

# Attachment I

## **31.2 Reliability Planning Process**

### **31.2.1 Local Transmission Owner Planning Process**

#### **31.2.1.1 Scope**

##### **31.2.1.1.1 Criteria, Assumptions and Data**

Each Transmission Owner will post on its website the planning criteria and assumptions currently used in its LTPP as well as a list of any applicable software and/or analytical tools currently used in the LTPP. Customers, Market Participants and other interested parties may review and comment on the planning criteria and assumptions used by each Transmission Owner, as well as other data and models used by each Transmission Owner in its LTPP. The Transmission Owners will take into consideration any comments received. Any planning criteria or assumptions for a Transmission Owner's BPTFs will meet or exceed any applicable NERC, NPCC or NYSRC criteria. The LTPP shall include a description of the needs addressed by the LTPP as well as the assumptions, applicable planning criteria and methodology utilized and the Public Policy Requirements considered. A link to each Transmission Owner's website will be posted on the ISO website.

##### **31.2.1.1.2 Consideration of Transmission Needs Driven by Public Policy Requirements**

###### **31.2.1.1.2.1 Procedures for the Identification of Transmission Needs Driven by Public Policy Requirements in Local Transmission Plans and for the Consideration of Transmission Solutions**

In developing its LTP, each Transmission Owner shall consider whether there is a transmission need on its system that is being driven by a Public Policy Requirement. The LTP will identify any transmission project included in the LTP as a solution to a transmission need being driven by a Public Policy Requirement. In evaluating potential transmission solutions, the

Transmission Owner will give consideration to the objectives of the Public Policy Requirement(s) driving the need for transmission.

#### **31.2.1.1.2.2 Determination of Local Transmission Needs Driven by Public Policy Requirements**

As part of its LTP process pursuant to Section 31.2.1.2 below, each Transmission Owner will consider whether there is a transmission need on its local system that is being driven by a Public Policy Requirement for which a local transmission solution should be evaluated, including needs proposed by market participants and other interested parties. A market participant or other interested party proposing a transmission need on a Transmission Owner's local system driven by a Public Policy Requirement shall submit its proposal to the ISO and the relevant Transmission Owner, and will identify the specific Public Policy Requirement that is driving the proposed transmission need and an explanation of why a local transmission upgrade is necessary to implement the Public Policy Requirement. Any proposed local system transmission need will be posted on the ISO website. The ISO will transmit proposed transmission needs on a Transmission Owner's local system driven by Public Policy Requirements to the NYDPS, with a request that the NYDPS review the proposals and provide the relevant Transmission Owner with input to assist the Transmission Owner in its determination. The Transmission Owner, after considering the input provided by the NYDPS and any information provided by a market participant or other party, will determine whether there are transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements for which local transmission solutions should be evaluated. The Transmission Owner will post on its website a list of the transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements for which local transmission solutions should be evaluated, with an explanation of why the Transmission Owner identified those transmission needs and declined to identify other proposed transmission needs.

### **31.2.1.1.2.3 Evaluation of Proposed Local Transmission Solutions**

In evaluating potential transmission solutions, if any, the Transmission Owner will give consideration to the objectives of the Public Policy Requirement driving the need for a local transmission solution. The Transmission Owner will evaluate solutions to identified transmission needs, including transmission solutions proposed by market participants and other parties for inclusion in its LTP. The Transmission Owner, in consultation with the NYDPS, will evaluate proposed transmission solutions on its local system to determine the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solutions. The Transmission Owner will consider the relative costs and benefits of proposed transmission solutions and their impact on the Transmission Owner's transmission system and its customers. Any local transmission solution identified by the Transmission Owner through the LTP process will be reviewed with stakeholders as part of each Transmission Owner's regular LTP process and will be included in the Transmission Owner's subsequent LTP. In conducting its evaluation, the Transmission Owner will use criteria that are relevant to the Public Policy Requirement driving the transmission need, which may include its published local planning criteria and assumptions.

### **31.2.1.2 Process Timeline**

31.2.1.2.1 Each Transmission Owner, in accordance with a schedule set forth in the ISO Procedures, will post its current LTP on its website for review and comment by interested parties sufficiently in advance of the time for submission to the ISO for input to its RNA so as to allow adequate time for stakeholder review and comment. Each LTP will include:

- identification of the planning horizon covered by the LTP,
- data and models used,

- reliability needs, needs driven by Public Policy Requirements, and other needs addressed,
- potential solutions under consideration, and,
- a description of the transmission facilities covered by the plan.

31.2.1.2.2 To the extent the current LTP utilizes data or inputs, related to the ISO's planning process, not already reported by the ISO in Form 715 and referenced on its website, any such data will be provided to the ISO at the time each Transmission Owner posts criteria and planning assumptions in accordance with Section 31.2.1.1 and will be posted by the ISO on its website subject to any confidentiality or Critical Energy Infrastructure Information restrictions or requirements.

31.2.1.2.3 Each planning cycle, the ISO shall hold one or more stakeholder meetings of the ESPWG and TPAS at which each Transmission Owner's current LTP will be discussed. Such meetings will be held either at the Transmission Owner's Transmission District, or at an ISO location. The ISO shall post notice of the meeting and shall disclose the agenda and any other material distributed prior to the meeting.

31.2.1.2.4 Interested parties may submit written comments to a Transmission Owner with respect to its current LTP within thirty days after the meeting. Each Transmission Owner shall list on its website, as part of its LTP, the person and/or location to which comments should be sent by interested parties. All comments will be posted on the ISO website. Each Transmission Owner will consider comments received in developing any modifications to its LTP. Any such modification will be explained in its current LTP posted on its website pursuant to

Section 31.2.1.2.2 above and discussed at the next meeting held pursuant to Section 31.2.1.2.3 above.

31.2.1.2.5 Each planning cycle, each Transmission Owner will submit the finalized portions of its current LTP to the ISO as contemplated in Section 31.2.2.4.2 below for timely inclusion in the RNA.

### **31.2.1.3 ISO Evaluation of Transmission Owner Local Transmission Plans in Relation to Regional and Local Transmission Needs**

The ISO will review the Transmission Owner LTPs as they relate to the BPTFs as set forth in Section 31.2.2.4.2. The ISO will also evaluate whether a regional transmission solution – including, but not limited to, regional transmission solutions proposed by Developers pursuant to this Attachment Y – could satisfy an identified regional transmission need on the BPTFs that impacts more than one Transmission District more efficiently or more cost effectively than a local transmission solution identified in a Transmission Owner’s LTP in accordance with Section 31.2.6.4.2 for the satisfaction of a regional Reliability Need, Section 31.3.1.3.6 for the reduction of congestion identified in the Economic Planning Process, or Section 31.4.7.2 for the satisfaction of a Public Policy Transmission Need. The ISO will report the results of its evaluation solely for informational purposes in the relevant ISO planning report prepared under this Attachment Y, and the Transmission Owners shall not be required to revise their LTPs based on the results of the ISO’s evaluation.

### **31.2.1.4 LTP Dispute Resolution Process**

#### **31.2.1.4.1 Disputes Related to the LTP; Objective; Notice**

Disputes related to the LTP are subject to the DRP. The objective of the DRP is to assist parties having disputes in communicating effectively and resolving disputes as

expeditiously as possible. Within fifteen (15) calendar days of the presentation by a Transmission Owner of its LTP to the ESPWG and TPAS, a party with a dispute shall notify in writing the Affected TO, the ISO, the ESPWG and TPAS of its intention to utilize the DRP. The notice shall identify the specific issue in dispute and describe in sufficient detail the nature of the dispute.

#### **31.2.1.4.2 Review by the ESPWG/TPAS**

The issue raised by a party with a dispute shall be reviewed and discussed at a joint meeting of the ESPWG and the TPAS in an effort to resolve the dispute. The party with a dispute and the Affected TO shall have an opportunity to present information concerning the issue in dispute to the ESPWG and the TPAS.

#### **31.2.1.4.3 Information Discussions**

To the extent the ESPWG and the TPAS are unable to resolve the dispute, the dispute will be subject to good faith informal discussions between the party with a dispute and the Affected TO. Each of those parties will designate a senior representative authorized to enter into informal discussions and to resolve the dispute. The parties to the dispute shall make a good faith effort to resolve the dispute through informal discussions as promptly as practicable.

#### **31.2.1.4.4 Alternative Dispute Resolution**

In the event that the parties to the dispute are unable to resolve the dispute through informal discussions within sixty (60) days, or such other period as the parties may agree upon, the parties may, by mutual agreement, submit the dispute to mediation or any other form of alternative dispute resolution. The parties shall attempt in good faith to resolve the dispute in accordance with a mutually agreed upon schedule but in no event may the schedule extend

beyond ninety (90) days from the date on which the parties agreed to submit the dispute to alternative dispute resolution.

#### **31.2.1.4.5 Notice of Results of Dispute Resolution**

The Affected TO shall notify the ISO and ESPWG and TPAS of the results of the DRP and update its LTP to the extent necessary. The ISO shall use in its planning process the LTP provided by the Affected TO.

#### **31.2.1.4.6 Rights Under the Federal Power Act**

Nothing in the DRP shall affect the rights of any party to file a complaint with the Commission under relevant provisions of the FPA.

#### **31.2.1.4.7 Confidentiality**

All information disclosed in the course of the DRP shall be subject to the same protections accorded to confidential information and CEII by the ISO under its confidentiality and CEII policies.

### **31.2.2 Reliability Needs Assessment**

#### **31.2.2.1 General**

The ISO shall prepare and publish the RNA as described below. The RNA will identify Reliability Needs. The ISO shall also designate in the RNA the Responsible Transmission Owner with respect to each Reliability Need.

#### **31.2.2.2 Interested Party Participation in the Development of the RNA**

The ISO shall develop the RNA in consultation with Market Participants and all other interested parties. TPAS will have responsibility consistent with ISO Procedures for review of the ISO's reliability analyses. ESPWG will have responsibility consistent with ISO Procedures

for providing commercial input and assumptions to be used in the development of reliability assessment scenarios provided under Section 31.2.2.5, and in the reporting and analysis of historic congestion costs. Coordination and communication will be established and maintained between these two groups and ISO staff to allow Market Participants and other interested parties to participate in a meaningful way during each stage of the CSPP. The ISO staff shall report any majority and minority views of these collaborative governance work groups when it submits the RNA to the Operating Committee for a vote, as provided below.

### **31.2.2.3 Preparation of the Reliability Needs Assessment**

31.2.2.3.1 The ISO shall evaluate bulk power system needs in the RNA over the Study Period.

31.2.2.3.2 The starting point for the development of the RNA Base Case will be the system as defined for the FERC Form No. 715 Base Case. The ISO shall develop this system representation to be used for its evaluations of the Study Period by primarily using: (1) the most recent NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report published by the ISO on its web site; (2) the most recent versions of ISO reliability analyses and assessments provided for or published by NERC, NPCC, NYSRC, and neighboring Control Areas; (3) information reported by neighboring Control Areas such as power flow data, forecasted load, significant new or modified generation and transmission facilities, and anticipated system conditions that the ISO determines may impact the BPTFs; and (4) data submitted pursuant to paragraph 31.2.2.4 below; *provided, however*, the ISO shall not include in the RNA Base Case an Interim Service Provider, an RMR Generator, or any other interim Short-Term Reliability Process Solution selected by the ISO pursuant to

Attachment FF of the ISO OATT; *provided, further*, the ISO will include in the RNA Base Case a permanent transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution selected by the ISO pursuant to Attachment FF of the ISO OATT if it meets the base case inclusion requirements in the ISO Procedures. The details of the development of the RNA Base Case are contained in the ISO Procedures. The RNA Base Case shall also include Interregional Transmission Projects that have been approved by the NYPSC transmission siting process and meet the base case inclusion requirements in the ISO Procedures.

31.2.2.3.3 The ISO shall assess the RNA Base Case to determine whether the BPTFs meet all Reliability Criteria for both resource and transmission adequacy in each year, and report the results of its evaluation in the RNA. Transmission analyses will include thermal, voltage, short circuit, and stability studies. Then, if any Reliability Criteria are not met in any year, the ISO shall perform additional analyses to determine whether additional resources and/or transmission capacity expansion are needed to meet those requirements, and to determine the Target Year of need for those additional resources and/or transmission. A short circuit assessment will be performed for the tenth year of the Study Period. The study will not seek to identify specific additional facilities. Reliability Needs will be defined in terms of total deficiencies relative to Reliability Criteria and not necessarily in terms of specific facilities.

#### **31.2.2.4 Planning Participant Data Input**

31.2.2.4.1 At the ISO's request, Market Participants, Developers, and other parties shall provide, in accordance with the schedule set forth in the ISO Procedures, the

data necessary for the development of the RNA. This data will include but not be limited to (1) existing and planned additions to the New York State Transmission System (to be provided by Transmission Owners and municipal electric utilities); (2) proposals for Merchant Transmission Facilities (to be provided by merchant transmission Developers); (3) generation additions and retirements (to be provided by generator owners, Aggregators and Developers); (4) demand response programs (to be provided by demand response providers); and (5) any long-term firm transmission requests made to the ISO.

31.2.2.4.2 The Transmission Owners shall submit their current LTPs referenced in Section 31.1.3 and Section 31.2.1 to the ISO. The Transmission Owners and the ISO will coordinate with each other in reviewing the LTPs. The ISO will review the Transmission Owners' LTPs, as they relate to BPTFs, to determine whether they will meet reliability needs identified in the LTPs, recommend an alternate means to resolve the local needs from a regional perspective pursuant to Section 31.2.6.4, and indicate if it is not in agreement with a Transmission Owner's proposed additions. The ISO shall report its determinations under this section in the RNA and in the CRP.

31.2.2.4.3 All data received from Market Participants, Developers, and other parties shall be considered in the development of the system representation for the Study Period in accordance with the ISO Procedures.

#### **31.2.2.5 Reliability Scenario Development**

The ISO, in consultation with the ESPWG and TPAS, shall develop reliability scenarios addressing the Study Period. Variables for consideration in the development of these reliability

scenarios include but are not limited to: load forecast uncertainty, fuel prices and availability, new resources, retirements, transmission network topology, and limitations imposed by proposed environmental or other legislation.

#### **31.2.2.6 Evaluation of Reliability Scenarios**

The ISO will conduct additional reliability analyses for the reliability scenarios developed pursuant to paragraph 31.2.2.5. These evaluations will test the robustness of the needs assessment studies conducted under paragraphs 31.2.2.3. This evaluation will only identify conditions under which Reliability Criteria may not be met. It will not identify or propose additional Reliability Needs. In addition, the ISO will perform appropriate sensitivity studies to determine whether Reliability Needs previously identified can be mitigated through alternate system configurations or operational modes. The Reliability Needs may increase in some reliability scenarios and may decrease, or even be eliminated, in others. The ISO shall report the results of these evaluations in the RNA.

#### **31.2.2.7 Consequences for Other Regions**

The ISO will coordinate with the ISO/RTO Regions to identify the consequences of the reliability transmission projects on such ISO/RTO Regions using the respective planning criteria of such ISO/RTO Regions. The ISO shall report the results in the CRP. The ISO shall not bear the costs of required upgrades in another region.

#### **31.2.2.8 Reliability Needs Assessment Report Preparation**

Once all the analyses described above have been completed, ISO staff will prepare a draft of the RNA including discussion of its assumptions, Reliability Criteria, and results of the analyses and, if necessary, designate the Responsible Transmission Owner. One or more

compensatory MW/ Load adjustment scenarios will be developed by the ISO as a guide to the development of proposed solutions to meet the identified Reliability Need.

### **31.2.3 RNA Review Process**

#### **31.2.3.1 Collaborative Governance Process**

The draft RNA shall be submitted to both TPAS and the ESPWG for review and comment. The ISO shall make available to any interested party sufficient information to replicate the results of the draft RNA. The information made available will be electronically masked and made available pursuant to a process that the ISO reasonably determines is necessary to prevent the disclosure of any Confidential Information or Critical Energy Infrastructure Information contained in the information made available. Market Participants and other interested parties may submit at any time optional suggestions for changes to ISO rules or procedures which could result in the identification of additional resources or market alternatives suitable for meeting Reliability Needs. Following completion of the TPAS and ESPWG review, the draft RNA reflecting the revisions resulting from the TPAS and ESPWG review, shall be forwarded to the Operating Committee for discussion and action. The ISO shall notify the Business Issues Committee of the date of the Operating Committee meeting at which the draft RNA is to be presented. Following the Operating Committee vote, the draft RNA will be transmitted to the Management Committee for discussion and action.

#### **31.2.3.2 Board Action**

Following the Management Committee vote, the draft RNA, with working group, Operating Committee, and Management Committee input, will be forwarded to the ISO Board for review and action. Concurrently, the draft RNA will be provided to the Market Monitoring Unit for its review and consideration of whether market rules changes are necessary to address

an identified failure, if any, in one of the ISO's competitive markets. The Board may approve the RNA as submitted, or propose modifications on its own motion. If any changes are proposed by the Board, the revised RNA shall be returned to the Management Committee for comment. The Board shall not make a final determination on a revised RNA until it has reviewed the Management Committee comments. Upon approval by the Board, the ISO shall issue the final RNA to the marketplace by posting it on its web site.

The responsibilities of the Market Monitoring Unit that are addressed in the above section of this Attachment are also addressed in Section 30.4.6.8.2 of the Market Monitoring Plan, Attachment O to the ISO Services Tariff.

#### **31.2.3.3 Needs Assessment Disputes**

Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in this Attachment, the ISO OATT, or the NYISO Services Tariff, in the event that a Market Participant raises a dispute solely within the NYPSC's jurisdiction relating to the final conclusions or recommendations of the RNA, a Market Participant may refer such dispute to the NYPSC for resolution. The NYPSC's final determination shall be binding, subject only to judicial review in the courts of the State of New York pursuant to Article 78 of the NYCPLR.

#### **31.2.3.4 Public Information Sessions**

In order to provide ample exposure for the marketplace to understand the identified Reliability Needs, the ISO will provide various opportunities for Market Participants and other potentially interested parties to discuss the final RNA. Such opportunities may include presentations at various ISO Market Participant committees, focused discussions with various industry sectors, and/or presentations in public venues.

## **31.2.4 Development of Solutions to Reliability Needs**

### **31.2.4.1 Eligibility and Qualification Criteria for Developers and Projects**

For purposes of fulfilling the requirements of the Developer qualification criteria in this Section 31.2.4.1 and its subsections, the term “Developer” includes Affiliates, as that term is defined in Section 2 of the ISO Services Tariff and Section 1 of the ISO OATT. To the extent that a Developer relies on Affiliate(s) to satisfy any or all of the qualification criteria set forth in Section 31.2.4.1.1.1, the Affiliate(s) shall provide to the ISO: (i) the information required in Section 31.2.4.1.1.1 to demonstrate its capability to satisfy the applicable qualification criteria, and (ii) a notarized officer’s certificate, signed by an authorized officer of the Affiliate with signatory authority, in a form acceptable to the ISO, certifying that the Affiliate will participate in the Developer’s project in the manner described by the Developer and will abide by the requirements set forth in this Attachment Y, the ISO Tariffs, and ISO Procedures related and applicable to the Affiliate’s participation.

#### **31.2.4.1.1 Developer Qualification and Timing**

The ISO shall provide each Developer with an opportunity to demonstrate that it has or can draw upon the financial resources, technical expertise, and experience needed to finance, develop, construct, operate and maintain a transmission project to meet identified Reliability Needs. The ISO shall consider the qualifications of each Developer in an evenhanded and non-discriminatory manner, treating Transmission Owners and Other Developers alike.

##### **31.2.4.1.1.1 Developer Qualification Criteria**

The ISO shall make a determination on the qualification of a Developer to propose to develop a transmission project as a solution to an identified Reliability Need based on the following criteria:

31.2.4.1.1.1.1 The technical and engineering qualifications and experience of the Developer relevant to the development, construction, operation and maintenance of a transmission facility, including evidence of the Developer's demonstrated capability to adhere to standardized construction, maintenance, and operating practices and to contract with third parties to develop, construct, maintain, and/or operate transmission facilities;

31.2.4.1.1.1.2 The current and expected capabilities of the Developer to develop and construct a transmission facility and to operate and maintain it for the life of the facility. If the Developer has previously developed, constructed, maintained or operated transmission facilities, the Developer shall provide the ISO a description of the transmission facilities (not to exceed ten) that the Developer has previously developed, constructed, maintained or operated and the status of those facilities, including whether the construction was completed, whether the facility entered into commercial operations, whether the facility has been suspended or terminated for any reason, and evidence demonstrating the ability of the Developer to address and timely remedy any operational failure of the facilities; and

31.2.4.1.1.1.3 The Developer's current and expected capability to finance, or its experience in arranging financing for, transmission facilities. For purposes of the ISO's determination, the Developer shall provide the ISO:

- (1) evidence of its demonstrated experience financing or arranging financing for transmission facilities, if any, including a description of such projects (not to exceed ten) over the previous ten years, the capital costs and financial structure of such projects, a description of any financing obtained for these projects through

- rates approved by the Commission or a state regulatory agency, the financing closing date of such projects, and whether any of the projects are in default;
- (2) its audited annual financial statements from the most recent three years and its most recent quarterly financial statement, or equivalent information;
  - (3) its credit rating from Moody's Investor Services, Standard & Poor's, or Fitch, or equivalent information, if available;
  - (4) a description of any prior bankruptcy declarations, material defaults, dissolution, merger or acquisition by the Developer or its predecessors or subsidiaries occurring within the previous five years; and
  - (5) such other evidence that demonstrates its current and expected capability to finance a project to solve a Reliability Need.

31.2.4.1.1.1.4 A detailed plan describing how the Developer – in the absence of previous experience financing, developing, constructing, operating, or maintaining transmission facilities – will finance, develop, construct, operate, and maintain a transmission facility, including the financial, technical, and engineering qualifications and experience and capabilities of any third parties with which it will contract for these purposes.

#### **31.2.4.1.1.2 Developer Qualification Determination**

Any Developer seeking to become qualified may submit the required information, or update any previously submitted information, at any time. The ISO shall treat on a confidential basis in accordance with the requirements of its Code of Conduct in Attachment F of the ISO OATT any non-public financial qualification information that is submitted to the ISO by the Developer under Section 31.2.4.1.1.1.3 and is designated by the Developer as “Confidential

Information.” The ISO shall within 15 days of a Developer’s submittal, notify the Developer if the information is incomplete. If the submittal is deemed incomplete, the Developer shall submit the additional information within 30 days of the ISO’s request. The ISO shall notify the Developer of its qualification status within 30 days of receiving all necessary information. A Developer shall retain its qualification status for a three-year period following the notification date; *provided, however*, that the ISO may revoke this status if it determines that there has been a material change in the Developer’s qualifications and the Developer no longer meets the qualification requirements. A Developer that has been qualified shall inform the ISO within thirty days of any material change to the information it provided regarding its qualifications and shall submit to the ISO each year its most recent audited annual financial statement when available. At the conclusion of the three-year period or following the ISO’s revocation of a Developer’s qualification status, the Developer may re-apply for a qualification status under this section.

Any Developer determined by the ISO to be qualified under this section shall be eligible to propose a regulated transmission project as a solution to an identified Reliability Need and shall be eligible to use the cost allocation and cost recovery mechanism for regulated transmission projects set forth in Section 31.5 of this Attachment Y and Rate Schedule 10, Section 6.10, of the ISO OATT for any approved project.

#### **31.2.4.2 Interregional Transmission Projects**

Interregional Transmission Projects may be proposed under Section 31.2.5.1 of this Attachment Y as regulated backstop solutions, alternative regulated solutions, or market-based solutions, in response to a request by the ISO for solutions to a Reliability Need under the relevant provisions of Section 31.2.4. Interregional Transmission Projects proposed as regulated

backstop solutions, alternative regulated solutions or market-based solutions shall be: (i) evaluated by the ISO in accordance with the applicable requirements of the Reliability Planning Process of this Attachment Y, and (ii) jointly evaluated by the ISO and the relevant adjacent transmission planning region(s) in accordance with Section 7.3 of the Interregional Planning Protocol.

### **31.2.4.3 Regulated Backstop Solutions**

31.2.4.3.1 When a Reliability Need is identified in any RNA issued under this tariff, the ISO shall request and the Responsible Transmission Owner shall provide to the ISO, as set forth in Section 31.2.5 below, a proposal for a regulated solution or combination of solutions that shall serve as a backstop to meet the Reliability Need if requested by the ISO due to the lack of sufficient viable market-based solutions to meet such Reliability Needs identified for the Study Period. The Responsible Transmission Owner shall be eligible to recover its costs for developing its proposal and seeking necessary approvals under Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT. Regulated backstop solutions may include generation, transmission, or demand side resources. Such proposals may include reasonable alternatives that would effectively address the Reliability Need; provided however, the Responsible Transmission Owner's obligation to propose and implement regulated backstop solutions under this tariff is limited to regulated transmission solutions. Prior to providing its response to the RNA, each Responsible Transmission Owner will present for discussion at the ESPWG and TPAS any updates in its LTP that impact a Reliability Need identified in the RNA. The ISO will present at the ESPWG and TPAS any updates to its

determination under Section 31.2.2.4.2 with respect to the Transmission Owners' LTPs. Should more than one regulated backstop solution be proposed by a Responsible Transmission Owner to address a Reliability Need, it will be the responsibility of that Responsible Transmission Owner to determine which of the regulated backstop solutions will proceed following a finding by the ISO under Section 31.2.8 of this Attachment Y. The determination by the Responsible Transmission Owner will be made prior to the approval of the CRP which precedes the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution with the longest lead time. Contemporaneous with the request to the Responsible Transmission Owner, the ISO shall solicit market-based and alternative regulated responses as set forth in Sections 31.2.4.5 and 31.2.4.7, which shall not be a formal RFP process.

#### **31.2.4.4 Qualifications for Regulated Backstop Solutions**

##### **31.2.4.4.1 Submission Requirements for Viability and Sufficiency Assessment**

The submission of a regulated backstop solution to a Reliability Need for purposes of the ISO's evaluation under Section 31.2.5 of the viability and sufficiency of the proposed solution and the determination of the Trigger Date for the proposed solution shall include, at a minimum, the following details: (1) contact information; (2) the lead time necessary to complete the project, including, if available, the construction windows in which the Responsible Transmission Owner can perform construction and what, if any, outages may be required during these periods; (3) a description of the project, including type, size, and geographic and electrical location, as well as planning and engineering

specifications and drawings, as appropriate, and the Responsible Transmission Owner's identification of any Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) included as a part of a transmission solution; (4) evidence of a commercially viable technology; (5) Network Upgrade Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities, System Deliverability Upgrades, and/or Attachment Facilities, as applicable, that: (a) the ISO has identified as required to interconnect the proposed project to the New York State Transmission System in compliance with the applicable interconnections standard in an interconnection study or transmission expansion study that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT, to the extent available, or (b) the Responsible Transmission Owner voluntarily identifies as potentially necessary to reliably interconnect the proposed project (subject to modification based on an ISO-conducted interconnection study or transmission expansion study that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT, as applicable); (6) a major milestone schedule, as well as identification of any in-service dates for specific components (such as a Reliability Transmission Upgrade) to properly sequence the project to meet the identified need; (7) the schedule for obtaining any permits and other certifications, if available; (8) status of ISO interconnection studies and interconnection agreement, if available; and (9) status of equipment availability and procurement, if available.

#### **31.2.4.4.2 Submission Requirements for Evaluation and Selection**

31.2.4.4.2.1 The submission of a regulated backstop solution to a Reliability Need for purposes of the ISO's evaluation of the proposed solution for possible

selection as the more efficient or cost effective solution to the Reliability Need shall include, at a minimum, the following details: (1) updates to the information required under Section 31.2.4.4.1; (2) the schedule for obtaining required permits and other certifications; (3) a demonstration of Site Control or a schedule for obtaining such control; (4) the status of any contracts (other than an interconnection agreement) that are under negotiation or in place, including any contracts with third-party contractors; (5) status of ISO interconnection studies and interconnection agreement; (6) status of equipment availability and procurement; (7) evidence of financing or ability to finance the project; (8) capital cost estimates for the project; (9) a description of permitting or other risks facing the project at the stage of project development, including evidence of the reasonableness of project cost estimates, all based on the information available at the time of the submission; and (10) any other information requested by the ISO.

