

FERC or State Jurisdiction: FERC

AD10-12 Increasing Market and Planning Efficiency through Improved Software

On February 26, 2015, FERC issued a Notice of Technical Conference to be held on June 22-24, 2015 to discuss opportunities for increasing real-time and day-ahead market efficiency through improved software.

AD13-7 Centralized Capacity Markets in Regional Transmission Organizations and Independent System Operators

On February 18, 2015, each RTO/ISO filed a report on the status of its efforts to address market and system performance associated with fuel assurance issues.

On February 20, 2015, FERC issued a Notice Allowing Public Comment in response to the reports on fuel assurance issues filed by the RTOs/ISOs on February 18, 2015. Comments are due on March 20, 2015.

AD14-3 Coordination Across the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO")/PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. ("PJM") Seam

On February 10, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. submitted an update on the Joint and Common Market Workplan.

On February 24, 2015, FERC issued an Order Requesting Additional Information from PJM, MISO, and their market monitors regarding 1) interface pricing; 2) capacity deliverability; 3) Day-Ahead market coordination; 4) modeling of the Ontario/Michigan phase angle regulators for congestion management; 5) Firm Flow Entitlement Freeze Date; and 6) use of commercial flow in the Market-to-Market process. The Commission will use this information to understand what, if any, additional steps it should take to improve the efficiency of the operations at the PJM/MISO seam.

AD14-8 Winter 2013-2014 Operations and Market Performance in Regional Transmission Organizations ("RTOs") and Independent System Operators ("ISOs")

On February 20, 2015, FERC issued a Notice Allowing Public Comment in response to the reports on fuel assurance issues filed by the RTOs/ISOs on February 18, 2015. Comments are due on March 20, 2015.

AD14-14 Price Formation in Energy and Ancillary Services Markets Operated by Regional Transmission Organizations ("RTOs") and Independent System Operators ("ISOs")

On February 2, 2015, SPP, California Independent System Operator Corporation, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., New York Independent System Operator, Inc. and PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. filed a Joint Answer in Support of Motion for Extension of Time to File Post Technical Workshop Comments.

On February 3, 2015, ISO New England Inc. filed a Motion for Extension of Time to submit a portion of the post-technical workshop comments.

On February 9, 2015, FERC issued a Notice Granting Extension of Time to March 6, 2015 for submitting post-technical workshop comments.

Regulatory Status Report

- AD15-4** **Technical Conference on Environmental Regulations and Electric Reliability, Wholesale Electricity Markets, and Energy Infrastructure (To Discuss Implications of Compliance Approaches to the Clean Power Plan Proposed Rule issued by the Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA"))**
- On February 2, 2015, FERC issued a Supplemental Notice of Technical Conference, including additional information regarding the National Overview technical conference to be held on February 19, 2015.
- On February 13, 2015, FERC issued a Supplemental Notice of Technical Conference, including the agenda for the Eastern Regional technical conference to be held on March 11, 2015.
- On February 13, 2015, FERC issued a Supplemental Notice of Technical Conference, including the agenda for the Western Regional technical conference to be held on February 25, 2015.
- The National Overview Technical Conference was held on February 19, 2015.
- The Western Region Technical Conference was held on February 25, 2015.
- AD15-5** **Available Transfer Capability ("ATC") Standards for Wholesale Electric Transmission Services**
- On February 27, 2015, FERC issued a Supplemental Notice of Workshop on Available Transfer Capability Standards, attaching an updated agenda for the workshop to be held on March 5, 2015.
- EL11-34** **Midwest Independent Transmission Operator, Inc. ("MISO") Petition for Declaratory Order Seeking Commission Confirmation Regarding Section 5.2 of the Joint Operating Agreement ("JOA") between MISO and SPP**
- On February 12, 2015, Judge Cintron issued a Settlement Judge Report, recommending that settlement judge procedures remain in place.
- EL12-59** **Complaint of Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Golden Spread") Against Southwestern Public Service Company ("SPS") Regarding Rate of Return on Common Equity ("ROE") Input Value for the Formula Rate Applicable to the Replacement Power Sales Agreement ("RPSA")**
- On February 2, 2015, Judge Wagner issued an Order of Chief Judge Denying Motion to Consolidate Docket No. EL15-8-000 with Docket Nos. EL13-78-000 and EL12-59-000 for purposes of hearing and decision.
- On February 25, 2015, Southwestern Public Service Company filed Prepared Answering Testimony and Exhibits.
- EL13-15** **Southwestern Public Service Company ("SPS") Complaint Seeking a Finding that the Rates in SPP Zone 11 are Unjust and Unreasonable due to the Inclusion of the Costs of Facilities of Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Tri-County")**
- On February 2, 2015, in accordance with paragraph 3.5 of the Settlement, Occidental and the New Mexico Cooperatives filed a Motion to Withdraw Request for Rehearing and Clarification filed on March 25, 2013.

Regulatory Status Report

EL13-35 **Southwestern Public Service Company ("SPS") Complaint Requesting Establishment of a January 1, 2013 Refund Effective Date and a Finding from the Commission that SPP has Violated the Federal Power Act by Implementing a 40% Increase in the Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Tri-County") Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement**

On February 2, 2015, in accordance with paragraph 3.5 of the Settlement, Occidental and the New Mexico Cooperatives filed a Motion to Withdraw Request for Rehearing and Clarification filed on March 25, 2013.

EL14-21 **SPP Complaint for an Order Finding the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") is Violating the Joint Operating Agreement ("JOA") between SPP and MISO and the SPP Tariff and Requiring MISO to Compensate SPP for Use of SPP's Transmission System**

On February 12, 2015, Judge Cintron issued a Settlement Judge Report, recommending that settlement judge procedures remain in place.

EL14-30 **Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") Complaint Regarding Transmission Service Invoices from SPP**

On February 12, 2015, Judge Cintron issued a Settlement Judge Report, recommending that settlement judge procedures remain in place.

EL14-49 **Petition for Declaratory Order Seeking the Commission's Confirmation that Acceptance of a Notice of Termination of a Point-to-Point Transmission Service Agreement Does Not Preclude a Transmission Provider from Seeking Contract Damages for Breach of the Service Agreement**

On February 18, 2015, FERC issued an Order on Petitions for Declaratory Orders. The Commission granted SPP's petition for a declaratory order, and denied AES Shady Point, LLC's petition for a declaratory order. The Commission found that SPP may pursue legal action in a state court against AES Shady Point, LLC for alleged contract damages for an alleged breach of the service agreement, but made no finding on whether such a claim has any merit.

EL14-65 **AES Shady Point, LLC's ("AES") Petition for Declaratory Order Asking the Commission to Determine that SPP's Tariff Prohibits SPP from Recovering Damages in the Form of Lost Revenues from AES**

On February 18, 2015, FERC issued an Order on Petitions for Declaratory Orders. The Commission granted SPP's petition for a declaratory order, and denied AES Shady Point, LLC's petition for a declaratory order. The Commission found that SPP may pursue legal action in a state court against AES Shady Point, LLC for alleged contract damages for an alleged breach of the service agreement, but made no finding on whether such a claim has any merit.

EL14-73 **Section 206 Proceeding Directing The Empire District Electric Company ("Empire") to File Revisions to its Formula Rate Protocols**

On February 6, 2015, City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri filed a Motion to Intervene Out-of-Time.

