

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Evaluation Criteria (EC)

Ranking			Alternative Code	Description	Comments
Like	Okay	Dislike	Source Maturity (EC-SM)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-1	For transition, only accept GIs that are late stage or bypass	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-2	LGIA executed	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-3	Issuance of the GI Facilities Study Report	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-4	Completion of GI Phase Two Cluster Study	We believe that the best path forward is to clear out a good portion of the queue and allow those to connect with little to no system improvements needed. Once the queue is cleared out we can move to the future state and connect those with the new methodology.Start processing de-minimis requests asap. Limit the risks of non-firm service to the existing customers. This option seems to be most risk that seems reasonable.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-5	Completion of GI Phase One Cluster Study AND Execution of GI Phase Two Cluster Study Agreement	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-6	Completion of Phase One of the GI study plus any needed restudy	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-7	Completion of Phase One GI study report	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-8	Completion of Phase One of the GI study	If BPA went this route would this be the point of offering a take or pay? I believe this is the option SCL was proposing along with Tacoma being in support of this. Offer everyone CFS and then enter into a take or pay if they want to move forward to make sure they are serious.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-9	Consultant GI Study	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-10	Minimal GI Criteria	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-SM-ALT-11	Incent LSE Engagement by Providing POR Flexibility	

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Like	Okay	Dislike	Load Maturity (EC-LM)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-LM-ALT-1	Must be in execution phase (agreements signed/funded)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-LM-ALT-2	Facilities Study required to be completed	This is pretty late in the game to find outwhether or not there could be a large financial burden for the customer.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-LM-ALT-3	System Impact Study required to be started or completed	This option seems to be the best use of BPA personnel time. At this stage there should be some certainty that the project will move forward. There is still some risk that the customer won't move forward, but the customer is shouldering more of the risk at this point than BPA would be exposed to by an order of magnitude.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-LM-ALT-4	Feasibility Study required to be completed	If this was selected I would hazard a guess that only 10% of the entities make it past Feasibility studies. This makes it seem not as refined and could waste BPA personnel time.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-LM-ALT-5	LLIR must be submitted, but no study required	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-LM-ALT-6	No requirement for LLIR submittal	
Like	Okay	Dislike	RAS Resource (EC-RAS)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-RAS-ALT-1	Require upon TSR/FTSR submittal	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-RAS-ALT-2	Require prior to preliminary engineering	This and the next option seem like the least regrets
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-RAS-ALT-3	Require prior to environmental study	This and the previous option seem like the least regrets
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-RAS-ALT-4	Require prior to decision to build the relevant project(s)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-RAS-ALT-5	Provide timing flexibility for resource specification, but customer contractually obligated to pay for the service upon project completion regardless of ability to utilize the service	Unsure about how this would work since it is a new process, but perhaps some interconnections would want to use this?
Like	Okay	Dislike	Requirements for Gen/Load Outside of the BPA Balancing Authority Area (EC-OB)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A	

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Like	Okay	Dislike	PTP requests to NT PODs (EC-PTP)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-PTP-ALT-1	Require demonstration of interest from NITS customer upon submittal	For PTP TSRs with a POD of on a NITS customer’s system, require a signed indication from the NITS customer that they are considering serving a portion of their load with PTP service. NITS customer to make one-time determination regarding whether it would pay both NITS and PTP billing determinant or seek to electrically separate the load. If the later, would need to start working with BPA re: electrical separability assessment. Resource may need to be in LARC. If so, FTSR would remain valid only if resource remains in LARC.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-PTP-ALT-2	Require demonstration prior to execution of contract	Allow a PTP TSR to be studied/proceed without indication from the NITS customer. However, the PTP contract execution would be contingent on indication of use from the NITS customer.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PTP-ALT-3	Only NITS Customers Allow to Submit PTP TSRs to serve their load	Require that any PTP TSR involving a NITS POD be submitted by the NITS customer.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-PTP-ALT-4	Status Quo	Do not place any specific requirement on PTP TSRs involving NITS PODs.
Like	Okay	Dislike	Battery-to-Battery (EC-B2B)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-B2B-ALT-1	Disallow battery-to-battery LTF F/TSRs	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-B2B-ALT-2	Allow battery-to-battery F/TSRs if Customer can provide reasonable scenarios	I would have to understand why there is a need to battery to battery to believe that this isn't gaming the system somehow.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-B2B-ALT-3	Allow LTF battery-to-battery F/TSRs	
Like	Okay	Dislike	Additional Information (EC-ADD)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-ADD-ALT-1	Modify section 17.2(x) and 29.2(ix) to read “Attachment K and other BPA transmission planning processes”	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-ADD-ALT-2	Use existing language in 17.2(x) and 29.2 (ix) Any additional information required by the Transmission Provider’s planning processes established in Attachment K	

