights to the extent provided for under this Tariff, for any Network Upgrade costs funded by or charged to the Interconnection Customer and not subject to repayment under the provisions of this Section III.A.2.d. In the event that a Generator Interconnection Project defers or displaces a Baseline Reliability Project, the costs of the Generator Interconnection Project up to the costs of the deferred or displaced Baseline Reliability Project shall be allocated consistent with the cost allocation for the Baseline Reliability Project.

4) International Transmission/Michigan Electric Transmission Company/ITC Midwest LLC:

(a) For those Generation Interconnection Projects for which International Transmission Company, Michigan Electric Transmission Company, LLC, or ITC Midwest LLC (“International” or “METC” or “ITC Midwest”) as Transmission Owners will be a signatory to the
interconnection agreement under the terms of Attachment X of this Tariff or any successor provision of the Tariff executed by the parties after the effective date of this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4, this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4 shall apply, except that, where ITC Midwest is the Transmission Owner, the Interconnection Customer may elect to have another approved methodology under Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d apply.

(b) Generation Interconnection Projects: The cost of Network Upgrades for Generation Interconnection Projects that are not determined by the Transmission Provider to be Baseline Reliability Projects shall be reimbursed by the Transmission Owner as provided in this Section III.A.2.d.4.

All costs of Network Upgrades for Generation Interconnection Projects will initially be paid by the Interconnection Customer in accordance with the terms of the Interconnection Agreement entered into pursuant to Attachment X of this Tariff. To the extent the Interconnection Customer demonstrates at the time of Commercial Operation of the Generating Facility one of the following:

i. Generating Facility has been designated as a Network Resource in accordance with the
ii. Contractual commitment has been entered into with a Network Customer for capacity, or in the case of an Intermittent Resource, for energy, from the Generating Facility for a period of one (1) year or longer.

The Interconnection Customer will receive up to one hundred percent (100%) reimbursement of reimbursable costs within ninety (90) days of the Commercial Operation Date, such reimbursement prorated by the percentage of the Generating Facility capacity or annual available energy output contracted for and as demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Transmission Provider.

If the Interconnection Customer is unable to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Transmission Provider at the time of Commercial Operation of the Generating Facility that the Generating Facility has met the repayment obligations set forth in Attachment FF Sections III.A.2.d.4.b.i. or III.A.2.d.4.b.ii. the Interconnection Customer shall be directly assigned 100% of the costs of the Generation Interconnection Project. The Transmission Owner may effect this direct assignment of costs by either foregoing any repayment of costs funded by the
Interconnection Customer, or by electing to repay 100% of the costs under repayment terms consistent with the schedules and other terms of Attachment X.

The Interconnection Customer shall be entitled, pursuant to Section 46 of this Tariff, to any Financial Transmission Rights or other rights to the extent provided for under this Tariff, for any Network Upgrade costs funded by or charged to the Interconnection Customer and not subject to repayment under the provisions of this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4. In the event that a Generation Interconnection Project defers or displaces a Baseline Reliability Project, the costs of the Generation Interconnection Project up to the costs of the deferred or displaced Baseline Reliability Project shall be allocated consistent with the cost allocation for the Baseline Reliability Project.

(c) For all amounts to be reimbursed by a Transmission Owner to an Interconnection Customer in accordance with this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4, the Transmission Owner will reimburse the sums received from the Interconnection Customer in cash together with any applicable interest, in accordance with the terms of the Interconnection Agreement.
(d) Allocation of Generation Interconnection Reimbursement. For all amounts reimbursed by a Transmission Owner to an Interconnection Customer under this Attachment FF Section III.A.2.d.4, the reimbursement will be allocated as follows:

i. Projects of Voltage Below 345 kV: 50% of the applicable Project Cost for Generation Interconnection Projects with a voltage class below 345 kV shall be allocated on a sub-regional basis to all Transmission Customers in designated pricing zones. The designated pricing zones and the sub-regional allocation of the Project Cost shall be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with a Line Outage Distribution Factor Table ("LODF Table") developed by the Transmission Provider which is similar in form to that attached hereto as Attachment FF-2. The LODF Table is based on Transmission System topology and Line-Outage Distribution Factors associated with the project under consideration and is used to determine the pricing zones to be included
in the sub-regional allocation of the Project Cost. The percentage of the sub-regional allocation assigned to each designated pricing zone shall be determined based on the relative share between pricing zones of the sum of the absolute value of the product of the Line-Outage Distribution Factor on each Branch Facility in a pricing zone and the length in miles of the Branch Facility.

The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the reimbursement will not be subject to any regional or sub-regional cost allocation, but will be recovered by that Transmission Owner under its Attachment O transmission rate formula under this Tariff.

ii. Projects of Voltage 345 kV and Higher:

10% of the applicable Project Cost for Generation Interconnection Projects with a voltage class of 345 kV or higher shall be allocated on a system-wide basis to all Transmission Customers and recovered through a system-wide rate. The remaining 40% of the applicable Project Cost for
Generation Interconnection Projects with a voltage class of 345 kV or higher shall be allocated on a sub-regional basis to all Transmission Customers in designated pricing zones. The designated pricing zones and the sub-regional allocation of the Project Cost shall be determined on a case-by-case basis in accordance with a Line Outage Distribution Factor Table ("LODF Table") developed by the Transmission Provider similar in form to that attached hereto as Attachment FF-2.

The LODF Table is based on Transmission System topology and Line-Outage Distribution Factors associated with the project under consideration and is used to determine the pricing zones to be included in the sub-regional allocation of the Project Cost. The percentage of the sub-regional allocation assigned to each designated pricing zone shall be determined based on the relative share between pricing zones of the sum of the absolute value of the product
of the Line-Outage Distribution Factor on each Branch Facility in a pricing zone and the length in miles of the Branch Facility.

The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the reimbursement will not be subject to any regional or sub-regional cost allocation, but will be recovered by that Transmission Owner under its Attachment O transmission rate formula under this Tariff.

e. Transmission Delivery Service Projects: Costs of Transmission Delivery Service Projects shall be assigned and recovered in accordance with Attachment N of this Tariff.

f. Market Efficiency Projects: Costs of Market Efficiency Projects shall be allocated as follows:

i) Twenty percent (20%) of the Project Cost of the Market Efficiency Project shall be allocated on a system-wide basis to all Transmission Customers and recovered through a system-wide rate.

ii) Eighty percent (80%) of the costs of the Market Efficiency Projects shall be allocated to all Transmission Customers in each of the Local Resource Zones, as defined in Attachment WW. The cost allocated to each Local Resource Zone shall
be based on the relative benefit determined for each Local Resource Zone that has a positive present value of annual benefits over the evaluation period using the methodology for project benefit determination of Section II.B.1.

iii) Excessive Funding or Requirements: The Transmission Provider shall seek to identify and manage the development of, as a part of the planning process for Market Efficiency Projects, portfolios of projects that tend to provide benefits throughout each Local Resource Zone, as defined in Attachment WW, over the planning horizon. The Transmission Provider shall analyze on an annual basis whether the project portfolios developed in accordance with this goal and the criteria in Section III. A.2.f unintentionally result in unjust or unreasonable annual capital funding requirements for any Transmission Owner or rate increases for Transmission Customers in designated pricing zones; or otherwise result in undue discrimination between the Transmission Customers, Transmission Owners, or any Market Participants; any such identified consequences shall be reported to the Planning Advisory Committee and to the Organization of MISO States. After discussing such assessments with the aforementioned stakeholder bodies, and taking into consideration the cumulative experience in
applying this Attachment FF, the Transmission Provider will make a determination as to whether Tariff modifications are required, and if so file such modifications.

g. Multi Value Projects: Costs of Multi Value Projects will be allocated as follows:

i) One-hundred percent (100%) of the annual revenue requirements of the Multi Value Projects shall be allocated on a system-wide basis to Transmission Customers that withdraw energy, including External Transactions sinking outside the Transmission Provider's region, and recovered through an MVP Usage Charge pursuant to Attachment MM.

h. Treatment of Projects that meet both Baseline Reliability Project Criteria and/or New Transmission Access Project Criteria, and the Market Efficiency Project Criteria: If the Transmission Provider determines that a project designated as a Market Efficiency Project also meets the criteria to be designated as a Baseline Reliability Project and/or a New Transmission Access Project, the cost of such project shall be allocated in accordance with the Market Efficiency Project allocation procedures.

i. Other Projects: Unless otherwise agreed upon pursuant to Section III.A.2.a. of this Attachment FF, the costs of Network Upgrades that are included in the MTEP, but do not qualify as
Baseline Reliability Projects, New Transmission Access Projects, Market Efficiency Projects or Multi-Value Projects, shall be eligible for recovery pursuant to Attachment O of this Tariff by the Transmission Owner(s) and/or ITC(s) paying the costs of such project, subject to the requirements of the ISO Agreement.

j. Withdrawal from MISO: A Transmission Owner that withdraws from the MISO as a Transmission Owner shall remain responsible for all financial obligations incurred pursuant to this Attachment FF while a Member of the MISO and payments applicable to time periods prior to the effective date of such withdrawal shall be honored by the MISO and the withdrawing Member.

k. New Transmission Owners: A new Transmission Owner joining the MISO will be responsible for the following financial obligations:

a. New Transmission Owners will not be responsible for any portion of Baseline Reliability Projects, Generator Interconnection Projects, Transmission Delivery Service Projects, or Market Efficiency Projects that were approved prior to their entry date.

b. For Multi-Value Projects approved prior to the new Transmission Owner’s entry date, the load interconnected to the Transmission Owner’s Transmission System will be responsible for one-hundred percent (100%) of the MVP
usage charge described in Attachment MM for the years following the Transmission Owner’s entry date applied to the Monthly Net Actual Energy Withdrawals for Load interconnected to the Transmission Owner’s Transmission System.