31.2.4.4.2.2 A Responsible Transmission Owner shall submit the following information to indicate its capital cost estimates for a regulated backstop transmission solution. The Responsible Transmission Owner shall provide the ISO with credible capital cost estimates for its proposed regulated backstop transmission solution, with itemized supporting work sheets that identify all material and labor cost assumptions, and related drawings to the extent applicable and available. The work sheets should include an estimated quantification of cost variance, providing an assumed plus/minus range around the capital cost estimate. The estimate shall include all components that are needed to meet the Reliability Need. To the extent information is available, the Responsible Transmission

Owner should itemize: material and labor cost by equipment, engineering and design work, permitting, site acquisition, procurement and construction work, and commissioning needed for the proposed project, all in accordance with Good Utility Practice. For each of these cost categories, the Responsible Transmission Owner should specify the nature and estimated cost of all major project components and estimate the cost of the work to be done at each substation and/or on each feeder to physically and electrically connect each facility to the existing system. The work sheets should itemize to the extent applicable and available all equipment for: (i) the proposed project (separately identifying new transmission facilities and Reliability Transmission Upgrades) and (ii) Network Upgrade Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities, System Deliverability Upgrades, and/or Attachment Facilities, as applicable, that: (a) the ISO has identified as required to interconnect the proposed project to the New York State Transmission System in compliance with the applicable interconnections standard in an interconnection study or transmission expansion study that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT or (b) the Responsible Transmission Owner voluntarily identifies as potentially necessary to reliably interconnect the proposed project (subject to modification based on an ISO-conducted interconnection study or transmission expansion study that are performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT, as applicable).

31.2.4.4.2.3 A Responsible Transmission Owner shall submit the following information to indicate the status of any contracts: (i) copies of all final contracts

the ISO determines are relevant to its consideration, or (ii) where one or more contracts are pending, a timeline on the status of discussions and negotiations with the relevant documents and when the negotiations are expected to be completed. The final contracts shall be submitted to the ISO when available. The ISO shall treat on a confidential basis in accordance with the requirements of its Code of Conduct in Attachment F of the ISO OATT any contract that is submitted to the ISO and is designated by the Responsible Transmission Owner as “Confidential Information.”

31.2.4.4.2.4 A Responsible Transmission Owner shall submit the following information to indicate the status of any required permits: (i) copies of all final permits received that the ISO determines are relevant to its consideration, or (ii) where one or more permits are pending, the completed permit application(s) with information on what additional actions must be taken to meet the permit requirements and a timeline providing the expected timing for finalization and receipt of the final permit(s). The final permits shall be submitted to the ISO when available.

31.2.4.4.2.5 A Responsible Transmission Owner shall submit the following information, as appropriate, to indicate evidence of financing by it or any Affiliate upon which it is relying for financing: (i) evidence of self-financing or project financing through approved rates or the ability to do so, (ii) copies of all loan commitment letter(s) and signed financing contract(s), or (iii) where such financing is pending, the status of the application for any relevant financing, including a timeline providing the status of discussions and negotiations of

relevant documents and when the negotiations are expected to be completed. The final contracts or approved rates shall be submitted to the ISO when available.

31.2.4.4.2.6 Upon the completion of any interconnection study or transmission expansion study of a proposed regulated backstop solution that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT, the Responsible Transmission Owner of the proposed project shall notify the ISO that the study has been completed and, at the ISO's request, shall submit to the ISO any study report and related materials prepared in connection with the study.

31.2.4.4.3 If the regulated backstop solution does not meet the Reliability Needs, the ISO will provide sufficient information to the Responsible Transmission Owner to determine how the regulated backstop should be modified to meet the identified Reliability Needs. The Responsible Transmission Owner will make necessary changes to its proposed regulated backstop solution to address reliability deficiencies identified by the ISO, and submit a revised proposal to the ISO for review and approval.

#### **31.2.4.5 Market-Based Responses**

At the same time that a proposal for a regulated backstop solution is requested from the Responsible Transmission Owner under Section 31.2.4.3, the ISO shall also request market-based responses from the market place. Subject to the execution of appropriately drawn confidentiality agreements and the Commission's standards of conduct, the ISO and the appropriate Transmission Owner or Transmission Owners shall provide any party who wishes to develop such a response access to the data that is necessary to develop its response. Such data

shall only be used for the purposes of preparing a market-based response to a Reliability Need under this section. Such responses will be open on a comparable basis to all resources, including generation, demand response providers, and merchant transmission Developers.

#### **31.2.4.6 Qualifications for a Valid Market-Based Response**

The submission of a proposed market-based solution must include, at a minimum:

(1) contact information; (2) the lead time necessary to complete the project, including, if available, the construction windows in which the Developer can perform construction and what, if any, outages may be required during these periods; (3) a description of the project, including type, size, and geographic and electrical location, as well as planning and engineering specifications and drawings as appropriate; (4) evidence of a commercially viable technology; (5) a major milestone schedule; (6) a schedule for obtaining any required permits and other certifications; (7) a demonstration of Site Control or a schedule for obtaining Site Control; (8) the status of any contracts (other than an interconnection agreement) that are under negotiation or in place; (9) the status of ISO interconnection studies and interconnection agreement; (10) the status of equipment availability and procurement; (11) evidence of financing or ability to finance the project; and (12) any other information requested by the ISO.

A Developer shall submit the following information to indicate the status of any contracts: (i) copies of all final contracts the ISO determines are relevant to its consideration, or (ii) where one or more contracts are pending, a timeline on the status of discussions and negotiations with the relevant documents and when the negotiations are expected to be completed. The final contracts shall be submitted to the ISO when available. The ISO shall treat on a confidential basis in accordance with the requirements of its Code of Conduct in

Attachment F of the ISO OATT any contract that is submitted to the ISO and is designated by the Developer as “Confidential Information.”

A Developer shall submit the following information to indicate the status of any required permits: (i) copies of all final permits received that the ISO determines are relevant to its consideration, or (ii) where one or more permits are pending, the completed permit application(s) with information on what additional actions must be taken to meet the permit requirements and a timeline providing the expected timing for finalization and receipt of the final permit(s). The final permits shall be submitted to the ISO when available.

A Developer shall submit the following information, as appropriate, to indicate evidence of financing by it or any Affiliate upon which it is relying for financing: (i) copies of all loan commitment letter(s) and signed financing contract(s), or (ii) where such financing is pending, the status of the application for any relevant financing, including a timeline providing the status of discussions and negotiations of relevant documents and when the negotiations are expected to be completed. The final contracts shall be submitted to the ISO when available.

Upon the completion of any interconnection study or transmission expansion study of a proposed market-based solution that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT, the Developer of the proposed project shall notify the ISO that the study has been completed and, at the ISO’s request, shall submit to the ISO any study report and related materials prepared in connection with the study.

Failure to provide any data requested by the ISO within the timeframe set forth in Section 31.2.5.1 of this Attachment Y will result in the rejection of the proposed market-based solution from further consideration during that planning cycle.

### **31.2.4.7 Alternative Regulated Responses**

31.2.4.7.1 The ISO will request alternative regulated responses to Reliability Needs at the same time that it requests market-based responses and regulated backstop solutions. Such proposals may include reasonable alternatives that would effectively address the identified Reliability Need.

31.2.4.7.2 In response to the ISO's request, Other Developers may develop alternative regulated proposals for generation, demand side alternatives, and/or other solutions to address a Reliability Need and submit such proposals to the ISO. Transmission Owners, at their option, may submit additional proposals for regulated solutions to the ISO. Transmission Owners and Other Developers may submit such proposals to the NYDPS for review at any time. Subject to the execution of appropriately drawn confidentiality agreements and the Commission's standards of conduct, the ISO and the appropriate Transmission Owner(s) shall provide Other Developers access to the data that is needed to develop their proposals. Such data shall be used only for purposes of preparing an alternative regulated proposal in response to a Reliability Need.

### **31.2.4.8 Qualifications for Alternative Regulated Solutions**

#### **31.2.4.8.1 Submission Requirements for Viability and Sufficiency Assessment**

The submission of an alternative regulated solution to a Reliability Need for purposes of the ISO's evaluation under Section 31.2.5 of the viability and sufficiency of the proposed solution and the determination of the Trigger Date for the proposed solution shall include, at a minimum, the following details: (1) contact information; (2) the lead time necessary to complete the project,

including, if available, the construction windows in which the Other Developer or Transmission Owner can perform construction and what, if any, outages may be required during these periods; (3) a description of the project, including type, size, and geographic and electrical location, as well as planning and engineering specifications and drawings, as appropriate, and the Other Developer's or Transmission Owner's identification of any Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) included as a part of a transmission solution; (4) evidence of a commercially viable technology; (5) any Network Upgrade Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities, System Deliverability Upgrades, and/or Attachment Facilities, as applicable, that: (a) the ISO has identified as required to interconnect the proposed project to the New York State Transmission System in compliance with the applicable interconnections standard in an interconnection study or transmission expansion study that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT or (b) the Other Developer or Transmission Owner voluntarily identifies as potentially necessary to reliably interconnect the proposed project (subject to modification based on an ISO-conducted interconnection study or transmission expansion study that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT, as applicable); (6) a major milestone schedule, as well as identification of any in-service dates for specific components (such as a Reliability Transmission Upgrade) to properly sequence the project to meet the identified need; (7) the schedule for obtaining any permits and other certifications, if available; (8) status of ISO interconnection studies and interconnection

agreement, if available; and (9) status of equipment availability and procurement, if available.

### **31.2.4.8.2 Submission Requirements for Evaluation and Selection**

31.2.4.8.2.1 The submission of a proposed alternative regulated solution to a Reliability Need for purposes of the ISO's evaluation of the proposed solution for possible selection as the more efficient or cost effective solution for the Reliability Need must include, at a minimum: (1) updates to the information required under Section 31.2.4.8.1; (2) a demonstration of Site Control or a schedule for obtaining Site Control; (3) the status of any contracts (other than an interconnection agreement) that are under negotiation or in place, including any contracts with third-party contractors; (4) the status of any interconnection studies and interconnection agreement; (5) the schedule for obtaining any required permits and other certifications; (6) the status of equipment availability and procurement; (7) evidence of financing or ability to finance the project; (8) capital cost estimates for the project; (9) a description of permitting or other risks facing the project at the stage of project development, including evidence of the reasonableness of project cost estimates, all based on the information available at the time of the submission; and (10) any other information requested by the ISO.

31.2.4.8.2.2 An Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall submit the following information to indicate its capital cost estimates for a proposed alternative regulated transmission solution. The Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall provide the ISO with credible capital cost estimates for its proposed alternative regulated transmission solution, with itemized supporting work sheets that identify all material and labor cost assumptions, and related drawings to the

extent applicable and available. The work sheets should include an estimated quantification of cost variance, providing an assumed plus/minus range around the capital cost estimate. The estimate shall include all components that are needed to meet the Reliability Need. To the extent information is available, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner should itemize: material and labor cost by equipment, engineering and design work, permitting, site acquisition, procurement and construction work, and commissioning needed for the proposed transmission solution, all in accordance with Good Utility Practice. For each of these cost categories, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner should specify the nature and estimated cost of all major project components and estimate the cost of the work to be done at each substation and/or on each feeder to physically and electrically connect each facility to the existing system. The work sheets should itemize to the extent applicable and available all equipment for: (i) the proposed project (separately identifying new transmission facilities and Reliability Transmission Upgrades) and (ii) Network Upgrade Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities, System Deliverability Upgrades, and/or Attachment Facilities, as applicable, that: (a) the ISO has identified as required to interconnect the proposed project to the New York State Transmission System in compliance with the applicable interconnections standard in an interconnection study or transmission expansion study that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT or (b) the Other Developer or Transmission Owner voluntarily identifies as potentially necessary to reliably interconnect the proposed project (subject to modification based on an

ISO-conducted interconnection study or transmission expansion study that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT, as applicable).

31.2.4.8.2.3 An Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall submit the following information to indicate the status of any contracts: (i) copies of all final contracts the ISO determines are relevant to its consideration, or (ii) where one or more contracts are pending, a timeline on the status of discussions and negotiations with the relevant documents and when the negotiations are expected to be completed. The final contracts shall be submitted to the ISO when available. The ISO shall treat on a confidential basis in accordance with the requirements of its Code of Conduct in Attachment F of the ISO OATT any contract that is submitted to the ISO and is designated by the Other Developer or Transmission Owner as “Confidential Information.”

31.2.4.8.2.4 An Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall submit the following information to indicate the status of any required permits: (i) copies of all final permits received that the ISO determines are relevant to its consideration, or (ii) where one or more permits are pending, the completed permit application(s) with information on what additional actions must be taken to meet the permit requirements and a timeline providing the expected timing for finalization and receipt of the final permit(s). The final permits shall be submitted to the ISO when available.

31.2.4.8.2.5 An Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall submit the following information, as appropriate, to indicate evidence of financing by it or

any Affiliate upon which it is relying for financing: (i) evidence of self-financing or project financing through approved rates or the ability to do so, (ii) copies of all loan commitment letter(s) and signed financing contract(s), or (iii) where such financing is pending, the status of the application for any relevant financing, including a timeline providing the status of discussions and negotiations of relevant documents and when the negotiations are expected to be completed. The final contracts or approved rates shall be submitted to the ISO when available.

31.2.4.8.2.6 Upon the completion of any interconnection study or transmission expansion study of a proposed alternative regulated solution that is performed under Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner of the proposed project shall notify the ISO that the study has been completed and, at the ISO's request, shall submit to the ISO any study report and related materials prepared in connection with the study.

31.2.4.8.3 Failure to provide any data requested by the ISO within the timeframe provided in Sections 31.2.5.1 and 31.2.6.1 of this Attachment Y will result in the rejection of the proposed alternative regulated solution from further consideration during that planning cycle. An Other Developer or Transmission Owner sponsoring a proposed alternative regulated solution must notify the ISO immediately of any material change in status of a proposed alternative regulated solution. For purposes of this provision, a material change includes, but is not limited to, a change in the financial viability of the Other Developer or Transmission Owner, a change in the siting status of the project, or a change in a

major element of the project's development. If the ISO, at any time, learns of a material change in the status of a proposed alternative regulated solution, it may, at that time, make a determination as to the continued viability of the proposed alternative regulated solution.

#### **31.2.4.9 Additional Solutions**

Should the ISO determine that it has not received adequate regulated backstop or market-based solutions to satisfy the Reliability Need, the ISO may, in its discretion, solicit additional regulated backstop or market-based solutions. Other Developers or Transmission Owners may submit additional alternative regulated solutions for the ISO's consideration at that time.

### **31.2.5 ISO Evaluation of Viability, Sufficiency, and Trigger Date of Proposed Solutions to Reliability Needs**

#### **31.2.5.1 Timing for Submittal of Project Information and Developer Qualification Information and Opportunity to Provide Additional Information**

31.2.5.1.1 Within 60 days after a request for solutions to a Reliability Need is made by the ISO after completion of the RNA, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7, all Developers proposing solutions to an identified Reliability Need shall submit to the ISO for purposes of its evaluation the project information, as applicable, for: (i) a proposed regulated backstop solution under Section 31.2.4.4.1, (ii) a proposed market-based solution under Section 31.2.4.6, or (iii) a proposed alternative regulated solution under Section 31.2.4.8.1 of this Attachment Y. The Developer of a proposed regulated transmission solution must also demonstrate to the ISO, simultaneous with its submission of project information, that it: (i) has submitted a Transmission Interconnection Application under Attachment P to the ISO OATT, (ii) has submitted an Interconnection Request for a Class Year Transmission Project

under Attachment X to the ISO OATT, or (iii) has completed a Cluster Study Process for a Cluster Study Transmission Project under Attachment HH to the ISO OATT.

31.2.5.1.2 Any Developer that the ISO has determined under Section 31.2.4.1.1.2 or as set forth in this Section 31.2.5.1 below to be qualified to propose to develop a project as a transmission solution to an identified Reliability Need may submit the required project information; *provided, however*, that: (i) the Developer shall provide a non-refundable application fee of \$10,000 and (ii) based on the actual identified need, the ISO may request that the qualified Developer provide additional Developer qualification information. Any Developer that has not been determined by the ISO to be qualified, but that wants to propose to develop a project, must submit to the ISO the information required for Developer qualification under Section 31.2.4.1.1 within 30 days after a request for solutions is made by the ISO. The ISO shall within 30 days of a Developer's submittal of its Developer qualification information, notify the Developer if this information is incomplete. The Developer shall submit additional Developer qualification information or project information required by the ISO within 15 days of the ISO's request. A Developer that fails to submit the additional Developer qualification information or the required project information will not be eligible for its project to be considered in that planning cycle.

31.2.5.1.3 If the Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner, or Other Developer submits Confidential Information, as defined in Section 31.2.12, as part of its project information submitted pursuant to Sections 31.2.4.4 or 31.2.4.8, the Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner, or Other Developer shall submit redacted and un-redacted versions of the project information.

### **31.2.5.2 Comparable Evaluation of All Proposed Solutions**

The ISO shall evaluate: (i) any proposed market-based solution submitted by a Developer pursuant to Section 31.2.4.5, (ii) any proposed regulated backstop solution submitted by a Responsible Transmission Owner pursuant to Section 31.2.4.3, and (iii) any proposed alternative regulated solution submitted by a Transmission Owner or Other Developer pursuant to Section 31.2.4.7. The ISO will evaluate whether each proposed solution is viable and is sufficient to satisfy the identified Reliability Need by the need date pursuant to Sections 31.2.5.3 and 31.2.5.4. The proposed solutions may include multiple components and resource types. When evaluating proposed solutions to Reliability Needs from any Developer, all resource types – generation, transmission, demand response, or a combination of these resource types – shall be considered on a comparable basis as potential solutions to the Reliability Needs identified. All solutions will be evaluated in the same general time frame.

### **31.2.5.3 Evaluation of Viability of Proposed Solution**

The ISO will determine the viability of a solution – transmission, generation, demand response, or a combination of these resource types – proposed to satisfy a Reliability Need. For purposes of its analysis, the ISO will evaluate whether: (i) the Developer has provided the required Developer qualification data pursuant to Section 31.2.4.1 and the required project information data under Sections 31.2.4.4.1, 31.2.4.6, or 31.2.4.8.1; (ii) the proposed solution is technically practicable; (iii) the Developer has indicated possession of, or an approach for acquiring, any necessary rights-of-way, property, and facilities that will make the proposal reasonably feasible in the required timeframe; and (iv) the proposed solution can be completed in the required timeframe. If the ISO determines that the proposed solution is not viable and, for regulated solutions, the Developer does not address any identified deficiency pursuant to Section

31.2.5.6, the ISO shall reject the proposed solution from further consideration during that planning cycle.

#### **31.2.5.4 Evaluation of Sufficiency of Proposed Solution**

The ISO will perform a comparable analysis of each proposed solution – transmission, generation, demand response, or a combination of these resource types – through the Study Period to identify whether it satisfies the Reliability Need(s). The ISO will evaluate each solution to determine whether the solution proposed by the Developer fully eliminates the Reliability Need(s). If the ISO determines that a proposed regulated solution is not sufficient and the Developer does not address any identified deficiency pursuant to Section 31.2.5.6, the ISO shall reject the proposed regulated solution from further consideration during that planning cycle.

#### **31.2.5.5 Establishment of Trigger Date of Proposed Regulated Solutions**

Upon receipt of all Developers' proposed regulated solutions pursuant to Section 31.2.5.1, the ISO will notify all Developers if any Developer has proposed a lead time for the implementation of its regulated solution that could result in a Trigger Date for the regulated solution within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG, provided that the ISO will not disclose the identity of such Developer or the details of its project at that time. The ISO will independently analyze the lead time proposed by each Developer for the implementation of its regulated solution. The ISO will use the Developer's estimate and the ISO's analysis to establish the ISO's Trigger Date for each regulated solution. The ISO will also establish benchmark lead times for proposed market-based solutions.

#### **31.2.5.6 Resolution of Deficiencies**

Following initial review of the proposals, as described above, ISO staff will identify any reliability deficiencies in each of the proposed solutions. The Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner or Other Developer will discuss any identified deficiencies with the ISO staff. Other Developers and Transmission Owners that propose alternative regulated solutions shall have the option to remedy their proposals to address any deficiency within 30 days of notification by the ISO. With respect to regulated backstop solutions proposed by a Responsible Transmission Owner pursuant to Section 31.2.4.3, the Responsible Transmission Owner shall make necessary changes to its proposed backstop solution to address any reliability deficiencies identified by the ISO, and submit a revised proposal to the ISO for review within 30 days. The ISO shall review all such revised proposals to determine whether the identified deficiencies have been resolved.

#### **31.2.5.7 ISO Report of Evaluation Results**

The ISO shall present its Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to stakeholders, interested parties, and the NYDPS for comment and will indicate at that time whether any of the proposed regulated solutions found to be viable and sufficient under this Section 31.2.5 will have a Trigger Date within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG.

The ISO shall report in the CRP the results of its evaluation under this Section 31.2.5: (i) whether each proposed regulated backstop solution, alternative regulated solution, and market-based solution is viable and is sufficient to satisfy the identified Reliability Need by the need date, and (ii) the Trigger Dates for the proposed regulated solutions.

## **31.2.6 ISO Evaluation and Selection of Proposed Regulated Transmission Solutions**

### **31.2.6.1 Submission of Project Information for Selection of Proposed Regulated Transmission Solution**

If the ISO determines that the Trigger Date of any Developer's proposed regulated solution that was found to be viable and sufficient under Section 31.2.5 will occur within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG, the ISO will request that all Developers of regulated transmission solutions that the ISO determined were viable and sufficient submit to the ISO their project information, as applicable, for: (i) a proposed regulated backstop transmission solution under Section 31.2.4.4.2, or (ii) a proposed alternative regulated transmission solution under Section 31.2.4.8.2. If the ISO determines that none of the Developers' proposed regulated solutions that were found to be viable and sufficient under Section 31.2.5 have a Trigger Date that will occur within the thirty-six month period, the ISO will not request further project information, perform the evaluation, or make a selection of a more efficient or cost effective regulated solution under this Section 31.2.6 for that planning cycle.

The ISO will make its request, if necessary, for project information under this Section 31.2.6.1 sufficiently in advance of the earliest Trigger Date of the viable and sufficient regulated solutions to enable the ISO to evaluate and select the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution. Upon the ISO's request for project information, the Developers shall submit such information for their regulated transmission solution within thirty (30) days, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7. The Developer must include with its project information: (i) for a regulated transmission solution that is subject to the Transmission Interconnection Procedures a demonstration that it has an executed System Impact Study Agreement under Attachment P to the ISO OATT or (ii) for a regulated transmission

solution that is subject to the Class Year Study process in Attachment X to the ISO OATT a demonstration that its System Reliability Impact Study has commenced. A Developer shall submit additional project information required by the ISO within 15 days of the ISO's request. A Developer that fails to submit the required project information will not be eligible for its project to be considered in that planning cycle.

### **31.2.6.2 Study Deposit for Proposed Regulated Transmission Solutions**

A Developer that proposes a regulated backstop transmission solution or an alternative regulated transmission solution to satisfy the identified Reliability Need shall submit to the ISO, at the same time that it provides the project information required pursuant to Section 31.2.6.1, a study deposit of \$100,000, which shall be held in an interest-bearing account for which the interest earned will be associated with the Developer and shall be applied to study costs and subject to refund as described in this Section 31.2.6.2.

The ISO shall charge, and a Developer proposing a regulated backstop transmission solution or an alternative regulated transmission solution shall pay, the actual costs of the ISO's evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution for purposes of the ISO's selection of the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy a Reliability Need for cost allocation purposes, including costs associated with the ISO's use of subcontractors. The ISO will track its staff and administrative costs, including any costs associated with using subcontractors, that it incurs in performing the evaluation of a Developer's proposed transmission solution under this Section 31.2.6 and any supplemental evaluation or re-evaluation of the proposed transmission solution. If the ISO or its subcontractors perform study work for multiple proposed transmission solutions on a combined basis, the ISO will allocate the costs of the combined study work equally among the applicable Developers. The ISO shall invoice the

Developer monthly for study costs incurred by the ISO in evaluating the Developer's proposed transmission solution as described above. Such invoice shall include a description and an accounting of the study costs incurred by the ISO and estimated subcontractor costs. The Developer shall pay the invoiced amount within thirty (30) calendar days of the ISO's issuance of the monthly invoice. The ISO shall continue to hold the full amount of the study deposit until settlement of the final monthly invoice; *provided, however*, if a Developer: (i) does not pay its monthly invoice within the timeframe described above, or (ii) does not pay a disputed amount into an independent escrow account as described below, the ISO may draw upon the study deposit to recover the owed amount. If the ISO must draw on the study deposit, the ISO shall provide notice to the Developer, and the Developer shall within thirty (30) calendar days of such notice make payments to the ISO to restore the full study deposit amount. If the Developer fails to make such payments, the ISO may halt its evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution and may disqualify the Developer's proposed transmission solution from further consideration. After the conclusion of the ISO's evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution or if the Developer: (i) withdraws its proposed transmission solution or (ii) fails to pay an invoiced amount and the ISO halts its evaluation of the proposed transmission solution, the ISO shall issue a final invoice and refund to the Developer any portion of the Developer's study deposit submitted to the ISO under this Section 31.2.6.2 and any interest actually earned on the deposited amount that together exceeds the outstanding amounts that the ISO has incurred in evaluating that Developer's proposed transmission solution. The ISO shall refund the remaining portion within sixty (60) days of the ISO's receipt of all final invoices from its subcontractors and involved Transmission Owners.

In the event of a Developer's dispute over invoiced amounts, the Developer shall: (i) timely pay any undisputed amounts to the ISO, and (ii) pay into an independent escrow account the portion of the invoice in dispute, pending resolution of such dispute. If the Developer fails to meet these two requirements, then the ISO shall not be obligated to perform or continue to perform its evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution. Disputes arising under this section shall be addressed through the Dispute Resolution Procedures set forth in Section 2.16 of the ISO OATT and Section 11 of the ISO Services Tariff. Within thirty (30) Calendar Days after resolution of the dispute, the Developer will pay the ISO any amounts due with interest actually earned on such amounts.

### **31.2.6.3 Evaluation of System Impact of Proposed Regulated Transmission Solution**

A proposed regulated transmission solution that will have a significant adverse impact on the reliability of the New York State Transmission System shall not be eligible for selection by the ISO under Section 31.2.6.5. The ISO shall evaluate the system impacts for the entire Study Period of a proposed regulated transmission solution that the ISO has determined under Section 31.2.5 is viable and sufficient. As part of this evaluation, the ISO shall give due consideration to the results of: (i) any completed System Impact Study performed in accordance with Attachment P to the ISO OATT, (ii) any completed System Reliability Impact Study for a Class Year Transmission Project performed in accordance with Attachment X to the ISO OATT, or (iii) any completed Cluster Study for a Cluster Study Transmission Project performed in accordance with Attachment HH to the ISO OATT, as applicable. The ISO shall perform power flow and short circuit studies for the proposed regulated transmission solutions and additional studies, as appropriate. If the ISO identifies a significant adverse impact based on these studies, the ISO shall request that the Developer make an adjustment to its proposed regulated transmission

solution to address this impact and remain eligible for selection. The Developer shall submit the adjustment within 30 days of the ISO's notification.

If the Developer modifies its proposed regulated transmission solution, the ISO shall confirm that the adjusted solution still satisfies the viability and sufficiency requirements set forth in Section 31.2.5. If the ISO determines that the proposed regulated transmission solution does not satisfy the viability and sufficiency requirements or continues to have a significantly adverse impact on the reliability of the New York State Transmission System, the ISO shall remove the proposed solution from further consideration during that planning cycle.

#### **31.2.6.4 Evaluation of Regional Transmission Solutions to Address Local and Regional Reliability Needs More Efficiently or More Cost Effectively Than Local Transmission Solutions**

The ISO will review the LTPs as they relate to BPTFs. The results of the ISO's analysis will be reported in the CRP.

##### **31.2.6.4.1 Evaluation of Regional Transmission Solutions to Address Local Reliability Needs Identified in Local Transmission Plans More Efficiently or More Cost Effectively than Local Transmission Solutions**

The ISO, using engineering judgment, will determine whether proposed regional transmission solutions on the BPTFs may more efficiently or cost effectively satisfy reliability needs identified in the LTPs. If the ISO identifies that a regional transmission solution on the BPTFs has the potential to more efficiently or cost effectively satisfy the reliability need identified in the LTPs, it will perform a sensitivity analysis to determine whether the proposed regional transmission solution on the BPTFs would satisfy the reliability needs identified in the LTPs. If the ISO determines that the proposed regional transmission solutions on the BPTFs would satisfy the reliability need, the ISO will evaluate the proposed regional transmission solution using the metrics set forth in Section 31.2.6.5.1 to determine whether it may be a more

efficient or cost effective solution on the BPTFs to satisfy the reliability needs identified in the LTPs than the local solutions proposed in the LTPs.

#### **31.2.6.4.2 Evaluation of Regional Transmission Solutions to Address Regional Reliability Needs More Efficiently or More Cost Effectively than Local Transmission Solutions**

As referenced in Section 31.2.1.3, the ISO, using engineering judgment, will determine whether a regional transmission solution might more efficiently or more cost effectively satisfy an identified regional Reliability Need on the BPTFs that impacts more than one Transmission District than any local transmission solutions identified by the Transmission Owners in their LTPs in the event the LTPs specify such transmission solutions are included to address local reliability needs.