Regulatory Status Report

- EL15-8** **Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Golden Spread"), Central Valley Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Central Valley"), Farmers' Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Farmers"), Lea County Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Lea County"), Roosevelt County Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Roosevelt") and the West Texas Municipal Power Agency ("WTMPA") (collectively the "Complainants") Complaint Against Southwestern Public Service Company ("SPS") Involving the Input Value for Rate of Return on Common Equity ("ROE") in the Formula Rate Applicable to the Replacement Power Sales Agreements Pursuant to which SPS Sells Capacity and Energy to the Complainants and the Formula Rate Applicable to Determination of the SPS Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement ("ATRR")**
- On February 2, 2015, Judge Wagner issued an Order of Chief Judge Denying Motion to Consolidate Docket No. EL15-8-000 with Docket Nos. EL13-78-000 and EL12-59-000 for purposes of hearing and decision.
- On February 5, 2015, Judge Wagner issued an Order of Chief Judge Designating Presiding Administrative Law Judge and Establishing Initial Decision Deadline.
- On February 6, 2015, FERC issued an Order Setting Pre-Hearing Conference to be held on February 12, 2015.
- On February 12, 2015, FERC issued an Order Adopting Procedural Schedule.
- A pre-hearing conference was held on February 12, 2015.
- ER07-1069** **AEP Filing of Revised Pro-forma Tariff Sheets to Update AEP's Transmission Service Rates and Institute a Formula Rate (AEP Formula Rate Case)**
- On February 4, 2015, American Electric Power Service Company filed its response to the Formal Challenge filed by Martha Peine on January 5, 2015.
- ER12-480** **Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") and the MISO Transmission Owners ("MISO TOs") Filing to Amend Open Access Transmission, Energy and Operating Reserve Markets Tariff Provisions on Allocation of Network Upgrade Costs in Connection with Transition and Integration of Entergy Corporation and its Operating Companies**
- On February 20, 2015, FERC issued an order accepting the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc.'s November 21, 2014 Compliance Filing.
- ER12-959** **Submission of Tariff Revisions to Implement a Formula Rate for Transmission Service for Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Tri-County"), a Transmission Owner in the Southwestern Public Service Company ("SPS") Zone**
- On February 18, 2015, Xcel Energy Services Inc. filed its Report Regarding Phase II Settlement Discussions. Xcel stated that Opinion No. 535 issued by the Commission on October 16, 2014, affirmed the Initial Decision, confirming that Tri-County's facilities are not "Transmission Facilities" under Attachment AI or transmission facilities under the Commission's seven factor test, and that none of Tri-County's facilities are eligible to be rolled into SPP's Zone 11 rates. Accordingly, Phase II, settlement discussions, which were intended to address the proposed tariff provisions associated with Tri-County's facilities for the SPP Tariff, have been rendered moot and are unnecessary.
- On February 20, 2015, Judge Wagner issued an order terminating the Phase II settlement

Regulatory Status Report

proceedings.

ER12-1179

Submission of Tariff Revisions to Implement SPP Integrated Marketplace

On February 6, 2015, SPP submitted an errata filing to correct its January 20, 2015 Compliance Filing to include "or a Local Emergency Condition" in Section 8.6.7 of Attachment AE of the Tariff.

ER13-366

Submission of Tariff Revisions to Comply with Order No. 1000 Regional Planning and Cost Allocation Requirements

On February 2, 2015, SPP filed an answer in response to the comments filed by South Central MCN, LLC on January 5, 2015.

SPP stated:

- 1) the Commission should reject the SCMCN Comments because they raise issues outside the scope of this proceeding;
- 2) SCMCN's collateral attacks on prior Commission orders provide no basis for further changes to SPP's Tariff or a technical conference; and
- 3) SCMCN's technical conference request is unsupported.

ER13-367

Submission of Revisions to its Membership Agreement to Comply with Order No. 1000

On February 2, 2015, SPP filed an answer in response to the comments filed by South Central MCN, LLC on January 5, 2015.

SPP stated:

- 1) the Commission should reject the SCMCN Comments because they raise issues outside the scope of this proceeding;
- 2) SCMCN's collateral attacks on prior Commission orders provide no basis for further changes to SPP's Tariff or a technical conference; and
- 3) SCMCN's technical conference request is unsupported.

ER13-1864

Joint Operating Agreement ("JOA") between SPP and the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") to Include Market-to-Market ("M2M") Terms and Conditions (SPP Rate Schedule FERC No. 9)

On February 23, 2015, SPP filed a Motion for Limited Extension of Time to Comply with one aspect of the January 22, 2015 Order.

On February 23, 2015, SPP submitted a compliance filing revising its Joint Operating Agreement with the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. pursuant to the January 22, 2015 order on market-to-market coordination.

ER13-1928

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC's and Duke Energy Progress, Inc.'s Order 1000 Interregional Filing

On February 23, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. and the MISO Transmission Owners filed a Request for Clarification, and in the Alternative Rehearing of the January 23, 2015 Order, which conditionally accepted MISO's and the SERTP Parties' respective proposals to address Order No. 1000's directives regarding the identification and evaluation of transmission facilities proposed to be located in both regions, as well as possible interregional transmission facilities that may resolve the individual needs of neighboring planning regions more efficiently or cost-effectively than transmission facilities located in only

one region.

On February 24, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., the MISO Transmission Owners, and the SERTP Parties filed a Joint Motion for Extension of Time to comply with the January 23, 2015 Order.

ER13-1930

Louisville Gas and Electric Company's and Kentucky Utilities Company's Order 1000 Interregional Filing

On February 23, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. and the MISO Transmission Owners filed a Request for Clarification, and in the Alternative Rehearing of the January 23, 2015 Order, which conditionally accepted MISO's and the SERTP Parties' respective proposals to address Order No. 1000's directives regarding the identification and evaluation of transmission facilities proposed to be located in both regions, as well as possible interregional transmission facilities that may resolve the individual needs of neighboring planning regions more efficiently or cost-effectively than transmission facilities located in only one region.

On February 24, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., the MISO Transmission Owners, and the SERTP Parties filed a Joint Motion for Extension of Time to comply with the January 23, 2015 Order.

ER13-1937

Joint Operating Agreement ("JOA") between SPP and the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") to Comply with Interregional Requirements of Order No. 1000 (SPP Rate Schedule FERC No. 9)

On February 19, 2015, FERC issued an Order on Compliance Filings.

The Commission issued an order on SPP's filings related to the proposed procedures established for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between SPP and the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") in Docket Nos. ER13-1937 and ER13-1939. The proposed procedures for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between SPP and other neighboring transmission planning regions will be addressed in separate orders.

The Commission conditionally accepted, subject to further compliance filing, SPP's revisions to the Joint Operating Agreement between SPP and MISO ("SPP-MISO JOA") to comply with Order No. 1000 interregional requirements. The Commission also conditionally accepted, subject to a further compliance filing, MISO's revisions to the SPP-MISO JOA in Docket No. ER13-1938.

An effective date of March 30, 2014 was granted.

SPP's and MISO's compliance filings are due on April 20, 2015.

The Commission found that SPP and MISO partially complied with the general interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000. Specifically, the Commission found that SPP and MISO complied with the requirement to coordinate with the neighboring public utility transmission providers within their interconnection to implement the interregional transmission coordination requirements. The Commission found that SPP and MISO are neighboring transmission planning regions in the eastern interconnection with interconnections at several points along the SPP/MISO seam. However, the Commission found that SPP and MISO partially comply with the requirement that each pair of neighboring transmission

Regulatory Status Report

planning regions develop the same language to describe the interregional transmission coordination procedures for that particular pair of regions. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit further compliance filings to revise the SPP-MISO JOA to include a common interregional cost allocation method(s) consistent with the directives in this order regarding Cost Allocation.