I. Only a Transmission Owner shall be authorized to construct and/or own transmission facilities associated with a Baseline Reliability Project, Market Efficiency Project and/or Multi Value Project. For projects jointly developed between Transmission Owners and other parties the portion constructed and owned by a Transmission Owner may qualify as a Baseline Reliability Project, Market Efficiency Project and/or Multi Value Project.

IV. **Merchant Transmission Project Data Requirements:** A proposed merchant transmission developer assumes all financial risk and funding requirements for developing its transmission project(s) and constructing the proposed transmission facility(ies). In order for a proposed merchant transmission developer’s facility to be interconnected to the Transmission System, it is first necessary for the impacted Transmission Owner and the Transmission Provider to analyze the reliability and operational impact of the proposed new merchant transmission facility(ies) on the Transmission System to determine if the new merchant transmission facilities can be reliably supported by the Transmission System, and if not, what Network Upgrades funded by the merchant transmission developer would be required to reliably support the proposed merchant transmission facility(ies). In order to perform the required reliability and
operational analyses, the merchant transmission developer must provide the following data to the Transmission Provider:

1. Each transmission circuit and substation, including new facilities, associated with the merchant transmission proposal;
2. Nominal operating voltage level in kV and voltage characteristics (i.e., AC or DC) for each transmission circuit associated with the merchant transmission proposal;
3. Typical and maximum MW power flow schedules, in each direction, for all proposed DC transmission circuits associated with the merchant transmission proposal;
4. Normal and emergency summer and winter load ratings for each transmission circuit associated with the merchant transmission proposal;
5. Maximum allowable positive sequence impedance for each AC transmission circuit associated with the merchant transmission proposal, when applicable;
6. List of all transmission buses associated with the merchant transmission proposal, including nominal operating voltage level in kV, voltage characteristics, and terminating transmission branches and shunts;
7. Proposed substation one-line diagrams for all new substations associated with the merchant transmission proposal, including circuit breaker and bus configuration details;
8. Load ratings, winding connections, impedances, tap data, and any other relevant information for load carrying equipment and facilities associated with the merchant transmission proposal, as applicable;
9. Modeling files to model proposed facilities and relevant new contingencies in power flow, stability, short-circuit and other relevant study models; and
10. Any other data determined pertinent to the study by the Transmission Provider
and/or interconnecting Transmission Owners for the specific merchant transmission facility proposal.

V. Designation of Entities to Construct, Implement, Own, Operate, Maintain, Repair, Restore, and/or Finance MTEP Projects: With the exception of Open Transmission Projects, for each project included in the recommended MTEP Appendix A and prior to approval by the Transmission Provider Board, the plan shall designate one or more Transmission Owners to construct, own, operate, maintain, repair, restore, and finance the recommended project, based on the planning analysis performed by the Transmission Provider and based on other input from participants, including, but not limited to, any indications of a willingness to bear cost responsibility for the project; and applicable provisions of the ISO Agreement. Regarding Open Transmission Projects, upon the determination of the Selected Transmission Developer for such projects, as set forth in Section VIII of this Attachment FF, the Transmission Provider shall update the approved MTEP Appendix A by identifying the Selected Transmission Developer for each Open Transmission Project. Should the facilities from such Open Transmission Projects not be approved by state regulatory authorities as New Transmission Facilities, but instead as upgrades to existing transmission facilities, as defined in Section VIII.C of this Attachment FF, the Transmission Provider shall update MTEP Appendix A by designating the appropriate Transmission Owner(s) to construct, own, operate, maintain, repair, restore, and finance such facilities in accordance with the ISO Agreement.

VI. Implementation of the MTEP:

A. If the Transmission Provider and any Transmission Owner’s planning representatives, or other designated entity(ies), cannot reach agreement on any element of the MTEP, the dispute may be resolved through the dispute resolution procedures provided in the
Tariff, or in any applicable joint operating agreement, or by the Commission or state regulatory authorities, where appropriate. The MTEP shall have as one of its goals the satisfaction of all regulatory requirements as specified in Appendix B or Article IV, Section I, Paragraph C of the ISO Agreement.

B. The Transmission Provider shall present the MTEP, along with a summary of relevant alternative projects that were not selected, to the Transmission Provider Board for approval on a biennial basis, or more frequently if needed. The proposed MTEP shall include specific projects already approved as a result of the Transmission Provider entering into Service Agreements with Transmission Customers where such agreements provide for identification of needed transmission construction, timetable, cost, and Transmission Owner or other parties’ construction responsibilities.

C. Approval of the MTEP by the Transmission Provider Board certifies it as the Transmission Provider plan for meeting the transmission needs of all stakeholders subject to any required approvals by federal or state regulatory authorities. The Transmission Provider shall provide a copy of the MTEP to all applicable federal and state regulatory authorities. The affected Transmission Owner(s), Selected Transmission Developer(s), or other designated entity(ies), shall make a good faith effort to design, certify, and build the designated facilities to fulfill the approved MTEP. However, in the event that an MTEP Appendix A project approved by the Transmission Provider Board or the selection of the Selected Transmission Developer is being challenged through the dispute resolution procedures under this Tariff or in court proceedings, the obligation of the Transmission Owners, or other designated entity(ies), to build that specific project (subject to required approvals) is waived until the approved project emerges from the dispute resolution procedures. The Transmission Provider Board shall allow the
Transmission Owners, or other designated entity(ies), to optimize the final design of specific facilities and their in-service dates if necessary to accommodate changing conditions, provided that such changes comport with the approved MTEP and provided that any such changes are accepted by the Transmission Provider through the reevaluation process described in Section VI of this Attachment FF, as necessary. Any disagreements concerning such matters shall be subject to the dispute resolution procedures of this Tariff.

D. The Transmission Provider shall assist the affected Owner(s), Selected Transmission Developer(s), or other designated entity(ies), in justifying the need for, and obtaining certification of, any facilities required by the approved MTEP by preparing and presenting testimony in any proceedings before state or federal courts, regulatory authorities, or other agencies as may be required. The Transmission Provider shall publish annually, and distribute to all Members and all appropriate state regulatory authorities, a five-to-ten-year planning report of forecasted transmission requirements. Annual reports and planning reports shall be available to the general public upon request.

VII. Multi-Value Project Costs and Benefits Review and Reporting

A. Frequency and Reporting of Multi-Value Project Review: Every three (3) years, as provided below and in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning, the Transmission Provider shall conduct a review of the cumulative costs and benefits associated with MVPs, and shall disseminate the results of such reviews to its stakeholders. The Transmission Provider shall use the review process and results to identify potential modifications to the MVP methodology and its implementation for projects to be approved at a future date.

1. Triennial Full MVP Review: Beginning with the MTEP for 2014 (“MTEP 14”),
and every third year thereafter, the Transmission Provider shall conduct a full MVP review, as provided in section VII.B of this Attachment FF.

2. Annual Limited MVP Review: Beginning with the MTEP for 2015 (“MTEP 15”), and each year thereafter when there is no full MVP review, the Transmission Provider shall conduct a limited MVP review, as provided in section VII.C of this Attachment FF.

3. Calculation of Costs and Benefits: The reviews shall calculate costs and benefits on a forward-looking basis over both twenty (20)-year and forty (40)-year periods. The costs calculation shall use updated project costs and in-service dates provided in the latest MTEP quarterly status report, and the benefits calculation shall use updated future scenarios from the latest MTEP planning cycle. The results of the costs and benefits calculation shall be provided for each Local Resource Zone as defined in RAR. If the Local Resource Zones as defined in accordance with RAR are modified, the Transmission Provider, working with stakeholders, may define different Local Resource Zones for purposes of reporting the results of the review. The definition of different Local Resource Zones in connection with reporting the results of the review will be detailed in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning.

4. Dissemination of the Results of the Full and Limited MVP Reviews: Within a reasonable time after completion of each MVP review, the Transmission Provider shall disseminate the results of and supporting analysis for the MVP review through: (a) publication in the MTEP; (b) posting on the appropriate section of the Transmission Provider’s public website; and (c) presentation to the
appropriate stakeholder committees.