#### **31.2.6.5 ISO Selection of More Efficient or Cost Effective Transmission Solution for Cost Allocation Purposes**

A proposed regulated transmission solution – including a regulated backstop transmission solution submitted by a Responsible Transmission Owner pursuant to Section 31.2.4.3 and an alternative regulated transmission solution submitted by a Transmission Owner or Other Developer pursuant to Section 31.2.4.7 – that the ISO has determined satisfies the viability and sufficiency requirements in Section 31.2.5 and the system impact requirements in Section 31.2.6.3 shall be eligible under this Section 31.2.6.5 for selection in the CRP for the purpose of cost allocation and recovery under the ISO Tariffs. The ISO shall evaluate any eligible proposed regulated transmission solutions for the planning cycle using the metrics set forth in Section 31.2.6.5.1 below. For purposes of this evaluation, the ISO will review the information submitted by the Developer and determine whether it is reasonable and how such information should be used for purposes of the ISO evaluating each metric. In its review, the ISO will give due

consideration to the status of, and any available results of, any applicable interconnection or transmission expansion studies concerning the proposed regulated transmission solution performed in accordance with Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT. The ISO may engage an independent consultant to review the reasonableness and comprehensiveness of the information submitted by the Developer and may rely on the independent consultant's analysis in evaluating each metric. The ISO shall select in the CRP for cost allocation purposes the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy a Reliability Need in the manner set forth in Section 31.2.6.5.3 below.

#### **31.2.6.5.1 Metrics for Evaluating More Efficient or Cost Effective Regulated Transmission Solution to Satisfy Reliability Need**

In determining which of the eligible proposed regulated transmission solutions is the more efficient or cost effective solution to satisfy the Reliability Need, the ISO will consider, and will consult with the NYDPS regarding, the following metrics set forth in this Section 31.2.6.5.1 and rank each proposed solution based on the quality of its satisfaction of these metrics:

31.2.6.5.1.1            The capital cost estimates for the proposed regulated transmission solutions, including the accuracy of the proposed estimates.

31.2.6.5.1.2        The cost per MW ratio of the proposed regulated transmission solutions.

For this evaluation, the ISO will first determine the present worth, in dollars, of the total capital cost of the proposed solution in current year dollars. The ISO will then determine the MW value of the solution by summing the Reliability Need, in MW, with the additional improvement, in MW, that the proposed solution offers beyond serving the Reliability Need. The ISO will then determine the cost per MW ratio by dividing the present worth of the total capital cost by the MW value.

- 31.2.6.5.1.3 The expandability of the proposed regulated transmission solution. The ISO will consider the impact of the proposed solution on future construction. The ISO will also consider the extent to which any subsequent expansion will continue to use this proposed solution within the context of system expansion.
- 31.2.6.5.1.4 The operability of the proposed regulated transmission solution. The ISO will consider how the proposed solution may affect additional flexibility in operating the system, such as dispatch of generation, access to operating reserves, access to ancillary services, or ability to remove transmission for maintenance. The ISO will also consider how the proposed solution may affect the cost of operating the system, such as how it may affect the need for operating generation out of merit for reliability needs, reducing the need to cycle generation, or providing more balance in the system to respond to system conditions that are more severe than design conditions.
- 31.2.6.5.1.5 The performance of the proposed regulated transmission solution. The ISO will consider how the proposed project may affect the utilization of the system (*e.g.* interface flows, percent loading of facilities).
- 31.2.6.5.1.6 The extent to which the Developer of a proposed regulated transmission solution has the property rights, or ability to obtain the property rights, required to implement the solution. The ISO will consider whether the Developer: (i) already possesses the rights of way necessary to implement the solution; (ii) has completed a transmission routing study, which (a) identifies a specific routing plan with alternatives, (b) includes a schedule indicating the timing for obtaining siting and permitting, and (c) provides specific attention to sensitive areas (*e.g.*,

wetlands, river crossings, protected areas, and schools); or (iii) has specified a plan or approach for determining routing and acquiring property rights.

31.2.6.5.1.7 The potential issues associated with delay in constructing the proposed regulated transmission solution consistent with the major milestone schedule and the schedule for obtaining any permits and other certifications as required to timely meet the need.

#### **31.2.6.5.2 Identification of Reliability Transmission Upgrades in Regulated Transmission Solutions**

At least 30 Calendar Days prior to the ISO's presentation of the initial draft of the CRP to stakeholders, the ISO shall post on its website a list of facilities that make up the regulated backstop transmission solutions and alternative regulated transmission solutions (but not including any potential interconnection facilities) that were determined to be viable and sufficient pursuant to Section 31.2.5.2 of the ISO OATT provided that one or more regulated solution has a Trigger Date within 36 months of the ISO's presentation of the viability and sufficiency assessment. The list will identify which transmission facilities are new facilities and which transmission facilities satisfy the definition of a Reliability Transmission Upgrade. For those facilities that satisfy the definition of a Reliability Transmission Upgrade, the list will also specify the Transmission Owner that owns the existing transmission facility that is proposed to be upgraded by an identified Reliability Transmission Upgrade, to the extent such information is available. The ISO shall also post on its website a list of interconnection facilities identified in proposals submitted by Developers in accordance with Sections 31.2.4.4 and 31.2.4.8 of the ISO OATT; however, this list of interconnection facilities shall be for informational purposes only and separate from the list of new transmission facilities and Reliability Transmission Upgrades. With the exception of the list of interconnection facilities, any interested party may dispute the

ISO's determination to identify, or not identify, a facility as a Reliability Transmission Upgrade by providing the ISO with written notice within 20 Calendar Days of the ISO's posting of the list pursuant to this Section 31.2.6.5.2, which notice shall be posted on the ISO's website. The ISO and the disputing party(ies) should attempt to resolve such dispute(s) as provided in Section 31.1.8.4 of this Attachment Y. The ISO shall post on its website the final list pursuant to this Section 31.2.6.5.2 on or before the presentation of the draft CRP to the ISO's Operating Committee.

#### **31.2.6.5.3 ISO Selection of More Efficient or Cost Effective Regulated Transmission Solution to Satisfy Reliability Need**

The ISO shall select under this Section 31.2.6.5.3 the proposed regulated transmission solution, if any, that is the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution proposed in the planning cycle to satisfy the identified Reliability Need. The ISO shall report the selected regulated transmission solution in the CRP.

The selected regulated transmission solution reported in the CRP shall be eligible to be triggered by the ISO to satisfy the identified Reliability Need pursuant to Section 31.2.8 at any point within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG. An Other Developer or Transmission Owner of an alternative regulated transmission project shall not be eligible for cost allocation and cost recovery under the ISO OATT for its project unless its project is selected pursuant to this Section 31.2.6.5.3. Once such project is selected, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall be eligible for cost allocation and cost recovery under the ISO OATT for its project. Within thirty (30) days of the ISO's selection of an alternative regulated transmission solution, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall submit to the ISO for the ISO's approval a proposed schedule and scope of work that describe the preparation work, if any, that the Developer must

perform prior to the Trigger Date of the project, including a good faith estimate of the costs of such work. Costs will be recovered when the project enters into service, is halted, or as otherwise determined by the Commission in accordance with the cost recovery requirements set forth in Section 31.5.6 of this Attachment Y and Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT. Actual project cost recovery, including any issues related to cost recovery and project cost overruns, will be submitted to and decided by the Commission.

### **31.2.7 Comprehensive Reliability Plan**

Following the ISO's evaluation of the proposed market-based and regulated solutions to Reliability Need(s), the ISO will prepare a draft CRP that sets forth the ISO's findings regarding the viability and sufficiency of solutions, the trigger dates of regulated solutions, and any recommendations that implementation of regulated solutions (which may be a Gap Solution) is necessary to ensure system reliability. The draft CRP will reflect any input from the NYDPS. If the CRP cannot be completed in the two-year planning cycle, the ISO will notify stakeholders and provide an estimated completion date and an explanation of the reasons the additional time is required.

The ISO will include in the draft CRP the list of Developers that qualify pursuant to Section 31.2.4.1 and will identify the proposed solutions that it has determined under Section 31.2.5 are viable and sufficient to satisfy the identified Reliability Need(s) by the need date. The ISO will identify in the CRP the regulated backstop solution that the ISO has determined will meet the Reliability Need by the need date and the Responsible Transmission Owner.

If the ISO determines at the time of the issuance of the CRP that sufficient market-based solutions will not be available in time to meet a Reliability Need, and finds that it is necessary to take action to ensure reliability, it will state in the CRP that the development of regulated

solutions (regulated backstop or alternative regulated solution) is necessary. The draft CRP will also include the results of the ISO's analysis of the LTPs consistent with Section 31.2.6.4.

The draft CRP shall indicate whether the ISO has determined that the Trigger Date to any proposed regulated solution will occur within thirty-six months of the date of ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG. If the Trigger Date of any proposed regulated solution will occur within the thirty-six month period and the ISO makes a selection of the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution under Section 31.2.6.5.3, the draft CRP shall include the regulated transmission solution selected for cost allocation purposes pursuant to Section 31.2.6.5.3 as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy the Reliability Need(s) and shall indicate whether that transmission solution should be triggered.

The draft CRP shall preliminarily identify (i) the Designated Reliability Transmission Project(s) that make up the regulated transmission solution selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost effective solution and the regulated backstop transmission solution (if different) and (ii) the Designated Entity responsible for each Designated Reliability Transmission Project. These designations will be finalized in accordance with Section 31.2.7.5 of the ISO OATT. A Designated Reliability Transmission Project will contain all of the facilities that the ISO preliminarily identifies as being designated to a particular Designated Entity. For purposes of this preliminary designation, the Developer that proposed a regulated transmission solution will be identified by the ISO as the Designated Entity for those facilities of its regulated transmission solution that do not meet the definition of Reliability Transmission Upgrade, which facilities shall constitute a Designated Reliability Transmission Project. If more than one Developer jointly proposes the regulated transmission solution, then they will collectively be the Designated Entity and jointly and severally responsible for the completion of the Designated Reliability

Transmission Project. If any facilities of the selected regulated transmission solution or regulated backstop transmission solution (if different) meet the definition of a Reliability Transmission Upgrade, the Transmission Owner owning the existing transmission facility(ies) to be upgraded will be identified by the ISO as the Designated Entity for the Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s), which Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) shall constitute a separate Designated Reliability Transmission Project.

The draft CRP shall also indicate the date by which a solution must be in-service to satisfy the Reliability Need. The in-service date for a selected regulated transmission solution or regulated backstop transmission solution (if different) shall apply to all Designated Reliability Transmission Projects that comprise that solution regardless of the Designated Entity; *provided, however,* that the draft CRP may also include specific dates by which one or more of the Designated Reliability Transmission Projects must be in service in order for the selected alternative regulated transmission or regulated backstop transmission solution to meet the overall in-service date to satisfy the Reliability Need.

If: (i) none of the proposed regulated solutions has a Trigger Date within the thirty-six month period, or (ii) the Trigger Date of any proposed regulated solution will occur within the thirty-six month period but the ISO determines in its discretion that it is not necessary at that time to select a more efficient or cost effective transmission solution under Section 31.2.6.5.3 prior to the completion of the CRP, the draft CRP will not select a regulated transmission solution. If: (i) the Trigger Date of any proposed regulated solution will occur within the thirty-six month period, and (ii) the ISO selects a more efficient or cost effective solution subsequent to the completion of the CRP but prior to the completion of that thirty-six month period, the ISO shall issue an updated CRP pursuant to Section 31.2.7.3 that indicates the regulated transmission

solution selected for cost allocation purposes pursuant to Section 31.2.6.5.3 as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy the Reliability Need(s) whether that transmission solution should be triggered, and the date by which a solution must be in-service to satisfy the Reliability Need.

The draft CRP shall include a comparison of a proposed regional solution to an identified Reliability Need to an Interregional Transmission Project identified and evaluated under the “Analysis and Consideration of Interregional Transmission Projects” section of the Interregional Planning Protocol, if any. An Interregional Transmission Project proposed in the Reliability Planning Process may be selected as a market based response, regulated backstop solution, or an alternative regulated solution under the provisions of the Reliability Planning Process.

#### **31.2.7.1 Collaborative Governance Process**

The ISO staff shall submit the draft CRP to the TPAS and ESPWG for review and comment. The ISO shall make available to any interested party sufficient information to replicate the results of the draft CRP. The information made available will be electronically masked and made available pursuant to a process that the ISO reasonably determines is necessary to prevent the disclosure of any Confidential Information or Critical Energy Infrastructure Information contained in the information made available. Following completion of the TPAS and ESPWG review, the draft CRP reflecting the revisions resulting from the TPAS and ESPWG review shall be forwarded to the Operating Committee for a discussion and action. The ISO shall notify the Business Issues Committee of the date of the Operating Committee meeting at which the draft CRP is to be presented. Following the Operating Committee vote, the draft CRP will be transmitted to the Management Committee for a discussion and action.

### **31.2.7.2 Board Review, Consideration, and Approval of CRP**

Following the Management Committee vote, the draft CRP, with working group, Operating Committee, and Management Committee input, will be forwarded to the ISO Board for review and action. Concurrently, the draft CRP will also be provided to the Market Monitoring Unit for its review and consideration of whether market rule changes are necessary to address an identified failure, if any, in one of the ISO's competitive markets. The Board may approve the draft CRP as submitted or propose modifications on its own motion, including the recommendations regarding the selection of transmission projects for cost allocation and cost recovery under the ISO Tariffs if such selection will occur during that planning cycle. If any changes are proposed by the Board, the revised CRP shall be returned to the Management Committee for comment. The Board shall not make a final determination on the draft CRP until it has reviewed the Management Committee comments. Upon final approval by the Board, the ISO shall issue the CRP to the marketplace by posting the CRP on its website. The ISO will provide the CRP to the appropriate regulatory agency(ies) for consideration and appropriate action.

The responsibilities of the Market Monitoring Unit that are addressed in the above section of Attachment Y to the ISO OATT are also addressed in Section 30.4.6.8.3 of the Market Monitoring Plan, Attachment O to the ISO Services Tariff.

### **31.2.7.3 Updated CRP**

If, pursuant to Section 31.2.7, the ISO identifies a proposed regulated transmission solution as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution following the completion of the CRP, the ISO will prepare a draft updated CRP that indicates (i) the regulated transmission solution recommended for selection for cost allocation purposes pursuant to Section 31.2.6.5.3 as

the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy the Reliability Need(s) and any regulated backstop transmission solution that the ISO determined to be viable and sufficient, (ii) whether a regulated transmission solution should be triggered at that time, (iii) the date by which a solution must be in-service to satisfy the Reliability Need, and (iv) the preliminary identification of the Designated Reliability Transmission Project(s) that comprise the recommended regulated transmission solution or regulated backstop transmission solution (if different) and the Designated Entity responsible for each Designated Reliability Transmission Project, which designations will be finalized in accordance with Section 31.2.7.5 of the ISO OATT. The draft updated CRP shall be reviewed in accordance with the stakeholder process set forth in Section 31.2.7.1 and will be then forwarded to the ISO Board for its review and action pursuant to Section 31.2.7.2.

#### **31.2.7.4 Reliability Disputes**

Notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in this Attachment, the ISO OATT, or the ISO Services Tariff, in the event that a Market Participant or other interested party raises a dispute solely within the NYPSC's jurisdiction concerning ISO's final determination in the CRP that a proposed solution will or will not meet a Reliability Need, a Market Participant or other interested party seeking further review shall refer such dispute to the NYPSC for resolution, as provided for in the ISO Procedures. The NYPSC's final determination of such disputes shall be binding, subject only to judicial review in the courts of the State of New York pursuant to Article 78 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules.

#### **31.2.7.5 Transmission Owner's Responsibility to Notify the ISO**

Within 60 Calendar Days following the posting of a CRP, or an updated CRP, that is approved by the Board of Directors and that identifies a proposed regulated transmission solution

as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution or a proposed regulated backstop transmission solution (if different), a Transmission Owner that has been identified as a Designated Entity for a Designated Reliability Transmission Project shall provide notice to the ISO if the Transmission Owner does not intend to exercise its right under Section 31.6.4 of this Attachment Y to build, own, and recover the cost of the Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) and serve as the Designated Entity for the Designated Reliability Transmission Project identified for the Transmission Owner in the CRP, or updated CRP. If the Transmission Owner notifies the ISO of its rejection to be the Designated Entity for one or more Reliability Transmission Upgrades identified for its Designated Reliability Transmission Project, the Developer that proposed the alternative regulated transmission solution and/or regulated backstop transmission solution shall be the Designated Entity for such Reliability Transmission Upgrades, which shall be incorporated into that Developer's Designated Reliability Transmission Project. If the Transmission Owner does not take action within the 60 Calendar Days with regard to one or more Reliability Transmission Upgrades identified for its Designated Reliability Transmission Project, the Transmission Owner shall be the Designated Entity concerning such Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) and shall have the obligations of a Designated Entity set forth in the ISO OATT, ISO Procedures, and a Development Agreement entered into by the Designated Entity and the ISO in accordance with Section 31.2.8.1.6 of this Attachment Y for constructing and placing the Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) in service to address the Reliability Need.

#### **31.2.7.6 Posting of Approved Solutions**

Following the later of the approval of the CRP or an updated CRP by the Board of Directors or the conclusion of the period identified in Section 31.2.7.5 of the ISO OATT, if applicable, the ISO shall post on its website a list of (i) all Developers that have undertaken a

commitment to the ISO to build a market-based response or gap solution and/or (ii) all Designated Entities that are responsible for a Designated Reliability Transmission Project that is necessary to ensure system reliability, as identified in the CRP and approved by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies).

## **31.2.8 Determination of Necessity**

### **31.2.8.1 Determination of Necessity of a Regulated Solution**

31.2.8.1.1 The ISO shall review proposals for market-based solutions pursuant to Sections 31.2.5, 31.2.8.3, and 31.2.13.1 of this Attachment Y. The ISO will not trigger a regulated solution if, based on this review, it determines prior to or at the Trigger Date for a regulated solution: (i) that sufficient market-based solutions are timely progressing to meet the Reliability Need by the need date or (ii) that, based upon circumstances at the time of the review, there is no longer a Reliability Need. If the ISO decides not to trigger a regulated backstop solution or selected alternative regulated transmission solution, the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner will be eligible to recover its costs incurred up to that point in the same manner it may recover the costs of a halted project in accordance with Section 31.2.8.2.1 for the Responsible Transmission Owner and Section 31.2.8.2.2 for the Other Developer or Transmission Owner.

31.2.8.1.2 If: (i) the ISO determines that there are not sufficient market-based solutions to meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date and that there continues to be a Reliability Need, (ii) the regulated backstop solution proposed by the Responsible Transmission Owner is the only proposed viable and sufficient regulated solution or is selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to meet the identified Reliability Need, and (iii) the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution has or will occur within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG, the ISO will trigger the regulated backstop solution at its Trigger

Date. The ISO will inform the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Backstop Transmission Project(s) that it should submit or the Responsible Transmission Owner that it should submit the regulated backstop solution containing non-transmission components, as applicable, to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) to begin the necessary approval process to site, construct, and operate the solution. In response to the ISO's request, the Designated Entity(ies) and/or Responsible Transmission Owner shall make such a submission to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies).

31.2.8.1.3 If: (i) the ISO determines that there are not sufficient market-based solutions to meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date and that there continues to be a Reliability Need; (ii) the ISO selects an alternative regulated transmission solution as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to meet the identified Reliability Need; (iii) the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution is later than the Trigger Date for the selected alternative regulated transmission solution; and (iv) the Trigger Date for the selected alternative regulated transmission solution has or will occur within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG, the ISO shall trigger the selected alternative regulated transmission solution at its Trigger Date. The ISO will inform the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Alternative Transmission Project(s) that it should submit the Designated Alternative Transmission Project(s) to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) to begin the necessary approval process to site, construct, and operate the solution. In response to the ISO's

request, the Designated Entity(ies) shall make such a submission to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies). Prior to the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution, the ISO will review the status of the development by the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Alternative Transmission Project(s), including, but not limited to, reviewing: (i) whether the Designated Entity(ies) has executed a Development Agreement or requested that it be filed unexecuted with the Commission pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6; (ii) whether the Designated Entity(ies) is timely progressing against the milestones set forth in the Development Agreement; and (iii) the status of the required permits or authorizations, including whether the Designated Entity(ies) has received its Article VII or Article VIII certification or other applicable siting permits or authorizations under New York State law. If, based on its review, the ISO determines prior to or at the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution that it is necessary for the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Backstop Transmission Project(s) or the Responsible Transmission Owner of the regulated backstop solution containing non-transmission components, as applicable, to proceed with the regulated backstop solution in parallel with the selected alternative regulated transmission solution to ensure the identified Reliability Need is satisfied by the need date, the ISO will trigger the regulated backstop solution and report to stakeholders the reasons for its determination. The Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Backstop Transmission Project(s) or the Responsible Transmission Owner of the regulated backstop solution containing non-transmission components, as applicable, shall proceed with due diligence to

develop its project in accordance with Good Utility Practice and to submit its proposed project to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies), unless or until notified by the ISO that it has determined that the regulated backstop solution is no longer needed as described in Section 31.2.8.2.1 below. If, based on its review, the ISO decides not to trigger the regulated backstop solution, the ISO will notify the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Backstop Transmission Projects or the Responsible Transmission Owner of the regulated backstop solution containing non-transmission components, as applicable, that its regulated backstop solution is no longer needed and will not be triggered. In such case, the Designated Entity(ies) or Responsible Transmission Owner shall be eligible to recover its costs incurred up to that point in the same manner as it may recover the costs of a halted project in accordance with Section 31.2.8.2.1.

31.2.8.1.4 If: (i) the ISO determines that there are not sufficient market-based solutions to meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date and that there continues to be a Reliability Need; (ii) the ISO selects an alternative regulated transmission solution as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to meet the identified Reliability Need; (iii) the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution is earlier than the Trigger Date for the selected alternative regulated transmission solution; and (iv) the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution has or will occur within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG, the ISO shall trigger both the selected alternative regulated transmission solution

and the regulated backstop solution at the Trigger Date for the regulated backstop solution. The ISO will inform the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Reliability Transmission Project(s) or Responsible Transmission Owner that proposed the regulated backstop solution containing non-transmission components, as applicable, and the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Reliability Transmission Project(s) that they should submit the proposed projects to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) to begin the necessary approval process to site, construct, and operate the projects. In response to the ISO's request, the Designated Entity(ies) and/or the Responsible Transmission Owner shall make such a submission to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies).

31.2.8.1.5 The ISO may make its determination regarding the triggering of a regulated solution pursuant to Sections 31.2.8.1.1 through 31.2.8.1.4 in the CRP or at any time before the approval of the next CRP.

31.2.8.1.6 A Designated Entity(ies) must enter into a Development Agreement with the ISO for its Designated Reliability Transmission Project, which project may include all or a portion of: (i) a regulated transmission solution selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to the Reliability Need, (ii) a regulated backstop transmission solution triggered by the NYISO pursuant to Sections 31.2.8.1.2, 31.2.8.1.3, or 31.2.8.1.4, or (iii) a selected alternative regulated transmission solution for which the Responsible Transmission Owner has agreed to become the Designated Entity to complete pursuant to Section 31.2.10.1.4. The ISO shall tender the Designated Entity(ies) a

draft Development Agreement with draft appendices as soon as reasonably practicable considering the project's Trigger Date following, as applicable: (i) the ISO's selection of the proposed regulated transmission solution, (ii) the ISO's triggering of a regulated backstop transmission solution pursuant to Sections 31.2.8.1.2, 31.2.8.1.3, or 31.2.8.1.4, or (iii) the Responsible Transmission Owner's agreement to complete an alternative regulated transmission solution pursuant to Section 31.2.10.1.4. The draft will be completed by the ISO to the extent practicable for review and completion by the Developer. The draft Development Agreement shall be in the form of the ISO's Commission-approved Development Agreement, which is in Appendix C in Section 31.7 of this Attachment Y. Each Designated Entity will receive a separate Development Agreement for its Designated Reliability Transmission Project. Each Designated Entity shall coordinate with any other Designated Entity for a Designated Reliability Transmission Project(s) that is a portion of the regulated transmission solution, to the extent feasible. The ISO and each Designated Entity shall finalize the Development Agreement and appendices and negotiate concerning any disputed provisions. For purposes of finalizing the Development Agreement, the ISO and Designated Entity shall develop the description and dates for the milestones necessary to develop and construct the selected project by the required in-service date identified in the CRP or updated CRP, as applicable, including the milestones for obtaining all necessary authorizations. Any milestone that requires action by another Designated Entity or a Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected System Operator identified pursuant to Attachment P of the ISO OATT

to complete must be included as an Advisory Milestone, as that term is defined in the Development Agreement.

Unless otherwise agreed by the ISO and the Designated Entity, the Designated Entity must execute the Development Agreement within three (3) months of the ISO's tendering of the draft Development Agreement; *provided, however*, if, during the negotiation period, the ISO or the Designated Entity determines that negotiations are at an impasse, the ISO may file the Development Agreement in unexecuted form with the Commission on its own or following the Designated Entity's request in writing that the agreement be filed unexecuted. If the Development Agreement resulting from the negotiation between the ISO and the Designated Entity does not conform with the Commission-approved standard form in Appendix C in Section 31.7 of this Attachment Y, the ISO shall file the agreement with the Commission for its acceptance within thirty (30) Business Days after the execution of the Development Agreement by both parties. If the Designated Entity requests that the Development Agreement be filed unexecuted, the ISO shall file the agreement at the Commission within thirty (30) Business Days of receipt of the request from the Designated Entity. The ISO will draft to the extent practicable the portions of the Development Agreement and appendices that are in dispute and will provide an explanation to the Commission of any matters as to which the parties disagree. The Designated Entity will provide in a separate filing any comments that it has on the unexecuted agreement, including any alternative positions it may have with respect to the disputed provisions.

31.2.8.1.7 Upon the ISO's and Designated Entity's execution of the Development Agreement or the ISO's filing of an unexecuted Development Agreement with the Commission pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6, the ISO and Designated Entity shall perform their respective obligations in accordance with the terms of the Development Agreement that are not in dispute, subject to modifications by the Commission.

31.2.8.1.8 Other Developers and Transmission Owners proposing alternative regulated solutions that ~~consistent~~consist of non-transmission elements and that the ISO has determined are viable and sufficient and will resolve the identified Reliability Need may submit these proposals to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) for review. The ISO does not determine the solution that will be permitted by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) with jurisdiction over siting or whether the regulated backstop solution or an alternative regulated solution will be constructed to address the identified Reliability Need. If the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) makes a final determination that an alternative regulated solution should be permitted and constructed to satisfy a Reliability Need and that the regulated backstop solution should not proceed, implementation of the alternative regulated solution will be the responsibility of the Transmission Owner or Other Developer that proposed the alternative regulated solution, and the Responsible Transmission Owner will not be responsible for addressing the Reliability Need through the implementation of its regulated backstop solution. Should a regulated

solution not be implemented, the ISO may request a Gap Solution pursuant to Section 31.2.11 of this Attachment Y.

### **31.2.8.2 Halting and Related Cost Recovery Requirements**

31.2.8.2.1 If the ISO has triggered a regulated backstop solution under Sections 31.2.8.1.2, 31.2.8.1.3, 31.2.8.1.4, or 31.2.8.1.5, the ISO will immediately notify the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Backstop Transmission Project(s) or the Responsible Transmission Owner of the regulated backstop solution containing non-transmission components, as applicable; post such notice on its website; and will state in the next CRP if it determines that the regulated backstop solution is no longer needed and should be halted because either: (i) the ISO has determined that there are sufficient market-based solutions to ensure that the identified Reliability Need is met by the need date or that there is no longer a Reliability Need, or (ii) the ISO: (A) has triggered an alternative regulated transmission solution that the ISO selected in the CRP as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution and (B) has determined that it is no longer necessary for the regulated backstop solution to proceed in parallel with the selected alternative regulated transmission solution to ensure the identified Reliability Need is satisfied by the need date. In making its determination under Section 31.2.8.2.1(ii), the ISO will review the status of the development by the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Alternative Transmission Project(s), including, but not limited to, reviewing: (i) whether the Designated Entity(ies) has executed a Development Agreement or requested that it be filed unexecuted with the Commission for the Designated Alternative Transmission Project(s) pursuant

to Section 31.2.8.1.6; (ii) whether the Designated Entity(ies) is timely progressing against the milestones set forth in the Development Agreement; and (iii) the status of the Designated Entity(ies)'s obtaining required permits or authorizations, including whether the Designated Entity(ies) has received its Article VII or Article VIII certification or other applicable siting permits or authorizations under New York State law.