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposals to define an Interregional Project that is eligible for interregional cost allocation as a new transmission facility that may interconnect to transmission facilities under the control of both SPP and MISO is over limiting and inconsistent with Order No. 1000's definition of an interregional transmission facility as one that is located in two or more transmission planning regions. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit further compliance filings to revise the definition of an Interregional Project consistent with Order No. 1000.

The Commission found that the SPP-MISO JOA partially complies with the data and information exchange requirements of Order No. 1000. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit a further compliance filing to include "Transmission Issue" as a defined term in the SPP-MISO JOA that includes issues related to regional transmission needs driven by reliability, economics, and public policy requirements. The Commission also directed SPP and MISO to remove the requirement that third parties must provide the analysis to support recommended transmission issues.

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposed procedures for joint evaluation of identified interregional transmission facilities partially comply with Order No. 1000. The Commission found that SPP and MISO have not proposed to consider regional reliability needs or transmission needs driven by public policy requirements in both transmission planning regions as part of the joint evaluation of an interregional transmission facility. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to revise their proposed interregional transmission coordination procedures so that an interregional transmission facility that may resolve regional reliability needs (which MISO's proposal lacks) and transmission needs driven by public policy requirements (which both SPP's and MISO's proposals lack) can be considered by each respective regional transmission planning process.

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposed revisions to the SPP-MISO JOA concerning transparency and stakeholder participation partially comply with the requirements of Order No. 1000. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to revise the SPP-MISO JOA to explain how all stakeholders can participate in the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee voting process and how their votes will be considered.

The Commission accepted the four criteria SPP and MISO jointly proposed for an interregional transmission facility to be eligible for interregional cost allocation.

As for the last criterion for which SPP and MISO cannot agree, the Commission accepted SPP's proposal and require MISO to revise the MISO Tariff to include SPP's proposed language. Specifically, the Commission accepted SPP's proposal that, to be eligible for interregional cost allocation, an interregional transmission facility must be "approved by both [p]arties in their respective regional planning process as outlined in their respective [Open Access Transmission Tariffs]."

The Commission agreed with commenters that MISO's proposal to limit an interregional transmission facility that is eligible for interregional cost allocation to those that qualify as a Market Efficiency Project under the MISO Tariff does not comply with Order No. 1000 because

Regulatory Status Report

MISO's regional cost allocation method for Market Efficiency Projects accounts for mainly regional economic benefits, but does not account for regional reliability benefits or benefits associated transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. Therefore, the Commission agreed with commenters that MISO's proposal to only consider Market Efficiency Projects fails to sufficiently consider all of the benefits that may accrue from an interregional transmission facility.

The Commission found that SPP's proposal allows SPP and MISO to jointly identify and evaluate interregional transmission facilities that account for regional transmission needs driven by reliability, economics, and public policy requirements consistent with each region's regional transmission planning processes.

The Commission directed MISO to revise section 9.6.3.1(iii) (Criteria for Project Designation as an Interregional Project) to state that Interregional Project must be "approved by both Parties in their respective regional transmission planning processed as outlined in their respective tariffs."

The Commission conditionally accepted SPP's and MISO's proposals to comply with the cost allocation requirements for interregional transmission facilities in Order No. 1000, subject to a further compliance filing to address Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6. The Commission found that MISO's proposal does not comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 because it does not include an interregional cost allocation method for regional reliability needs and transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. The Commission found that SPP's proposal does not comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 because it does not include an interregional cost allocation method for regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements.

The Commission found that SPP's proposal complied with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4. MISO did not include such a provision. Therefore, MISO was directed to add a new section 9.3.3.4.1 to its version of the SPP-MISO JOA that matches the proposed language in SPP's version of the SPP-MISO JOA.

The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit a further compliance filing to propose a new interregional cost allocation method that applies to interregional transmission facilities addressing regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements and are eligible to be selected in both SPP's and MISO's regional transmission planning processes for purposes of cost allocation. In addition, MISO was directed to submit a further compliance filing to revise its version of the SPP-MISO JOA to adopt SPP's cost allocation method that applies to interregional transmission facilities addressing regional reliability transmission needs.

The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit revisions to sections 9.7 (Network Upgrade Construction and Ownership) and 9.7.1 (Interregional Project Construction and Ownership) of the SPP-MISO JOA to provide additional detail and examples concerning the determination of the ownership rights and construction obligations.

ER13-1938

Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") Submission of Joint Operating Agreement ("JOA") between SPP and MISO to Comply with Interregional Requirements of Order No. 1000

On February 19, 2015, FERC issued an Order on Compliance Filings.

The Commission issued an order on SPP's filings related to the proposed procedures

Regulatory Status Report

established for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between SPP and the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") in Docket Nos. ER13-1937 and ER13-1939. The proposed procedures for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between SPP and other neighboring transmission planning regions will be addressed in separate orders.

The Commission conditionally accepted, subject to further compliance filing, SPP's revisions to the Joint Operating Agreement between SPP and MISO ("SPP-MISO JOA") to comply with Order No. 1000 interregional requirements. The Commission also conditionally accepted, subject to a further compliance filing, MISO's revisions to the SPP-MISO JOA in Docket No. ER13-1938.

An effective date of March 30, 2014 was granted.

SPP's and MISO's compliance filings are due on April 20, 2015.

The Commission found that SPP and MISO partially complied with the general interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000. Specifically, the Commission found that SPP and MISO complied with the requirement to coordinate with the neighboring public utility transmission providers within their interconnection to implement the interregional transmission coordination requirements. The Commission found that SPP and MISO are neighboring transmission planning regions in the eastern interconnection with interconnections at several points along the SPP/MISO seam. However, the Commission found that SPP and MISO partially comply with the requirement that each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions develop the same language to describe the interregional transmission coordination procedures for that particular pair of regions. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit further compliance filings to revise the SPP-MISO JOA to include a common interregional cost allocation method(s) consistent with the directives in this order regarding Cost Allocation.

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposals to define an Interregional Project that is eligible for interregional cost allocation as a new transmission facility that may interconnect to transmission facilities under the control of both SPP and MISO is over limiting and inconsistent with Order No. 1000's definition of an interregional transmission facility as one that is located in two or more transmission planning regions. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit further compliance filings to revise the definition of an Interregional Project consistent with Order No. 1000.

The Commission found that the SPP-MISO JOA partially complies with the data and information exchange requirements of Order No. 1000. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit a further compliance filing to include "Transmission Issue" as a defined term in the SPP-MISO JOA that includes issues related to regional transmission needs driven by reliability, economics, and public policy requirements. The Commission also directed SPP and MISO to remove the requirement that third parties must provide the analysis to support recommended transmission issues.

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposed procedures for joint evaluation of identified interregional transmission facilities partially comply with Order No. 1000. The Commission found that SPP and MISO have not proposed to consider regional reliability needs or transmission needs driven by public policy requirements in both transmission planning regions as part of the joint evaluation of an interregional transmission facility. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to revise their proposed interregional transmission

Regulatory Status Report

coordination procedures so that an interregional transmission facility that may resolve regional reliability needs (which MISO's proposal lacks) and transmission needs driven by public policy requirements (which both SPP's and MISO's proposals lack) can be considered by each respective regional transmission planning process.

