

144 FERC ¶ 61,111  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

August 7, 2013

In Reply Refer To:  
California Independent System  
Operator Corporation  
Docket No. ER00-2383-001

California Independent  
System Operator Corporation  
250 Outcropping Way  
Folsom, CA 95630

Attention: Nancy Saracino  
General Counsel

Reference: July 31, 2000 Compliance Filing

Dear Ms. Saracino:

1. On July 31, 2000, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) submitted a compliance filing in ER00-2383-001, which included a modification to the revisions in Amendment No. 29 to its tariff that was conditionally accepted by Commission Order dated June 29, 2000.<sup>1</sup> Among other things, Amendment No. 29 proposed an exemption from the no-pay rule for Participating Loads taking part in CAISO's Summer 2000 trial program for Load Participation in the Ancillary Service markets.<sup>2</sup> The Commission directed CAISO

---

<sup>1</sup> *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp.*, 91 FERC ¶ 61,324 (2000).

<sup>2</sup> The no-pay rule was accepted by the Commission as part of Amendment No. 13 to the CAISO Tariff. *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp.*, 86 FERC ¶ 61,122, at 61,417-19 (1999). Under that rule, a Scheduling Coordinator that engages in the uninstructed generation of energy from capacity committed to CAISO of operating reserves or replacement reserves may forfeit a portion of the payment to which it is otherwise entitled for that capacity.

in the June 29, 2000 order to submit a compliance filing modifying its tariff to incorporate a broader applicability of the no-pay exemption providing that all participating load, not just load engaging in the temporary program, be exempted from the penalties associated with the 10-minute market rules. In this order, the Commission dismisses CAISO's July 31, 2000 compliance filing as moot.

2. Notice of CAISO's filing was published in the Federal Register, 65 Fed. Reg. 48,983 (2000), with interventions and protests due on or before August 21, 2000. On August 21, 2000 the California Department of Water Resources (CDWR) submitted comments. CAISO subsequently filed an answer.
3. CDWR argues that the proposed tariff language is ambiguous and requests that the Commission order CAISO to revise the tariff language to conform to the less ambiguous language found in participating load agreements. CDWR also argues that conditions in California warrant making this exemption available on a long-term basis, rather than only temporary.
4. In a September 5, 2000 Answer, CAISO submitted a revision to clarify the wording of the section to provide that any Participating Load that enters into an appropriate agreement will benefit from the same no-pay exemption that applies to load that has been selected to participate in the Summer 2000 trial program, as required by the Commission.
5. On February 9, 2006, CAISO filed its Market Redesign and Technology Upgrade (MRTU) Tariff for Commission approval. On September 21, 2006, the Commission issued an order conditionally accepting the MRTU Tariff,<sup>3</sup> which significantly modified CAISO's markets and operations, and it became fully effective in April 2009. As a result, the tariff revisions submitted in this docket have been supplanted and the issues raised by CDWR have been resolved and overtaken by subsequent events. Implementation of the MRTU Tariff has superseded all other Market Rules existing at the time of the July 31, 2000 compliance filing; therefore, the outstanding tariff sheet revisions in this case are moot and CAISO's July 31, 2000 compliance filing (as well as its September 5, 2000 proposed tariff revision) are hereby dismissed.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp.*, 116 FERC ¶ 61,274 (2006).

6. This order terminates Docket No. ER00-2383-001.

By direction of the Commission.

Kimberly D. Bose,  
Secretary.