If a regulated backstop solution is halted by the ISO, all of the costs incurred and commitments made by the Designated Entity(ies) or Responsible Transmission Owner for the regulated backstop solution up to that point, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, to the extent permitted by the Commission in accordance with its regulations, will be recoverable by the Designated Entity(ies) or Responsible Transmission Owner under the cost recovery mechanism in Rate Schedule 10 of this tariff regardless of the nature of the solution.

31.2.8.2.2 If the ISO has triggered an alternative regulated transmission project under Sections 31.2.8.1.3 or 31.2.8.1.4 that the ISO has selected as the more efficient or cost effective solution, the ISO will immediately notify the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Alternative Transmission Project(s); post such notice on its website; and state in the next CRP if it determines that the alternative regulated transmission solution is no longer needed and should be halted because the ISO has determined that there are sufficient market-based solutions to ensure that the identified Reliability Need is met by the need date or that there is no longer a Reliability Need.

If a selected alternative regulated transmission solution is halted by the ISO, all of the costs incurred and commitments made by the Designated Entity(ies) up to that point, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, to the extent permitted by the Commission in accordance with its regulations, will be recoverable by the Designated Entity(ies) under the cost recovery mechanism in Rate Schedule 10 of ISO OATT.

31.2.8.2.3 Once the Designated Entity(ies) or Responsible Transmission Owner receives state regulatory approval of its Designated Backstop Transmission Project(s) or the regulated backstop solution containing non-transmission components, respectively, or, if state regulatory approval is not required, once the Designated Entity(ies) or Responsible Transmission Owner receives necessary regulatory approval, the entry of a market-based solution or a Designated Alternative Transmission Project will not result in the halting by the ISO of the regulated backstop solution pursuant to Section 31.2.8.2.1. Similarly, once the Designated Entity(ies) of Designated Alternative Transmission Project(s) receives its state regulatory approval or any other necessary regulatory approval of its Designated Alternative Transmission Project that is, or a part of, the triggered alternative regulated transmission solution, the entry of a market-based solution will not result in the halting by the ISO of the Designated Alternative Transmission Project(s) pursuant to Section 31.2.8.2.2.

31.2.8.2.4 The ISO is not required to review market-based solutions to determine whether they will meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date after the

triggered alternative regulated transmission solution or regulated backstop solution has received federal and state regulatory approval, unless a federal or state regulatory agency requests the ISO to conduct such a review. The ISO will report the results of its review to the federal or state regulatory agency, with copies to the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner.

31.2.8.2.5 If the appropriate federal, state or local agency(ies) does not approve a necessary authorization for the triggered regulated backstop solution or alternative regulated transmission solution, all of the necessary and reasonable costs incurred and commitments made up to the final federal, state or local regulatory decision, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, to the extent permitted by the Commission in accordance with its regulations, will be recoverable by the Designated Entity or Responsible Transmission Owner, as applicable, under the ISO cost recovery mechanism in Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT regardless of the nature of the solution.

31.2.8.2.6 If a necessary federal, state or local authorization for a triggered alternative regulated transmission solution or regulated backstop solution is withdrawn, all expenditures and commitments made up to that point including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, to the extent permitted by the Commission in accordance with its regulations, will be recoverable under the ISO cost recovery mechanism in Rate

Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT by the Designated Entity or Responsible Transmission Owner, as applicable, regardless of the nature of the solution.

31.2.8.2.7 If a material modification to a Designated Reliability Transmission Project is proposed by any federal, state or local agency, the Designated Entity shall address any proposed modification in accordance with the requirements of the Development Agreement entered into pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6 of the ISO OATT. If a material modification to a regulated solution containing non-transmission components is proposed by any federal, state or local agency, the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner will request the ISO to conduct a supplemental reliability review. If the ISO identifies any reliability deficiency in the modified solution, the ISO will so advise the Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner and/or the appropriate federal, state or local regulatory agency(ies).

### **31.2.8.3 Criteria for Cutoff Date of Market-Based Solution**

31.2.8.3.1 The ISO will apply the criteria in this Section 31.2.8.3 for determining the cutoff date for a determination that a market-based solution will not be available to meet a Reliability Need by the need date.

31.2.8.3.2 In the first instance, the ISO shall employ its procedures for monitoring the viability of a market-based solution to determine when it may no longer be viable. Under the conditions where a market-based solution is proceeding after the Trigger Date for the relevant regulated solution, it becomes even more critical for the ISO to conduct a continued analysis of the viability of such market-based solutions.

31.2.8.3.3 The Developer of such a market-based solution shall submit updated information to the ISO twice during each Reliability Planning Process cycle, first during the input phase of the RNA, and again during the solutions phase during the period allowed for the solicitation for market-based and regulated solutions. If no solutions are requested in a particular year, then the second update will be provided during the ISO's analysis of whether existing solutions continue to meet identified Reliability Needs. The updated information of the project status shall include: status of final permits, status of major equipment, current status of construction schedule, estimated in-service date, any potential impediments to completion by the Target Year, and any other information requested by the ISO.

31.2.8.3.4 The Developer shall immediately report to the ISO when it has any indication of a material change in the project status or that the project in-service date may slip beyond the Target Year. A material change shall include, but not be limited to, a change in the financial viability of the Developer, a change in siting status, or a change in a major element of the project development.

31.2.8.3.5 Based upon the above information, the ISO will perform an independent review of the development status of the market-based solution to determine whether it remains viable to meet the identified Reliability Need by the need date. If the ISO, at any time, learns of a material change in the project status of a market-based solution, it may, at that time, make a determination as to the continued viability of such project.

31.2.8.3.6 The ISO, prior to making a determination about the viability of a specific proposed solution, will communicate its intended determination to the project

Developer along with the basis for its intended determination. The ISO shall provide the Developer a reasonable period (not more than 2 weeks) to respond to the ISO's intended determination, including an opportunity to provide additional information to the ISO to support the continued viability of the proposed solution.

31.2.8.3.7 If the ISO determines that a market-based solution that is needed to meet an identified Reliability Need is no longer viable, it will request that a regulated solution proceed or seek other measures including, but not limited to, a Gap Solution, to ensure the reliability of the system.

31.2.8.3.8 If the ISO determines that the market-based solution is still viable, but that its in-service date is likely to slip beyond the Target Year, the ISO may, if needed, request the Responsible Transmission Owner to prepare a Gap Solution in accordance with the provisions of Section 31.2.11 of this Attachment Y.

### **31.2.9 Process for Consideration of Regulated Backstop Solution and Alternative Regulated Solutions**

Upon a determination by the ISO under Section 31.2.8 that a regulated solution should proceed, the Designated Entity(ies) or Responsible Transmission Owner, as applicable, will make a presentation to the ESPWG that will provide a description of the regulated solution. The presentation will include a non-binding preliminary cost estimate of that regulated solution; provided, however, that the Designated Entity of a Designated Reliability Transmission Project or the Responsible Transmission Owner of a regulated backstop solution containing non-transmission components shall be entitled to full recovery of all reasonably incurred costs as described in Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT. The ISO and stakeholders through this process will have the opportunity to review and discuss the scope of the projects and their associated non-binding preliminary cost estimates prior to implementation.

### **31.2.10 Process for Addressing Inability to Complete Triggered Regulated Solution**

31.2.10.1 The ISO may take the actions described in Sections 31.2.10.1.1 through 31.2.10.1.4 as soon as practicable if: (i) a Designated Entity of a Designated Reliability Transmission Project is required to enter into a Development Agreement pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6, and (ii) one of the following events occur: (A) the Designated Entity responsible for the Designated Reliability Transmission Project does not execute the Development Agreement, or does not request that it be filed unexecuted with the Commission, within the timeframes set forth in Section 31.2.8.1.6, or (B) the ISO determines that an effective Development Agreement may be terminated or terminates the Development Agreement under the terms of the agreement prior to the completion of the term of the agreement.

31.2.10.1.1 If the Development Agreement has been filed with and accepted by the Commission and is terminated under the terms of the agreement, the ISO shall, upon terminating the Development Agreement, file a notice of termination with the Commission.

31.2.10.1.2 The ISO may revoke its inclusion of the Designated Reliability Transmission Project in the CRP and the eligibility of the Designated Entity to recover its costs pursuant to the ISO's regional cost allocation mechanism; *provided, however*, the Designated Entity may recover its costs to the extent provided in Sections 31.2.8.1.1, 31.2.8.2.1, 31.2.8.2.2, 31.2.8.2.5, and 31.2.8.2.6 or as otherwise determined by the Commission.

31.2.10.1.3 The ISO may take one or more of the following actions to address the Reliability Need based on the particular circumstances: (i) address the Reliability Need in the CRP for the next planning cycle; (ii) address the Reliability Need in the next Short-Term Reliability Process; (iii) direct the Designated Entity(ies) to continue with the development of its Designated Reliability Transmission Project for completion beyond the in-service date required to address the Reliability Need; (iv) direct the Designated Entity(ies) or Responsible Transmission Owner to proceed with the regulated backstop solution if it has not yet been halted by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.2.8.2.1; (v) offer the Transmission Owner or Other Developer that originally submitted the selected alternative regulated transmission solution the opportunity to be the Designated Entity of a Designated Alternative Transmission Project in accordance with Section 31.2.10.2; (vi) request that the Responsible Transmission Owner complete a Designated Alternative Transmission Project; (vii) commence the Gap Solution process under Section 31.2.11; and/or (viii) adopt new ISO or Transmission Owner operating procedures. If a Transmission Owner or Other Developer is alternatively designated to complete a Designated Reliability Transmission Project or a Responsible Transmission Owner agrees to complete a Designated Alternative Reliability Project, it shall enter into a Development Agreement, or amend an existing Development Agreement related to fulfillment of the same Reliability Need, with the ISO in accordance with Sections 31.2.8.1.6 and 31.2.8.1.7.

31.2.10.1.4 If the Responsible Transmission Owner agrees to complete a Designated Alternative Transmission Project, the Responsible Transmission Owner shall

become the Designated Entity, and the Responsible Transmission Owner and the entity that was responsible for that Designated Alternative Transmission Project shall work cooperatively with each other to implement the transition, including negotiating in good faith with each other to transfer the project; *provided, however,* that the transfer is subject to: (i) any required approvals by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies), (ii) any requirements or restrictions on the transfer of the Designated Entity's rights-of-way under federal or state law, regulation, or contract (including mortgage trust indentures or debt instruments), and (iii), if the Designated Entity is a New York public authority, any requirements or restrictions on the transfer under the New York Public Authorities Law; *provided, further,* that the Responsible Transmission Owner and the Designated Entity will address any disputes regarding the transfer of the project in accordance with the dispute resolution provisions in Article 11 of the ISO Services Tariff.

31.2.10.2 If the ISO determines in accordance with Section 31.2.10.1.3 that an alternative Developer should be designated to complete a Designated Reliability Transmission Project that was initially designated to the owner of the impacted transmission facility, the ISO shall first offer the Transmission Owner or Other Developer that originally proposed the regulated transmission solution the opportunity to be the Designated Entity of that Designated Reliability Transmission Project to finance and complete the development and construction of the project to bring it into service. The alternative Designated Entity shall have 30 Calendar Days from the ISO tendering its offer to accept the Designated

Reliability Transmission Project. Thereupon, the alternative Designated Entity must enter into a Development Agreement, or amend an existing Development Agreement related to fulfillment of the same Reliability Need, with the ISO in accordance with the requirements in Section 31.2.8.1.6. The alternative Designated Entity will be eligible for cost allocation and cost recovery under the ISO OATT for its development and construction of the Designated Reliability Transmission Project. The alternative Designated Entity and the original Designated Entity of the transferred Designated Reliability Transmission Project shall work cooperatively with each other to implement the transition, including negotiating in good faith with each other to transfer the project; *provided, however,* that the transfer is subject to: (i) any required approvals by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies), (ii) any requirements or restrictions on the transfer of rights-of-way under federal or state law, regulation, or contract (including mortgage trust indentures or debt instruments), and (iii) if the original Designated Entity of the Designated Reliability Transmission Project is a New York public authority, any requirements or restrictions on the transfer under the New York Public Authorities Law; *provided, further,* that the alternative Designated Entity and the original Designated Entity of the Designated Reliability Transmission Project may address any disputes regarding such transfer of the project using dispute resolution procedures that are the same as those available to Transmission Customers under Section 11 of the ISO Market Administration and Control Area Services Tariff.

31.2.10.3 If (i) another Designated Entity defaulted on the development of a separate Designated Reliability Transmission Project that is a component of the same regulated transmission solution to address a Reliability Need and (ii) the ISO determined to (a) address the Reliability Need in the next planning cycle for the CRP, (b) address the Reliability Need in the next Short-Term Reliability Process, (c) commence the Gap Solution process under Section 31.2.11, or (d) adopt new ISO or Transmission Owner operating procedures to address the Reliability Need pursuant to Section 31.2.10.1.3 of the ISO OATT, the ISO may elect to terminate the Development Agreement for a Designated Entity's Designated Reliability Transmission Project and Designated Network Upgrade Facilities identified for the interconnection of such Designated Reliability Transmission Project in accordance with Attachment P (as applicable) and halt the development of the Designated Reliability Transmission Project and associated Designated Network Upgrade Facilities (as applicable).

31.2.10.4 If: (i) the Responsible Transmission Owner's non-transmission or partial transmission regulated backstop solution has been triggered by the ISO under Sections 31.2.8.1.2, 31.2.8.1.3, or 31.2.8.1.4, and the regulated backstop solution has not been halted by the ISO under Section 31.2.8.2.1, and (ii) the ISO determines that the Responsible Transmission Owner: (A) has not submitted its proposed regulated backstop solution for necessary regulatory action within a reasonable period of time, (B) is unable to or fails to obtain the approvals or property rights necessary to construct the project, or (C) is otherwise not taking the actions necessary to construct the project to satisfy the Reliability Need by the

need date, the ISO shall: (i) submit a report to the Commission for its consideration and determination of whether action is appropriate under federal law and (ii) take such action as it reasonably considers is appropriate to ensure that the Reliability Need is satisfied by the need date.

### **31.2.11 Gap Solutions**

31.2.11.1 If the ISO determines that neither market-based proposals nor regulated proposals can satisfy the Reliability Needs by the need date, the ISO will set forth its determination that a Gap Solution is necessary in the CRP. The ISO will also request the Responsible Transmission Owner to seek a Gap Solution. Gap Solutions may include generation, transmission, or demand side resources.

31.2.11.2 If there is an imminent threat to the reliability of the New York State Power System, the ISO Board, after consultation with the NYDPS, may request the appropriate Transmission Owner or Transmission Owners to propose a Gap Solution outside of the normal planning cycle.

31.2.11.3 Notwithstanding Sections 31.2.11.1 and 31.2.11.2, if a Market Participant notifies the ISO of its intent for its Generator to be Retired or to enter into a Mothball Outage pursuant to Section 38.3.1 of Attachment FF of the ISO OATT or if a Market Participant's Generator enters into an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage pursuant to Section 5.18.2.1 of the ISO Services Tariff, the ISO will evaluate whether a Short-Term Reliability Process Need or an immediate reliability need will result from the Generator's deactivation and will address any resulting Short-Term Reliability Process Need or immediate reliability need in

accordance with the Short-Term Reliability Process set forth in Attachment FF of the ISO OATT.

31.2.11.4 Upon the ISO's determination of the need for a Gap Solution, pursuant to Sections 31.2.11.1 or 31.2.11.2 above, the Responsible Transmission Owner will propose such a solution as soon as reasonably possible, for consideration by the ISO and NYDPS. The Responsible Transmission Owner shall be eligible to recover its costs for developing its Gap Solution proposal and seeking necessary approvals pursuant to the cost recovery requirements in Section 31.5.6 of this Attachment Y and Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT.

31.2.11.5 Any party may submit an alternative Gap Solution proposal to the ISO and the NYDPS for their consideration. The ISO shall evaluate all Gap Solution proposals to determine whether they will meet the Reliability Need or imminent threat. The ISO will also evaluate, as an alternative Gap Solution proposal, any Generator in a Mothball Outage or an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage to determine whether its return to service would meet the Reliability Need or imminent threat; provided, however, that the Mothball Outage began on or after May 1, 2015 and the ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage followed a Forced Outage that began after May 1, 2015. The ISO will report the results of its evaluation to the party making the proposal, or to the Generator when evaluating its return to service, as well as to the NYDPS and/ or other appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) for consideration in their review of the proposals. The appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) with jurisdiction over the implementation or siting of Gap Solutions will determine

whether the Gap Solution or an alternative Gap Solution will be implemented to address the identified Reliability Need. When the return to service of a Generator in a Mothball Outage or an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage has been selected as either the Gap Solution or to resolve a reliability issue arising on a non-New York State Bulk Power Transmission Facility during its outage, the compensation and return to service procedures set forth in Section 5.18.4 of the Services Tariff shall apply.

31.2.11.6 A Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner may recover its costs with respect to a transmission Gap Solution that is implemented pursuant to Section 31.2.11.5 in accordance with the cost recovery requirements in Section 31.5.6 of this Attachment Y and Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT.

31.2.11.7 Gap Solution proposals submitted under Sections 31.2.11.4 and 31.2.11.5 shall be designed to be temporary solutions and to strive to be compatible with permanent market-based proposals.

31.2.11.8 A permanent regulated solution, if appropriate, may proceed in parallel with a Gap Solution.

### **31.2.12 Confidentiality of Solutions**

31.2.12.1 The ISO shall treat Confidential Information, as defined in this Section 31.2.12, that is submitted to the ISO by the Developer of a market-based solution, regulated backstop solution, or alternative regulated solution to a Reliability Need in accordance with the requirements for the treatment of Confidential Information in Section 12.4 of its Code of Conduct in Attachment F of the ISO OATT. The

ISO shall treat Critical Energy Infrastructure Information submitted to the ISO by the Developer of a proposed solution to a Reliability Need in accordance with ISO Procedures.

31.2.12.2 For purposes of this Section 31.2, except as provided in Sections 31.2.12.3 through 31.2.12.6, the ISO shall treat all types of solutions to Reliability Needs that are submitted to the ISO as a response to Reliability Needs identified in any RNA issued by the ISO as part of the Reliability Planning Process if the Developer of that solution designates such reliability solutions as confidential; *provided, however*, that the term “Confidential Information” shall at all times include the following non-public information submitted by a Developer and labeled as Confidential Information: (i) any part of its Developer qualification requirements pursuant to Section 31.2.4.1 or (ii) any part of its submission of the project information requirements for its market-based solution, regulated backstop solution, or alternative regulated solution to satisfy its project information requirements pursuant to Sections 31.2.4.4, 31.2.4.6, and 31.2.4.8 that includes: (a) preliminary project cost information; (b) all details of the Developer’s financing arrangements; (c) any non-public financial qualification information submitted; and (d) any contracts provided under Sections 31.2.4.4.2.3, 31.2.4.6, and 31.2.4.8.2.3. Notwithstanding the requirements in this Section 31.2.12 or the Developer’s designation of project information as “Confidential Information,” the ISO may publicly disclose information regarding the proposed facility that the ISO is required to disclose under its interconnection or transmission expansion

processes pursuant to Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments P, X, or HH of the ISO OATT.

31.2.12.3 For regulated transmission solutions submitted by the Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner, or Other Developer in response to the findings of the RNA, the ISO shall maintain the confidentiality of the proposed solution until the ISO has determined that (i) the regulated transmission solution is viable and sufficient to meet the Reliability Need(s) and (ii) that one or more regulated solution has a Trigger Date within 36 months of the ISO's presentation of the viability and sufficiency assessment, however, the ISO shall not disclose any Confidential Information, as defined in Section 31.2.10.1, that the Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner, or Other Developer has labeled as Confidential Information. Following submission of the required information pursuant to Section 31.2.4.4.2 and Section 31.2.4.8.2 of the ISO OATT and at least 30 Calendar Days prior to the ISO's posting of the initial facility characterization list pursuant to Section 31.2.6.5.2 of the ISO OATT, the ISO shall make available upon request the submission of (i) a description of the proposed transmission solution, including type, size, and geographic and electrical location, as well as planning and engineering specifications and drawings, and (ii) the Responsible Transmission Owner's, Transmission Owner's, or Other Developer's identification of any Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) included as part of its proposed transmission solution, subject to a requestor's compliance with the ISO's requirements concerning the disclosure of Critical Energy Infrastructure Information.

31.2.12.4 For a regulated backstop non-transmission solution or an alternative regulated non-transmission solution, the ISO shall maintain the confidentiality of such proposed solution until the ISO has determined, after consulting with the Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner, or Other Developer thereof, that the proposed solution would meet a Reliability Need identified in an RNA, whether the response is viable and sufficient to meet all or part of the Reliability Need, and the Developer consents to the ISO's inclusion of the proposed solution in the CRP or the Developer makes the information publicly available. Thereafter, the ISO shall disclose the regulated backstop non-transmission solution or an alternative regulated non-transmission solution response to the Market Participants and other interested parties; however, the ISO shall not disclose any Confidential Information, as defined in Section 31.2.12.2, that the Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner, or Other Developer has labeled as Confidential Information.

31.2.12.5 For a market-based response, the ISO shall maintain the confidentiality of the same during the Reliability Planning Process and in the CRP, except for the following information which may be disclosed by the ISO: (i) the type of resource proposed (e.g., generation, transmission, demand side); (ii) the size of the resource expressed in megawatts of equivalent load that would be served by that resource; (iii) the subzone in which the resource would interconnect or otherwise be located; and (iv) the proposed in-service date of the resource. The ISO shall not disclose any Confidential Information, as defined in Section

31.2.12.2, that the Developer of the market-based solution has labeled as Confidential Information.

31.2.12.6 In the event that the Developer of a market-based response has made a public announcement of its project or has submitted a proposal for interconnection with the ISO, the ISO shall disclose the identity of the market-based Developer and the specific project during the Reliability Planning Process and in the CRP.

### **31.2.13 Monitoring of Reliability Project Status**

31.2.13.1 The ISO will monitor and report on the status of market-based solutions to ensure their continued viability to meet Reliability Needs by the need date in the CRP. The ISO shall assess the continued viability of such projects using the following criteria:

31.2.13.1.1 Between three and five years before the Trigger Date for a regulated solution, the ISO will use a screening analysis to verify the feasibility of the proposed market-based solution (this analysis will not require final permit approvals or final contract documents).

31.2.13.1.2 Between one and two years before the Trigger Date for a regulated solution, the ISO will perform a more extensive review of the proposed market-based solution, including such elements as: status of the required interconnection studies, contract negotiations, permit applications, financing, and Site Control.

31.2.13.1.3 Less than one year before the Trigger Date of a regulated solution, the ISO will perform a detailed review of the market-based solution's status and schedule, including the status of: (1) final permits; (2) required interconnection studies; (3)

the status of an interconnection agreement; (4) financing; (5) equipment; and (6) the implementation of construction schedules.

31.2.13.1.4 If the ISO, following its analysis, determines that a proposed market-based solution is no longer viable to meet the Reliability Need, the proposed market-based solution will be removed from the list of potential market-based solutions.

31.2.13.2 The ISO will monitor and report on the status of regulated solutions to ensure their continued viability to meet Reliability Needs by the need date in the CRP. The ISO will undertake this monitoring and reporting in accordance with this Attachment Y, ISO Procedures, and the terms of the Development Agreement (if applicable) until the project has been completed and is in-service or has been halted in accordance with this Attachment Y or the terms of the Development Agreement (if applicable). Prior to the Trigger Date for the regulated solution, the ISO shall assess the continued viability of regulated solutions using the following criteria:

31.2.13.2.1 Between three and five years before the Trigger Date for the regulated solution, the ISO will use a screening analysis to verify the feasibility of the regulated solution.

31.2.13.2.2 Between one and two years before the Trigger Date for the regulated solution, the ISO will perform a more extensive review of the proposed regulated solution, including such elements as: the status of the required interconnection studies, contract negotiations, permit applications, financing, and Site Control.

31.2.13.2.3 Less than one year before the Trigger Date for the regulated solution, the ISO will perform a detailed review of the regulated solution's status, including the

status of: (1) final permits; (2) required interconnection studies; (3) the status of an interconnection agreement; (4) financing; (5) equipment; and (6) the implementation of construction schedules.

31.2.13.2.4 Prior to making a determination about the viability of a regulated solution, the ISO will communicate its intended determination to the project sponsor along with the basis for its intended determination, and will provide the sponsor a reasonable period (not more than two weeks) to respond to the ISO's intended determination, including an opportunity to provide additional information to the ISO to support the continued viability of the proposed regulated solution. If the ISO, following its analysis, determines that a proposed regulated solution is no longer viable to meet the Reliability Need, the proposed regulated solution will be removed from the list of potential regulated solutions.

## 38.1 Definitions

Whenever used in the **Short-Term Reliability Process** requirements in this Section 38 with initial capitalization, the following terms shall have the meaning specified in this Section

38.1. Terms used in this Section 38 with initial capitalization that are not defined in this Section 38.1 shall have the meanings specified in Section 31.1.1 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT or, if not defined therein, in Section 1 of the ISO OATT or Section 2 of the ISO Services Tariff.

**Developer:** A person or entity, including a Transmission Owner, sponsoring or proposing a solution to a Short-Term Reliability Process Need pursuant to this Attachment FF.

**Designated Entity:** A Developer or Transmission Owner that the ISO designates pursuant to Section 31.2.7, 31.3.2.4, or 31.4.11 of Attachment Y or Section 38.10.2.1.3 or 38.10.5 of Attachment FF as the person or entity to build, own, and recover the costs of a Designated Reliability Transmission Project, Designated Economic Transmission Project, Designated Public Policy Project, or Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, or a Transmission Owner that the ISO designates pursuant to Section 22.9.6 of Attachment P as the entity to build, own, and recover the costs of Designated Network Upgrade Facilities. For Public Policy Transmission Projects selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost effective solution to a Public Policy Transmission Need prior to the 2020-2021 cycle of the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process, the Designated Entity shall mean the Developer of the selected Public Policy Transmission Project.

**Designated Network Upgrade Facilities:** The Network Upgrade Facilities that are identified through the Transmission Interconnection Procedures for a Designated Reliability Transmission Project, Designated Economic Transmission Project, Designated Public Policy Project, or Designated Short-Term Transmission Project; that meet the definition of upgrade under Section 31.6.4 of Attachment Y; and that are designated to the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner pursuant to Section 22.9.6 of Attachment P.

**Designated Short-Term Transmission Project:** The regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution selected by the ISO to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, or a portion of such regulated transmission solution, that the ISO designates to a Designated Entity pursuant to Section 38.10.2.1.3 or Section 38.10.5 of Attachment FF.

**Generator Deactivation Assessment:** The ISO's analysis, in coordination with the Responsible Transmission Owner(s), of whether a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need will result from a Generator becoming Retired, entering into a Mothball Outage, or being unavailable due to an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage. Except when the ISO elects to assess the reliability impacts of a Generator's ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage outside the quarterly STAR, a Generator Deactivation Assessment will be a component of a STAR.

**Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date:** The date on which the ISO next commences a STAR after the ISO issues a written notice to a Market Participant pursuant to Section 38.3.1.4 indicating that the Generator Deactivation Notice for its Generator is complete. If a Market Participant's Generator enters into an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage pursuant to Section 5.18.2.1 of the ISO Services Tariff, then the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date is the date on which the ISO next commences a STAR; except (i) when the ISO determines that it should commence a stand alone Generator Deactivation Assessment based on the potential for an immediate reliability need to arise (*see* Section 38.3.4), or (ii) when the ISO is able to and elects to add a Generator that is in an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage to a STAR that has already begun. Under either exception [(i) or (ii)], the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date is the date on which the Generator entered an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage.

**Generator Deactivation Notice:** The form set forth in Section 38.24 (Appendix A) of this Attachment FF.

**Generator Deactivation Reliability Need:** A condition identified by the ISO in a STAR or a Generator Deactivation Assessment as a violation or potential violation of one or more Reliability Criteria and applicable local criteria. Violations and potential violations identified in a STAR are only Generator Deactivation Reliability Needs if the need can be resolved, in whole or in part, by the continued availability or operation of an Initiating Generator. A Generator Deactivation Reliability Need is a type of Short-Term Reliability Process Need.

**Generator Owner:** (a) the entity or entities that have executed an RMR Agreement and assumed ultimate responsibility for the operation of an RMR Generator and its participation in the ISO Administered Markets; (b) the entity or entities that have indicated their willingness to execute an RMR Agreement and assume ultimate responsibility for the operation of an RMR Generator and its participation in the ISO Administered Markets by submitting a filing to FERC proposing a rate for providing RMR service or seeking to recover the cost of Capital Expenditures; or (c) the entity or entities that possess ultimate responsibility for the operation of an Interim Service Provider and its participation in the ISO Administered Markets. The Generator Owner may be a Market Party and/or a Market Participant, may include one or more Market Parties and/or Market Participants, or may participate in the ISO Administered Markets by and through one or more Market Parties and/or Market Participants.