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposed revisions to the SPP-MISO JOA concerning transparency and stakeholder participation partially comply with the requirements of Order No. 1000. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to revise the SPP-MISO JOA to explain how all stakeholders can participate in the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee voting process and how their votes will be considered.

The Commission accepted the four criteria SPP and MISO jointly proposed for an interregional transmission facility to be eligible for interregional cost allocation.

As for the last criterion for which SPP and MISO cannot agree, the Commission accepted SPP's proposal and require MISO to revise the MISO Tariff to include SPP's proposed language. Specifically, the Commission accepted SPP's proposal that, to be eligible for interregional cost allocation, an interregional transmission facility must be "approved by both [p]arties in their respective regional planning process as outlined in their respective [Open Access Transmission Tariffs]."

The Commission agreed with commenters that MISO's proposal to limit an interregional transmission facility that is eligible for interregional cost allocation to those that qualify as a Market Efficiency Project under the MISO Tariff does not comply with Order No. 1000 because MISO's regional cost allocation method for Market Efficiency Projects accounts for mainly regional economic benefits, but does not account for regional reliability benefits or benefits associated transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. Therefore, the Commission agreed with commenters that MISO's proposal to only consider Market Efficiency Projects fails to sufficiently consider all of the benefits that may accrue from an interregional transmission facility.

The Commission found that SPP's proposal allows SPP and MISO to jointly identify and evaluate interregional transmission facilities that account for regional transmission needs driven by reliability, economics, and public policy requirements consistent with each region's regional transmission planning processes.

The Commission directed MISO to revise section 9.6.3.1(iii) (Criteria for Project Designation as an Interregional Project) to state that Interregional Project must be "approved by both Parties in their respective regional transmission planning processed as outlined in their respective tariffs."

The Commission conditionally accepted SPP's and MISO's proposals to comply with the cost allocation requirements for interregional transmission facilities in Order No. 1000, subject to a further compliance filing to address Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6. The Commission found that MISO's proposal does not comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 because it does not include an interregional cost allocation method for regional reliability needs and transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. The Commission found that SPP's proposal does not comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 because it does not include an interregional cost allocation method for regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements.

The Commission found that SPP's proposal complied with Interregional Cost Allocation

Regulatory Status Report

Principle 4. MISO did not include such a provision. Therefore, MISO was directed to add a new section 9.3.3.4.1 to its version of the SPP-MISO JOA that matches the proposed language in SPP's version of the SPP-MISO JOA.

The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit a further compliance filing to propose a new interregional cost allocation method that applies to interregional transmission facilities addressing regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements and are eligible to be selected in both SPP's and MISO's regional transmission planning processes for purposes of cost allocation. In addition, MISO was directed to submit a further compliance filing to revise its version of the SPP-MISO JOA to adopt SPP's cost allocation method that applies to interregional transmission facilities addressing regional reliability transmission needs.

The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit revisions to sections 9.7 (Network Upgrade Construction and Ownership) and 9.7.1 (Interregional Project Construction and Ownership) of the SPP-MISO JOA to provide additional detail and examples concerning the determination of the ownership rights and construction obligations.

ER13-1939

SPP Submission of Tariff Revisions to Comply with Order No. 1000 Interregional Coordination and Cost Allocation Requirements

On February 19, 2015, FERC issued an Order on Compliance Filings.

The Commission issued an order on SPP's filings related to the proposed procedures established for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between SPP and the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") in Docket Nos. ER13-1937 and ER13-1939. The proposed procedures for interregional transmission coordination and cost allocation between SPP and other neighboring transmission planning regions will be addressed in separate orders.

The Commission conditionally accepted, subject to further compliance filing, SPP's revisions to the Joint Operating Agreement between SPP and MISO ("SPP-MISO JOA") to comply with Order No. 1000 interregional requirements. The Commission also conditionally accepted, subject to a further compliance filing, MISO's revisions to the SPP-MISO JOA in Docket No. ER13-1938.

An effective date of March 30, 2014 was granted.

SPP's and MISO's compliance filings are due on April 20, 2015.

The Commission found that SPP and MISO partially complied with the general interregional transmission coordination requirements of Order No. 1000. Specifically, the Commission found that SPP and MISO complied with the requirement to coordinate with the neighboring public utility transmission providers within their interconnection to implement the interregional transmission coordination requirements. The Commission found that SPP and MISO are neighboring transmission planning regions in the eastern interconnection with interconnections at several points along the SPP/MISO seam. However, the Commission found that SPP and MISO partially comply with the requirement that each pair of neighboring transmission planning regions develop the same language to describe the interregional transmission coordination procedures for that particular pair of regions. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit further compliance filings to revise the SPP-MISO JOA to include a common interregional cost allocation method(s) consistent with the directives in this order regarding Cost Allocation.

Regulatory Status Report

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposals to define an Interregional Project that is eligible for interregional cost allocation as a new transmission facility that may interconnect to transmission facilities under the control of both SPP and MISO is over limiting and inconsistent with Order No. 1000's definition of an interregional transmission facility as one that is located in two or more transmission planning regions. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit further compliance filings to revise the definition of an Interregional Project consistent with Order No. 1000.

The Commission found that the SPP-MISO JOA partially complies with the data and information exchange requirements of Order No. 1000. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit a further compliance filing to include "Transmission Issue" as a defined term in the SPP-MISO JOA that includes issues related to regional transmission needs driven by reliability, economics, and public policy requirements. The Commission also directed SPP and MISO to remove the requirement that third parties must provide the analysis to support recommended transmission issues.

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposed procedures for joint evaluation of identified interregional transmission facilities partially comply with Order No. 1000. The Commission found that SPP and MISO have not proposed to consider regional reliability needs or transmission needs driven by public policy requirements in both transmission planning regions as part of the joint evaluation of an interregional transmission facility. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to revise their proposed interregional transmission coordination procedures so that an interregional transmission facility that may resolve regional reliability needs (which MISO's proposal lacks) and transmission needs driven by public policy requirements (which both SPP's and MISO's proposals lack) can be considered by each respective regional transmission planning process.

The Commission found that SPP's and MISO's proposed revisions to the SPP-MISO JOA concerning transparency and stakeholder participation partially comply with the requirements of Order No. 1000. The Commission directed SPP and MISO to revise the SPP-MISO JOA to explain how all stakeholders can participate in the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee voting process and how their votes will be considered.

The Commission accepted the four criteria SPP and MISO jointly proposed for an interregional transmission facility to be eligible for interregional cost allocation.

As for the last criterion for which SPP and MISO cannot agree, the Commission accepted SPP's proposal and require MISO to revise the MISO Tariff to include SPP's proposed language. Specifically, the Commission accepted SPP's proposal that, to be eligible for interregional cost allocation, an interregional transmission facility must be "approved by both [p]arties in their respective regional planning process as outlined in their respective [Open Access Transmission Tariffs]."

The Commission agreed with commenters that MISO's proposal to limit an interregional transmission facility that is eligible for interregional cost allocation to those that qualify as a Market Efficiency Project under the MISO Tariff does not comply with Order No. 1000 because MISO's regional cost allocation method for Market Efficiency Projects accounts for mainly regional economic benefits, but does not account for regional reliability benefits or benefits associated transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. Therefore, the Commission agreed with commenters that MISO's proposal to only consider Market Efficiency

Regulatory Status Report

Projects fails to sufficiently consider all of the benefits that may accrue from an interregional transmission facility.

