Name (2 Responses)
Organization (2 Responses)
Group Name (3 Responses)
Lead Contact (3 Responses)
Contact Organization (3 Responses)
Question 1 (5 Responses)
Question 1 Comments (5 Responses)
Question 2 (5 Responses)
Question 2 Comments (5 Responses)
Question 3 (5 Responses)
Question 3 Comments (5 Responses)
Question 4 (5 Responses)
Question 4 Comments (5 Responses)
Question 5 (5 Responses)
Question 5 Comments (5 Responses)

| Individual  |  |
|---|--|
| Mike Burleson                                     |  |
| Arizona Public Service                            |  |
| Yes   |  |
|   |  |
| No  |  |
|   |  |
| No  |  |
|   |  |
| No  |  |
|   |  |
| Yes   |  |
|   |  |
| Group   |  |
| pacificorp  |  |
| ryan millard                                      |  |
| pacificorp  |  |
| Yes   |  |
|   |  |
| No  |  |
|   |  |
| No  |  |
|   |  |
| No  |  |
|   |  |
| Yes   |  |
|   |  |
| Individual  |  |
| Janelle Marriott-Gill                             |  |
| Tri-State Generation and Transmission Assn., Inc. |  |
| Yes   |  |
|   |  |
| No  |  |
|   |  |
| No  |  |
|   |  |

| No   |
|--|
| Tri-State has been a strong advocate for bringing WECC's curtailment practices in line with the  |
| curtailment priorities of FERC's pro forma OATT. As explained in its complaint at FERC in Docket Nos.  |
| EL13-11-000 and RD13-1-000, WECC's current curtailment practices are not consistent with the   |
| curtailment priorities of FERC's pro forma OATT. While Tri-State does not object to the substance of   |
| the requirements of this standard, which Tri-State views are largely clarifying, Tri-State does object to  |
| the Effective Date provision to the extent it authorizes WECC staff to delay implementation of a resolution of the inconsistency until "complete implementation of applicable webSAS changes and |
| FERC approval of this standard and the revised Unscheduled Flow Mitigation Plan Documents." As   |
| drafted in IRO-006-WECC-2, the requirements are indifferent to the methodology or tools to be used   |
| to mitigate unscheduled flow. Upon FERC approval, this standard has no bearing or impact to either   |
| the current or future WECC relief methodologies. Tacking on language to hold the effective date of   |
| IRO-006-WECC-2 until software is developed, and until the separate FERC docket approval process is   |
| complete for "plan" documents is not derived from the language in the standard, is not necessary,  |
| provides a loophole for the potential delay of implementation of IRO-006-WECC-2, and thus potential  |
| delay of resolution of FERC pro forma OATT priorities indefinitely. Accordingly, Tri-State believes the  |
| Effective Date provision in the revised standard would "pose a serious and substantial burden on   |
| competitive markets within the interconnection that is not necessary for reliability." Tri-State   |
| proposes the following Effective Date language: "On the latter of the first day of the first quarter at least 45 days after Regulatory approval." Thank you.                                     |
| Yes  |
|  |
| Group  |
| Bonneville Power Administration  |
| Chris Higgins  |
| Transmission Reliability Program   |
| Yes  |
|  |
| No   |
|  |
| No   |
|  |
| No   |
|  |
| Yes  |
|  |
| Group  |
| Arizona Public Service Company   |
| Janet Smith, Regulatory Affairs Supervisor   |
| Arizona Public Service Company   |
| Yes  |
|  |
| No   |
|  |
| No   |
|  |
| No   |
|  |
| Yes  |
|  |