B. **Scope of Full Multi-Value Project Review:** Each full MVP review shall at a minimum include the following:

1. **Quantitative Benefits:** Analysis of the quantifiable economic benefits resulting from the addition of MVPs, including, but not limited to:
   a. **Congestion and Fuel Savings:** Savings from increased access to lower cost Resources;
   b. **Decreased Operating Reserves:** Savings associated with lower Operating Reserve requirements;
   c. **Decreased System Planning Reserve Margin:** Savings associated with deferred generation investment due to a reduction in the system-wide Planning Reserve Margin; and
   d. **Decreased Transmission Line Losses:** Savings associated with deferred generation investment due to a reduction in the Capacity required to serve transmission losses during peak hours, to the extent that MVPs reduce such losses.

2. **Public Policy and Other Qualitative Benefits:** Analysis of the public policy and other qualitative benefits accruing from MVPs, such as newly interconnected wind units; and an increase in the percentage of the Transmission Provider’s Energy needs being supplied by wind and/or other renewable resources, and wind curtailments.

3. **Historical Data:** Provision, beginning with the MTEP for 2017 (“MTEP 17”), and based on the historical data available to the Transmission Provider for the five (5)
prior years, of information on certain additional market trend metrics including, but not limited to:

a. Congestion costs;
b. Energy prices;
c. Fuel costs;
d. Planning Reserve Margin requirements;
e. Number of newly interconnected Resources, by Resource type; and
f. The share of the Transmission Provider’s Energy supplied, by Resource type.

C. Scope of Limited Multi-Value Project Review: Each limited MVP review shall at a minimum include the items described in Sections VII.B.1.a and VII.B.3 of this Attachment FF, based on the latest available data for the current year, in preparation for the next full MVP review.

VIII. Transmission Developer Selection

A. State or Local Rights of First Refusal. The Transmission Provider shall comply with any Applicable Laws and Regulations granting a right of first refusal to a Transmission Owner. The Transmission Owner will be assigned any transmission project within the scope, and in accordance with the terms, of any Applicable Laws and Regulations granting such a right of first refusal. These Applicable Laws and Regulations include, but are not limited to, those granting a right of first refusal to the incumbent Transmission Owner(s) or governing the use of existing developed and undeveloped right of way held by an incumbent utility.

B. State Selection of Qualified Transmission Developers. In the absence of any Applicable Laws and Regulations granting a right of first refusal, a state with the authority to do
so may elect to determine the Selected Transmission Developer(s) from the Qualified Transmission Developers who have submitted Transmission Proposals for any Open Transmission Projects, or portion of such Open Transmission Projects that are physically located within such state’s boundaries, in accordance with applicable state criteria and procedures. Prior to the Transmission Provider Board’s approval of Open Transmission Project(s) for inclusion in Appendix A of the MTEP, states may identify any potential Open Transmission Projects within its state boundaries for which it will determine the Selected Transmission Developer. States that elect to determine the Selected Transmission Developer may request additional state-specific data or qualification criteria related to the specific potential Open Transmission Project(s), for which the state has indicated that it will determine the Selected Transmission Developer to be included in the corresponding Transmission Proposal Request(s) prior to the Transmission Provider Board’s approval of potential Open Transmission Project(s) for inclusion in Appendix A of the MTEP.

Upon receipt of a New Transmission Proposal, the Transmission Provider will review the New Transmission Proposal to ensure all qualifications and requirements from the Transmission Proposal Request, including state-specific qualifications, have been satisfied. Should the New Transmission Proposal not satisfy one or more of the requirements or qualifications outlined in this Tariff and/or specified in the Transmission Proposal Request, the Transmission Provider will notify the New Transmission Proposal Applicant and initiate a Cure Period as described in Section VIII.F of this Tariff. Within five (5) business days following the completion of this Cure Period, Transmission Provider will submit all applicable New Transmission Proposals, including any whose deficiencies have been cured, to the appropriate state(s) for their consideration, subject to execution of appropriate Non-Disclosure Agreements.
If, for any reason, a state is unable or declines to determine the Selected Transmission Developer within the time period defined in Section VIII.G, the Transmission Provider will assume responsibility for determining the Selected Transmission Developer. In this event, the Transmission Provider will, pursuant to the evaluation process outlined in Section VIII.G of this Attachment FF: i) evaluate each New Transmission Proposal submitted by a Qualified Transmission Developer; ii) select one of the New Transmission Proposals for implementation and; iii) post the Selected Transmission Developer on its website within 180 calendar days of the notification from a state that it is unable or declines to select a developer, or the lapse of the 180 calendar day timeframe defined in Section VIII.G of this Attachment FF, not to exceed 450 calendar days from posting of the Transmission Proposal Request.

C. Upgrades to Existing Transmission Facilities. A Transmission Owner shall have the right to develop, own and operate any upgrade to a transmission facility owned by the Transmission Owner, in accordance with this Tariff and the ISO Agreement.

1.1 Upgrades to Existing Transmission Lines. Upgrades to existing transmission line facilities include any expansion, replacement or modification, for any purpose, made to existing transmission line facilities that are classified as transmission plant and owned by one or more Transmission Owners, for reasons including, but not limited to:

(a) increasing the load capability of the transmission line or an associated circuit;

(b) increasing the nominal operating voltage of the transmission line or an associated circuit;

(c) installing additional plant on an existing overhead or underground
transmission line facility, such as, but not limited to:

i. plant associated with an additional circuit installed on spare structure positions;

ii. additional structures to increase a sag limit or for other purposes;

iii. a sectionalizing switch installed on an existing transmission line circuit regardless of whether or not it is installed on an existing structure; and

iv. any other plant additions to existing transmission line facilities.

(d) relocating the existing transmission line, or any portion thereof, for any purpose;

(e) replacing an entire existing transmission line facility with a new transmission line facility on the same right-of-way or on a different right-of-way if the replacement is driven by a relocation request or requirement;

(f) replacing one or more existing components of any existing transmission line facility, such as, but not limited to:

i. replacing existing conductors with higher capacity conductors or better performing conductors;

ii. replacing single-circuit structures with multi circuit structures;

iii. replacing insulators rated at a specific voltage with insulators rated at a higher voltage;

iv. replacing aging or defective components associated with the existing transmission line;

(g) improving the performance or characteristics of the existing transmission
(h) converting an existing overhead transmission line to an underground transmission line on the same right-of-way and/or converting an existing underground transmission line to an overhead transmission on the same right-of-way;

(i) improving land and land rights booked under the Commission’s Uniform System of Accounts, Account Nos. 105, 350, and/or 380; or

(j) any other modifications to existing transmission facilities.

1.1.1 **Combination of Upgrades and New Facilities.** If a proposed transmission project includes a combination of new transmission line sections and upgrades to existing transmission line sections, and the new transmission line sections are less than twenty (20) contiguous miles in total length, construction of the new transmission line sections will be considered a transmission upgrade for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal. In either event, upgrades made to the existing transmission line sections will be considered transmission upgrades for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal.

1.2 **Upgrades to Existing Substations.** Upgrades to existing substations include any expansions, replacements or modifications made, in part or in whole, to any existing substation or portion thereof that is owned by one or more Transmission Owners, and where some or all of the plant within the existing substation is classified as transmission plant. These upgrades include, but are not limited to:
(a) replacing facilities and/or equipment within an existing substation footprint;
(b) installing additional plant within an existing substation footprint;
(c) modifying facilities and/or equipment within an existing substation footprint;
(d) expanding an existing substation footprint within the existing substation site boundaries and installing additional plant within the expanded area; and
(e) acquiring additional land adjacent to or near the existing substation in conjunction with installation of additional plant within the boundaries of this additional land, including facilities to interconnect such plant to the existing substation plant.

1.2.1 Construction of a new substation facility at the common junction point(s) of a transmission line containing more than two terminals or along an existing two terminal transmission line, where such transmission line facilities are owned by an incumbent Transmission Owner, for the purpose of implementing: i) transmission line protection system upgrades; ii) improving operational flexibility; iii) improving customer service reliability indices (e.g., reducing SAIFI, CAIDI, SAIDI, etc.); iv) increasing the load capability of the transmission line; v) improving transmission voltages and reactive power management; vi) mitigating the economic and/or reliability impact of contingencies; and vii) any other purpose other than facilitating the interconnection of a New Transmission Line Facility will be considered a transmission upgrade for the purpose of
retaining a right of first refusal. Furthermore, construction of a new substation for the purpose of interconnecting two or more existing transmission circuits where all such existing transmission circuits are owned by incumbent Transmission Owner(s) will be considered a transmission upgrade for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal. Examples of newly constructed substations that will be considered transmission upgrades for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal include, but are not limited to, i) circuit breaker substations installed along an existing two-terminal transmission line to improve operational flexibility or customer service reliability via automatic sectionalizing; ii) series capacitor substations installed within an existing transmission line to increase load capability; iii) circuit breaker switching substations installed at the common junction point of a three-terminal line to improve loading and protection capabilities of protective relay systems; and iv) newly constructed switching substation to interconnect two existing transmission circuits at the point where they physically cross each other where such existing transmission circuits are owned by the same Transmission Owner. Examples of new substation facilities that would not be considered transmission upgrades for the purpose of retaining a right of first refusal include, but are not limited to, i) a New Substation Facility proposed to interconnect three New Transmission Line Facilities; ii) a New Substation Facility proposed to facilitate connecting a 345 kV New Transmission Line Facility to the midpoint of an existing 345 kV transmission circuit owned by an incumbent Transmission Owner; and iii) a 765-345 kV New Substation Facility constructed to interconnect a 765 kV New Transmission Line Facility
with an existing double circuit 345 kV transmission line, where such 345 kV
double circuit transmission line is owned by incumbent Transmission Owner(s).