The Commission found that SPP's proposal allows SPP and MISO to jointly identify and evaluate interregional transmission facilities that account for regional transmission needs driven by reliability, economics, and public policy requirements consistent with each region's regional transmission planning processes.

The Commission directed MISO to revise section 9.6.3.1(iii) (Criteria for Project Designation as an Interregional Project) to state that Interregional Project must be "approved by both Parties in their respective regional transmission planning processed as outlined in their respective tariffs."

The Commission conditionally accepted SPP's and MISO's proposals to comply with the cost allocation requirements for interregional transmission facilities in Order No. 1000, subject to a further compliance filing to address Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6. The Commission found that MISO's proposal does not comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 because it does not include an interregional cost allocation method for regional reliability needs and transmission needs driven by public policy requirements. The Commission found that SPP's proposal does not comply with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6 because it does not include an interregional cost allocation method for regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements.

The Commission found that SPP's proposal complied with Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4. MISO did not include such a provision. Therefore, MISO was directed to add a new section 9.3.3.4.1 to its version of the SPP-MISO JOA that matches the proposed language in SPP's version of the SPP-MISO JOA.

The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit a further compliance filing to propose a new interregional cost allocation method that applies to interregional transmission facilities addressing regional transmission needs driven by public policy requirements and are eligible to be selected in both SPP's and MISO's regional transmission planning processes for purposes of cost allocation. In addition, MISO was directed to submit a further compliance filing to revise its version of the SPP-MISO JOA to adopt SPP's cost allocation method that applies to interregional transmission facilities addressing regional reliability transmission needs.

The Commission directed SPP and MISO to submit revisions to sections 9.7 (Network Upgrade Construction and Ownership) and 9.7.1 (Interregional Project Construction and Ownership) of the SPP-MISO JOA to provide additional detail and examples concerning the determination of the ownership rights and construction obligations.

ER13-1940

Ohio Valley Electric Corporation's Order 1000 Interregional Filing

On February 23, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. and the MISO Transmission Owners filed a Request for Clarification, and in the Alternative Rehearing of the January 23, 2015 Order, which conditionally accepted MISO's and the SERTP Parties' respective proposals to address Order No. 1000's directives regarding the identification and evaluation of transmission facilities proposed to be located in both regions, as well as possible interregional transmission facilities that may resolve the individual needs of neighboring planning regions more efficiently or cost-effectively than transmission facilities located in only one region.

Regulatory Status Report

On February 24, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., the MISO Transmission Owners, and the SERTP Parties filed a Joint Motion for Extension of Time to comply with the January 23, 2015 Order.

ER13-1941

Southern Company Services, Inc.'s Order 1000 Interregional Filing

On February 23, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. and the MISO Transmission Owners filed a Request for Clarification, and in the Alternative Rehearing of the January 23, 2015 Order, which conditionally accepted MISO's and the SERTP Parties' respective proposals to address Order No. 1000's directives regarding the identification and evaluation of transmission facilities proposed to be located in both regions, as well as possible interregional transmission facilities that may resolve the individual needs of neighboring planning regions more efficiently or cost-effectively than transmission facilities located in only one region.

On February 24, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., the MISO Transmission Owners, and the SERTP Parties filed a Joint Motion for Extension of Time to comply with the January 23, 2015 Order.

ER14-1174

Unexecuted Firm Point-To-Point Transmission Service Agreement between SPP as Transmission Provider and Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") as Transmission Customer

On February 12, 2015, Judge Cintron issued a Settlement Judge Report, recommending that settlement judge procedures remain in place.

ER14-2363

Southwestern Public Service Company's ("SPS") Request for Waiver of the Provisions in Schedules 1A and 11 of SPP's Open Access Transmission Tariff ("Tariff")

On February 23, 2015, FERC issued an Order Denying Request for Waiver.

ER14-2445

Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") Submission of Tariff Revisions to Modify the Demand Curves Associated with Sub-Regional Power Balance Constraints ("SRPBC")

On February 2, 2015, the Wisconsin TDUs filed a Limited Protest in response to MISO's January 12, 2015 Compliance Filing.

On February 2, 2015, Potomac Economics, Ltd. filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the December 12, 2014 Order.

On February 3, 2015, the Public Utility Commission of Texas filed a Protest in response to MISO's January 12, 2015 Compliance Filing.

On February 6, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. submitted an errata to its January 12, 2015 Compliance Filing.

On February 11, 2015, FERC issued an Order Granting Rehearing for Further Consideration of the December 12, 2014 Order.

On February 18, 2015, SPP filed an answer in opposition to Motion for Reconsideration filed by Potomac Economics, Ltd. on February 2, 2015. SPP stated that the motion should be rejected because it is, in essence, an untimely rehearing request and constitutes an impermissible collateral attack on the Commission's Service Agreement Order in Docket Nos. EL14-21-000, et al.

Regulatory Status Report

ER14-2553

Order No. 681 Compliance Filing to Implement Long-Term Congestion Rights ("LTCRs")

On February 3, 2015, American Electric Power Service Corporation filed a Motion to Intervene.

On February 20, 2015, Boston Energy Trading and Marketing, LLC filed a Protest in response to SPP's January 30, 2015 Compliance Filing.

BETM stated:

- 1) SPP's \$5,000,000 minimum for sponsored upgrade costs to receive Incremental LTCRs is not just and reasonable; and
- 2) SPP's provisions that upgrades must be in-service prior to Incremental LTCR verification to receive Incremental LTCRs for that year is unreasonable.

On February 24, 2015, the American Wind Energy Association and the Wind Coalition filed a Motion to Intervene Out-of-Time.

On February 27, 2015, the American Wind Energy Association and the Wind Coalition filed late Comments in response to SPP's January 30, 2015 Compliance Filing.

The parties stated:

- 1) Order No. 681 allows SPP to offer customers the option to choose Credits or Incremental LTCRs;
- 2) the priority awarded to Incremental LTCRs in SPP's Compliance Filing is inconsistent with Order No. 681; and
- 3) the proposed treatment of Incremental LTCRs in SPP's planning process may lead to overbuilding of transmission capacity and other unintended consequences.

ER14-2850

Submission of Tariff Revisions to Facilitate the Integration of Western Area Power Administration - Upper Great Plains Region ("Western-UGP"), Basin Electric Power Cooperative ("Basin Electric"), and Heartland Consumers Power District ("Heartland") (collectively the "IS Parties"), which Jointly Own and Operate the Integrated System, into the SPP Regional Transmission Organization ("RTO")

On February 3, 2015, Judge McCartney filed a Status Report, recommending that settlement judge procedures continue. The next settlement conference is scheduled for February 12, 2015.

A settlement conference was held on February 12, 2015.

On February 13, 2015, Judge McCartney issued a Notice Scheduling Settlement Conference to be held on March 31, 2015.

ER14-2851

Submission of Bylaws and Membership Agreement ("Governing Documents") Revisions to Facilitate the Integration of Western Area Power Administration - Upper Great Plains Region ("Western-UGP"), Basin Electric Power Cooperative ("Basin Electric"), and Heartland Consumers Power District ("Heartland") (collectively the "IS Parties"), which Jointly Own and Operate the Integrated System, into the SPP Regional Transmission Organization ("RTO")

On February 3, 2015, Judge McCartney filed a Status Report, recommending that settlement judge procedures continue. The next settlement conference is scheduled for February 12, 2015.