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Like	Okay	Dislike	Virtual Hubs Mid-C and NW Market Hub (EC-VHUB)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-1	Remove Mid-C Remote only - see Sub-Alternatives (SUB)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-1-SUB-A	Remove Mid-C Remote Only	This alternative would involve requiring Customers with unstudied TSRs that involve MIDCRemote to modify that POR/POD to NWHUB, or in the case of the POR, NWHUB or Grant, Chelan, or Douglas, depending on the customer's needs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-1-SUB-B	Conform to NW Hub	This alternative would involve requiring Customers with unstudied TSRs that involve MIDCRemote to modify that POR/POD to NWHUB, or in the case of the POR, NWHUB or Grant, Chelan, or Douglas, depending on the customer's needs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-2	Offer Reassessment Only	For any virtual, flexible point that remains active in the long-term firm market, stop offering 7F or 7FN long-term firm and offer only Reassessment CFS/interim service. Stop developing plans of service to support TSRs/FTSRs that involve virtual points.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-3	Mix of Firm and CF	Provide firm service (including plan of service development) for transmission system requests from NWHUB to load; provide reassessment CFS (no plan of service development) for TSRs/FTSRs from resource to NWHUB.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-4	Remove both from the LFT market	Remove LTF market access to MIDCRemote and NWHUB but retain them in the short-term market. BPA would not develop plans of service to support transmission associated with virtual points, nor would CFS/interim service be available to/from them.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-5	Require TSR pairing at NW Hub	At one time, BPA required the customer to specify the additional TSR for the other leg of a NWHUB transaction. Subsequent use of that pair was not required. BPA could return that a requirement.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-6	Actively support LFT use of NW Hub	Recognize that many customers who are seeking long-term firm don't know what paths they are going to use and provide other; focus efforts on identifying other inputs to define plans of service for these TSRs/FTSRs and continue to offer firm service for them. ALL * main grid projects from that study cycle will be applied to the plan of service development in addition to any sub-grid plan of service associated with the physical POR or POD.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-VHUB-ALT-7	Status Quo	BPA provides access to MIDCRemote and NWHUB and endeavors to plan system expansion for associated requests based on assumptions. Substantial uncertainty regarding assumptions.Substantial uncertainty regarding Data Exhibit validation.

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Like	Okay	Dislike	Delivering/Receiving Party Validation (EC-PV)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-1	Require confirmation of Delivering/Receiving Party; if not remove from queue	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-2	Utilize contingent validation; remove from queue if deal not executed	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-3	If unable to provide required bilateral demonstration, provide only Reassessment CFS or Interim Service	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-4	Allow financial demonstration in lieu of required bilateral demonstration; if not provided remove from queue	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-5	Require FERC marketer registration if no bilateral demonstration; if not remove from queue	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-6	Short-term market only if bilateral demonstration unavailable; remove from (LTF) queue	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-7	Only Offer Up to 4 years, 11 months	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-8	Use points system for validation	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-9	Contingent Validation with Financial Option to Retain TSR	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-10	Allow a Dispute Mechanism – Only request verification when another party suggests that the information was incorrectly supplied	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-PV-ALT-11	Status Quo, take information at face value without any further validation or confirmation	
Like	Okay	Dislike	Minimum Cap Requirements (EC-MCAP)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-MCAP-ALT-1	Minimum capitalization requirement scaled based on level of transmission service request activity in study.	There seems to be too much speculation and need to free this up to people who are actually going to move forward with a project rather than tie up the queue.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	EC-MCAP-ALT-2	Flat minimum capitalization requirement regardless of level of transmission service request activity in study.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EC-MCAP-ALT-3	Status Quo – do not have a minimum capitalization requirement.	