D. Data Submission

1. Determination of Projects Not Subject to a Right of First Refusal.
   Upon the Transmission Provider Board’s approval of transmission projects for
   inclusion in Appendix A of the MTEP, the Transmission Provider will develop a
   separate Transmission Proposal Request for each Open Transmission Project.
   These Transmission Proposal Request(s) will be posted on the Transmission
   Provider website within thirty (30) calendar days of the date the Transmission
   Provider Board approved the Open Transmission Project for inclusion in
   Appendix A of the MTEP.

2. Transmission Proposal Requests
   a. Transmission Proposal Request Deposit. The New
      Transmission Proposal Applicant will submit a deposit per proposal equal
to one percent (1%) of the projected project cost, not to exceed $500,000.
The Transmission Provider shall track all time and expenses specifically
associated with the evaluation process identified in this Section VIII of
Attachment FF and the Transmission Proposal Request deposits will be
applied to the cost of evaluating the New Transmission Proposals. Any
remaining funds shall be refundable on a pro rata basis to each New
Transmission Proposal Applicant within thirty (30) days following the
designation of the Selected Transmission Developer. No interest will be
paid on any deposit funds held by the Transmission Provider during this
b. **Minimum Contents of Transmission Proposal Requests.** The Transmission Proposal Request will specify i) each New Transmission Line Facility and/or each New Substation Facility associated with the Open Transmission Project that should be included in the New Transmission Proposal; ii) the date by which the New Transmission Proposal must be submitted to the Transmission Provider, which shall not exceed 180 calendar days from the posting of the Transmission Proposal Request; and iii) a list of the current transmission facility interconnection standards and requirements established by the Transmission Owner(s) to which the New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities will interconnect.

i. Furthermore, where it involves one or more New Transmission Line Facilities, the Transmission Proposal Request will specify for each New Transmission Line Facility, at a minimum:

1. Expected in-service date;
2. Implementation schedule indicating the required steps to develop and construct the Open Transmission Project, including, but not limited to, all required regulatory approvals;
3. Nominal operating voltage level in kV and voltage characteristics \((i.e., \text{three-phase AC, bipolar DC,})\)
etc.) for each transmission circuit;

(4) Terminating substations and buses for each transmission circuit;

(5) Minimum required normal and emergency load ratings for both summer and winter seasons for each transmission circuit; and

(6) Maximum allowable positive sequence impedance for each transmission circuit when determined applicable by planning studies performed by the Transmission Provider.

ii. Where it involves one or more New Substation Facilities, the Transmission Proposal Request will specify for each New Substation Facility, at a minimum, the following information:

(1) Expected in-service date;

(2) Implementation schedule indicating the required steps to develop and construct the Open Transmission Project, including, but not limited to, all required regulatory approvals;

(3) List of all transmission buses within the New Substation Facility, including nominal operating voltage level in kV and voltage characteristics;

(4) List of all major equipment and facilities within the
New Substation Facility and associated terminating buses including power transformers, voltage regulators, phase angle regulators, series reactors, series capacitors, shunt reactors, shunt capacitors, static VAR compensators, DC converters, transmission line circuit terminals, generator terminals, and loads;

(5) Limitations on and/or requirements for bus configurations when determined applicable by planning studies performed by the Transmission Provider including required load ratings of circuit breakers, disconnects, bus sections and other load carrying equipment under alternative bus configurations;

(6) Required load ratings for all load carrying equipment and facilities identified in item (4) above;

(7) Winding connection and tap requirements for power transformers, voltage regulators, phase angle regulators and load tap changers when determined necessary by planning studies performed by the Transmission Provider;

(8) Impedance requirements for power transformers, phase angle regulators, series reactors and series
capacitors when determined necessary by planning studies performed by the Transmission Provider; and

(9) Limitations on and/or requirements for protection systems when determined applicable by a planning driver or Applicable Reliability Standard or in order to ensure a compatible interconnection with existing protection systems associated with existing transmission facilities to which the New Transmission Facilities will interconnect.

c. **Other Requirements of Transmission Proposal Requests.** The Transmission Provider reserves the right to specify in Transmission Proposal Requests, if deemed necessary and/or appropriate, additional information for any specific New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities.

3. **Contents of New Transmission Proposals.** New Transmission Proposal Applicants that submit a New Transmission Proposal in response to a Transmission Proposal Request must submit all data required by the Transmission Proposal Request, including, but not limited to:

(1) Documentation of satisfaction of general requirements for Qualified Transmission Developers;

(2) Cost estimate data for each proposed New Transmission Line Facility and/or New Substation Facility;
(3) Reasonably descriptive facility design proposals for each New Substation Facility and/or New Transmission Line Facility included in the Open Transmission Project;

(4) Documentation of project implementation capabilities;

(5) Documentation of operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities;

(6) Modeling data files for all proposed New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities included in the Open Transmission Project; and

(7) Descriptions of relevant partnerships or agreements (if applicable).

4. General Requirements for Qualified Transmission Developers. The general requirements applicable to Qualified Transmission Developers include, but are not limited to:

   (1) Agreement to execute the ISO Agreement if designated as the Selected Transmission Developer in the evaluation process to develop, own and operate New Substation Facilities and/or New Transmission Line Facilities after the facilities have been constructed but prior to energization of such New Transmission Facilities, unless New Transmission Proposal Applicant is already a Transmission Owner;

   (2) Agreement to comply with all Applicable Laws and Regulations, codes, and standards governing the engineering, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of transmission facilities including, but not limited to, federal laws, state laws, local laws, state and local building codes, federal
regulatory requirements, state and local regulatory requirements, state and local licensing authorities, the National Electric Safety Code, the National Electric Code, Applicable Reliability Standards, and Good Utility Practice;

(3) Agreement to register with NERC as the transmission owner (TO), transmission operator (TOP) and transmission planner (TP), as defined by NERC, for all transmission facilities which the Selected Transmission Developer will own that are to be part of the Transmission System;

(4) Agreement to either i) contract with the interconnecting Local Balancing Authority (LBA) to include the New Transmission Facilities within the boundaries of the LBA and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Transmission Provider and per agreement by the LBA that applicable LBA-related tasks associated with the proposed New Transmission Facilities that are delegated to an LBA by the Balancing Authority Agreement will be carried out either by the LBA or the Selected Transmission Developer; or ii) execute the Balancing Authority Agreement, register with NERC as a Balancing Authority (BA), and be designated as the Local Balancing Authority for the proposed New Transmission Facilities, unless the New Transmission Proposal Applicant is already registered with NERC as a BA and designated as an LBA for one or more of the existing facilities that interconnect directly with the New Transmission Facilities associated with the Open Transmission Project in question;
5. **Cost Estimates.** Proposed cost estimate data must be based on the reasonably descriptive facility design proposals submitted in the New Transmission Proposal and will include, at a minimum:

   (1) Estimated project cost for each proposed New Transmission Line Facility and/or New Substation Facility; and

   (2) Estimated annual revenue requirements for the first 40 years the facilities included in the New Transmission Proposal will be in service.
6. **Reasonably Descriptive Facility Design Proposals.** Reasonably descriptive facility design proposals must be submitted for each New Transmission Line Facility and/or New Substation Facility included in the Open Transmission Project. Reasonably descriptive facility design proposals represent descriptions of the core attributes and features of a design, not the detailed engineering and design calculations and documents.

a. **Reasonably Descriptive Facility Design Proposals for New Transmission Facilities.** For each New Transmission Line Facility, reasonably descriptive facility design proposals must include, at a minimum:

   (1) Estimated length of New Transmission Line Facility in miles and basis for estimate;

   (2) Proposed conductor type, size, and, if applicable, bundling configuration;

   (3) Proposed default or typical structure design attribute(s) (e.g., steel vs. wood vs. aluminum vs. concrete, monopole vs. H-frame vs. lattice, single circuit vs. double circuit, self-supporting vs. guyed, structural calculation assumptions, etc.) to be used for tangent, running angle, in-line dead-end, and angle dead-end structures when feasible and/or for the majority of the New Transmission Line Facility;

   (4) Estimated positive sequence line impedance and pi-equivalent shunt susceptance;
(5) Calculated normal and emergency seasonal thermal loading ratings, including basis for calculations;

(6) Proposed type of lightning protection system to be used when feasible and/or for the majority of the New Transmission Line Facility (e.g., shield wires vs. surge arresters, etc.) and key attributes (e.g., shielding angle, arrester location and type, etc.);

(7) Proposed grounding method to be used when feasible and/or for the majority of the New Transmission Line Facility (e.g., ground rods only, counterpoise, etc.) and key attributes (e.g., targeted structure footing grounding resistance, etc.);