Regulatory Status Report

- ER15-211** **Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Nemaha-Marshall Electric Cooperative ("Nemaha-Marshall") as Network Customer, and Westar Energy, Inc. ("Westar") as Host Transmission Owner**
- On February 19, 2015, SPP filed the refund report pursuant to the December 23, 2014 Order.
- ER15-279** **Submission of Tariff Revisions to Implement a Stated Rate to Accommodate Recovery of the Annual Transmission Revenue Requirements ("ATRR") for The Central Nebraska Public Power & Irrigation District ("Central")**
- On February 19, 2015, Settlement Judge Johnson issued a Status Report stating that the participants reported they are continuing settlement discussions and will report on their progress after February 24, 2015.
- ER15-509** **Submission of Tariff Revisions to Refine Processes Related to SPP's Order No. 1000 Competitive Transmission Owner Selection Process**
- On February 23, 2015, SPP submitted its compliance filing pursuant to the January 23, 2015 Order.
- On February 23, 2015, SPP filed a Request for Clarification, or in the Alternative, Rehearing of the January 23, 2015 Order.
- ER15-599** **Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Kansas Municipal Energy Agency ("KMEA") as Network Customer, and Westar Energy, Inc. ("Westar") as Host Transmission Owner**
- On February 3, 2015, FERC issued a letter order accepting the agreement, effective February 7, 2015, which differs from the date requested of August 1, 2014.
- This order constitutes final agency action.
- ER15-603** **Meter Agent Services Agreement between Kansas Power Pool ("KPP") as Market Participant and Westar Energy, Inc. ("Westar") as Meter Agent**
- On February 3, 2015, FERC issued a letter order accepting the agreement, effective December 1, 2014 as requested.
- This order constitutes final agency action.
- ER15-617** **Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation ("AECC") as Network Customer, and American Electric Power Service Corporation ("AEP") as Host Transmission Owner**
- On February 3, 2015, FERC issued a letter order accepting the agreement, effective December 1, 2014 as requested.
- This order constitutes final agency action.
- ER15-630** **Submission of Tariff Revisions to Attachment AE Section 4.1 to Clarify Certain Criteria Applicable to the Submission of Resource Offers for Supplemental Reserve into the**

Regulatory Status Report

Day-Ahead Market and Real-Time Balancing Market

On February 3, 2015, FERC issued an order accepting tariff revisions to Attachment AE Section 4.1 to clarify certain criteria applicable to submission of Resource Offers for Supplemental Reserve into the Day-Ahead Market and Real-Time Balancing Market.

An effective date of February 13, 2015 was granted.

This order constitutes final agency action.

ER15-633

Submission of Tariff Revisions to Include Violation Relaxation Limits for Market-to-Market Coordination with the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO")

On February 23, 2015, FERC issued an order accepting the tariff revisions modifying Addendum 1 to Attachment AE to add clarifying language that allows the implementation of Market-to-Market Coordination with the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., and the resulting operating constraints to be recognized by SPP's Real-Time Balancing Market.

An effective date of March 1, 2015 was granted.

This order constitutes final agency action.

ER15-673

Submission of Tariff Revisions to Modify Certain Market Power Mitigation Measures Applicable to Manual Resource Commitments

On February 10, 2015, FERC issued an order accepting the tariff revisions to modify certain market power mitigation measures applicable to manual resource commitments.

An effective date of February 17, 2015 was granted.

This order constitutes final agency action.

ER15-695

Submission of Tariff Revisions Regarding Updates to Invoice Dispute Information Requirements in Attachment AE, Section 10.3

On February 18, 2015, FERC issued an order accepting the tariff revisions to update the Invoice Dispute provisions set forth in Attachment AE, Section 10.3.

An effective date of March 1, 2014 was granted.

This order constitutes final agency action.

ER15-714

Submission of Tariff Revisions Regarding Adjustments to Mitigated Offers

On February 19, 2015, FERC issued an order accepting the tariff revisions to make explicit and thus clarify for Market Participants the circumstances under which mitigated offers may be adjusted during the course of the operating day.

An effective date of February 21, 2015 was granted.

This order constitutes final agency action.

Regulatory Status Report

- ER15-759** **Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("AECI") as Network Customer, and KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company ("KCPL-GMO") as Host Transmission Owner**
- On February 24, 2015, FERC issued a letter order accepting the agreement, effective December 1, 2014 as requested.
- This order constitutes final agency action.
- ER15-763** **Submission of Tariff Revisions to Modify Allocation of Over-Collected Losses ("OCL")**
- On February 3, 2015, Tenaska Power Services Co. filed an answer in response the Protest filed by Xcel Energy Services Inc. on January 20, 2015.
- Tenaska stated that the Commission should accept SPP's current proposal because it corrects existing flaws in SPP's distribution methodology. Tenaska further stated that to the extent necessary, the Commission could direct SPP and its stakeholders to engage in further discussions to explore whether additional improvements may be made to the methodology set forth in SPP's December 30 Filing.
- On February 10, 2015, SPP filed an answer in response to the Protest filed by Xcel Energy Services Inc. on January 20, 2015.
- SPP stated that the Commission should reject Xcel's Protest. SPP also stated with respect to the treatment of Bilateral Settlement Schedule activity, nothing in the December 30, 2014 Filing proposed any change to how Bilateral Settlement Schedule transactions are accounted for the over-collected losses methodology.
- ER15-774** **Submission of Tariff Revisions to Modify Provisions Addressing Regulation Compensation and Mitigation of Regulation Offers**
- On February 6, 2015, FERC issued an order accepting the tariff revisions to modify certain aspects of SPP's regulating reserve compensation methodology and mitigation of regulating reserve offers.
- An effective date of March 1, 2015 was granted.
- This order constitutes final agency action.
- ER15-788** **Submission of Tariff Revisions Regarding Thresholds for Uneconomic Production Investigation**
- On February 27, 2015, FERC issued a letter requiring additional information in order to process the December 31, 2014 Filing.
- SPP's response is due on April 13, 2015.
- ER15-789** **Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("GSEC") as Network Customer, and Southwestern Public Service Company ("SPS") and Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company ("OG&E") as Host Transmission Owners**

Regulatory Status Report

On February 24, 2015, FERC issued a letter order accepting the agreement, effective December 1, 2014 as requested.

This order constitutes final agency action.

ER15-815

Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority ("OMPA") as Network Customer, and American Electric Power Service Corporation ("AEP"), Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company ("OG&E") and Western Farmers Electric Cooperative ("WFEC") as Host Transmission Owners

On February 19, 2015, FERC issued a letter order accepting the agreement, effective December 1, 2014 as requested.

This order constitutes final agency action.

ER15-859

Submission of Tariff Amendments to Revise Attachments H and AI to Establish a Process by Which Prior to the Submission of a Filing to Incorporate a Transmission Owner's Initial Revenue Requirement into Attachment H, SPP will Review the Data and Information to be Included in the Filing

On February 5, 2015, Western Farmers Electric Cooperative filed a Motion to Intervene and Comments in support of SPP's January 15, 2015 Filing.

On February 5, 2015, Missouri River Energy Services filed a Motion for Leave to Intervene and Comments Seeking Clarification.