**Initiating Generator:** A Generator with a nameplate rating that exceeds 1 MW that submits a Generator Deactivation Notice for purposes of becoming Retired or entering into a Mothball Outage or that has entered into an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage pursuant to Section 5.18.2.1 of the ISO Services Tariff, which action is being evaluated by the ISO in accordance with its Short-Term Reliability Process requirements in this Section 38 of the ISO OATT.

**Interim Service Provider:** A Generator that must remain in service during the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date beyond the latest of (a) the 181<sup>st</sup> day after the ISO issues a written notice to a Market Participant pursuant to Section 38.3.1.4 indicating that the Generator Deactivation Notice for its Generator is complete, or (b) ten days after the posting of a STAR that assessed the Generator's deactivation, or (c) the Generator's requested deactivation date. A Generator that submitted a Generator Deactivation Notice to be Retired is an Interim Service Provider even if the ISO authorizes the Generator to be deactivated,

if the ISO or a Responsible Transmission Owner requires the step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment to remain in service during the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date beyond the latest of (a) the 181<sup>st</sup> day after the ISO issues a written notice to a Market Participant pursuant to Section 38.3.1.4 indicating that the Generator Deactivation Notice for its Generator is complete, or (b) ten days after the posting of a STAR that assessed the Generator's deactivation, or (c) the Generator's requested deactivation date, or (d) the date on which the generating unit(s) deactivate. Interim Service Providers are compensated in accordance with Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff.

**Market Party:** Any person or entity that is, or proposes or plans (including any participant therein,) a project that would be, a buyer or a seller in, or that makes bids or offers to buy or sell in, or that schedules or seeks to schedule Transactions with the ISO in or affecting any of the ISO Administered Markets, or any combination of the foregoing.

**Near-Term Reliability Need:** A Generator Deactivation Reliability Need that the ISO determines will arise within three years of the conclusion of the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date; or a Short-Term Reliability Process Need that is not a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need that the ISO determines will arise within three years of the posting of the STAR in which the need is identified.

**New York State Bulk Power Transmission Facilities ("BPTFs"):** Defined in Section 31.1.1 of the OATT.

**Reliability Need:** Defined in Section 31.1.1 of the OATT.

**Reliability Planning Process:** The term shall have the meaning set forth in Section 31.1.1 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT.

**Reliability Transmission Upgrade:** Any portion(s) of a regulated transmission solution submitted to address a Reliability Need or a Short-Term Reliability Process Need that satisfies the definition of upgrade in Section 31.6.4 of Attachment Y.

**Responsible Transmission Owner:** The Transmission Owner or Transmission Owners designated by the ISO pursuant to this Attachment FF: (i) to conduct the necessary reliability studies to review the impact of a Generator's proposed deactivation on the reliability of the non-BPTFs that are part of the New York State Transmission System, (ii) to prepare a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and, if required, a conceptual permanent solution to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, and (iii) to proceed with a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution if directed to do so by the ISO. The Responsible Transmission Owner will normally be the Transmission Owner in whose Transmission District the ISO identifies a Short-Term Reliability Process Need and/or that owns a transmission facility on which a Reliability Need arises.

**RMR Service Offer:** An offer submitted to the ISO by a Generator to provide RMR service.

**RMR Start Date:** The date an RMR Generator begins participating, offering, and operating in the ISO Administered Markets pursuant to the ISO Tariff rules that apply to RMR Generators and the terms of an RMR Agreement.

**Short-Term Assessment of Reliability (STAR):** The ISO's assessment, in coordination with the Responsible Transmission Owner(s), of whether a Short-Term Reliability Process Need will result from a Generator becoming Retired, entering into a Mothball Outage, a Generator being unavailable due to an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage, or from other changes to the availability of Resources or to the New York State Transmission System. The ISO performs STARs on a quarterly basis, commencing on the dates specified in ISO Procedures.

**Short-Term Reliability Process Need:** A Generator Deactivation Reliability Need or a condition identified by the ISO in a STAR as a violation or potential violation of one or more Reliability Criteria on the BPTF.

**Short-Term Reliability Process:** The process set forth in this Attachment FF by which the ISO evaluates and addresses the reliability impacts resulting from both: (i) Generator Deactivation Reliability Need(s), and/or (ii) other Reliability Needs on the BPTFs that are identified in a STAR.

**Short-Term Reliability Process Solution:** A solution to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, which may include (i) an Initiating Generator, (ii) a solution proposed pursuant to Section 38.4, or (iii) a Generator identified by the ISO pursuant to Section 38.5.

**Viable and Sufficient:** Term that describes a proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution that the ISO has determined in accordance with Section 38.6 to be viable and sufficient to satisfy the identified Short-Term Reliability Process Need individually or in conjunction with other solutions.

## **38.2 Scope of Short-Term Reliability Process**

The Short-Term Reliability Process includes within its scope the ISO's review of Generator deactivations to address any identified Generator Deactivation Reliability Needs and the ability for the ISO to address other Reliability Needs on the BPTF that are identified in a STAR. The STAR will use the most recent base case from the Reliability Planning Process, updated in accordance with ISO Procedures for the Reliability Planning Process, and the ISO will review key study assumptions with its stakeholders.

The Short-Term Reliability Process set forth in this Attachment FF establishes the process by which the ISO will address a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need that results from a Generator that has a nameplate rating that exceeds 1 MW becoming Retired, entering into a Mothball Outage, or being unavailable due to an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage. Pursuant to this process, the ISO will first determine through a STAR (or possibly a Generator Deactivation Assessment for Generators in an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage) whether a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need would result from a Generator's deactivation. If the STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment identifies a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need that arises three years or less after the conclusion of the 365 day prior notice period set forth in Section 38.3.1 below, then the ISO will solicit and evaluate market-based and regulated Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions to address the need, including, but not limited to, entering into an RMR Agreement with the Initiating Generator. Generator Deactivation Reliability Needs that arise more than three years after the conclusion of the 365 day prior notice period will only be addressed using this Short-Term Reliability Process if the identified needs cannot timely be addressed through the ISO's Reliability Planning Process. Rules addressing cost allocation for Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions are set forth in Section 38.22. Rules addressing cost

recovery for Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions are set forth in Section 38.23, Rate Schedules 14 and 16 to the ISO OATT, and Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff.

The Short-Term Reliability Process enables the ISO to perform STARs to assess reliability concerns that should not wait for the next Reliability Needs Assessment to be conducted, and to procure solutions to identified Short-Term Reliability Process Needs. In addition to evaluating the reliability impacts of Generator deactivations, the ISO can assess the reliability impacts of other changes to the availability of Resources and to the New York State Transmission System in a STAR. STARs are performed on a quarterly basis. Each STAR looks out five years from its start date. Each STAR will use the most recent base cases from the Reliability Planning Process (year 1 through year 5), updated in accordance with ISO Procedures for the Reliability Planning Process, and the ISO will review key study assumptions with its stakeholders.

Short-Term Reliability Process Needs that arise within three years of the later of (a) the conclusion of the 365 day prior notice period for Generator Deactivation Reliability Needs, or (b) the posting of a completed STAR for other Reliability Needs on the BPTF, will be addressed using this Short-Term Reliability Process. Short-Term Reliability Process Needs that arise more than three years after the later of (x) the conclusion of the 365 day prior notice period for Generator Deactivation Reliability Needs, or (y) the posting of a completed STAR for other Reliability Needs on the BPTF, will only be addressed using this Short-Term Reliability Process if an identified Reliability Need cannot timely be addressed through the ISO's Reliability Planning Process.

If the Market Participant that administers a Generator's participation in the ISO Administered Markets is a different entity than the entity that possesses the ultimate decision-

making authority concerning the deactivation, retirement and/or outage or repair of a Generator that has a nameplate rating that exceeds 1 MW, then (i) the entity with ultimate decision-making authority regarding the deactivation, retirement and/or outage or repair of the Generator must agree, as part of the registration of the Generator with the ISO for participation in the ISO Administered Markets, that it will be subject to and comply with the requirements of this Attachment FF, and (ii) the entity with ultimate decision-making authority regarding the deactivation, retirement and/or repair of the Generator shall, along with the Market Participant, be subject to all of the requirements in this Attachment FF that apply to a Market Participant, Market Party, Generator Owner or a Generator.

### **38.3 Generator Deactivation Requirements**

#### **38.3.1 Requirements for Initiating Generator Seeking to Be Retired or Enter into Mothball Outage**

- 38.3.1.1 A Market Participant must provide the ISO with a minimum of 365 days prior notice (such period beginning after its Generator Deactivation Notice has been determined to be complete by the ISO, as explained in Section 38.3.1.4 below) before its Generator that has a nameplate rating that exceeds 1 MW may be Retired or enter into a Mothball Outage; except for Generators reclassified as Retired pursuant to Sections 5.18.2.3.1 or 5.18.3.3.1 of the ISO Services Tariff, or as provided for an RMR Generator under an RMR Agreement.
- 38.3.1.2 The Market Participant shall provide this notice to the ISO by submitting a Generator Deactivation Notice in the form set forth in Appendix A to this Attachment FF, along with all information required by that form, the supporting certification from a duly authorized officer, and the information required for an Initiating Generator in accordance with Sections 38.25.2, and 38.25.5 through 38.25.7 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF.
- 38.3.1.3 The Market Participant must specify in the Generator Deactivation Notice its proposed date for its Generator that has a nameplate rating that exceeds 1 MW to be Retired or enter into a Mothball Outage.
- 38.3.1.4 The 365-day notice period applicable to a Generator proposing to be Retired or enter into a Mothball Outage will begin to run on the date the ISO commences the next STAR after it issues a written notice to the Market Participant indicating that the Generator Deactivation Notice, including the supporting information and certification, is complete. For purposes of this

Attachment FF, “complete” shall mean sufficiently complete for the ISO to begin its review of the reliability impacts that would result from a Generator being Retired or entering into a Mothball Outage under this Attachment FF, to review as required by Sections 38.7 and 38.8 the information provided in accordance with Appendix B of this Attachment FF, and to assess market impacts under Section 23 of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff.

38.3.1.5 Within ten (10) business days of receiving a Generator Deactivation Notice, the ISO shall review the notice form, along with the supporting information and affidavit submitted with it, and will inform the Market Participant whether its submission is complete or whether additional information is required. The Market Participant shall provide the ISO with any requested additional information, and the ISO will promptly review the information to determine whether the Market Participant’s notice is complete. Within ten (10) business days of the ISO receiving all additional information it requested, the ISO will inform the Market Participant whether its submission is complete, or whether further information is needed. Upon its determination that a submitted Generator Deactivation Notice is complete, the ISO will concurrently notify the Generator and post a notice on its website that the Generator Deactivation Notice has been determined to be complete, and the Generator’s deactivation will be included in the next STAR that the ISO commences.

38.3.1.6 If one of the two Generators in a CSR enters a Mothball Outage but the other CSR Generator continues operating, the remaining Generator may continue

to participate as a Generator in a CSR unless or until the Generator in the Mothball Outage becomes Retired.

### **38.3.2 Requirements for Initiating Generator that Has Entered into ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage and Generator Deactivation Assessment**

Within 20 days of a Market Participant's Generator that has a nameplate rating that exceeds 1 MW entering into an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage, the Market Participant shall submit the information required for an Initiating Generator in accordance with Sections 38.25.2 and 38.25.5 through 38.25.7 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF. It shall also provide the information required by Section 38.25.4 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF.

Distinct from the Initiating Generator's obligation to timely submit required information to the ISO that is set forth above, when a Generator that has a nameplate rating that exceeds 1 MW enters an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage the ISO shall determine whether it will (a) immediately commence a Generator Deactivation Assessment to review the deactivation of the Initiating Generator, or (b) if practicable, add the Initiating Generator to a STAR that is already in progress, or (c) include the Initiating Generator in the next STAR it commences. The ISO will make its determination based on the expected likelihood of identifying a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need, and the expected immediacy of any need that may arise. The ISO shall consult with the Responsible Transmission Owner(s) to the extent feasible before reaching its determination. The ISO will notify the Initiating Generator and post a notice on its website specifying whether it will immediately commence a Generator Deactivation Assessment to review the deactivation of the Initiating Generator, add the Initiating Generator to a STAR that is already in progress, or include the Initiating Generator in the next STAR it commences.

If one of the two Generators in a CSR enters an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage but the other CSR Generator continues operating, the remaining Generator may continue to participate

as a Generator in a CSR unless or until the Generator in the ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage becomes Retired.

### **38.3.3 Continuing Obligation for Market Participants and Market Parties to Respond to ISO Information Requests**

Following the submission of a complete Generator Deactivation Notice or the entry of its Generator into an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage, the Market Participant (which is also a Market Party) is subject to a continuing obligation to promptly submit any additional information requested by the ISO in connection with the ISO's evaluation under this Attachment FF or to assess market impacts under Section 23 of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff.

The Market Participant shall provide the ISO with any requested additional information, and the ISO will promptly review the information it receives to determine whether the information provided is sufficient to permit the ISO to perform its duties under this Attachment FF (including but not limited to the calculation of an Interim Service Provider rate and/or an Availability and Performance Rate), and to assess market impacts under Section 23 of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff. Within ten (10) business days of the ISO receiving all of the additional information it requested, the ISO will inform the Market Participant whether its submission is sufficient, or whether further information is needed.

### **38.3.4 Immediate Reliability Need**

The ISO may take immediate action to implement an interim solution to maintain reliability if the ISO determines that a Short-Term Reliability Process Need may not be timely addressed through the normal Short-Term Reliability Process. To maintain reliability in such circumstances, the ISO may abbreviate, as necessary, the time periods and requirements set forth in this Attachment FF and make any necessary filings with the Commission.

To address an immediate Short-Term Reliability Process Need the ISO may pay the demonstrated costs in excess of \$100,000 that a Market Party or Generator Owner incurs to repair or replace a damaged step-up transformer and/or other system protection equipment. Such costs may be recovered as Capital Expenditures in accordance with the requirements of Sections 38.17.3 and 38.17.4 of this Attachment FF to the ISO OATT even if the Generator is not eligible to be an Interim Service Provider because it is in an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage. If the cost of returning a damaged step-up transformer and/or other system protection equipment is not expected to exceed \$100,000, then the Generator Owner shall promptly return the step-up transformer and/or other system protection equipment designated by the ISO to service without additional recompense.

### **38.3.5 Performance of STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment**

38.3.5.1 The ISO performs STARs on a quarterly basis, commencing on the dates specified in ISO Procedures. Following the quarterly Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date, the ISO will perform, in coordination with the Responsible Transmission Owner(s) identified by the ISO, a Generator Deactivation Assessment concerning the Initiating Generator(s) that have complete Generator Deactivation Notices (*see* Section 38.3.1.4 above). Except when the ISO is assessing a potential immediate reliability need, one or more Generator Deactivation Assessment(s) will be performed together as components of a STAR. The ISO will conduct the necessary reliability studies to review the impact on the reliability of the BPTFs that would result from the Generator that has a nameplate rating that exceeds 1 MW being Retired, entering into a Mothball Outage, or being unavailable due to an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage. The

Responsible Transmission Owner(s) will conduct the necessary reliability studies to review the impact on the reliability of the non-BPTFs that are part of the New York State Transmission System, which studies the ISO will review and verify.

In addition to reviewing Generator deactivations, STARs will also (or alternatively) assess the potential BPTF reliability impacts of other changes to the availability of Resources or to the New York State Transmission System in accordance with ISO Procedures for the Reliability Planning Process. The ISO will conduct the necessary reliability studies to review the impact on the reliability of the BPTFs, which may include assistance from the Responsible Transmission Owner(s).

For the STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment, the ISO will use the most recent base case from the Reliability Planning Process, updated in accordance with ISO Procedures for the Reliability Planning Process. The study period for a stand-alone Generator Deactivation Assessment will be the four years following the conclusion of the 365-day notice period. The study period for a STAR will be the five years following the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date. For both types of assessments, the ISO will review key study assumptions with its stakeholders.

38.3.5.2 As part of the assessment, the ISO shall review whether any potential Short-Term Reliability Process Need can be addressed through the adoption of alternative ISO or Transmission Owner operating procedures or by updates to Local Transmission Owner Plans, other than an agreement with the Generator addressed in the Generator Deactivation Notice or a Generator already in a

Mothball Outage, an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage, or that has been mothballed since before May 1, 2015.

38.3.5.3 Within ninety days of the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date, the ISO shall concurrently notify the Initiating Generator(s) and post on its website the results of the STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment. The assessment will specify: (i) whether one or more Short-Term Reliability Process Need(s) would arise, and (ii) whether the retention of one or more Initiating Generator(s) would resolve, in whole or in part, one or more Short-Term Reliability Process Need(s), and (iii) whether the ISO has determined that any Short-Term Reliability Process Need can be timely addressed in the current or next planning cycle of the biennial Reliability Planning Process, or must be addressed using this Short-Term Reliability Process. The Short-Term Reliability Process will conclude if the STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment: (i) does not identify a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, or (ii) states that a Short-Term Reliability Process Need identified in the assessment will be addressed in the Reliability Planning Process. The STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment will also state whether a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need is only a reliability need on non-BPTFs for which solely the Responsible Transmission Owner may propose a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. Any Generator that the ISO determines is Viable and Sufficient may participate as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to part or all of a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, including a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need arising only on the non-BPTFs.

38.3.5.4 If a Short-Term Reliability Process Need is identified in a STAR that could be resolved by two or more Initiating Generators that each seek to deactivate prior to the conclusion of the 365 day notice period, then the ISO shall temporarily retain as Interim Service Providers the Initiating Generator(s) necessary to resolve the Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The ISO shall determine which Initiating Generators to retain as Interim Service Providers based on the date on which each Initiating Generator's Generator Deactivation Notice was determined to be complete by the ISO; retaining the necessary Generator(s) that completed their Generator Deactivation Notice last. However, the ISO shall not retain more Initiating Generators as Interim Service Providers than are necessary to resolve a Short-Term Reliability Process Need.

### **38.3.6 Near-Term Reliability Needs**

38.3.6.1 As part of the STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment, the ISO will determine whether any Short-Term Reliability Process Need identified in the assessment is a Near-Term Reliability Need. Any Generator that the ISO determines is Viable and Sufficient may participate as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to part or all of a Near-Term Reliability Need, including a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need arising only on non-BPTFs.

38.3.6.2 If the ISO determines that a Short-Term Reliability Process Need is a Near-Term Reliability Need, the ISO shall:

38.3.6.2.1 Include an explanation in the STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment of the Near-Term Reliability Need in sufficient detail, including the

reliability criteria violations and system conditions, to allow stakeholders to understand the need and why it is time sensitive.

38.3.6.2.2 Provide to stakeholders and post on its website a full and supported written explanation of the ISO's decision to solicit a regulated, non-generation Short-Term Reliability Process Solution solely from a Responsible Transmission Owner, including an explanation of the other transmission and non-transmission options that the ISO considered, but concluded would not sufficiently address the Near-Term Reliability Need, the circumstances that generated the need, and an explanation of why the need was not identified earlier.

38.3.6.2.3 Provide the appropriate stakeholder working group a reasonable opportunity to provide comments to the ISO on the written explanation and publicly post any written comments that the ISO receives on its web site.

38.3.6.3 The ISO shall maintain and post on its website a list of all transmission solutions selected by the ISO in prior years to be built in response to Near-Term Reliability Needs for which the ISO designated solely the Responsible Transmission Owner to propose a regulated Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. The list must include the Near-Term Reliability Need, the identity of the designated Responsible Transmission Owner, the transmission solution selected by the ISO, its in-service date, and the date on which the Responsible Transmission Owner energized or otherwise implemented the transmission solution. The ISO shall file the list with the Commission as an informational filing in January of each year covering the designations of the prior calendar year,

if the ISO selected a Responsible Transmission Owner's regulated transmission solution to a Near-Term Reliability Need in the prior year.

### **38.3.7 Deactivation Prior to the Expiration of the 365-Day Notice Period**

If: (i) the ISO determines in a STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment either that a Short-Term Reliability Process Need would not be resolved, in whole or in part, by the continued availability or operation of an Initiating Generator, or that the need can be timely addressed in the ISO's Reliability Planning Process, and (ii) the Market Participant indicated in the Generator Deactivation Notice an interest in deactivating its Generator earlier than the completion of the 365-day notice period, then the ISO will notify the Market Participant when its Generator has completed all required ISO administrative processes and procedures, and may be Retired or enter into a Mothball Outage, which deactivation date shall be no earlier than 91 days after the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date. The ISO's issuance of a final physical withholding determination shall occur in accordance with Section 23.4.5.6 of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff.

## **38.4 Solicitation of Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions to a Short-Term Reliability Process Need**

38.4.1 If the ISO determines in its STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment that a Short-Term Reliability Process Need should be addressed in the Short-Term Reliability Process, the ISO shall solicit Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions to address the need. The ISO shall issue one solicitation seeking solutions to all of the Short-Term Reliability Process Needs identified in a STAR. A Developer must submit a proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution within sixty (60) days of the ISO's request.

The solicitation process set forth in this Section 38.4 is not the process for offering a Market Participant's Generator that is in a Mothball Outage, an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage, or has been mothballed since before May 1, 2015 as a proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. Such Generator may be offered as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution by submitting a statement of intent to participate as a proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution in accordance with Section 38.5 and satisfying the other requirements of that Section.

### **38.4.2 In response to the ISO's solicitation of proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions:**

38.4.2.1 The Responsible Transmission Owner must submit a proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. The proposed solution must, to the extent practicable, completely address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need and satisfy the project information requirements in Sections 31.2.4.4.1 and 31.2.4.4.2 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT. The Responsible Transmission Owner's

proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution may include transmission, demand response, or generation resources; *provided, however*, only the ISO may enter into an RMR Agreement with a Generator to address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The Responsible Transmission Owner may only allocate and recover under the ISO OATT the costs of a regulated transmission solution in accordance with the requirements in Sections 38.22 and 38.23. If a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need is only a reliability need on non-BPTFs, then the Responsible Transmission Owner must submit a permanent Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. If the ISO determines, after considering input from the Responsible Transmission Owner, that the Responsible Transmission Owner's proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution is an interim solution, then the Responsible Transmission Owner must also submit a conceptual permanent solution to address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need.

38.4.2.2 Any Developer may submit a proposed market-based Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. A market-based Short-Term Reliability Process Solution may include generation, transmission, or demand response solutions and must satisfy the project information requirements in Section 31.2.4.6 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT. Market-based solutions are not eligible for cost recovery under Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff, or Rate Schedules 14 or 16 to the ISO OATT.

38.4.2.3 Any Developer may submit a proposed new Generator that requires an RMR Agreement to operate as a temporary Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. A proposed new Generator that requires an RMR Agreement must

satisfy the project information requirements in Sections 31.2.4.8.1 and 31.2.4.8.2 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT.

38.4.2.4 Any Developer that has been determined to be qualified under Section 31.2.4.1.1.2 of Attachment Y to the ISO OATT may submit a proposed regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, unless: (i) the Short-Term Reliability Process Need is a Near-Term Reliability Need, or (ii) the Generator Deactivation Reliability Need is only a reliability need on non-BPTFs as stated by the ISO in the STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment pursuant to Section 38.3.5.3. The proposed regulated transmission solution must satisfy the project information requirements in Sections 31.2.4.8.1 and 31.2.4.8.2 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT.

38.4.2.5 If a Short-Term Reliability Process Need is not a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need or a Near Term Reliability Need, and the ISO addresses the need in the Short-Term Reliability Process, then for purposes of Sections 38.4.2.1, 38.4.2.2, and 38.4.2.4 of this Attachment FF, an Interregional Transmission Project (as defined in Section 31.1.1 of the ISO OATT), may be proposed as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. Interregional Transmission Projects proposed as Short-term Reliability Process Solutions shall be: (i) evaluated by the ISO in accordance with the applicable requirements of this Attachment FF, and (ii) jointly evaluated by the ISO and the relevant adjacent transmission planning region(s) in accordance with Section 7.3 of the Interregional Planning Protocol (defined in Section 31.1.1 of the OATT).

38.4.3 As part of its submission of its proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, a Developer shall provide the information required for each proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution in accordance with Sections 38.25.3, and 38.25.5 through 38.25.7 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF. It shall also provide the information required by Section 38.25.4 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF.

38.4.4 Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions proposed under this Section 38.4 shall strive to be compatible with permanent market-based solutions and regulated solutions identified in the CSPP, as applicable. A permanent regulated solution may proceed in parallel with an interim solution selected in this Attachment FF.

38.4.5 The ISO may disclose to Market Participants and other interested parties the Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and plans proposed pursuant to this Section 38.4; *provided, however*, that the ISO will maintain as confidential the following information if designated as “Confidential Information”: (i) a Responsible Transmission Owner’s conceptual permanent solution, except for its proposed project type, general geographic location, and in-service date; (ii) the information required to be maintained as confidential for a market-based solution pursuant to Sections 31.2.12.5 and 31.2.12.6 of Attachment Y to the ISO OATT, and (iii) any non-public financial qualification information submitted in accordance with Section 31.2.4.1.1.1.3 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT.

Following submission of the required information pursuant to this Section 38.4 of this Attachment FF and prior to the ISO’s posting of the initial facility characterization list pursuant to Section 38.10.2.1.2 of this Attachment FF, the

ISO shall make available upon request the submission of (i) a description of a transmission solution (with the exception of a Responsible Transmission Owner's conceptual permanent solution), including type, size, and geographic and electrical location, as well as planning and engineering specifications and drawings, and (ii) the Responsible Transmission Owner's or Developer's identification of any Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) included as part of its proposed transmission solution, subject to a requestor's compliance with the ISO's requirements concerning the disclosure of Critical Energy Infrastructure Information.

#### **38.4.6 Application Fee and Study Deposit**

38.4.6.1 When the ISO performs a selection process among regulated transmission solutions, any Developer that proposes a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need shall submit to the ISO, at the same time it provides the project information required pursuant to Section 38.4.2, a non-refundable application fee of \$10,000 and a study deposit of \$100,000, which shall be applied to study costs and subject to refund as described in this Section 38.4.6.

38.4.6.2 If the ISO performs a selection process among regulated transmission solutions, the ISO shall charge, and a Developer proposing a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution shall pay, the actual costs of the ISO's evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution for purposes of the ISO's selection among transmission solutions to address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, including costs associated with the ISO's

use of subcontractors. The ISO will track its staff and administrative costs, including any costs associated with using subcontractors, that it incurs in performing the evaluation of a Developer's proposed transmission solution and any supplemental evaluation or re-evaluation of the proposed transmission solution. If the ISO or its subcontractors perform study work for multiple proposed transmission solutions on a combined basis, the ISO will allocate the costs of the combined study work equally among the applicable Developers.

38.4.6.3 The ISO shall invoice the Developer monthly for study costs incurred by the ISO in evaluating the Developer's proposed transmission solution as described above. Such invoice shall include a description and an accounting of the study costs incurred by the ISO and estimated subcontractor costs. The Developer shall pay the invoiced amount within thirty (30) calendar days of the ISO's issuance of the monthly invoice. The ISO shall continue to hold the full amount of the study deposit until settlement of the final monthly invoice; *provided, however*, if a Developer: (i) does not pay its monthly invoice within the timeframe described above, or (ii) does not pay a disputed amount into an independent escrow account as described below, the ISO may draw upon the study deposit to recover the owed amount. If the ISO must draw on the study deposit, the ISO shall provide notice to the Developer, and the Developer shall within thirty (30) calendar days of such notice make payments to the ISO to restore the full study deposit amount. If the Developer fails to make such payments, the ISO may halt its evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution and may disqualify the Developer's proposed transmission solution from further consideration. After the conclusion

of the ISO's evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution or if the Developer: (i) withdraws its proposed transmission solution or (ii) fails to pay an invoiced amount and the ISO halts its evaluation of the proposed transmission solution, the ISO shall issue a final invoice and refund to the Developer any portion of the Developer's study deposit submitted to the ISO under this Section 38.4.6 that exceeds outstanding amounts that the ISO has incurred in evaluating that Developer's proposed transmission solution, including interest on the refunded amount calculated in accordance with Section 35.19a(a)(2) of FERC's regulations. The ISO shall refund the remaining portion within sixty (60) days of the ISO's receipt of all final invoices from its subcontractors and involved Transmission Owners.