(8) Proposed method to address or mitigate adverse impacts of galloping conductors and/or Aeolian vibration, if any (e.g., Stockbridge dampers, special conductors, etc.);

(9) Continuous rating of any load carrying switchgear installed on the New Transmission Line Facility; and

(10) Assumed communications systems to be used for the New Transmission Line Facility to facilitate protective relaying (e.g., fiber optic, power line carrier, microwave, etc.).

b. **Reasonably Descriptive Facility Design Proposals for New Substation Facilities.** For New Substation Facilities, reasonably descriptive facility design proposals must include, at a minimum:

(1) Detailed one-line diagram;
(2) Proposed protection systems including protection schemes, any anticipated interaction with existing/other facilities and conceptual protection system design (including backup protection systems, if applicable). Remote system monitoring capability shall be described with major features listed (redundancy, monitored parameters, etc.);

(3) Detailed specifications for proposed power transformers;

(4) Description of other substation equipment items, including load ratings, voltage ratings, fault interrupting ratings, tap data, and impedances as applicable, where other substation equipment includes, but is not limited to, bus sections, circuit breakers, circuit switchers, switches, disconnects, regulating transformers, station service transformers, series and shunt capacitors, series and shunt reactors, static VAR compensators, DC conversion equipment, instrument transformers (metering and relaying), wave traps, and surge arresters;

(5) Proposed line terminal ratings and basis for calculation, including limiting element;

(6) Basis for load rating calculations on any equipment where nameplate continuous ratings are not used; and

(7) Description of the communication system for remote monitoring, control and data acquisition facilities, including monitoring and control points.
Any specific Transmission Proposal Request may require submission of additional facility design data when deemed necessary by the Transmission Provider. Any New Transmission Proposal may also include additional facility data, including but not limited to, optional facility design data listed in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning, which may be considered by the Transmission Provider in the evaluation and selection of New Transmission Proposals.

7. **Project Implementation Capabilities.** Documentation of project implementation capabilities required in a New Transmission Proposal must include documented processes and methods to be used by the entity to perform:

   (1) Project management;
   
   (2) Routing evaluation studies for New Transmission Line Facilities, if applicable;
   
   (3) Site evaluation studies for New Substation Facilities, if applicable;
   
   (4) Regulatory permitting;
   
   (5) Right-of-way acquisition for New Transmission Line Facilities, if applicable;
   
   (6) Land acquisition for New Substation Facilities, if applicable;
   
   (7) Engineering and surveying required for New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities;
(8) Material procurement for New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities;

(9) Construction of New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities; and

(10) Commissioning of New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities.

Any specific Transmission Proposal Request may require submission of additional data related to the policies, processes, methods, capabilities, experience, and past performance of New Transmission Proposal Applicants regarding project implementation when deemed necessary by the Transmission Provider.

Any New Transmission Proposal may also include additional information regarding project implementation capabilities, including but not limited to, existing capabilities and past experience regarding project implementation, which may be considered by the Transmission Provider in the evaluation and selection of New Transmission Proposals.

8. **Operations, Maintenance, Repair, and Replacement Capabilities.**

Documentation of operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities required in a New Transmission Proposal must include documented processes and methods to be used by the New Transmission Proposal Applicant to perform the following as applicable depending on types of facilities included in the Open Transmission Project:

(1) Forced outage response for transmission line circuits;
(2) Forced outage response for substations;
(3) Switching for transmission line circuits;
(4) Switching for substations;
(5) Transmission line emergency repair;
(6) Substation emergency repair and testing;
(7) Transmission line preventative and/or predictive maintenance, including vegetation management;
(8) Substation preventative and/or predictive maintenance including equipment testing;
(9) Maintenance and management of spare parts, spare structures, and/or spare equipment inventories for substations and/or transmission lines, as applicable, including description of any agreements to share spare equipment, spare parts, and/or spare structures with other transmission entities;
(10) Real-time operations monitoring and control capabilities, if the Open Transmission Project contains one or more New Substation Facilities; and
(11) Major facility replacements or rebuilds required as a result of catastrophic destruction or natural aging through normal wear and tear, including financial strategy to facilitate timely replacements and/or rebuilds.

Any specific Transmission Proposal Request may require submission of additional data related to the policies, processes, methods, capabilities, experience, and past performance of entities regarding operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement when deemed necessary by the Transmission Provider.
Additional information regarding operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities may also be included in any New Transmission Proposal, including but not limited to, existing capabilities and past experience regarding operations, maintenance, repair and replacement, which may be considered by the Transmission Provider in the evaluation and selection of New Transmission Proposals.

9. **Transmission Provider Planning Process Participation Documentation.**

While not required, should a New Transmission Proposal Applicant participate in the Transmission Provider planning process and desire to have such participation considered in the evaluation as described in Section VIII.G of this Attachment FF, the New Transmission Proposal Applicant should include in its New Transmission Proposal documentation regarding relevant planning studies performed by the New Transmission Proposal Applicant and results supplied to the Transmission Provider planning process, as well as documentation on past transmission project ideas submitted by the New Transmission Proposal Applicant to the Transmission Provider to address the same Transmission Issues being addressed by the Open Transmission Project for which the New Transmission Proposal is being submitted.

10. **Modeling Data.** Modeling data files submitted with the New Transmission Proposal must meet the requirements outlined in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning, including, at a minimum, data files necessary:

(1) To model New Transmission Line Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities in power flow and short-circuit models and
(2) To model new contingencies associated with New Transmission Lines Facilities and/or New Substation Facilities.

11. **Period for Submission of New Transmission Proposals.** New Transmission Proposals must be submitted within 180 calendar days from the date the Transmission Proposal Request is posted, or within the time period specified in the Transmission Proposal Request, whichever comes first. If the due date falls on a federal holiday, Saturday, or Sunday, the New Transmission Proposals will be due on the next business day. Two copies of the New Transmission Proposal in hard copy form must be delivered to the address specified in the Transmission Proposal Request no later than 5:00 PM EPT on the due date and one electronic copy of the New Transmission Proposal must be e-mailed to the e-mail address specified in the Transmission Proposal Request no later than 5:00 PM EPT on the due date. Any inquiries by New Transmission Proposal Applicants regarding a Transmission Proposal Request prior to submission of a New Transmission Proposal should be made directly with the contacts listed in the Transmission Proposal Request and not to the interconnecting incumbent Transmission Owners.

12. **Additional Data Requests.** If, during the evaluation of New Transmission Proposals, the Transmission Provider determines that additional information is required to evaluate the Qualified Transmission Developers, the Transmission Provider will request, in writing, the additional data from all Qualified Transmission Developers, along with the timeframe that this data must be submitted within. If the additional data is not submitted within the specified timeframe, the New Transmission Proposal will not be evaluated or considered.
further. This timeframe will not be less than ten (10) business days from when the Transmission Provider issues the additional data request. This data request will not extend the evaluation timeframe defined in Section VIII.G.

13. **Confidential Treatment of New Transmission Proposals.** All information submitted with the New Transmission Proposal will be considered Confidential Information and will not be publicly posted or shared with any individual, except employees of the Transmission Provider, applicable state parties who have elected to choose the Selected Transmission developers, as specified in Section VIII.A of this Attachment FF, and/or contractors of the Transmission Provider that have executed an appropriate non-disclosure agreement.

E. **Developer Qualifications.** Any New Transmission Proposal Applicant may submit a New Transmission Proposal, but must meet the minimum qualifications required for a Qualified Transmission Developer in order for the Transmission Provider to accept and consider the New Transmission Proposal. A New Transmission Proposal Applicant must either be a Transmission Owner as defined in this Tariff or a Non-owner Member as defined in the ISO Agreement at the time the Transmission Proposal Request is posted, and must maintain such status throughout the entire process of evaluation and selection of New Transmission Proposals and project implementation, provided that a Non-owner Member must become a Transmission Owner. To be eligible to be considered a Qualified Transmission Developer, a New Transmission Proposal Applicant that submits a New Transmission Proposal must include therein all the agreements specified in Section VIII.D of this Attachment FF. Furthermore, a New Transmission Proposal Applicant will not be considered a Qualified Transmission Developer if all required data specified in the Transmission Proposal Request, including, but not
limited to, the required data outlined in Section VIII.D of this Attachment FF, is not included in the New Transmission Proposal as required by Sections VIII.D and VIII.F of this Attachment FF.