MRES requested that the Commission:

- 1) clarify that new Attachment H and Attachment AI review procedures will be applied prospectively and will not apply to the ongoing SPP internal review of MRES' initial attachment H rate filing;
- 2) clarify that notwithstanding the language in Attachment AI, an entity desiring to incorporate its ATRR and protocols into SPP's Attachment H may propose, support and defend for inclusion in the SPP Transmission System any transmission facility that satisfies the Commission's seven factor test, regardless of whether it is operated at, above, or below 60 kV; and
- 3) allow a phased approach to its pre-filing review, as described herein, requiring SPP to first identify any issues with the facilities proposed for inclusion in rate base according to the criteria established in Attachment AI, and then evaluate the remainder of the information required for its pre-filing review.

On February 5, 2015, the TDU Intervenors filed a Motion to Intervene and Protest.

The parties stated:

- 1) SPP's proposal would not effectively prevent Transmission Owners from proposing unjust and unreasonable Annual Transmission Revenue Requirements;
- 2) SPP's proposal would unjustly and unreasonably impair a new Transmission Owner's ability to recover its costs; and
- 3) SPP's proposal is unduly discriminatory.

On February 5, 2015, South Central MCN, LLC filed a Motion to Intervene and Protest.

SCMCN stated that SPP has failed to demonstrate a need for the proposed new review

Regulatory Status Report

process for FERC-regulated entities and has not explained why current processes in place are inadequate for initial rate filings for a new Transmission Owner who must also separately obtain FERC approval of its rates.

Several parties filed motions to intervene.

On February 6, 2015, South Central MCN, LLC filed an amended Protest, adopting the protest and recommendations of the TDU Intervenors.

On February 23, 2015, SPP filed an answer in response to protests and comments in this proceeding.

SPP stated:

- 1) the six-month review period specified in the revisions to Attachment AI is just and reasonable; and
- 2) the Commission need not consider the phased in approach suggested in this proceeding by Missouri River Energy Services.

In addition, SPP clarified that entities with whom SPP is currently working to facilitate their initial rate filings will not be adversely impacted nor will their reviews be delayed by the acceptance of the proposed revisions to Attachment AI. SPP also clarified that nothing in the proposed revisions is intended to be inconsistent with the Commission's orders regarding the application of the seven-factor test to the determination of what transmission facilities may be included in a Transmission Owner's Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement to be incorporated into Attachment H of the Tariff.

ER15-863

Ministerial Filing to Update Bylaws and Membership Agreement

On February 6, 2015, South Central MCN, LLC filed a Motion to Intervene.

ER15-899

Agreement Establishing a Pseudo-Tie Electrical Interconnection Point between SPP, KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company ("KCPL-GMO") as the Market Participant, and Entergy Services, Inc. ("ESI"), on behalf of Entergy Louisiana, LLC ("Entergy Louisiana"), as the External Local Balancing Authority

On February 3, 2015, KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company filed a Motion to Intervene.

ER15-929

Submission of Changes to Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority's ("OMPA") Stated Rate

On February 18, 2015, South Central MCN, LLC and Western Area Power Administration filed Motions to Intervene.

ER15-932

Submission of Tariff Revisions to Clarify the Definition of Settlement Area

On February 3, 2015, American Electric Power Service Corporation and Westar Energy, Inc. filed Motions to Intervene.

On February 6, 2015, South Central MCN, LLC filed a Motion to Intervene.

On February 11, 2015, Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc. filed a Motion to Intervene.

On February 20, 2015, Western Farmers Electric Cooperative filed a Motion to Intervene.

Regulatory Status Report

- ER15-938** **Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP and American Electric Power Service Corporation ("AEP") as Network Customer and Host Transmission Owner**
- On February 20, 2015, American Electric Power Service Corporation filed a Motion to Intervene.
- ER15-961** **Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP and The Empire District Electric Company ("Empire") as Network Customer and Host Transmission Owner**
- On February 2, 2015, SPP submitted an executed NITSA and NOA between SPP as Transmission Provider and The Empire District Electric Company as both Network Customer and Host Transmission Owner. SPP Service Agreement No. Fifth Revised 1630.
- An effective date of January 1, 2015 was requested.
- ER15-964** **Submission of Tariff Revisions to Implement a Cost-Based Transmission Formula Rate for City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri**
- On February 3, 2015, SPP submitted tariff revisions to update SPP Member City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri's Annual Transmission Revenue Requirement and to implement a cost-based transmission formula rate.
- An effective date of April 1, 2015 was requested.
- On February 3, 2015, City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri filed a Motion to Intervene.
- On February 6, 2015, the Missouri Public Service Commission filed a Notice of Intervention.
- On February 10, 2015, the Missouri Public Service Commission filed a Motion for an Extension of Time to File Comments and Request for Expedited Action.
- On February 18, 2015, FERC issued a Notice Granting Extension of Time to and including March 4, 2015 to file comments in response to SPP's February 3, 2015 Filing.
- On February 19, 2015, South Central MCN, LLC and Western Area Power Administration filed Motions to Intervene.
- ER15-990** **Petition for Waiver of Tariff Provisions Regarding the Establishment of Certain Resource Hubs in SPP's Integrated Marketplace**
- On February 4, 2015, SPP filed a request that the Commission waive applicable provisions of SPP's Tariff to recognize the establishment of certain resource hubs in SPP's Integrated Marketplace.
- Specifically, SPP requested that the Commission waive Section 3.1.1 of Attachment AE of SPP's Tariff to recognize the existing hubs described in this filing to permit implementation of the new Resource Hub proposed by Xcel Energy Inc.
- On February 6, 2015, South Central MCN, LLC filed a Motion to Intervene.
- On February 24, 2015, Sunflower Electric Power Corporation and Mid-Kansas Electric Company, LLC filed a Motion to Intervene.

Regulatory Status Report

On February 25, 2015, Xcel Energy Services Inc. and Golden Spread Electric Cooperative, Inc. filed a Motion to Intervene and Comments in support of SPP's Petition filed on February 4, 2015.

ER15-1027

Transmission Interconnection Agreement between Southwestern Electric Power Company ("SWEPCO"), Rayburn Country Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Rayburn") and East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("ETEC"), with SPP as Signatory

On February 12, 2015, SPP submitted an executed Transmission Interconnection Agreement between Southwestern Electric Power Company, Rayburn Country Electric Cooperative, Inc. and East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc., with SPP as signatory. SPP Service Agreement No. 2965.

An effective date of April 13, 2015 was requested.

On February 20, 2015, American Electric Power Service Corporation filed a Motion to Intervene.

ER15-1043

Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Kansas Power Pool ("KPP") as Network Customer, and Midwest Energy, Inc. ("Midwest"), Mid-Kansas Electric Company, LLC ("MKEC"), and Westar Energy, Inc. ("Westar") as Host Transmission Owners

On February 13, 2015, SPP submitted an executed NITSA between SPP as Transmission Provider, Kansas Power Pool as Network Customer, as well as a NOA with Midwest Energy, Inc., Mid-Kansas Electric Company, LLC, and Westar Energy, Inc. as Host Transmission Owners. SPP Service Agreement No. Seventeenth Revised 2198.

In addition, SPP submitted a Notice of Cancellation of the NITSA between SPP as Transmission Provider, City of Mulvane, Kansas as Network Customer, as well as a NOA with Westar Energy, Inc. as Host Transmission Owner. SPP Service Agreement No. Second Revised 1997. This service was transferred into Seventeenth Revised 2198.