38.4.6.4 In the event of a Developer's dispute over invoiced amounts, the Developer shall: (i) timely pay any undisputed amounts to the ISO, and (ii) pay into an independent escrow account the portion of the invoice in dispute, pending resolution of such dispute. If the Developer fails to meet these two requirements, then the ISO shall not be obligated to perform or continue to perform its evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution. Disputes arising under this section shall be addressed through the Dispute Resolution Procedures set forth in Section 2.16 of the ISO OATT and Section 11 of the ISO Services Tariff. Within thirty (30) Calendar Days after resolution of the dispute, the Developer will pay the ISO any amounts due with interest calculated in accordance with Section 35.19a(a)(2) of FERC's regulations.

**38.4.7 Including Identified Short Term Reliability Process Solutions in Subsequent STARS and Generator Deactivation Assessments**

38.4.7.1 Short-Term Reliability Process Needs that have been identified in a STAR or a Generator Deactivation Assessment and that are in the process of being resolved shall continue to be included in subsequent STARS to identify possible changes in the scope, scale or nature of the need.

38.4.7.2 Solutions to Short-Term Reliability Process Needs will be included in subsequent STARS and Generator Deactivation Assessments when they satisfy the Reliability Planning Process base case development and inclusion rules set forth in ISO Procedures.

**38.4.8 Change in Scope, Scale or Nature of Short-Term Reliability Process Need After Solicitation Issued**

38.4.8.1 If the ISO determines that the scope, scale or nature of a Short-Term Reliability Process Need for which it has already solicited Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions in accordance with Sections 38.4 and 38.5 of this Attachment FF changed in a subsequent STAR, Generator Deactivation Assessment or Reliability Needs Assessment, then the ISO may:

- (a) select one or more of the proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution(s) that address the changed scope, scale or nature of the Short-Term Reliability Process Need that the ISO identified from the solutions that the ISO received in response to its solicitation; or
- (b) reject all of the proposals it received, withdraw the solicitation it issued, return all fees and deposits it received to Developers except for monies the ISO owes to third-party contractors for their assistance in

assessing a proposal or proposals, and issue a new solicitation in accordance with Sections 38.4 and 38.5 of this Attachment FF that reflects the updated Short-Term Reliability Process Need; or

(c) select one or more of the proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution(s) that partially address the changed scope, scale or nature of the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, and issue a new, additional solicitation covering only the unaddressed, incremental Short-Term Reliability Process Need that is not expected to be resolved by the Short-Term Reliability Process Solution(s) that the ISO has already selected.

### **38.5 Review and Notification of Generator(s) Currently in an Outage State**

If the ISO determines that a Market Participant's Generator that is in a Mothball Outage, an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage, or has been mothballed since before May 1, 2015, may be capable of satisfying in whole or in part a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, the ISO will notify the Market Participant that its Generator is under review to determine whether it can satisfy the Short-Term Reliability Process Need as a possible Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. Within ten (10) days of the ISO's issuance of a written notification (including an email), a Market Participant that is interested in offering its Generator as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to address the identified Reliability Need shall inform the ISO in writing whether it intends to offer its Generator as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. A Market Participant that submits a statement of intent to offer its Generator shall provide to the NYISO within twenty (20) days of submitting its statement of intent the information required for a Generator identified under this Section 38.5 in accordance with Sections 38.25.3.1, 38.25.3.2, and 38.25.5 through 38.25.7 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF if it has not previously provided such information to the ISO. If the Market Participant has previously provided such information for the relevant Generator, then it shall update all such information, including, but not limited to, the updates required by Section 38.25.4 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF.

Notwithstanding whether a Market Participant submitted a statement of intent to offer its Generator as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, the ISO may request at any time that a Market Participant submit the information required for a Generator identified under this Section 38.5 in accordance with Sections 38.25.3.1, 38.25.3.2, and 38.25.5 through 38.25.7 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF or any updates to previously submitted information addressing its Generator, which information must be submitted within twenty (20) days of the NYISO's request.

When the return to service of a Generator in a Mothball Outage or an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage is the Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, the return to service procedures set forth in Section 5.18.4 of the ISO Services Tariff shall apply.

**38.6 Viability and Sufficiency Evaluation of Proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions and Monitoring of Selected Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions**

38.6.1 The ISO shall evaluate all proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions and, if applicable, shall evaluate the conceptual permanent solution provided by the Responsible Transmission Owner pursuant to Section 38.4.2.1 to determine whether each is viable and sufficient to satisfy individually, or in conjunction with other solutions, the Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The ISO shall perform this viability and sufficiency evaluation consistent with the requirements set forth in Sections 31.2.5.3 and 31.2.5.4 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT. The ISO shall coordinate with the Responsible Transmission Owner(s), as necessary, in performing its evaluation.

38.6.2 If the ISO determines that there are adequate Viable and Sufficient market-based or demand response Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions to satisfy completely the identified Short-Term Reliability Process Need, the ISO will conclude the Short-Term Reliability Process under this Attachment FF. As part of its final Short-Term Reliability Process report, the ISO shall present the results of its viability and sufficiency assessment to interested parties if the Short-Term Reliability Process has been concluded because there are adequate market-based or demand response Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions to satisfy completely the Short-Term Reliability Process Need.

**38.6.3 Monitoring of Selected Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions**—the ISO will monitor the development of all Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions, including market-based and demand response solutions, to confirm that

they continue to develop consistent with the conditions, actions, or schedules for the projects in accordance with ISO Procedures.

## **38.7 ISO Review of Information**

38.7.1 **Cost, Revenue and System Impact Information.** The ISO shall review, verify and/or validate to the extent necessary the information provided in accordance with Sections 38.3, 38.4, and 38.5 and Appendix B of this Attachment FF. The ISO's review, verification and/or validation, as applicable, of the financing cost of each capital expense that the ISO determines is necessary in accordance with Good Utility Practice shall consider the market interest rate available to the Market Party or the Generator Owner (as appropriate).

38.7.2 The ISO may reject, and may require a Market Party or Generator Owner to re-submit, or substantiate information (including estimates) that the ISO determines is not adequately supported or otherwise verifiable. The Market Party or the Generator Owner shall promptly provide any additional information that the ISO may request, and update and revise information previously provided, and provide new information as set forth in Section 38.25.4 of Appendix B of this Attachment FF. Upon the ISO's prior notice, the Market Party or the Generator Owner shall make qualified representatives available to answer the ISO's question(s) and otherwise facilitate the ISO's review of the information. The NYISO may terminate its consideration of a proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution if a Market Party or Generator Owner fails to provide requested information.

38.7.3 **Market Power Information.** The Market Participant or the Generator Owner shall provide the ISO with any information that the ISO determines it requires in order to assess market impacts under Section 23 of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff. The primary focus of the NYISO's review will be

Sections 23.4.5.6 (physical withholding) and/or 23.6 (energy market participation rules) of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff.

38.7.4           **ISO Notification to Market Participant or Generator Owner.** The ISO shall notify the Market Participant or the Generator Owner, in writing, when the ISO has received all of the data and information it requires to perform its duties under both (a) this Attachment FF and (b) Section 23 of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff.

38.7.4.1           The notice that the ISO provides to a Market Participant (which is also a Market Party) or to the Generator Owner that it has received all of the data and information it requires to perform its obligations under this Attachment FF and under Section 23 of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff does not absolve the Market Party or the Generator Owner of its affirmative and continuing obligation under Section 38.25.4 of Appendix B to this Attachment FF to supplement and update information and data it has submitted to the ISO when a material change in facts or circumstances occurs that makes the previously submitted information insufficient or inaccurate.

38.7.4.2           The notice that the ISO provides to a Market Participant or Generator Owner that it has received all of the data and information it requires to perform its obligations under this Attachment FF and under Section 23 of Attachment H of the ISO Services Tariff does not bar the ISO from asking additional questions of the Market Participant or the Generator Owner, nor does it excuse the Market Participant or the Generator Owner from its continuing obligation to promptly

respond to ISO requests for information or data in accordance with Sections 38.3.3 and 38.7 of this Attachment FF.

## **38.8 Determining RMR Avoidable Costs**

38.8.1 Determinations pursuant to this section are solely for purposes of determining the RMR Avoidable Cost of Initiating Generators and Generators that are determined to be a Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to a Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The ISO shall determine the cost (net of estimated revenues, as applicable) of each Initiating Generator and of each Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to a Short-Term Reliability Process Need that responds to the ISO's request for Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions in accordance with Sections 38.4 and 38.5. The ISO may also determine the costs of Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions that do not respond to the ISO's request for Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions. The ISO's determination for a Generator shall be its "RMR Avoidable Costs." The ISO shall use the costs, revenues, and other information submitted in accordance with Sections 38.3, 38.4, 38.5, 38.7, 38.8 and Appendix B of this Attachment FF that it verifies and/or validates, as applicable. If the ISO cannot verify and/or validate, as applicable, a cost or revenue submitted by a Market Party or Generator Owner, the ISO shall substitute an estimated value. The ISO's cost determinations pursuant to this Section shall be for the shorter of (i) the duration of the Short-Term Reliability Process Need identified by the ISO in its request for Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions, and (ii) the period identified by the ISO that an Initiating Generator or Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution can satisfy the Short-Term Reliability Process Need.

- 38.8.1.1 Cost savings due to an Initiating Generator's continuation of service. Costs submitted in accordance with Sections 38.3, 38.4, 38.5, 38.7, 38.8, or Appendix B of this Attachment FF that arise out of an agreement that contains a cost, premium, or fee to terminate the agreement in whole or in part prior to the anticipated RMR Start Date, or commencement of service as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, shall be reduced by the cost, premium or fee that would have been incurred had the Generator ceased operations on a date identified in the Generator Deactivation Notice, or such other date associated with performing service as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution.
- 38.8.1.2 For each transmission project that is proposed in accordance with this Attachment FF, the ISO shall calculate the net costs that would be incurred to provide the service identified in the Developer's response to the ISO's request for Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions, considering any costs the Developer otherwise had a contractual or regulatory obligation to incur.
- 38.8.1.3 The ISO shall identify as "Capital Expenditures" the purchase or non-operational lease of, or modification to real property or assets (including, but not limited to, land, buildings, and equipment) that (a) are necessary to permit an Initiating Generator or Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to provide service to satisfy, in whole or in part, the Short-Term Reliability Process Need identified in the ISO's request for Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions, (b) have a useful life greater than one year, and (c) are not otherwise included in the ISO's calculation of RMR Avoidable Costs. The ISO shall also identify the reasonably anticipated date the Capital Expenditure will be

placed into service, or otherwise integrated into the Short-Term Reliability Process Solution.

38.8.1.4 Revenue Calculation. As a component to the ISO's calculation of the total net cost of each Initiating Generator and Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, the ISO shall calculate the estimated revenues thereof.

38.8.1.4.1 If an Initiating Generator or other Generator that has been determined to be a Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution has a contract pursuant to which it provides energy, capacity, or ancillary services, the ISO shall also, for the period of such contract, calculate the estimated revenues for the provision of energy, capacity or ancillary services thereunder.

38.8.2 The ISO shall seek comment from the Market Monitoring Unit on matters relating to the inputs and the calculations performed pursuant to Section 38.8. The responsibilities of the Market Monitoring Unit that are addressed in this Section are also addressed in Section 38.18.1 of this Attachment FF and in Section 30.4.6.8.6 of Attachment O to the ISO Services Tariff.

## **38.9 RMR Service Offers**

38.9.1 If: (i) there is only one Generator that is a Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, or (ii) there are multiple Generators that are a Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions to a Short-Term Reliability Process Need that are all owned or controlled by the same Generator Owner, then the ISO shall provide to that individual Generator or Generator Owner, as applicable, its RMR Avoidable Cost and an opportunity for it to enter into the Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement set forth in Appendix C of this Attachment FF to the ISO OATT. If there is more than one Generator that is a Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution for a Reliability Need and the Generators are not all owned or controlled by the same Generator Owner, the ISO shall notify each such Generator that responded to the ISO's request for Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions that it has been determined to be a Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solution that the ISO is requesting RMR Service Offers to provide service pursuant to an RMR Agreement.

38.9.2 The ISO shall concurrently post on its website that it has issued a request for RMR Service Offers.

38.9.3 The ISO's notice to each Generator of a request for RMR Service Offers shall include (a) the Generator's RMR Avoidable Costs determined pursuant to Section 38.8, and separately identify the Capital Expenditure amount that is included in the RMR Avoidable Costs and the reasonably anticipated date the Capital Expenditure will be placed into service, or otherwise integrated into the Generator, (b) the duration of the period for which the ISO determined the

Generator was viable and sufficient to meet (in whole or in part) the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, (c) the deadline by which offers must be received by the ISO, and (d) any other information that must be provided in the Generator's response in accordance with ISO Procedures.

38.9.4 Offers in response to a request for RMR Service Offers shall (A) state the price at which the Generator is willing to enter into an RMR Agreement with (i) an Availability and Performance Rate or (ii) an Owner Developed Rate for which the Generator would be seeking approval from the Commission, (B) separately state the anticipated timing and cost of each Capital Expenditure that is included in the offer, (C) if any provision of the Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement set forth in Appendix C of Attachment FF to the ISO OATT is incompatible with the Generator's ability to provide service absent a modification to a term or condition, provide a blackline marking any and all changes that are necessary to permit the Generator to provide RMR service, and explain why, absent such changes, the Generator would be unable to provide RMR service, (D) state the duration for which the Generator is being made available to provide the RMR service (which shall be no longer than the duration the ISO determined the Generator is a viable and sufficient solution,) and specify whether the offer would be the same for any shorter period of time, and (E) state whether the offer is for less than or equal to the generator's full cost of service. The offer must be executed by a duly authorized officer with authority to bind the Market Party or Generator Owner to an RMR Agreement. The ISO will not consider offers that indicate they are for an amount greater than the Generator's full cost of service.

The ISO shall exclude from consideration offers that are received after the deadline.

## **38.10 ISO Selection of Solution to Address Short-Term Reliability Process Need**

38.10.1 An Initiating Generator and other Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions are eligible for selection by the ISO to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need. In selecting a solution to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need the ISO will first consider the expected impact of any Viable and Sufficient market-based or demand response Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions it identifies on the scope of the need. Prior to the ISO making its selection pursuant to this Section 38.10, the ISO may enter into an RMR Agreement with one or more Generators, if necessary, to provide the ISO sufficient time to complete the selection process.

A Viable and Sufficient transmission solution selected by the ISO shall be eligible for cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22 and cost recovery in accordance with Section 38.23. An Initiating Generator or another Viable and Sufficient generation solution selected by the ISO shall be eligible to enter into an RMR Agreement with the ISO in accordance with Section 38.11.

38.10.1.1 If the ISO determines that there is a Viable and Sufficient permanent transmission solution that completely satisfies the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, the ISO may select that solution.

38.10.1.2 If the Generator Deactivation Reliability Need is only a reliability need on non-BPTFs, in addition to selecting any interim solution it determines is necessary, the ISO will select a Viable and Sufficient permanent transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution.

If a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need arises on non-BPTFs, it shall be resolved in the Short-Term Reliability Process. Other reliability needs that arise on non-BPTFs may be reported in a STAR for informational purposes.

38.10.1.3 If, following completion of the identification of solutions pursuant to Sections 38.10.1 and 38.10.1.1 or 38.10.1.2, there remains a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, then the ISO shall perform the selection process set forth in Sections 38.10.2 through 38.10.5.

### **38.10.2 Selection Process if a Viable and Sufficient Transmission Solution Is Available**

38.10.2.1 This solution selection process is designed to ensure that executing an RMR Agreement with a Generator is a last resort to addressing a Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The ISO will select a Viable and Sufficient transmission solution to address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need if: (i) there are one or more Viable and Sufficient transmission solutions, and (ii) none of the Viable and Sufficient generation solutions have a “distinctly higher net present value” than a transmission solution. If the ISO is selecting between and among Viable and Sufficient transmission solutions, the ISO will perform its selection based on the degree to which each transmission solution satisfies the metrics set forth in Section 38.10.4.

38.10.2.1.1 If a Short-Term Reliability Process Need is not a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need or a Near Term Reliability Need, and the ISO addresses the need in the Short-Term Reliability Process, then the ISO shall, in performing its evaluation of transmission solutions that are proposed as Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, do so consistent with the following tariff requirements from

Attachment Y of the ISO OATT: Sections 31.2.2.7 (Consequences for Other Regions), 31.2.6.3 (Evaluation of System Impact of Proposed Regulated Transmission Solution), and 31.2.6.4 (Evaluation of Regional Transmission Solutions to Address Local and Regional Reliability Needs More Efficiently or More Cost Effectively than Local Transmission Solutions).

When the ISO addresses a Short-Term Reliability Process Need that is not a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need or a Near Term Reliability Need in the Short-Term Reliability Process, interested parties may invoke the Dispute Resolution Procedure set forth in Section 11 of the ISO Services Tariff to resolve any disputes.

38.10.2.1.2 If the ISO is required to evaluate pursuant to this Attachment FF a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need or if a Responsible Transmission Owner submits a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to address a Near-Term Reliability Need, the ISO shall post on its website, at least 45 Calendar Days prior to its presentation to stakeholders of ~~a~~the initial draft Short-Term Reliability Process Report for their review and comment, a list of facilities (not including any potential interconnection facilities) that make up the proposed regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions that the ISO determined to be Viable and Sufficient. The list will identify which facilities are new transmission facilities and which facilities satisfy the definition of a Reliability Transmission Upgrade. For those facilities that satisfy the definition of a Reliability Transmission Upgrade, the list will also specify the Transmission

Owner that owns the existing transmission facility to be upgraded by an identified Reliability Transmission Upgrade, to the extent such information is available.

The ISO shall also post on its website a list of interconnection facilities identified in proposal submitted by a Developer in accordance with Sections 31.2.4.8 and 38.4.2 of the ISO OATT; however, this list of interconnection facilities shall be for informational purposes only and separate from the list of new transmission facilities and Reliability Transmission Upgrades. With the exception of the list of interconnection facilities, any interested party may dispute the ISO's determination to identify, or not identify, a facility as a Reliability Transmission Upgrade by providing the ISO with written notice within 20 Calendar Days of the ISO's posting of the list pursuant to this Section 38.10.2.1.2, which notice shall be posted on the ISO's website. The ISO and the disputing party(ies) should attempt to resolve such dispute(s) as provided in Section 31.1.8.4 of Attachment Y. The ISO shall include the final list pursuant to this Section 38.10.2.1.2 when it posts the final Short-Term Reliability Report.

38.10.2.1.3 When the ISO addresses a Short-Term Reliability Process Need that is not a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need or a Near Term Reliability Need in the Short-Term Reliability Process, and the ISO is selecting among proposed transmission solutions to address the need, the ISO shall prepare and present to stakeholders a draft Short-Term Reliability Process Report for review and comment. The draft report shall describe the transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution(s) the ISO proposes to select and explain the reasons supporting the ISO's proposed selection(s). The ISO shall review stakeholder comments on

the draft report prior to finalizing its selection of Short-Term Reliability Process Solution(s) in the final Short-Term Reliability Process Report it issues in accordance with Section 38.10.5 of this Attachment FF. The final Short-Term Reliability Process Report shall include a list preliminarily identifying the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project(s) that is, or is a part of, a selected regulated transmission solution and the Designated Entity responsible for each Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, which designations will be based on the criteria set forth in Section 31.2.7 of Attachment Y and finalized in accordance with Section 38.10.6 of this Attachment FF.

#### **38.10.2.2 Determining if a Solution has a “Distinctly” Higher Net Present Value**

A Short-Term Reliability Process Solution has a “distinctly” higher net present value if it is the Viable and Sufficient solution with the lowest reasonably calculated net cost to consumers to meet the identified Reliability Need until the permanent solution can be implemented. A generation solution has a “distinctly” higher net present value than a transmission solution if, after accounting for the accuracy range of each transmission project cost estimate and generation revenue estimate using the confidence interval the ISO selects, the ISO determines that the range of net present values of the generation solution is higher than the range of the net present values of the transmission solution. If there is an overlap between the ranges of net present values between a generation solution and a transmission solution, then the generation solution does not have a distinctly higher net present value than the transmission solution. If the ISO determines that a generation solution has a distinctly higher net present value than a transmission solution, then both solutions will be considered in accordance with Section 38.10.2.4 of this solution selection process.

The net present value of a generation solution is the present value of the difference between the generation solution's offered service cost and its expected market revenues for the expected duration of an RMR Agreement. The net present value of a transmission solution is the present value of the difference between the transmission solution's estimated costs and its expected market revenues (if any).

To account for the accuracy of cost estimates in comparing the net present values of Viable and Sufficient generation and transmission solutions, the NYISO will:

1. Undertake reasonable efforts to validate the information submitted in the time available; and
2. Determine an accuracy range for each solution's estimated, submitted and verified costs, including the assumptions used to develop the cost estimate based on (i) the age, operating status and technology type of each generation or transmission solution, (ii) the assumptions used to develop each cost estimate, and (iii) data from credible independent resources, including but not limited to consultants hired by the ISO.

### **38.10.2.3 Multi-Element Solutions**

If there are no Viable and Sufficient generation solutions that have a distinctly higher net present value than a Viable and Sufficient transmission solution, but the transmission solution or combination of transmission solutions selected by the ISO only partially satisfy the duration or the size of the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, then the ISO may supplement the partial transmission solution with one or more Viable and Sufficient generation solutions that will be eligible to enter into an RMR Agreement with the ISO. The ISO will select the supplemental Generator or Generators primarily based on which RMR Service Offer, or set of RMR Service

Offers from more than one Generator, results in the highest net present value solution to the Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The ISO shall also consider any blacklined modifications to the Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement set forth in Appendix C of this Attachment FF of the ISO OATT when selecting a generation solution. If these two criteria do not provide for a clear delineation between two or more RMR Service Offers, the ISO shall also consider the operational, performance, and market impacts and the size of the Generators when selecting the generation component of a multi-element solution.

Alternatively, the ISO may select a Viable and Sufficient generation solution in place of a multi-element solution that includes transmission if it determines that the generation solution has a distinctly higher net present value than the combination of partial transmission and generation solutions the ISO might otherwise select under this Section 38.10.2.3. The ISO shall choose between a multi-element solution that includes transmission and a generation solution that has a distinctly higher net present value than the multi-element solution using the selection criteria specified in Section 38.10.2.4.

38.10.2.4 Viable and Sufficient generation solutions that have a distinctly higher net present value than a Viable and Sufficient transmission solution will be considered when the ISO selects the solution or combination of solutions to address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need based on: (i) the net present value of each solution calculated in accordance with Section 38.8 and 38.9, and (ii) the degree to which each solution satisfies the metrics set forth in Section 38.10.4.

### **38.10.3 Selection Process if a Viable and Sufficient Transmission Solution Is Not Available**

If there is not a Viable and Sufficient transmission solution, the ISO will select among the Viable and Sufficient generation solutions as follows. The ISO will select the Generator or Generators primarily based on which RMR Service Offer, or set of RMR Service Offers from more than one Generator, results in the highest net present value solution to the Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The ISO shall also consider any blacklined modifications to the Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement set forth in Appendix C of this Attachment FF of the ISO OATT. If these two criteria do not provide for a clear delineation between two or more RMR Service Offers, the ISO shall also consider the operational, performance and market impacts, and the size of the Generators.

### **38.10.4 Metrics for Evaluating Solution to Address Short-Term Reliability Process Need**

The ISO will consider the following metrics in its evaluation of each Viable and Sufficient solution, as applicable:

38.10.4.1 The capital cost estimates for the proposed transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution or the cost information submitted by the Initiating Generator or the generation Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, including the accuracy of the proposed estimates.

38.10.4.2 The cost per MW ratio of the proposed transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution or the RMR Service Offers of the Initiating Generator or the generation Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. For this evaluation, the ISO will first determine the present worth, in dollars, of the total capital cost of the proposed solution in current year dollars. The ISO will then determine the

MW value of the solution by summing the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, in MW, with the additional improvement, in MW, that the proposed solution offers beyond serving the Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The ISO will then determine the cost per MW ratio by dividing the present worth of the total capital cost by the MW value.

38.10.4.3 The expandability of the proposed solution. The ISO will consider the impact of the proposed solution on future construction. The ISO will also consider the extent to which any subsequent expansion will continue to use this proposed solution within the context of system expansion.

38.10.4.4 The operability of the proposed solution. The ISO will consider how the proposed solution may affect additional flexibility in operating the system, such as dispatch of generation, access to operating reserves, access to ancillary services, or ability to remove transmission for maintenance. The ISO will also consider how the proposed solution may affect the cost of operating the system, such as how it may affect the need for operating generation out of merit for reliability needs, reducing the need to cycle generation, or providing more balance in the system to respond to system conditions that are more severe than design conditions.

38.10.4.5 The performance of the proposed solution. The ISO will consider how the proposed solution may affect the utilization of the system (e.g. interface flows, percent loading of facilities).

38.10.4.6 The extent to which the Developer of a proposed transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution or each generation Short-Term Reliability Process

Solution has the property rights, or ability to obtain the property rights, required to implement the solution. The ISO will consider, as applicable, whether the Developer or Market Participant: (i) already possesses property rights or the rights of way necessary to implement the solution; (ii) has completed a transmission routing study or Generator siting study, which (a) identifies, for transmission, a specific routing plan with alternatives, (b) includes a schedule indicating the timing for obtaining siting and permitting, and (c) provides specific attention to sensitive areas (*e.g.*, wetlands, river crossings, protected areas, and schools); or (iii) has specified a plan or approach for determining routing or siting and for acquiring property rights.

38.10.4.7 The potential issues associated with delay in constructing the proposed transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution or in entering or in returning to service the Initiating Generator or a generation Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, consistent with the major milestone schedule and the schedule for obtaining any permits and other certifications as required to timely meet the need.

38.10.4.8 The impact on other pending Short-Term Reliability Process Needs, other system reliability needs, and pending solutions to those needs.

### **38.10.5 Short-Term Reliability Process Report**

If the ISO selects a transmission solution proposed by a Responsible Transmission Owner in response to a Near-Term Reliability Need, then: (i) the ISO shall post on its website and present to stakeholders a preliminary written determination indicating its proposed selection of a solution or combination of solutions, along with a reasoned explanation regarding why the

particular generator and/or transmission solutions were selected; (ii) the ISO will provide stakeholders an opportunity to submit written comments, which will be posted on the ISO's website, and (iii) the ISO will consider stakeholder comments before making its final selection in the Short-Term Reliability Process Report. The final Short-Term Reliability Process Report shall include a list preliminarily identifying the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project(s) that is, or is a part of, a selected regulated transmission solution and the Designated Entity responsible for each Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, which designations will be based on the criteria set forth in Section 31.2.7 of Attachment Y and finalized in accordance with Section 38.10.6 of this Attachment FF.

Otherwise, the ISO shall post on its website a written determination indicating its selection of a solution or combination of solutions, along with a reasoned explanation regarding why particular generation and/or transmission solutions were selected. The ISO will review the results of its determination with stakeholders.

Finally, following the conclusion of the Transmission Owner notification period identified in Section 38.10.6, if applicable, the ISO shall post on its website a list of (i) all Developers that have undertaken a commitment to the ISO to build a project (which may be a regulated non-transmission or partial transmission backstop solution or market-based response) and/or (ii) all Designated Entities that are responsible for the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project(s) that make up a regulated transmission solution that was selected as a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution.

#### **38.10.6 Transmission Owner's Responsibility to Notify the ISO**

Within 30 Calendar Days following the posting of a list preliminarily identifying any Designated Short-Term Transmission Project(s) that is, or a part of, a selected regulated

transmission solution, and the Designated Entity responsible for each Designated Short-Term Transmission Project in accordance with Section 38.10.2.1.3 or 38.10.5, a Transmission Owner that has been identified as a Designated Entity for a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project shall provide notice to the ISO if the Transmission Owner does not intend to exercise its right under Section 31.6.4 of Attachment Y to build, own, and recover the cost of the Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) and serve as the Designated Entity for the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project identified for the Transmission Owner in the Short-Term Reliability Process Report. If the Transmission Owner notifies the ISO of its rejection to be the Designated Entity for one or more Reliability Transmission Upgrades identified for its Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, the Developer that proposed the regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution shall be the Designated Entity for such Reliability Transmission Upgrades, which shall be incorporated into that Developer's Designated Short-Term Transmission Project. If the Transmission Owner does not take action within the 30 Calendar Days with regard to one or more Reliability Transmission Upgrades identified for its Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, the Transmission Owner shall be the Designated Entity for such Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) and shall have the obligations of a Designated Entity set forth in the ISO OATT, ISO Procedures, and a Development Agreement entered into by the Designated Entity and the ISO in accordance with Section 38.12.3 of this Attachment FF for constructing and placing the Reliability Transmission Upgrade(s) in service to address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need.