**F. Cure Period.** Immediately after the date New Transmission Proposals are due, the Transmission Provider will review each New Transmission Proposal to ensure all qualifications and data requirements have been satisfied by each respective New Transmission Proposal Applicant. Should a New Transmission Proposal fail to satisfy one or more of the qualifications or data requirements specified in this Tariff and/or in the Transmission Proposal Request, the Transmission Provider will, within ten (10) business days, via e-mail notify the submitting New Transmission Proposal Applicant, through the contact person designated in the New Transmission Proposal, of any deficiency, and that New Transmission Proposal Applicant will have a single Cure Period of ten (10) business days from this notice to revise and resubmit the New Transmission Proposal to address the deficiency, except that if the New Transmission Proposal Applicant is neither a Non-owner Member nor a Transmission Owner on the date the Transmission Proposal Request was posted or ceases to become a Non-owner Member or Transmission Owner after the date the Transmission Proposal Request was posted, that New Transmission Proposal Applicant shall not be designated a Qualified Transmission Developer and the New Transmission Proposal will not be evaluated or considered further. If a revised New Transmission Proposal is submitted after the Cure Period has elapsed, or continues to have one or more deficiencies with regard to qualifications or data requirements, the New Transmission Proposal Applicant shall not be designated a Qualified Transmission Provider and the New Transmission Proposal will not be evaluated or considered further. The Transmission
Provider will provide a written explanation identifying why the New Transmission Proposal Applicant has been disqualified.

G. Evaluation

1. **Steps of Evaluation and Selection Process.** Upon receipt of all New Transmission Proposals, sufficient in form and substance, by the due date specified in the Transmission Proposal Request, and upon completion of the process outlined in Section VIII.F of this Attachment FF, notwithstanding the authority of states to elect to choose the Selected Transmission Developer within 360 days of the Transmission Proposal Request, the Transmission Provider will:

   (1) Evaluate each New Transmission Proposal submitted by a Qualified Transmission Developer;

   (2) Select one of the New Transmission Proposals for implementation based on application of the evaluation criteria below; and

   (3) Post the name of the Selected Transmission Developer on its website within 180 calendar days of the due date for the submission of New Transmission Proposals for the selection of the developer either by a competent state regulatory authority that chooses to make the selection, or by the Transmission Provider, or within 450 calendar days from the posting of the Transmission Proposal Request if a state initially elects to perform an evaluation of the New Transmission Proposals submitted for an Open Transmission Project and then the
Transmission Provider assumes responsibility for performing evaluation as outlined in Section VIII.B of this Attachment FF.

2. **General Criteria.** In evaluating each New Transmission Proposal, the Transmission Provider will consider the following general aspects of the proposal:

   (1) Cost and reasonably descriptive facility design quality;

   (2) Project implementation capabilities;

   (3) Operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities; and

   (4) Transmission Provider planning process participation.

3. **Cost and Reasonably Descriptive Facility Design.** When considering cost and reasonably descriptive facility design quality, the Transmission Provider shall evaluate, at a minimum:

   (1) Estimated project cost for each proposed New Transmission Line Facility and/or New Substation Facility;

   (2) Estimated annual revenue requirements for all New Transmission Facilities included in the New Transmission Proposal;

   (3) Cost estimate rigor, which shall include financial assumptions and supporting information to clearly demonstrate a thorough analysis in support of the cost estimate;

   (4) Reasonably descriptive facility design quality; and

   (5) Reasonably descriptive facility design rigor, which shall include facility studies performed and other specific supporting data that
clearly documents and supports consideration and attention given to the proposed reasonably descriptive facility designs.

4. **Project Implementation Capabilities.** When considering project implementation capabilities, the Transmission Provider shall evaluate, at a minimum, existing or planned capabilities and processes regarding:

   (1) Project management;
   (2) Route and site evaluation;
   (3) Land acquisition;
   (4) Engineering and surveying;
   (5) Material procurement;
   (6) Facility construction;
   (7) Final facility commissioning; and
   (8) Previous applicable experience and demonstrated ability.

5. **Operations, Maintenance, Repair, and Replacement Capabilities.** When considering operations, maintenance, repair and replacement capabilities, the Transmission Provider shall evaluate, at a minimum, existing or planned capabilities and processes regarding the following, as applicable, based on the types of facilities included in the Transmission Proposal Request:

   (1) Forced outage response;
   (2) Switching;
   (3) Emergency repair and testing;
   (4) Spare parts;
(5) Preventative and/or predictive maintenance and testing;
(6) Real-time operations monitoring and control; and
(7) Major facility replacement capabilities, including ongoing financial capabilities to restore facilities after catastrophic outages.

6. **Transmission Provider Planning Process Participation.** When considering transmission provider planning process participation, the Transmission Provider will consider relevant planning studies conducted by the Qualified Transmission Developer and the associated results supplied to the Transmission Provider planning process, as well as transmission project ideas submitted in the past by the Qualified Transmission Developer as potential solutions to address the same Transmission Issues addressed by the Open Transmission Project.

7. **General Criteria Weighting.** In evaluating each New Transmission Proposal, the Transmission Provider will apply the following weighting to each New Transmission Facility criteria evaluated:

a. **New Transmission Line Facilities.** The following weights will be applied to New Transmission Line Facility criteria:

   (1) Cost and reasonably descriptive facility design quality: 30%
   (2) Project implementation capabilities: 35%
   (3) Operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities: 30%
   (4) Transmission Provider planning process participations: 5%
b. **New Substation Facilities.** The following weights will be applied to New Substation Facility criteria:

1. Cost and reasonably descriptive facility design quality: 30%
2. Project implementation capabilities: 30%
3. Operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement capabilities: 35%
4. Transmission Provider planning process participations: 5%

8. **Evaluation and Selection.** Specific methods used to evaluate various aspects of a New Transmission Proposal shall be described in the Business Practices Manual for Transmission Planning. This evaluation will be conducted by Transmission Provider planning staff and/or independent consultants competent in the areas of finance, transmission facility design, transmission project implementation, and transmission operations, maintenance, repair, and replacement. The Transmission Provider planning staff, and any independent consultants, will be overseen by an executive oversight committee consisting of three or more executive staff of the Transmission Provider, including at least one officer, and the final designation of the Selected Transmission Developer will rest with this committee. The committee shall possess certain specific expertise necessary for evaluation of New Transmission Proposals, such as, but not limited to, transmission construction, engineering, project management, financing, state regulatory, and operations. Within thirty (30) calendar
days of the designation of the Selected Transmission Developer, the Transmission Provider will provide a report in which it explains the basis for designating the Selected Transmission Developer for each Open Transmission Project. Any disputes regarding the developer selection will be referred to the Dispute Resolution Process under Attachment HH of this Tariff.

The Selected Transmission Developer will assume the responsibility and obligation to construct the facilities it is selected to construct. If the Selected Transmission Developer is financially incapable of carrying out its construction responsibilities, alternate construction arrangements shall be identified. Depending on the specific circumstances, such alternate arrangements shall include solicitation of Transmission Owners to take on financial and/or construction responsibilities. If the delay in construction may adversely affect the Transmission System reliability, the Transmission Provider shall coordinate with and support the affected Transmission Owner(s) regarding any mitigation measures that may be required by Applicable Reliability Standards.

However, in the event that an MTEP Appendix A Open Transmission Project approved by the Transmission Provider Board or selection of the designated Selected Transmission Developer to construct the approved project is being challenged through the Dispute Resolution process under Attachment HH of this Tariff or a court proceeding, the obligation of the Selected Transmission Developer to build the specific Open Transmission
Project (subject to required approvals) is waived until the Open Transmission Project or Selected Transmission Developer emerges from the Dispute Resolution process or court proceedings as an approved project with a Selected Transmission Developer designated to construct, implement, own, operate, maintain, repair, restore, and/or finance the recommended Open Transmission Project.

9. **Recourse if No New Transmission Proposals are Received.** If no New Transmission Proposals are received from Qualified Transmission Developers, the Open Transmission Project will be assigned to the applicable Transmission Owner(s), as defined below:

   (1) Ownership and the responsibility to construct facilities which are connected to a single Transmission Owner’s system belong to that Transmission Owner; (2) Ownership and the responsibilities to construct facilities which are connected between two (2) or more Transmission Owners’ facilities belong equally to each Transmission Owner, unless such Transmission Owners otherwise agree; and (3) Ownership and the responsibility to construct facilities which are connected between a Transmission Owner(s)’ system and a system or systems that are not part of the Transmission Provider belong to such Transmission Owner(s) unless the Transmission Owner(s) and the non-Transmission Provider party or parties otherwise agree.

IX. **Reevaluation.** After Transmission Provider Board MTEP Appendix A approval, certain circumstances or events may significantly affect such an Open Transmission Project in a manner
and to a degree that would require the Transmission Provider to perform Variance Analysis. Such circumstances or events may include, but are not limited to: material schedule delays, cost increases, or changes to the Selected Transmission Developer’s qualifications, as compared to the schedule, cost estimates, and qualifications represented in the New Transmission Project Proposal and/or MTEP Appendix A, as applicable. The Variance Analysis shall consider, among other things: (i) causes of, or reasons for, any such circumstance or event; (ii) impacts, including potential reliability impacts of a delay in the Open Transmission Project, canceling the Open Transmission Project, or replacing the Selected Transmission Developer; (iii) mitigation measures and responsibilities; and (iv) solutions, and the timetable for the implementation of such solutions. This process will begin at assignment of an Open Transmission Project and end when construction begins.

A. **Grounds for Variance Analysis**

The following factors shall trigger the Transmission Provider’s Variance Analysis for an Open Transmission Project. The Variance Analysis will focus on the materiality of the changes identified and determine the need for full reevaluation.