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Interim Service (IS)

Ranking			Alternative Code	Description	Notes
Like	Okay	Dislike	Product Options (IS-POPT)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IS-POPT-ALT-1	Seasonal Firm NITS	Due to more cons than pros, maybe dislike.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-POPT-ALT-2	Long Term 6-NN	Allows NITS customers to request long-term 6-NN TSRs as bridge to firm service. Provides service option while awaiting firm plan of service. TSR would reference pending firm TSR and FTSR in long-term pending que. Per Transmission service reservation priorities 6-NN is either hourly, daily, weekly or monthly.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-POPT-ALT-3	NITS LT 6-NN and PTP LT Priority 5 Non-Firm Service	Allow NITS customers to request long-term 6-NN TSRs as a bridge to firm service.Allow PTP customers to request long-term priority 5 non-firm TSRs.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-POPT-ALT-4	CFS - PTP vs NITS - see Sub-Alternatives (SUB)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>IS-POPT-ALT-4-SUB-A</i>	PTP CFS	Provide the opportunity for customers to receive early access for a CFS offer.Determine whether CFS offer is mandatory for early access, mandatory with a plan of service or not mandatory. Determine scope of Systems Conditions and/or X% Number of Hours (8760 hrs/yr). Service into/out of NWHub or MIDCREMOTE would be subject to data requirements under the evaluation criteria for market hubs (EC-2). Consider whether to allow option for bridge termination with or without movement to reassessment service should the plan of service be determined to include a project at an incremental rate.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>IS-POPT-ALT-4-SUB-B</i>	NITS CFS	Provide the opportunity for customers to receive early access for a CFS offer.Determine whether CFS offer is mandatory for early access, mandatory with a plan of service or not mandatory.Determine scope of Systems Conditions and/or X% Number of Hours (8760 hrs/yr). Service into/out of NWHub or MIDCREMOTE would be subject to data requirements under the evaluation criteria for market hubs (EC-2).Consider whether to allow option for bridge termination with or without movement to reassessment service should the plan of service be determined to include a project at an incremental rate. Requires a tariff deviation . NITS CFS can only be implemented if NITS on OASIS Phase 2 is not implemented.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-POPT-ALT-5	CF on the BPA Network - see Sub-Alternatives (SUB)	There are some areas which we may not be able to offer CFS due to ongoing technical constraints.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>IS-POPT-ALT-5-SUB-A</i>	for Ready PTP TSRs	This alternative focuses CFS offers on requests ready to take service.To be eligible for CF, the TSR must meet all of the following criteria if applicable:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>IS-POPT-ALT-5-SUB-B</i>	for Ready NITS F/TSRs	This alternative focuses CFS offers on requests ready to take service.To be eligible for CF, the F/TSR must meet all of the following criteria if applicable.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-POPT-ALT-6	Planning Redispatch	Planning redispatch involves determining whether there is a 24/7 available resource that can be called upon in times when the service being requested needs to be decreased. Planning redispatch can be offered as either a bridging or reassessment product. Planning redispatch is different from NITS redispatch as it is a tool to both award service and manage congestion, whereas NITS redispatch is only an operational tool.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-POPT-ALT-7	Firming up 6-NN in ST	Firming up" 6-NN service in the short-term market is not feasible.
Like	Okay	Dislike	Mandatory-Voluntary (IS-MV)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-MV-ALT-1	Mandatory for early access	All CFS offers would require the customer to accept service or their TSR would be removed from the Long-Term Pending Queue. This mandatory nature does not take into consideration whether a plan of service has been developed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-MV-ALT-2	Not mandatory until POS has been developed	Only CFS offers made after the development of the POS would require the customer to accept service or their TSR would be removed from the Long-Term Pending Queue.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-MV-ALT-3	Status Quo - Not Mandatory	Not accepting CFS service would not result in removal of a Customer’s TSR from the Long-Term Pending Queue.
Like	Okay	Dislike	Curtailment Type (IS-CT)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-CT-ALT-1	Systems conditions only.	Just looking to get off pause as quickly as possible.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	IS-CT-ALT-2	System condition and/or x% number of 8760 hours of the year.	