## **38.11 Entry into RMR Agreements**

38.11.1 The ISO may enter into an RMR Agreement for service from one or more of the Generators that the ISO selected in accordance with Section 38.10 that can individually, or in conjunction with other Viable and Sufficient Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions, satisfy the identified Reliability Need. If multiple Generators are capable of satisfying in whole or in part the identified Reliability Need, the ISO may execute an RMR Agreement with the Generator, or more than one Generator that the ISO selected pursuant to Section 38.10, provided that the RMR Service Offer accepts the Availability and Performance Rate, does not exceed the RMR Avoidable Costs determined by the ISO, and that the amount of Capital Expenditures in any given year included in the RMR Service Offer does not exceed 10,000,000 U.S. Dollars if a non-nuclear Generator, and 25,000,000 U.S. Dollars if a nuclear Generator. If the RMR Service Offer satisfies the stated requirements, but the amount of Capital Expenditures in any given year included in the RMR Service Offer exceeds the applicable limit in the preceding sentence, then the ISO may accept the RMR Service Offer conditioned upon the Commission approving the Capital Expenditure amount. If the RMR Service Offer exceeds the RMR Avoidable Costs determined by the ISO, and if there are no modifications, or only modifications which the ISO has determined are reasonable, to the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* set forth in Appendix C of this Attachment FF, then the ISO will identify the Generator, and the ISO and the Generator Owner will submit filings to the Commission in accordance with Section 38.11.5. If a Generator's RMR Service Offer is lower than the other

RMR Service Offers but the Generator's proposed revisions to the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* are not acceptable to the ISO, then the ISO may proceed to enter into an RMR Agreement, in accordance with this section, with one or more Generator(s) that submitted the next best offer or offers pursuant to Section 38.10.3.

38.11.2 The ISO will tender to the Generator Owner(s) of the selected Generator(s) the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* set forth in Appendix C of this Attachment FF. The term of the RMR Agreement will be determined by the ISO based on: (i) the in-service date of the conceptual permanent solution to the identified Reliability Need submitted by the Responsible Transmission Owner(s) pursuant to Section 38.4.2.1, and (ii) any modifications to the scope and timing of the Short-Term Reliability Process Need resulting from circumstances including information provided by the NYPSC (or other agency or authority with jurisdiction over the implementation or siting of non-generation Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions), information provided by the Responsible Transmission Owner, the ISO's identification of market-based solutions, and RMR Agreements entered into between the ISO and other Generators. If the Short-Term Reliability Process Need is identified pursuant to a STAR or a Generator Deactivation Assessment, the effective date of the RMR Agreement shall be no earlier than the completion of the applicable 365-day notice period, except as provided in Section 38.3.4 of this Attachment FF.

### **38.11.3 Filing of Executed RMR Agreement**

The ISO will submit an RMR Agreement, including a proposed Availability and Performance Rate, to the Commission pursuant to Section 205 of the Federal Power Act if the ISO and Generator Owner agree on the terms and conditions of the RMR Agreement, Generator Owner accepts the Availability and Performance Rate calculated by the ISO for its Generator, and the ISO and Generator Owner execute the RMR Agreement. The ISO's filing shall specifically identify and explain any changes to the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* terms and conditions that ISO and Generator Owner have mutually agreed to.

### **38.11.4 Filing of Unexecuted RMR Agreement by ISO and Capital Expenditures in Excess of Annual Limit by Generator Owner**

The ISO will submit an RMR Agreement, including a proposed Availability and Performance Rate, to the Commission pursuant to Section 205 of the Federal Power Act if the ISO and Generator Owner agree on the terms and conditions of the RMR Agreement and Generator Owner accepts the Availability and Performance Rate calculated by the ISO for its Generator. The ISO's filing shall specifically identify and explain any changes to the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* terms and conditions that ISO and Generator Owner have mutually agreed to. Generator Owner shall submit a filing pursuant to Section 205 of the Federal Power Act in addition to the ISO's filing of the RMR Agreement that proposes the inclusion of the costs of certain Capital Expenditures in the Availability and Performance Rate that exceed the U.S. Dollar limits specified in Section 38.11.1, which filing shall be consistent with the terms and conditions of service proposed in the RMR Agreement that the ISO submits, and shall track the format of the RMR Agreement that the ISO submits.

### **38.11.5 Filing of Unexecuted RMR Agreement and Generator Owner Developed Rate**

If the ISO and Generator Owner agree on the terms and conditions of the RMR Agreement, but Generator Owner rejects the Availability and Performance Rate calculated by the ISO for its Generator and proposes an Owner Developed Rate, the ISO will submit an unexecuted RMR Agreement to the Commission pursuant to Section 205 of the Federal Power Act that sets forth the agreed upon terms and conditions of the RMR Agreement. The ISO's filing shall specifically identify and explain any changes to the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* terms and conditions that ISO and Generator Owner have mutually agreed to. Generator Owner shall submit a separate filing to the Commission pursuant to Section 205 of the Federal Power Act that proposes an "Owner Developed Rate," which filing shall be consistent with the terms and conditions of service proposed in the RMR Agreement the ISO submitted and shall track the format of the RMR Agreement the ISO submitted.

38.11.6 As part of its submission of an executed RMR Agreement pursuant to 38.11.3 or an unexecuted RMR Agreement pursuant to Sections 38.11.4 or 38.11.5, the ISO will include: (i) a description of the methodology and results of the reliability studies that identified a Short-Term Reliability Process Need requiring a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, which description will specify identified violations of Reliability Criteria and local criteria and describe the impacted criteria, and (ii) a description of the alternative solutions evaluated by the ISO and why the term of the RMR Agreement is appropriate in light of these alternative solutions.

## **38.12 Developer's Responsibility Following Selection of Its Transmission Solution**

### **38.12.1 Responsible Transmission Owner's Obligation to Develop and Construct a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution**

The Responsible Transmission Owner must develop and construct its proposed Short-Term Reliability Process Solution if it is selected by the ISO pursuant to Section 38.10. The Responsible Transmission Owner shall be entitled to the full recovery of all reasonably incurred costs, including a reasonable return on investment and any applicable incentives, related to the development, construction, operation, and maintenance of the selected transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, as set forth in Section 38.23.

### **38.12.2 Designated Entity's Responsibility to Obtain Necessary Approvals and Authorizations for Regulated Transmission Solution**

38.12.2.1 Upon the selection of a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution pursuant to Section 38.10, the ISO will inform the Designated Entity(ies) of the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project(s) that comprise the selected Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to submit the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) to begin the necessary approval process to the site, construct, and operate the project, if such approvals are required. In response to the ISO's request, a Designated Entity shall make such a submission to the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies) to the extent such authorization has not already been requested or obtained.

38.12.2.2 If the appropriate federal, state or local agency(ies) either rejects a necessary authorization, or approves and later withdraws its authorization of the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, the Designated Entity may recover

all of the necessary and reasonable costs it incurred and commitments made up to the final federal, state or local regulatory decision, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, to the extent permitted by the Commission in accordance with its regulations on abandoned plant recovery. The ISO shall allocate these costs among Load Serving Entities in accordance with Section 38.22 the ISO OATT, except as otherwise determined by the Commission. The ISO shall recover such costs in accordance with Section 38.23.

### **38.12.3 Development Agreement**

As soon as reasonably practicable following the ISO's selection of a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and following the period set forth in Section 38.10.6 of the ISO OATT, the ISO shall tender to the Designated Entity that was designated a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project pursuant to Section 38.10.2.1.3 or 38.10.5 a draft Development Agreement, with draft appendices completed by the ISO to the extent practicable, for review and completion by the Designated Entity. The draft Development Agreement shall be in the form of the ISO's Commission-approved Development Agreement for its Reliability Planning Process, which is in Appendix C in Section 31.7 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT, as amended by the ISO to reflect the Short-Term Reliability Process. Each Designated Entity will receive a separate Development Agreement for its Designated Short-Term Transmission Project.

The ISO and the Designated Entity shall finalize the Development Agreement and appendices as soon as reasonably practicable after the ISO's tendering of the draft Development Agreement. For purposes of finalizing the Development Agreement, the ISO and Designated

Entity shall develop the description and dates for the milestones necessary to develop and construct the selected project by the required in-service date identified in the STAR or Generator Deactivation Assessment, including the milestones for obtaining all necessary authorizations. For purposes of developing these milestones, the ISO and Designated Entity will coordinate, if applicable and to the extent feasible, with the Designated Entities for the Designated Short-Term Transmission Projects(s) that comprise the other parts of the selected regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. Any milestone that requires action by another Designated Entity or a Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected System Operator identified pursuant to Attachment P of the ISO OATT to complete must be included as an Advisory Milestone, as that term is defined in the Development Agreement.

If the ISO or the Designated Entity determines that negotiations are at an impasse, the ISO may file the Development Agreement in unexecuted form with the Commission on its own, or following the Designated Entity's request in writing that the agreement be filed unexecuted. If the Development Agreement is executed by both parties, the ISO shall file the agreement with the Commission for its acceptance within ten (10) Business Days after the execution of the Development Agreement by both parties. If the Designated Entity requests that the Development Agreement be filed unexecuted, the ISO shall file the agreement at the Commission within ten (10) Business Days of receipt of the request from the Designated Entity. The ISO will draft, to the extent practicable, the portions of the Development Agreement and appendices that are in dispute and will provide an explanation to the Commission of any matters as to which the parties disagree. The Designated Entity will provide in a separate filing any comments that it has on the unexecuted agreement, including any alternative positions it may have with respect to the disputed provisions. Upon the ISO's and the Designated Entity's execution of the Development

Agreement or the ISO's filing of an unexecuted Development Agreement with the Commission, the ISO and the Designated Entity shall perform their respective obligations in accordance with the terms of the Development Agreement that are not in dispute, subject to modification by the Commission. The Connecting Transmission Owner(s) and Affected System Operator(s) that are identified in Attachment P of the ISO OATT in connection with the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project shall act in good faith in timely performing their obligations that are required for the Designated Entity to satisfy its obligations under the Development Agreement.

**38.12.4 Process for Addressing Inability of Designated Entity to Complete a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project**

38.12.4.1 The ISO may take the action set forth in this Section 38.12.4 if: (i) the ISO has selected a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, (ii) the ISO has designated the corresponding Designated Short-Term Transmission Project(s) to a Designated Entity(ies), and (iii) one of the following events occur: (A) the Designated Entity does not execute the Development Agreement or does not request that it be filed unexecuted with the Commission as described in Section 38.12.3, or (B) an effective Development Agreement is terminated under the terms of the agreement prior to the completion of the term of the agreement.

38.12.4.2 If the Development Agreement has been filed with and accepted by the Commission, the ISO shall, upon terminating the Development Agreement under the terms of the agreement, file a notice of termination with the Commission.

38.12.4.3 If the ISO determines that it must identify a solution to the Short-Term Reliability Process Need prior to the next planning cycle of the biennial Reliability Planning Process, the ISO may take one or more of the following

actions to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need based on the particular circumstances: (i) address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need in the next Short-Term Reliability Process, (ii) address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need as an immediate reliability need pursuant to Section 38.3.4, (iii) direct the Designated Entity to continue with the development of its Designated Short-Term Reliability Project for completion beyond the in-service date required to address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, (iv) request that the Responsible Transmission Owner complete a Designated Short-Term Reliability Project if the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project was designated to the sponsoring Developer of a selected alternative transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, or (v) offer the Developer that originally submitted the selected alternative regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution the opportunity to be the Designated Entity of a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project in accordance with Section 38.12.4.5.

38.12.4.4 If the Responsible Transmission Owner agrees to complete a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project that was designated to the Developer that originally submitted the selected alternative transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, the Responsible Transmission Owner and the Designated Entity that proposed the selected solution shall work cooperatively with each other to implement the transition, including negotiating in good faith with each other to transfer the project; *provided, however*, that the transfer is subject to: (i) any required approvals by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies), (ii) any requirements or restrictions on the transfer of Designated

Entity's rights-of-way under law, conveyance, or contract, and (iii), if the Designated Entity is a New York public authority, any requirements or restrictions on the transfer under the New York Public Authorities Law; *provided, further*, that the Responsible Transmission Owner and the Designated Entity will address any disputes regarding the transfer of the project in accordance with the dispute resolution provisions in Article 11 of the ISO Services Tariff.

38.12.4.5 If the ISO determines in accordance with Section 38.12.4.3 that an alternative Developer should be designated to complete a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project that was initially designated to the owner of the impacted transmission facility, the ISO shall offer the Developer that originally proposed the selected alternative regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution the opportunity to be the Designated Entity of that Designated Short-Term Transmission Project to finance and complete the development and construction of the project to bring it into service. The alternative Designated Entity shall have 30 Calendar Days from the ISO tendering its offer to accept the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project. Thereupon, the alternative Designated Entity must enter into a Development Agreement, or amend an existing Development Agreement related to fulfillment of the same Short-Term Reliability Process Need, with the ISO in accordance with the requirements in Section 38.12.3. The alternative Designated Entity will be eligible for cost allocation and cost recovery under the ISO OATT for its development and construction of the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project. The alternative Designated Entity and the original Designated Entity of the transferred

Designated Short-Term Transmission Project shall work cooperatively with each other to implement the transition, including negotiating in good faith with each other to transfer the project; *provided, however*, that the transfer is subject to: (i) any required approvals by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies), (ii) any requirements or restrictions on the transfer of rights-of-way under federal or state law, regulation, or contract (including mortgage trust indentures or debt instruments), and (iii) if the original Designated Entity of the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project is a New York public authority, any requirements or restrictions on the transfer under the New York Public Authorities Law; *provided, further*, that the alternative Designated Entity and the original Designated Entity of the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project may address any disputes regarding the transfer of the project using dispute resolution procedures that are the same as those available to Transmission Customers under Section 11 of the ISO Market Administration and Control Area Services Tariff.

38.12.4.6 If the ISO elects to terminate the Development Agreement for a Designated Entity's Designated Short-Term Transmission Project because (i) another Designated Entity defaulted on the development of a separate Designated Short-Term Transmission Project that is a component of the same regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and (ii) the ISO determined to (a) address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need in the next Short-Term Reliability Process or (b) address the Short-Term Reliability Process Need as an immediate reliability need pursuant to Section 38.3.4, the ISO may halt the

development of the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project consistent with  
Section 38.15 of the ISO OATT.

### **38.13 Interim Service Providers**

38.13.1 At the time the ISO issues its STAR, the ISO shall inform an Initiating Generator that requested a deactivation date prior to the conclusion of the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date (a) whether the Initiating Generator will be permitted to deactivate or will need to remain in service for the 365 day notice period that follows the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date; and if an Initiating Generator that submitted a Generator Deactivation Notice to retire *is* permitted to deactivate prior to the conclusion of the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date, (b) whether the step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment will be required to remain in service for the 365 day notice period that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date.

38.13.2 If the NYISO does not authorize an Initiating Generator to deactivate by the latest of: (a) the 181<sup>st</sup> day after the ISO issues a written notice to a Market Participant pursuant to Section 38.3.1.4 indicating that the Generator Deactivation Notice for its Generator is complete, or (b) ten days after the posting of a STAR that assessed the Generator's deactivation, or (c) the date on which the Initiating Generator indicated it wanted to deactivate in its Generator Deactivation Notice, then for the remainder of the 365 day notice period that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date, the Initiating Generator shall be an Interim Service Provider, subject to the following rules and exceptions.

An Initiating Generator that submitted a Generator Deactivation Notice to be Retired shall be an Interim Service Provider, even if the ISO authorized the generating unit(s) to be deactivated, if the ISO or a Responsible Transmission

Owner requires the step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment to remain in service during the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date beyond the latest of (a) the 181<sup>st</sup> day after the ISO issues a written notice to a Market Participant pursuant to Section 38.3.1.4 indicating that the Generator Deactivation Notice for its Generator is complete, or (b) ten days after the posting of a STAR that assessed the Generator's deactivation, or (c) the Generator's requested deactivation date, or (d) the date on which the generating unit(s) deactivate. Under this alternative, after the generating unit(s) deactivate the Initiating Generator will be an Interim Service Provider to the extent its step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment that the ISO designates are required to remain in service for the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date, subject to the following rules and exceptions.

**38.13.2.1 Interim Service Providers shall be compensated in accordance with Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff.**

38.13.2.1.1 Rate Schedule 8 to the Services Tariff sets forth rules to calculate Interim Service Provider compensation for Initiating Generators that are required to remain in-service, or for the continued operation of step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment following the deactivation of a Generator that submitted a Generator Deactivation Notice to be Retired. The ISO shall use the costs, revenues, and other information submitted in accordance with Sections 38.3, 38.4, 38.5, 38.7, 38.8 and Appendix B of this Attachment FF that it verifies and/or validates, as applicable to calculate an Interim Service Provider's rate. If

the ISO cannot verify and/or validate, as applicable, a cost or revenue submitted by a Market Party, the ISO shall substitute an estimated value.

38.13.2.1.1.1 Interim Service Providers that deactivate their Generator but are required to keep their step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment that the ISO designates in-service for the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date will be compensated for the demonstrated *RMRAvoidCost* of maintaining the designated facilities in-service in accordance with Section 15.8.6 of Rate Schedule 8 to the Services Tariff.

38.13.2.2 Generators are not eligible to be Interim Service Providers while they are in an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage. Generators in an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage are required to keep their step-up transformer(s) and other system protection equipment in service unless or until (i) they are given permission, in writing, to deactivate the facilities by the ISO, or (ii) the step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment is damaged and would require either an expenditure of more than \$100,000, or more than 365 days, to repair and return to service, or (iii) the Generator becomes Retired.

38.13.2.3 Generators in a Mothball Outage are required to keep their step-up transformer(s) and other system protection equipment in service for the duration of the Mothball Outage unless they are given permission, in writing, by the ISO to deactivate the facilities for the duration of the Mothball Outage. Generators are not eligible for compensation as an Interim Service Provider to keep their step-up transformer(s) and other system protection equipment in service during a Mothball Outage.

38.13.2.4 The ISO may allow a Generator or its step-up transformer(s) and system protection facilities that the ISO determined needed to remain in service as an Interim Service Provider to deactivate prior to the conclusion of the 365 day notice period if the ISO provides at least 60 days prior notice that the Generator may deactivate, or that the Generator's step-up transformer(s) and system protection facilities may be deactivated. After the conclusion of this notice period, the Generator or its step-up transformer(s) and system protection facilities will be permitted to deactivate, and the Generator will no longer be an Interim Service Provider.

38.13.2.5 The ISO may allow a Generator or its step-up transformer(s) and system protection facilities that the ISO determined needed to remain in service as an Interim Service Provider to deactivate prior to the conclusion of the 365 day notice period if the Generator or the Generator's step-up transformer(s) and protection facilities experience a Forced Outage of ten days or greater duration, and the ISO provides at least 30 days prior notice that the Generator or its step-up transformer(s) and system protection facilities may deactivate. After the conclusion of this notice period, the Generator or its step-up transformer(s) and system protection facilities will be permitted to deactivate, and the Generator will not be an Interim Service Provider.

38.13.2.6 Generators that remain in service to operate as Interim Service Providers must comply with the RMR Generator Energy and Ancillary Service Market Participation Rules that are set forth in Section 23.6 of the ISO Services Tariff.

- 38.13.2.7 Generators that remain in service to operate as Interim Service Providers that have Capacity Resource Interconnection Rights, pursuant to the applicable provisions of Attachments S, X, Z, or HH to the ISO OATT, must take all required actions to qualify as an Installed Capacity Supplier pursuant to Section 5.12 of the ISO Services Tariff. Generators that remain in service to operate as Interim Service Providers must also comply with the rules that are set forth in Sections 5.14.1.1 and 15.8.6 of the ISO Services Tariff.
- 38.13.2.8 A Generator that was an Interim Service Provider that has deactivated and that wants to return to participating in any of the ISO Administered Markets while it is eligible to receive market-based rates must give the ISO at least 60 days advance notice of its desire to return to the ISO Administered Markets in order to permit the ISO to determine a repayment obligation (if any) in accordance with Services Tariff Rate Schedule 8, and an associated credit requirement in accordance with Sections 26.4 and 26.5 of the ISO Services Tariff.
- 38.13.2.9 A Generator that is an Interim Service Provider that wants to continue participating in the ISO Administered Markets while it is eligible to receive market-based rates (after it is no longer an Interim Service Provider and when it is not operating pursuant to an RMR Agreement) must give the ISO at least 30 days advance notice of its desire to continue participating in the ISO Administered Markets in order to permit the ISO to determine and impose a repayment obligation (if any) in accordance with Services Tariff Rate Schedule 8, and an associated credit requirement in accordance with Sections 26.4 and 26.5 of the ISO Services Tariff.

## **38.14 Initiating Generator's Failure to Timely Deactivate**

- 38.14.1 A Market Participant's Generator that satisfies the requirements to be Retired or enter into a Mothball Outage may be Retired or enter into a Mothball Outage, as applicable, within 365 days of: (i) the conclusion of the 365 days that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date, or (ii) the date specified in the Generator Deactivation Notice for the Generator to be Retired or enter into a Mothball Outage if the Market Participant provided greater than 365 days prior notice. If the Generator is not Retired or does not enter into a Mothball Outage within this time period, the Market Participant must submit a new Generator Deactivation Notice and satisfy anew the requirements of Sections 38.3.1 before the Generator may be Retired or enter into a Mothball Outage.
- 38.14.2 If (i) a Market Participant rescinds its Generator Deactivation Notice, or (ii) a Market Participant's Generator has not Retired or entered into a Mothball Outage within the timeframes described in Section 38.14.1 and is not operating under an RMR Agreement, the Market Participant must reimburse the ISO and the Responsible Transmission Owner(s) the actual costs that each incurred in performing their responsibilities under this Section 38 in response to the Market Participant's submission of a Generator Deactivation Notice, including any costs associated with using contractors. In the event that a Market Participant rescinds its Generator Deactivation Notice before the ISO posts the results of the Generator Deactivation Assessment conducted under Section 38.3.5, the ISO will not thereafter post the results of said assessment.

38.14.2.1 ISO and Responsible Transmission Owner(s) study costs shall be charged to Market Participants that fail to timely deactivate a Generator or that rescind a Generator Deactivation Notice as follows:

**ISO Short-Term Reliability Process Costs**—the total, actual costs incurred by the ISO to perform its responsibilities under this Section 38, including but not limited to the ISO’s cost of using contractors, shall be assigned in equally divided portions to the ISO and to each Initiating Generator that had the reliability impacts of its deactivation studied in the relevant STAR. Each Market Participant that failed to timely deactivate a Generator or that rescinded a Generator Deactivation Notice will be charged the portion of the total ISO costs assigned to the relevant Generator.

**Responsible Transmission Owner(s) Short-Term Reliability Process Costs**—the total, actual costs incurred by each Responsible Transmission Owner to perform its responsibilities under this Section 38, including but not limited to that Transmission Owner’s cost of using contractors, shall be assigned in equally divided portions to each Initiating Generator that had the reliability impacts of its deactivation studied by that Transmission Owner in the relevant STAR. Each Market Participant that failed to timely deactivate a Generator or that rescinded a Generator Deactivation Notice will be charged the portion of the Transmission Owner’s costs assigned to the relevant Generator.

**Generator-Specific Assessment**—the costs incurred by the ISO and by the Responsible Transmission Owner(s) to perform their responsibilities under this Section 38 in response to the Market Participant’s submission of a Generator

Deactivation Notice shall be assigned to the Generator that is the subject of a Generator Deactivation Assessment that is not performed as a component of a STAR.

38.14.3 If the Initiating Generator was an Interim Service Provider and (i) it rescinds its Generator Deactivation Notice, or (ii) it has not Retired or entered into a Mothball Outage within the timeframes described in Section 38.14.1 and is not operating under an RMR Agreement, then the Initiating Generator may also be subject to a repayment obligation pursuant to Section 15.8.7 of Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff.

## **38.15 Halting of a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project Process Solution**

38.15.1 The ISO may determine to halt a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project for a regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution that the ISO has selected pursuant to Section 38.10 to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need if: (a) a Market Participant rescinds the Generator Deactivation Notice that resulted in the Generator Deactivation Reliability Need, (b) the Market Participant's Generator has not Retired or entered into a Mothball Outage within the timeframes described in Section 38.14.1 and is not operating under an RMR Agreement, (c) the Short-Term Reliability Process Need has been otherwise addressed or eliminated (*e.g.*, a market-based solution that satisfies the Short-Term Reliability Process Need has commenced operation), or (d) the scope, scale or nature of the Short-Term Reliability Process Need has changed. In making its determination whether to halt a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project under this Section 38.15.1, the ISO will consider, among other things: (i) whether the Designated Entity has executed a Development Agreement for its Designated Short-Term Transmission Project or requested that it be filed unexecuted with the Commission; (ii) the status of the Designated Entity's progress against the milestones in the Development Agreement (*e.g.*, completion of engineering design, procurement of major equipment and materials, execution of key contracts, completion of project financing, obtaining Site Control, commencing physical construction, including excavation and pouring for foundations or the installation or erection of improvements); (iii) the status of Designated Entity's obtaining required permits or authorizations; (iv) whether the selected regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution is an interim or permanent

project; and (v) the operational and performance benefits of the selected regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution. If the ISO determines to halt a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, it will notify the Designated Entity of the project and post the notice on its website. If a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project is halted by the ISO, all of the costs incurred and commitments made by the Designated Entity up to that point, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, will be recoverable by the Designated Entity in accordance with Section 38.23 and the cost recovery mechanism in Rate Schedule 16 of the ISO OATT.

38.15.2 Notwithstanding Section 38.15.1, the ISO shall not halt a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project once the Designated Entity: (i) has received its Article VII or Article VIII certification or other applicable siting permits or authorizations under New York State law or (ii) if permitting or regulatory approval is not required, has commenced physical construction of the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, including excavation and pouring for foundations or the installation or erection of improvements.

## **38.16 RMR Generator Additional Costs**

### **38.16.1 Proposed Additional Costs**

During the performance of an RMR Agreement, the Generator Owner of one or more RMR Generators shall promptly notify the ISO of an event that (a) could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time the rate in the RMR Agreement was executed, and that (b) it reasonably expects may require it to incur costs that in the aggregate exceed the lesser of (x) \$250,000, and (y) five (5) percent of the annual RMR Avoidable Costs excluding the cost of Capital Expenditures, that (i) it can reasonably demonstrate was not among the costs (A) submitted to the ISO prior to the execution of an RMR Agreement with an Availability and Performance Rate, or (B) within the categories of costs submitted to the Commission in a petition for an Owner Developed Rate, and (ii) are necessary to incur in order for the RMR Generator to be able to continue to perform its obligations under the RMR Agreement after the event (a “Notice of Event of Proposed Additional Cost”).

If the NYISO informs an Initiating Generator that submitted a Generator Deactivation Notice that the Generator or its step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment will need to remain in service as an Interim Service Provider for the 365 day period that follow the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date, the Generator Owner of the Initiating Generator shall promptly notify the ISO of an event (a) that occurred after the Generator Deactivation Notice was submitted, but prior to the conclusion of the 365 day notice period, and (b) that could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time the Generator Deactivation Notice was submitted; where (i) Generator Owner reasonably expects it will be required to incur unanticipated costs that, in the aggregate, will exceed \$100,000 to operate for the remainder of the 365 day notice period, and (ii) incurring the costs is necessary for the Generator to be able to

perform or continue to perform as an Interim Service Provider after the event (also a “Notice of Event of Proposed Additional Cost”).

Following its submission of the required Notice of Event of Proposed Additional Cost, the Generator Owner shall promptly notify the ISO of, and provide updates addressing the following: (i) the reason(s) why the expense was or must be incurred, (ii) viable alternatives to incurring the expense, (iii) actions examined or taken to avoid the need to incur the expense, and to minimize the expense, (iv) the potential impact on the RMR Generator’s or Interim Service Provider’s ability to perform its obligations if the expense is not incurred, (v) the estimated and actual costs of the proposed expense, (vi) the plan specifying the schedule and timing of any planned action or expenditure, (vii) an explanation and supporting documentation of how that plan compares with the Generator Owner’s past similar actions and protocols, (viii) whether each cost is associated solely with the RMR Generator or Interim Service Provider, or are for services or functions shared with other units or businesses; and if a shared cost, the Generator Owner shall identify the other entities with which the cost is shared, the entity that allocates the cost to it, and accounting protocols and methodology used to allocate the units and businesses across which the cost is allocated.

38.16.1.1 If the cost of returning an RMR Generator to service does not exceed the lesser of (x) \$250,000, and (y) five (5) percent of the annual RMR Avoidable Costs excluding the cost of Capital Expenditures, then the Generator Owner shall promptly return the RMR Generator to service without additional recompense.

38.16.1.2 If the cost of returning an Interim Service Provider to service (which may be the cost of repairing and returning step-up transformer(s) and/or other system protection equipment if the generating unit(s) were permitted to deactivate) is not

expected to exceed \$100,000, then the Generator Owner shall promptly return the Generator to service without additional recompense.