1. **Cost Increases**

Any project cost increase which reduces the benefit-cost ratio of an economically-driven Open Transmission Project to less than the required benefit-to-cost threshold, as defined in Section II.B.1.e or Section II.C.7 of this Attachment FF of the Tariff.

2. **Schedule Delays**

A reported or otherwise identified delay of 6 months or more from the in-service date established in MTEP Appendix A and agreed upon in the
accepted New Transmission Proposal and Binding Proposal Agreement of any assigned Open Transmission Project. This analysis may also be based upon failure to obtain necessary regulatory approvals; failure to execute necessary agreements; or failure to take the actions described in the Selected Transmission Developer’s accepted New Transmission Proposal.

3. **Deviation From Selected Transmission Developer Qualifications**

Material changes in the condition and characteristics of the Selected Transmission Developer, as described in its accepted New Transmission Proposal.

Material changes in this subsection may include, but are not limited to, any delegation or assignment not described in the New Transmission Proposal of project responsibilities to another entity, including affiliates, or a partner that is either previously undisclosed, or disclosed but assigned to or designated for different responsibilities or failure to conform to the terms described in the Selected Transmission Developer’s accepted New Transmission Proposal.

**B. Project Reevaluation**

If required by the results of the above-described additional analysis, the Transmission Provider shall perform a reevaluation of the Open Transmission Project and/or Selected Transmission Developer, including, but not limited to:

1. **Cost Increases**

As applicable and necessary based upon the Variance Analysis, theTransmission Provider shall use the Open Transmission Project’s current
cost estimate to perform an analysis and determine if said Open Transmission Project’s currently estimated benefit is sufficient to justify its continued construction.

2. **Schedule Delays**

As necessary based upon the Variance Analysis, the Transmission Provider shall perform an analysis to determine if the delay in the achievement of any significant schedule milestone(s) (including, but not limited to, failure to obtain necessary regulatory approvals) will delay the applicable Open Transmission Project’s in-service date, and if so, whether such delay poses risks of adverse impacts on Transmission System reliability, and what mitigation measures and plan should be implemented.

3. **Deviation From Selected Transmission Developer Qualifications**

As necessary based upon the Variance Analysis, the Transmission Provider shall perform an analysis to determine if the Selected Transmission Developer remains qualified to construct, implement, operate, maintain, and/or restore the Open Transmission Project.

C. **Reevaluation Outcomes**

Based on all the required analysis described in subparagraphs a and b of this section, the Transmission Provider may decide to (i) make no change to the Open Transmission Project; (ii) reassign the Open Transmission Project to a different Qualified Transmission Developer; (iii) cancel the Open Transmission Project (iv) implement a reliability mitigation plan, in coordination with the affected Transmission Owner(s); or (v) such other remedy or solution as may be appropriate under the circumstances,
including a suitable combination of two or more of the foregoing courses of action.

1. **Reassignment**

   If a Selected Transmission Developer is found to no longer be a Qualified Transmission Developer, the applicable Open Transmission Project may be reassigned. Open Transmission Projects will be offered to the applicable Transmission Owner, as defined below:

   (1) Ownership and the responsibility to construct facilities which are connected to a single Transmission Owner’s system belong to that Transmission Owner; (2) Ownership and the responsibilities to construct facilities which are connected between two (2) or more Owners’ facilities belong equally to each Transmission Owner, unless such Transmission Owners otherwise agree; and (3) Ownership and the responsibility to construct facilities which are connected between a Transmission Owner(s)’ system and a system or systems that are not part of the Transmission Provider belong to such Transmission Owner(s) unless the Transmission Owner(s) and the non-Transmission Provider party or parties otherwise agree.

   If the applicable Transmission Owner(s) decline to construct the Open Transmission Project, it will be reassigned, as applicable, through the developer evaluation process, as described in Section VIII.F.

2. **Project Cancellation**

   Following reevaluation, the Transmission Provider may cancel economically-driven Open Transmission Projects if (1) cost increases
reduce the benefit-cost ratio to the point where the currently estimated cost exceed previously defined benefits; and (2) reliability and/or public policy benefits (if any), are insufficient to justify continuation and completion of the project.

3. **Reliability Mitigation Plan**

If the Transmission Provider’s analysis determines that Transmission System reliability may be adversely affected by the delay of an assigned Open Transmission Project, the Transmission Provider shall coordinate with and support the affected Transmission Owner(s) regarding any mitigation measures that may be required by Applicable Reliability Standards. The mitigation measures may include, without limitation, any one or combination of the following components: i) an updated implementation plan of the Selected Transmission Developer to meet the required in-service date; ii) an operating procedure; or iii) an alternative project to mitigate the reliability violation.
X. Interregional Coordination and Cost Allocation with the Southeastern Regional Transmission Planning Region

The public utility transmission providers in the Southeastern Regional Transmission Planning region (“SERTP”) and the Midcontinent Independent System Operator region (“MISO”) shall undertake the interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation procedures under Section X of this Attachment FF.

Where the regional transmission planning process is referenced as part of this interregional transmission coordination process the applicable regional transmission planning process for the Transmission Provider is described in Attachment FF; and is described for the SERTP in attachment K of the applicable SERTP transmission provider.

A. Interregional Transmission Coordination

1. Annual Meeting: Representatives of the SERTP, and staff of the Transmission Provider will meet no less than once per year to facilitate the interregional coordination procedures described below (as applicable). Representatives of the SERTP and staff of the Transmission Provider may meet more frequently during the evaluation of interregional transmission project(s) proposed for purposes of interregional cost allocation between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider transmission planning regions.

2. Website Posting of Information on Interregional Coordination: The Transmission Provider shall utilize the regional planning website for communication of information related to these coordinated interregional transmission planning procedures. The Transmission Provider shall coordinate with the SERTP with respect to the posting of materials to the regional planning
website related to the interregional coordination procedures between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider transmission planning regions. The Transmission Provider shall, at a minimum, provide the following on the regional planning website:

a. Interregional coordination and cost allocation procedures between the SERTP and Transmission Provider;

b. Links to where stakeholders can register (if applicable/available) for the stakeholder committees or distribution lists of the SERTP;

c. Documents related to joint evaluation of interregional transmission projects; and

d. Status report on interregional transmission projects selected for purposes of interregional cost allocation between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider.

B. Model and Data Exchange

At least annually, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP shall exchange their then-current regional transmission plans including power-flow models and associated data used in the regional transmission planning processes to develop such transmission plan(s). This exchange will occur when such data is available in each of the regional transmission planning processes, typically during the first calendar quarter of each year. Additional transmission-based models and data may be exchanged between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider as necessary and if requested. For purposes of their interregional coordination activities, the Transmission Provider and SERTP will exchange only data and models used in the development of their then-current regional
transmission process and plans. This data will be posted on the pertinent regional transmission planning process’ websites, consistent with the posting requirements of the respective regional transmission planning processes, and subject to the applicable treatment of confidential data and Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (CEII). The Transmission Provider shall notify SERTP of such posting.

C. Identification and Joint Evaluation of Proposed Interregional Transmission Projects

1. **Identification of Interregional Transmission Projects:** At least biennially, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP shall meet to review the respective regional transmission plans. Such plans include each region’s transmission needs as prescribed by each region’s planning process. This review shall occur on a mutually agreeable timetable, taking into account each region’s regional transmission planning process timeline. If through this review, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP identify a potential interregional transmission project that may be more efficient or cost-effective than regional transmission projects, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP shall jointly evaluate the potential interregional transmission project pursuant to Section X.C.3.

2. **Identification of Interregional Transmission Projects by Stakeholders:** Stakeholders and transmission developers (pursuant to Section X.D.1) may also propose interregional transmission projects that may be more efficient or cost-effective than regional transmission projects pursuant to the procedures in each region’s regional transmission planning processes.
3. **Evaluation of Interregional Transmission Projects:** The Transmission Provider and the SERTP shall act through their respective regional transmission planning processes in the joint evaluation of potential interregional transmission projects identified pursuant to Sections X.C.1 and X.C.2 to determine whether the inclusion of any potential interregional transmission projects in each region’s regional transmission plan would be more efficient or cost-effective than regional projects. Such analysis shall be consistent with accepted transmission planning practices of the respective regions and the methods utilized to produce each region’s respective regional transmission plan(s).

4. **Review of Proposed Interregional Transmission Projects:** Initial coordination activities regarding potential interregional transmission projects will typically begin during the third quarter of each calendar year. The Transmission Provider and the SERTP will exchange status updates regarding interregional transmission projects that are newly proposed or that are currently under consideration as needed. These status updates will generally include, if applicable: (i) an update of the region’s evaluation of the proposal(s); (ii) the latest calculation of benefits (as identified pursuant to Section X.D.2); and (iii) the anticipated timeline for future assessments.

5. **Coordination of Assumptions Used in Joint Evaluation:** The Transmission Provider and the SERTP will coordinate assumptions and data used in joint evaluations, as necessary, including items such as:
   a. Expected timelines and milestones associated with the joint evaluation;
b. Study assumptions;

c. Models; and

d. benefit calculations (as identified pursuant to Section X.D.2).