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Queue Management (QM)

Ranking			Alternative Code	Description	Notes
Like	Okay	Dislike	Applying Evaluation Criteria to the Queue (QM-ECQ)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-ECQ-ALT-1	Keep existing queue.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-ECQ-ALT-2	Empty existing queue.	Just looking to get off pause as quickly as possible. See QM-SQS-ALT-2 comment
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-ECQ-ALT-3	Apply the new requirements through an agreement.	
Like	Okay	Dislike	Collecting New Evaluation Criteria (QM-CEC)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-CEC-ALT-1	Start where we are.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-CEC-ALT-2	Customers submit a new data form.	Just looking to get off pause as quickly as possible.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-CEC-ALT-3	Combine ALT-1 and ALT-2	
Like	Okay	Dislike	Structuring the Queue for Study (QM-SQS)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-1	No Transition Study	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-2	Batch Studies - see Sub-Alternatives (SUB)	First pass: Study the queue with the projects that don't have sub grid constraints or other limitations. Refer to those areas where no sink/source issues are identified (Not eligible for CFS asterix slides 132-136). Offer those service. Batch if necessary. Then make the next pass (future state) be everyone else and apply the evaluaction criteria, etc and do a deeper dive after whomever from the first pass moves forward or not. The sink area limits this to 19,143 MW; Source area 8319 MW so likely less than 8319 MW total. If this ends up being the green No currently identified issues area switch to a CAP on what can be studied and call it good enough.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-2-SUB-A	Queue order	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-2-SUB-B	Geographic	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-2-SUB-C	POR/POD	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-2-SUB-D	LSE vs. Non-LSE	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-2-SUB-E	NITS vs. PTP	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-2-SUB-F	Resource/Load maturity	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-2-SUB-G	Options	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-SQS-ALT-3	Cap the LTF Queue	Not sure if the QM-SQS=ALT2 comment above is what you are intending for this, but perhaps a variation on it. This seems like an OK approach if some effort was put into making offers to those areas without known constraints in some manner. Essentially connect what we can easily achieve. If some of this is the new TSR after the cutoff then great - include them.

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Like	Okay	Dislike	Handling New (F)TSR Submissions (QM-HNS)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-HNS-ALT-1	Decline All (F)TSRs submitted after 12pm 8/15/24	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-HNS-ALT-2	Study (F)TSRs in Proactive Planning Program (Future State)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-HNS-ALT-3	Include in 2025 TSEP CS Group	Include, but only if they are in an area with no known constraints.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-HNS-ALT-4	Second Transition Study	This also seems acceptable.
Like	Okay	Dislike	Firm Service Prioritization (QM-FSP)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-FSP-ALT-1	Status Quo	Ift feels like it should be either this option or -3
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QM-FSP-ALT-2	Prioritizing Service Readiness	This seems fraught with management issues. 1/4 pros, while 3/4 cons.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	QM-FSP-ALT-3	First Right of Refusal	Ift feels like it should be either this option or -1

TC-27 Alternatives | Dec. 17-19, 2025

Proactive Planning (PP)

Ranking			Alternative Code	Description	Notes
Like	Okay	Dislike	Transition Studies (PP-TS)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PP-TS-ALT-1	Main Grid SIS, with Full POS After SIS Decision Point	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PP-TS-ALT-2	Full SIS with Decision Point, prior to full POS	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PP-TS-ALT-3	Long-Term Planning Study + Partial Commercial Study	This feels like the right choice
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PP-TS-ALT-4	Long-Term Planning Study + Full Commercial Study	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PP-TS-ALT-5	Study to Resolve Interim Service Ineligibility	Heavy operational burden isn't great so maybe between okay and dislike. Clarity on sub grid constraints might be beneficial in developing a better solutions Long term.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PP-TS-ALT-6	Distribution Factors	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PP-TS-ALT-7	10- & 20-Year Transition Study	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PP-TS-ALT-8	Wait for Future State Process	