An effective date of September 1, 2014 was requested.

On February 19, 2015, Kansas Power Pool filed a Motion to Intervene.

ER15-1044

Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Westar Energy, Inc. ("Westar") as Network Customer, and Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company ("OGE") and Westar as Host Transmission Owners

On February 13, 2015, SPP submitted an executed NITSA and NOA between SPP as Transmission Provider, Westar Energy, Inc. as both Network Customer and Host Transmission Owner, and Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company as Host Transmission Owner. SPP Service Agreement No. Twenty-Fourth Revised 607.

An effective date of February 1, 2014 was requested.

ER15-1049

Submission of Tariff Revisions Regarding Frequently Constrained Areas

On February 13, 2015, SPP submitted tariff revisions to update the list of Frequently Constrained Areas in accordance with the findings of the SPP Market Monitoring Unit's recent

reevaluation.

An effective date of April 15, 2015 was requested.

On February 18, 2015, Kansas City Power & Light Company and KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company filed a Motion to Intervene.

On February 23, 2015, Westar Energy, Inc. filed a Motion to Intervene.

ER15-1139

Submission of Tariff Revisions to Section III.D of Attachment J to Add Potential Remedies that SPP Could Recommend as Part of the Regional Cost Allocation Review ("RCAR") Process

On February 27, 2015, SPP submitted tariff revisions to add potential remedies to Section III.D of Attachment J that SPP could recommend as part of its Regional Cost Allocation Review ("RCAR") process.

An effective date of May 1, 2015 was requested.

ER15-1140

Network Integration Transmission Service Agreement ("NITSA") and Network Operating Agreement ("NOA") between SPP, Kansas Power Pool ("KPP") as Network Customer, and Midwest Energy, Inc. ("Midwest"), Mid-Kansas Electric Company, LLC ("MKEC"), and Westar Energy, Inc. ("Westar") as Host Transmission Owners

On February 27, 2015, SPP submitted an executed NITSA between SPP as Transmission Provider, Kansas Power Pool as Network Customer, as well as a NOA with Midwest Energy, Inc., Mid-Kansas Electric Company, LLC, and Westar Energy, Inc. as Host Transmission Owners. SPP Service Agreement No. Eighteenth Revised 2198.

An effective date of February 1, 2015 was requested.

ER15-1141

Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. ("MISO") Filing of Operations Reliability Coordination Agreement ("ORCA") between MISO, SPP, Associated Electric Cooperative, Inc., Louisville Gas and Electric Company, Kentucky Utilities Company, PowerSouth Energy Cooperative, Southern Companies, and Tennessee Valley Authority

On February 27, 2015, the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. filed a proposed Operations Reliability Coordination Agreement. MISO originally entered into the agreement in 2013 with several neighboring utilities and/or transmission service providers to support the reliable integration of the MISO South Region into the MISO Balancing Authority Area ("Initial Agreement"). The Initial Agreement is set to expire on April 1, 2015. In anticipation of the expiration date, MISO and the Joint Parties have negotiated the ORCA as the successor arrangement to the Initial Agreement in order to afford the Joint Parties greater familiarity and experience with the expanded MISO Balancing Authority Area operations.

An effective date of April 1, 2015 was requested.

RM10-12

Electricity Market Transparency Provisions of Section 220 of the Federal Power Act (Order No. 768)

On February 6, 2015, FERC issued Order No. 768-B, granting rehearing of Order No. 768 issued on September 21, 2012.

Regulatory Status Report

The Commission stated that although the requirement to file e-Tag information in the Electric Quarterly Report could improve the usefulness of EQR data, the Commission granted rehearing due to the likely substantial costs of complying with such a requirement at this time.

Therefore, the Commission will not require that EQR filers submit e-Tag IDs for each transaction reported in EQR if an e-Tag was used to schedule the transaction.

RM14-2 **Coordination of the Scheduling Processes of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines and Public Utilities**

On February 2, 2015, certain parties filed comments in response to the data responses filed by the RTOs/ISOs in response to the request issued by the Commission on December 12, 2014.

RM14-12 **Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Proposing to Approve Reliability Standard MOD-031-1 - Demand and Energy Data Developed by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation ("NERC")**

On February 19, 2015, FERC issued Order No. 804, Final Rule approving Demand and Energy Data Reliability Standard MOD-031-1. The Commission directed NERC to 1) develop a modification to the Reliability Standard to clarify certain obligations to provide data to the Regional Entity, and 2) consider the compliance obligations of an applicable entity upon receipt of a data request that seeks confidential information.

This rule will become effective 60 days after publication in the Federal Register.

RR15-2 **North American Electric Reliability Corporation's ("NERC") Implementation of the Reliability Assurance Initiative ("RAI")**

On February 19, 2015, FERC issued an approving NERC's implementation of the Reliability Assurance Initiative, finding that NERC's overall goal of focusing Electric Reliability Organization and industry compliance resources on higher-risk issues that matter more to reliability is reasonable. However, to ensure that NERC implements RAI in a reasonable and transparent manner, and that the Commission will maintain its oversight role in a meaningful manner, the Commission directed, pursuant to section 215(f) of the Federal Power Act, that NERC submit a compliance filing proposing revisions to the NERC Rules of Procedure that articulate the RAI concepts and programs. The Commission also identified certain conditions as to NERC's implementation and continued development of the risk-based approach for compliance monitoring and enforcement reflected in RAI. The Commission also directed NERC to submit an annual report on RAI, to be submitted within one year from the date of this order.

Regulatory Status Report

FERC or State Jurisdiction: State of Kansas

15-WSEE-365-MIS

In the Matter of the Application of Westar Energy, Inc. for a Siting Permit for the Construction of a 345 kV Transmission Line in Riley and Pottawatomie Counties, Kansas

On February 20, 2015, Westar Energy, Inc. filed an application for a siting permit granting Westar the right to construct a 345 kV transmission line from Westar's Jeffrey Energy Center Substation to Westar's East Manhattan Substation located near Manhattan, Kansas.

On February 20, 2015, Westar Energy, Inc. filed a Motion for Procedural Schedule.

FERC or State Jurisdiction: United States Court of Appeals

- 14-1053** **Southwest Power Pool, Inc. v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission - Petition for Review of the June 20, 2013 and February 20, 2014 Orders issued in Docket Nos. ER12-2681, et al.**
- On February 2, 2015, the parties filed a Status Report. The parties stated the settlement process initiated in the June 20, 2013 Order issued in FERC Docket Nos. ER12-2681 and ER13-948 continues, and the deadline to file a final settlement agreement was extended to April 30, 2015.
- 14-1281** **Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company ("OG&E") v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Concerning Orders Issued in Docket Nos. ER13-366 and ER13-367 Regarding SPP's Order No. 1000 Regional Compliance Filings**
- On February 19, 2015, the court issued an order granting motions for leave to intervene.
- 14-1282** **Xcel Energy Services Inc. ("Xcel") v. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Concerning Orders Issued in Docket No. ER12-959 Regarding Tri-County Electric Cooperative, Inc.'s Formula Rate**
- On February 2, 2015, FERC filed the Certified Index to the Record.
- On February 6, 2015, the court issued an order requiring that intervenors show cause by March 5, 2015 why they should not be limited to one joint brief and one joint reply brief.