D. Interregional Cost Allocation: If an interregional transmission project is proposed for interregional cost allocation purposes (“Interregional CAP”) in the SERTP and the Transmission Provider transmission planning regions, then the following cost allocation and benefits calculations, as identified pursuant to Section X.D.2, shall apply to the project:

1. Interregional Transmission Projects Proposed for Interregional Cost Allocation Purposes:

   a. For a transmission project to be eligible for Interregional CAP within the SERTP and the Transmission Provider, the project must:

      i. Interconnect to the transmission facilities of one or more transmission owners in the SERTP planning region and the transmission facilities of one or more Transmission Owners of the Transmission Provider;

      ii. Have a combined benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.25 or higher to the SERTP and Transmission Provider regions, as calculated in Section X.D.3; and

      iii. Meet the threshold and qualification criteria for transmission projects potentially eligible to be included in the respective regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation in the Transmission Provider, as a Market Efficiency Project, and the
SERTP, pursuant to their respective regional transmission planning processes.

b. On a case-by-case basis, the Transmission Provider and the SERTP may consider an interregional transmission project that does not satisfy all of the criteria specified in this Section X.D.1, but that: (i) meets the threshold criteria for a project proposed to be included in the regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation in only one of the two regions; and (ii) would be interconnected to the transmission facilities of one or more transmission owners in the SERTP planning region and the transmission facilities of one or more Transmission Owners of the Transmission Provider.

c. The transmission project must be proposed for purposes of cost allocation in both the SERTP and the Transmission Provider. The project submittal must satisfy all criteria specified in the respective regional transmission processes, including the respective timeframes for submittals proposed for cost allocation purposes. If a project is proposed by a transmission developer, the transmission developer must also satisfy the qualification criteria specified by each region.
2. Calculation of Benefits for Interregional Transmission Projects Proposed for Interregional Cost Allocation Purposes: The benefits used to establish the allocation of costs of a transmission project proposed for Interregional CAP between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider shall be determined as follows:

a. Each transmission planning region, acting through its regional transmission planning process, will evaluate proposals to determine whether the proposed project(s) addresses transmission needs that are currently being addressed with projects in its regional transmission plan and, if so, which projects in the regional transmission plan could be displaced by the proposed project(s).

b. Based upon its evaluation, each region will quantify its benefits based upon the transmission costs that each region is projected to avoid due to its transmission projects being displaced by the proposed interregional transmission project as follows:

i. for the SERTP, the total avoided costs of projects included in the then-current regional transmission plan that would be displaced if the proposed interregional transmission project was included; and

ii. for the Transmission Provider, the total avoided costs of Market Efficiency Projects identified, but not approved, in the then-current regional transmission plan that would be
displaced if the proposed interregional transmission project was included.

The benefits calculated pursuant to this Section X.D.2 are not necessarily the same as the benefits used for purposes of regional cost allocation.

3. Calculation of Benefit-to-Cost Ratio for an Interregional Transmission Project Proposed for Interregional CAP:

Prior to any regional benefit-to-cost ratio calculation pursuant to either regional transmission planning process, the combined interregional benefit-to-cost ratio, referenced in Section X.D.1.a, shall be calculated for an interregional transmission project proposed for Interregional CAP. Such calculation shall be performed by dividing the sum of the present value of the avoided project cost determined in accordance with Section X.D.2.b.i for the SERTP region and the present value of avoided project cost determined in accordance with Section X.D.2.b.ii for the Transmission Provider region by the present value of the proposed interregional transmission project’s total project cost. The present values used in the cost calculation shall be based on a common date, comparable cost components, and the latest cost estimates used in the evaluation of the interregional transmission project. The combined interregional benefit-to-cost ratio will be assessed in addition to, not in the place of, the SERTP’s and the Transmission Provider’s respective regional benefit-to-cost ratio assessment(s) (if applicable) as specified in the respective regional processes.
4. **Inclusion in Regional Transmission Plans:** An interregional transmission project proposed for Interregional CAP in the transmission planning regions of the SERTP and the Transmission Provider will be included in the respective regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation after:

a. Each region has performed all evaluations, as prescribed in its regional transmission planning process, necessary for a project to be included in its regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation including any regional benefit-to-cost ratio calculations. Each region shall utilize the benefit calculation(s) as defined in such region’s regional transmission planning process (for purposes of clarity, these benefits are not necessarily the same as the benefits determined pursuant to Section X.D.2). Each region shall utilize the cost calculation(s) as defined in such region’s regional transmission planning process. The anticipated percentage allocation of costs of the interregional transmission project to each region shall be based upon the ratio of the region’s benefits to the sum of the benefits, both as determined pursuant to Section X.D.2, identified for both the SERTP and the Transmission Provider.

b. Each region has obtained all approvals, as prescribed in its regional process, necessary for a project to be included in the regional transmission plan for purposes of regional cost allocation.

5. **Allocation of Costs Between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider Regions:** The cost of an interregional transmission project, selected for
purposes of cost allocation in the regional transmission plans of both the SERTP and the Transmission Provider, will be allocated as follows:

a. Each region will be allocated a portion of the interregional transmission project’s costs in proportion to such region’s benefit as calculated pursuant to Section X.D.2 to the sum of the benefits identified for both the SERTP and the Transmission Provider calculated pursuant to Section X.D.2.

   i. The benefits used for this determination shall be based upon the benefit calculation most recently performed – pursuant to the method described in Section X.D.2 – before each region included the project in its regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation and as approved by each region.

b. Costs allocated to each region shall be further allocated within each region pursuant to the cost allocation methodology contained in its regional transmission planning process.

6. **Milestones of Required Steps Necessary to Maintain Status as Being Selected for Interregional Cost Allocation Purposes:** Once selected in the respective regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation, the transmission owners in the SERTP planning region that will be allocated costs of the transmission project, the Transmission Provider, and the transmission developer(s) must mutually agree upon an acceptable development schedule including milestones by which the necessary steps to develop and construct the interregional transmission project must occur. These milestones may include (to the extent not already accomplished) obtaining all necessary
rights-of-way and requisite environmental, state, and other governmental approvals and executing a mutually-agreed upon contract(s) between the applicable transmission owners in the SERTP planning region, the Transmission Provider and the transmission developer. If such critical steps are not met by the specified milestones and then afterwards maintained, then the Transmission Provider and the SERTP may remove the transmission project from the selected category in the regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation.

7. **Interregional Transmission Project Contractual Arrangements:** The contracts referenced in Section X.D.6 will address terms and conditions associated with the development of the proposed interregional transmission project included in the regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation, including but not limited to:

a. Engineering, procurement, construction, maintenance, and operation of the proposed transmission project, including coordination responsibilities of the parties;

b. Emergency restoration and repair;

c. The specific financial terms and specific total amounts to be charged by the transmission developer of the transmission project to each beneficiary, as agreed to by the parties;

d. Creditworthiness and project security requirements;

e. Milestone reporting, including schedule of projected expenditures;

f. Reevaluation of the transmission project; and
g. Non-performance or abandonment.

8. **Removal from Regional Transmission Plans:** An interregional transmission project may be removed from the SERTP’s or the Transmission Provider’s regional transmission plan(s) for Interregional CAP: (i) if the transmission developer fails to meet developmental milestones; (ii) pursuant to the reevaluation procedures specified in the respective regional transmission planning processes; or (iii) if the project is removed from one of the region’s regional transmission plans pursuant to the requirements of its regional transmission planning process.

   a. The Transmission Provider shall notify the SERTP if an interregional transmission project or a portion thereof is likely to be, and/or is actually removed from its regional transmission plan.

E. **Transparency**

1. Stakeholders will have an opportunity to provide input and feedback within the respective regional transmission planning processes of the SERTP and the Transmission Provider related to interregional transmission projects identified, analysis performed, and any determination/results. Stakeholders may participate in either or both regions’ regional transmission planning processes to provide their input and feedback regarding the interregional coordination between the SERTP and the Transmission Provider.

2. The Transmission Provider shall use the existing planning stakeholder forums, such as the Planning Advisory Committee and Sub-regional
Planning Meetings, to review with stakeholders the interregional activities associated with the SERTP.
TAB C

Table of MISO’s Order No. 1000
Interregional Stakeholder Meetings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MISO Stakeholder Forums</th>
<th>Dates of Meetings and Conference Calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Advisory Committee (&quot;PAC&quot;)</td>
<td>02/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03/21/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/30/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/29/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/26/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/23/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/28/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/30/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/27/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03/20/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/17/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/26/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Sub-Committee</td>
<td>02/21/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/25/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/26/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04/16/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/25/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Expansion and Benefits Criteria (&quot;RECB&quot;) Task Force</td>
<td>03/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>08/02/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>09/27/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/29/2012 (joint meeting with PAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISO Stakeholder Forums</td>
<td>Dates of Meetings and Conference Calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/31/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/21/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/27/2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>