### **38.16.1.3 ISO Identification of Proposed Additional Costs**

If the ISO determines that the Notice of Event of Proposed Additional Cost was timely provided and each of the requirements in Subsections (a) and (b) of Section 38.16.1 have been met, and the information required by Subsections (i) through (viii) has been provided, it shall be a “Proposed Additional Cost.”

### **38.16.2 Proposed Additional Cost Eligibility for Recovery**

38.16.2.1 The ISO shall review, verify, and/or validate the information provided by the Generator Owner for a Proposed Additional Cost. The ISO may require the Generator Owner to re-submit or to submit additional information to support statements and costs that the ISO determines are not adequately supported or otherwise verifiable. A “Substantiated Additional Cost” shall mean a Proposed Additional Cost that the ISO has either verified is the actual cost, or verified and validated the estimated cost information received from the Generator Owner, provided that (a) the Generator Owner demonstrates it took measures to minimize the expense, or if the ISO determines that the Generator Owner did not demonstrate it took such steps, such amount estimated by the ISO that would be the expense had the RMR Generator or Interim Service Provider taken measures to reduce it, and (b) it is or was necessary for the Generator Owner to incur these costs for the RMR Generator to perform its obligations under the RMR Agreement or for the Interim Service Provider to be able to operate all required facilities during the 365 day period that follows the Short-Term Assessment of

Reliability Start Date; provided the ISO has not issued a notice of shut-down (or similar notice) to Generator Owner for the RMR Generator pursuant to the RMR Agreement or to Generator Owner of the Interim Service Provider pursuant to Section 38.13.2.4 or 38.13.2.5 of this Attachment FF. If the cost information provided by the Generator Owner cannot be verified and validated by the ISO, the ISO shall substitute the amount it reasonably determines. The ISO shall also identify if the Substantiated Additional Costs, or a component thereof, is a Capital Expenditure by using the applicable criteria set forth in Section 38.8.1.3. The ISO shall notify the Generator Owner of its determination regarding whether Proposed Additional Costs are Substantiated Additional Costs.

38.16.2.2 The ISO shall seek comment from the Market Monitoring Unit on its review of Proposed Additional Costs and determinations of Substantiated Additional Costs. The responsibilities of the Market Monitoring Unit that are addressed in this Section are also addressed in Section 38.18.1 of this Attachment FF and in Section 30.4.6.8.6 of Attachment O of the ISO Services Tariff.

**38.16.3 ISO's Authority to Recover and Pay Substantiated Additional Costs that Are Capital Expenditures to RMR Generators with Availability and Performance Rates**

This Section shall apply only to RMR Agreements with an Availability and Performance Rate. If a Substantiated Additional Cost is determined by the ISO to be a Capital Expenditure and it does not exceed 10,000,000 U.S. Dollars if a non-nuclear Generator, or 25,000,000 U.S. Dollars if a nuclear Generator, on the basis of the total expenditure needed to address the event that resulted in the Notice of Event of Proposed Additional Cost, then the ISO may recover the Substantiated Additional Cost that is a Capital Expenditure pursuant to OATT Rate Schedule 14

and pay that amount to Generator Owner in accordance with (a) the rules in Section 38.17 that address the ISO's payment of Capital Expenditures, and (b) Rate Schedule 8 to the Services Tariff. The ISO shall submit an informational filing to the Commission identifying any Capital Expenditures it is paying pursuant to the authority granted in this section.

**38.16.4 ISO's Authority to Recover and Pay Substantiated Additional Costs that are Capital Expenditures to Interim Service Providers**

This Section shall apply only to Interim Service Providers. If a Substantiated Additional Cost is determined by the ISO to be a Capital Expenditure and it does not exceed 1,000,000 U.S. Dollars, on the basis of the total expenditure needed to address the event that resulted in the Notice of Event of Proposed Additional Cost, then the ISO may recover the Substantiated Additional Cost that is a Capital Expenditure pursuant to OATT Rate Schedule 14 and pay that amount to Generator Owner in accordance with (a) the rules in Section 38.17 that address the ISO's payment of Capital Expenditures, and (b) Rate Schedule 8 to the Services Tariff. The ISO shall submit an informational filing to the Commission identifying any Capital Expenditures it is paying pursuant to the authority granted in this section.

**38.16.5 Owner May Request Commission Approval for Recovery of Additional Costs**

If the Owner makes such a filing, it shall also submit the ISO's determinations pursuant to Sections 38.16.1.2 and 38.16.2.1 with its filing, or promptly after receipt of either determination. The ISO shall only be obligated to pay the Owner under this section if (a) the Commission determines that the cost filed for the RMR Generator or Interim Service Provider is eligible for recovery as a Proposed or Substantiated Additional Cost, and (b) the Commission approves the specific amount and authorizes its recovery. If the Proposed or Substantiated Additional Cost that the Commission authorizes payment of is for a Capital Expenditure, the ISO

will pay in accordance with (a) the rules in Section 38.17 that address the ISO's payment of Capital Expenditures, and (b) Rate Schedule 8 to the Services Tariff. If the Proposed or Substantiated Additional Cost that the Commission authorizes payment of is an Avoidable Cost that is not a Capital Expenditure, then payment directed by a Commission order shall be made in accordance with Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff.

## **38.17 Payment of Capital Expenditures to RMR Generators and Interim Service Providers**

- 38.17.1 Capital Expenditures that are specifically identified (including an estimated cost and estimated in-service date) in a Commission-accepted Availability and Performance Rate or in a Commission-accepted Owner Developed Rate are eligible for recovery in accordance with the rules set forth in Section 38.17, Section 23.6.5 of the ISO Services Tariff, Rate Schedule 8 of the ISO Services Tariff, Schedule 14 of the ISO OATT, and any relevant Commission order.
- 38.17.2 Capital Expenditures that are Proposed Additional Costs or Substantiated Additional Costs are eligible for recovery in accordance with the rules set forth in Sections 38.16 and 38.17 of the ISO OATT, Section 23.6.5 of the ISO Services Tariff, Rate Schedule 8 of the ISO Services Tariff, Schedule 14 of the ISO OATT, and any relevant Commission order.
- 38.17.3 The ISO may agree to permit an Interim Service Provider to recover the cost of Capital Expenditures during the 365 day period that follows the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date if (a) recovery is authorized as an Additional Cost under Section 38.16 of the ISO OATT, or (b) the Capital Expenditure is necessary to permit the Interim Service Provider to address the Reliability Need, and Generator Owner enters into a written agreement with the ISO in which the Generator Owner commits that the Capital Expenditure will be completed and placed in-service by a specified date or within a range of dates that fall within the 365 day period that follows the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date.

#### **38.17.4 ISO Authority to Authorize Capital Expenditures**

If the ISO determines that (a) Capital Expenditures are necessary for a Generator to provide service under an RMR Agreement, and (b) work on one or more of the Capital Expenditures must commence in advance of Commission action in order to timely, or more timely, address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, then the ISO may authorize the Generator Owner to spend up to 10,000,000 U.S. Dollars if a non-nuclear Generator, or 25,000,000 U.S. Dollars if a nuclear Generator, in total, to develop the Capital Expenditure(s) in advance of receiving an order from the Commission. The ISO shall submit an informational filing to the Commission identifying any Capital Expenditures it is authorizing pursuant to the authority granted in this Section. The ISO may recover the cost of such a Capital Expenditure pursuant to Schedule 14 of the ISO OATT and pay the Generator Owner in accordance with (i) the rules in this Section 38.17, and (ii) Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff. If the Commission issues an order rejecting the proposed Capital Expenditure, then the Generator Owner shall cease work on the Capital Expenditure and take reasonable efforts to minimize the costs it incurs. Reimbursement of a rejected Capital Expenditure shall be limited to actual costs incurred, including reasonable wind-down costs, shall be subject to the dollar limits set forth in this section, and shall be reviewed in accordance with Section 38.17.7 below. Allowed wind-down costs shall be reimbursed as additional Avoidable Costs that are not Capital Expenditures. ISO review pursuant to Section 38.17.7 shall include consideration of whether the Generator Owner timely ceased developing a Capital Expenditure and made reasonable efforts to minimize its wind-down costs.

For an Interim Service Provider, if the ISO determines that (x) the requirements of Section 38.17.3 have been satisfied, and (y) the Capital Expenditure does not exceed 1,000,000 U.S. Dollars on the basis of the total expenditure needed, then the ISO may recover the Capital

Expenditure pursuant to OATT Rate Schedule 14 and pay that amount to Generator Owner in accordance with (a) the rules in this Section 38.17 that address the ISO's payment of Capital Expenditures, and (b) Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff. The ISO shall submit an informational filing to the Commission identifying any Capital Expenditures it is paying to an Interim Service Provider pursuant to the authority granted in this section.

### **38.17.5 Early Termination of RMR Agreement**

If the Generator Owner is working to complete a Capital Expenditure consistent with an accepted RMR Agreement or consistent with an approved or accepted Proposed Additional Cost or Substantiated Additional Cost and the RMR Agreement is terminated early because (x) the Short-Term Reliability Process Need is resolved sooner than expected, or (y) the RMR Generator suffers a forced outage that would require significant costs to repair, or (z) for any other reason that does not involve an uncured Generator Owner default under the RMR Agreement or the RMR Generator failing to satisfy one or more of the operating standards described in Sections 38.19.4(A) and (B) below, and if Generator Owner ceased work on the Capital Expenditure and made reasonable efforts to minimize the costs it incurred, then, following review, the ISO shall recover the actual costs the Generator Owner incurred to construct the Capital Expenditure and to wind-down its work on the Capital Expenditure pursuant to Schedule 14 of the ISO OATT and pay Generator Owner in accordance with (a) the rules in this Section 38.17, and (b) Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff. Allowed wind-down costs shall be reimbursed as additional Avoidable Costs that are not Capital Expenditures. ISO review pursuant to Section 38.17.7 below shall include consideration of whether the Generator Owner timely ceased developing a Capital Expenditure and made reasonable efforts to minimize its wind-down costs.

38.17.6 The ISO shall not reimburse Interim Service Providers for Capital Expenditures that are not completed and placed in service during the 365 day period that follows the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date. The ISO shall not pay wind-down costs to Interim Service Providers. Subject to the foregoing requirements, the ISO's obligation to pay for Capital Expenditures that are not timely completed in accordance with the written agreement between the Generator Owner and the ISO that is described in Section 38.17.3 shall be addressed in that agreement. Even if a Capital Expenditure by an Interim Service Provider or potential Interim Service Provider is not eligible for compensation under Sections 38.17.3 or 38.17.6, the ISO may agree to pay Capital Expenditure costs that were incurred during the 365 day period that follows the Short-Term Assessment of Reliability Start Date in an RMR Agreement.

**38.17.7 ISO Review of Actual Costs Incurred Prior to Commencing Payment**

After the Generator Owner expends money for an allowed or accepted Capital Expenditure, including expenditures that may be eligible for recovery under Sections 38.17.4 and 38.17.5 above, it shall submit to the ISO copies of original documentation of the expenditure (including the financing costs) and an explanation of any difference between the estimated amount and the actual expenditure. If Generator Owner submits an actual total amount for a Capital Expenditure that is five (5) percent or more above (a) the estimate that was used by the ISO to develop an Availability and Performance Rate or to authorize recovery of a Substantiated Additional Cost; or (b) the estimate that was presented to the Commission to recover Capital Expenditure costs that exceed the dollar thresholds specified in Section 38.11.1, in an Owner Developed Rate, or in a request by the Generator Owner to recover a Proposed or Substantiated

Additional Cost; or (c) an appropriate portion of the estimate provided pursuant to (a) or (b) if the Capital Expenditure was not completed plus wind-down costs (if any), then the Generator Owner shall demonstrate to the ISO that reasonable efforts were made to expend the least amount necessary. The ISO shall review, verify and/or validate the actual expenditure provided by the Generator Owner. The ISO may require the Generator Owner to re-submit, information that the ISO determines is not adequately supported or otherwise verifiable. The amount due for Capital Expenditure shall be equal to the amount verified and validated by the ISO as the actual expenditure. If the ISO cannot verify and/or validate, as applicable, the information the Generator Owner provides, or if the ISO determines that reasonable efforts were not made to expend the least amount necessary, then compensation for the Capital Expenditure shall only be due after the Generator Owner submits its Capital Expenditure to the Commission and the Commission determines the amount to be paid.

38.17.7.1 If the Commission specified the amount that it authorized to be recovered for a particular Capital Expenditure in an order, then the ISO shall permit the Generator Owner to recover the actual amount verified and validated by the ISO, up to the limit(s) specified in the Commission order.

### **38.17.8 ISO Payment and Recovery of Authorized or Accepted Capital Expenditures**

38.17.8.1 The ISO shall commence paying for Capital Expenditures as soon as practicable after (i) the capital asset that is a Capital Expenditure (a) has been placed into service, or otherwise integrated into the Generator, or (b) was not placed into service solely due to the ISO instructing the RMR Generator to halt implementation of the Capital Expenditure, or issuing a Notice of Shut-down or terminating the RMR Agreement after costs had already been incurred; and

(ii) the amount paid by the Owner is verified and /or validated, as applicable, by the ISO as described in Section 38.17.7, or is determined by the Commission.

38.17.8.2 The ISO shall implement a repayment schedule in accordance with the formula specified in Section 38.17.8.2.1 below for each Capital Expenditure that will permit the Capital Expenditure to be completely repaid by the end date specified in Section 2.2.5 of the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* set forth in Appendix C of this Attachment FF or by the equivalent date specified in an RMR Agreement that is not a *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement*, or by the conclusion of the 365 day notice period if the ISO is repaying an allowed Capital Expenditure to an Interim Service Provider. If an RMR Agreement terminates prior to the end date that is specified in the RMR Agreement, then the ISO may continue repaying any Capital Expenditures the Generator Owner remains eligible to receive until that end date.

#### **38.17.8.2.1 Repayment Schedule for Capital Expenditures**

For each Capital Expenditure *CapEx Monthly Payment* is the amount that Generator Owner is permitted to recover each month:

$$CapEx\ Monthly\ Payment = \frac{Verified\ CapEx_{g,k}}{M_{E-k}}$$

Where:

*Verified CapEx<sub>g,k</sub>* = the amount due for a Capital Expenditure, verified and validated by the ISO as an actual expenditure for Generator *g*.

Month *k* is the month in which Repayment of a Capital Expenditure commences.

Month *E* is the month that includes the end date specified in Section 2.2.5 in the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* or by the equivalent date specified in an RMR

Agreement that is not a *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* for Generator  $g$ , or the conclusion of the 365 day notice period for an Interim Service Provider.

$M_{E-k}$  = the number of months from month  $k$  to month  $E$ , including month  $k$  and month  $E$ .

- 38.17.8.3 The ISO shall pay the Generator Owner amounts due for Capital Expenditures as a component of RMR Avoidable Costs (for an RMR Agreement with an Availability and Performance Rate or an Interim Service Provider) or RMR Cost (for an RMR Agreement with an Owner Developed Rate) under Rate Schedule 8 to the ISO Services Tariff. The ISO shall recover the cost of Capital Expenditures from RMR LSEs in accordance with Schedule 14 to the OATT.
- 38.17.8.4 Unless the Commission issues an order instructing it to pay, the ISO shall not pay the cost of Capital Expenditures that Section 23.6.5.2 of the ISO Services Tariff prohibits it from paying, even if the Capital Expenditures might otherwise be payable under the rules specified in this Attachment FF.
- 38.17.8.5 A Generator Owner that recovers the cost of Capital Expenditures may be required to repay to the ISO the depreciated value of the Capital Expenditure costs it recovered before the RMR Generator or Interim Service Provider at or for which the Capital Expenditure was incurred is permitted to be offered into or scheduled in the ISO Administered Markets. *See* Section 15.8.7 of Rate Schedule 8 to the Services Tariff.

### **38.18 Market Monitoring Unit Review of Determinations**

- 38.18.1 The ISO shall seek comments from the Market Monitoring Unit on matters relating to the inputs and the calculations the ISO performed pursuant to Section 38.8 of this Attachment FF.
- 38.18.2 The ISO shall seek comments from the Market Monitoring Unit on its review of Proposed Additional Costs and its determinations of Substantiated Additional Costs under Section 38.16 of this Attachment FF.
- 38.18.3 Concurrent with the ISO or a Generator filing with the Commission an RMR Agreement pursuant to Sections 38.11.3, 38.11.4 or 38.11.5, the Market Monitoring Unit shall publish a report. The report shall review the ISO's determination of the highest net present value offer (or more than one offer) to provide RMR service in accordance with Sections 38.8, 38.9 and 38.10. In the event that cost alone did not provide for a clear delineation between two or more RMR Service Offers, the report shall also review the ISO's consideration of the Generator Owner's proposed changes to the *Form of Reliability Must Run Agreement* and the operational, performance and market impacts, and the size of the Generators. If the RMR Agreement contains RMR Avoidable Costs and an Availability and Performance Rate, the report shall also review the inputs to, and ISO's calculation of, the RMR Avoidable Costs and the Availability and Performance Rate.
- 38.18.4 The responsibilities of the Market Monitoring Unit that are addressed in this Section 38.18 are also addressed in Section 30.4.6.8.6 of Attachment O of the ISO Services Tariff.

### **38.19 Terminating RMR Agreements**

- 38.19.1 Each RMR Agreement shall include an end date. RMR Agreements may incorporate a different end date for each RMR Generator that operates pursuant to the RMR Agreement.
- 38.19.2 RMR Agreements that include more than one RMR Generator shall permit the ISO to terminate the RMR Agreement for an RMR Generator without requiring the ISO to terminate the RMR Agreement for any or all of the other RMR Generator(s) that are operating pursuant to the same RMR Agreement.
- 38.19.3 The ISO shall timely terminate an RMR Agreement for an RMR Generator when that RMR Generator is no longer needed to address identified Short-Term Reliability Process Need(s).
- 38.19.4 The ISO may terminate an RMR Agreement for an RMR Generator under any of the following circumstances: (A) if the RMR Generator fails to satisfy any of the minimum operating standards specified in the RMR Agreement; (B) if the RMR Generator repeatedly fails to operate as requested when it is called upon by the ISO or by a Transmission Owner to address one or more of the identified Short-Term Reliability Process Need(s) the RMR Generator is being retained to address; (C) when the RMR Generator suffers a forced outage that will prevent it from being available for 180 or more days to address the identified Short-Term Reliability Process Need(s) that the RMR Generator is being retained to address; or (D) if significant Additional Costs arise (*see* Section 38.16) that make the RMR Generator more expensive than other solutions to the identified Short-Term Reliability Process Need(s).

**38.20      Reserved**

**38.21 Reserved**

### **38.22 Cost Allocation Methodology for Short-Term Reliability Process**

The cost allocation mechanism under this Section 38.22 sets forth the basis for allocating costs associated with: (i) a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project that is, or is a part of, the selected regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution pursuant to Section 38.10, (ii) the development of a Responsible Transmission Owner's transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution proposed in accordance with Section 38.4 and, if applicable, its conceptual permanent transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, or (iii) a Generator operating under an RMR Agreement to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The ISO shall implement the specific cost allocation methodology set forth in this Section 38.22 of this Attachment FF in accordance with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles as set forth in Section 31.5.2.1 of Attachment Y. The cost allocation formula that is applied to a selected regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution in accordance with this Section 38.22 shall apply to (i) all Designated Short-Term Transmission Projects that comprise the regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and (ii) Designated Network Upgrade Facilities identified for the interconnection of such Designated Short-Term Transmission Project(s) in accordance with Attachment P to the ISO OATT (if applicable).

The formula is applicable to the ISO's share of the costs of an Interregional Transmission Project proposed as a regulated transmission solution to an identified Short Term Reliability Process Need in accordance with Section 38.4.2.5 of Attachment FF. The formula is not applicable to that portion of the cost of a regulated transmission reliability project that is, pursuant to, as applicable, Section 25.7.12 of Attachment S or Section 40.13.12 of Attachment HH to the ISO OATT, paid for with funds (1) previously committed by or collected from Interconnection Customers through their acceptance of a Project Cost Allocation for System

Deliverability Upgrades required for the interconnection of generation projects, Class Year Transmission Projects, or Cluster Study Transmission Projects, or (2) funds collected as a Highway Facilities Charge pursuant to Rate Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT.

This Section 38.22 establishes the allocation of the costs related to resolving Short-Term Reliability Process Needs resulting from resource adequacy, BPTF thermal transmission security, local transmission security for a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need, dynamic stability, and short circuit issues. Costs will be allocated in accordance with the following hierarchy: (i) resource adequacy pursuant to Section 38.22.1, (ii) BPTF thermal transmission security pursuant to Section 38.22.2, (iii) BPTF voltage security pursuant to Section 38.22.3, (iv) local transmission security for a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need pursuant to Section 38.22.4, (v) dynamic stability pursuant to Section 38.22.5, and (vi) short circuit pursuant to Section 38.22.6.

### **38.22.1 Resource Adequacy Reliability Solution Cost Allocation Formula**

For purposes of solutions eligible for cost allocation under this Section 38.22, this section sets forth the cost allocation methodology applicable to that portion of the costs of the solution attributable to resolving resource adequacy. The same cost allocation formula is applied regardless of the project or sets of projects being triggered; however, the nature of the solution set may lead to some terms equaling zero, thereby dropping out of the equation. To ensure that appropriate allocation to the LCR and non-LCR zones occurs, the zonal allocation percentages are developed through a series of steps that first identify responsibility for LCR deficiencies, followed by responsibility for remaining need. The following formula shall apply to the allocation of the costs of the solution attributable to resource adequacy:

$$\text{Resource Adequacy Cost Allocation}_i = \left[ \frac{\text{LCRdef}_i}{1} + \left( \frac{\text{Concident Peak}_i * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_i) * \text{Soln STWdef}}{1} \right) \right]$$

$$\frac{\text{Soln Size}}{\sum_{k=1}^n \text{Coincident Peak}_k * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_k)} + \left( \frac{\text{Concident Peak}_i * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_i)}{\sum_{l=1}^m \text{Coincident Peak}_l * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_l)} * \frac{\text{Soln Cldf}}{\text{Soln Size}} \right) * 100\%$$

Where  $i$  is for each applicable zone,  $n$  represent the total zones in NYCA,  $m$  represents the zones isolated by the binding interfaces, IRM is the statewide reserve margin, and where LCR is defined as the locational capacity requirement in terms of percentage and is equal to zero for those zones without an LCR requirement, LCRdef <sub>$i$</sub>  is the applicable zonal LCR deficiency, SolnSTWdef is the STWdef for each applicable project, SolnCldf is the Cldf for each applicable project, and Soln\_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by each applicable project for all reliability cost allocation steps in this Section 38.22.

Three step cost allocation methodology for regulated reliability solutions:

### 38.22.1.1 Step 1 - LCR Deficiency

38.22.1.1.1 Any deficiencies in meeting the LCRs for the Target Year will be referred to as the LCRdef. If the reliability criterion is met once the LCR deficiencies have been addressed, that is LOLE  $\leq$  0.1 for the Target Year is achieved, then the only costs allocated will be those related to the LCRdef MW. Cost responsibility for the LCRdef MW will be borne by each deficient locational zone(s), to the extent each is individually deficient.

For a single solution that addresses only an LCR deficiency in the applicable LCR zone, the equation would reduce to:

$$\text{Allocation}_i = \frac{\text{LCRdef}_i}{\text{Soln\_Size}} * 100\%$$

Where  $i$  is for each applicable LCR zone,  $LCR_{def_i}$  represents the applicable zonal LCR deficiency, and  $Soln\_Size$  represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the applicable project.

38.22.1.1.2 Prior to the LOLE calculation, voltage constrained interfaces will be recalculated to determine the resulting transfer limits when the  $LCR_{def}$  MW are added.

38.22.1.2 Step 2 - Statewide Resource Deficiency. If the reliability criterion is not met after the  $LCR_{def}$  has been addressed, that is an  $LOLE > 0.1$ , then a NYCA Free Flow Test will be conducted to determine if NYCA has sufficient resources to meet an LOLE of 0.1.

38.22.1.2.1 If NYCA is found to be resource limited, the ISO, using the transfer limits and resources determined in Step 1, will determine the optimal distribution of additional resources to achieve a reduction in the NYCA LOLE to 0.1.

38.22.1.2.2 Cost allocation for compensatory MW added for cost allocation purposes to achieve an LOLE of 0.1, defined as a Statewide MW deficiency ( $STW_{def}$ ), will be prorated to all NYCA zones, based on the NYCA coincident peak load. The allocation to locational zones will take into account their locational requirements. For a single solution that addresses only a statewide deficiency, the equation would reduce to:

$$Allocation_i = \left[ \frac{Coincident\ Peak_i * (1 + IRM - LCR_i)}{\sum_{k=1}^n Coincident\ Peak_k} * \frac{Soln\ STW_{def}}{Soln\ Size} \right] * 100\%$$

$$* (1 + IRM - LCR_k)$$

Where  $i$  is for each applicable zone,  $n$  is for the total zones in NYCA, IRM is the statewide reserve margin, and LCR is defined as the locational capacity

requirement in terms of percentage and is equal to zero for those zones without an LCR requirement, Soln STWdef is the STWdef for the applicable project, and Soln\_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the applicable project.

38.22.1.3 Step 3 - Constrained Interface Deficiency. If the NYCA is not resource limited as determined by the NYCA Free Flow Test, then the ISO will examine constrained transmission interfaces, using the Binding Interface Test.

38.22.1.3.1 The ISO will provide output results of the reliability simulation program utilized for the RNA that indicate the hours that each interface is at limit in each flow direction, as well as the hours that coincide with a loss of load event. These values will be used as an initial indicator to determine the binding interfaces that are impacting LOLE within the NYCA.

38.22.1.3.2 The ISO will review the output of the reliability simulation program utilized for the RNA along with other applicable information that may be available to make the determination of the binding interfaces.

38.22.1.3.3 Bounded Regions are assigned cost responsibility for the compensatory MW, defined as CDef, needed to reach an LOLE of 0.1.

38.22.1.3.4 If one or more Bounded Regions are isolated as a result of binding interfaces identified through the Binding Interface Test, the ISO will determine the optimal distribution of compensatory MW to achieve a NYCA LOLE of 0.1. Compensatory MW will be added until the required NYCA LOLE is achieved.

38.22.1.3.5 The Bounded Regions will be identified by the ISO's Binding Interface Test, which identifies the bounded interface limits that can be relieved and have

the greatest impact on NYCA LOLE. The Bounded Region that will have the greatest benefit to NYCA LOLE will be the area to be first allocated costs in this step. The ISO will determine if after the first addition of compensating MWs the Bounded Region with the greatest impact on LOLE has changed. During this iterative process, the Binding Interface Test will look across the state to identify the appropriate Bounded Region. Specifically, the Binding Interface Test will be applied starting from the interface that has the greatest benefit to LOLE (the greatest LOLE reduction per interface compensatory MW addition), and then extended to subsequent interfaces until a NYCA LOLE of 0.1 is achieved.

38.22.1.3.6 The CIdf MW are allocated to the applicable Bounded Region isolated as a result of the constrained interface limits, based on their NYCA coincident peaks. Allocation to locational zones will take into account their locational requirements. For a single solution that addresses only a binding interface deficiency, the equation would reduce to:

$$\text{Allocation}_i = \left[ \frac{\text{Coincident Peak}_i * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_i)}{\sum_{l=1}^m \text{Coincident Peak}_l * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_l)} * \frac{\text{SolnCIdf}}{\text{Soln Size}} \right] * 100\%$$

Where  $i$  is for each applicable zone,  $m$  is for the zones isolated by the binding interfaces, IRM is the statewide reserve margin, and where LCR is defined as the locational capacity requirement in terms of percentage and is equal to zero for those zones without an LCR requirement, SolnCIdf is the CIdf for the applicable project and Soln\_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the applicable project.

### **38.22.2 BPTF Thermal Transmission Security Cost Allocation Formula**

For purposes of solutions eligible for cost allocation under this Section 38.22, this section sets forth the cost allocation methodology applicable to that portion of the costs of the solution attributable to resolving BPTF thermal transmission security issues. If, after consideration of the compensatory MW identified in the resource adequacy reliability solution cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.1, there remains a BPTF thermal transmission security issue, the ISO will allocate the costs of the portion of the solution attributable to resolving the BPTF thermal transmission security issue(s) to the Subzones that contribute to the BPTF thermal transmission security issue(s) in the following manner.

#### **38.22.2.1 Calculation of Nodal Distribution Factors**

The ISO will calculate the nodal distribution factor for each load bus modeled in the power flow case utilizing the output of the reliability simulation program that identified the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, including the NYCA generation dispatch and NYCA coincident peak Load. The nodal distribution factor represents the percentage of the Load that flows across the facility subject to the Short-Term Reliability Process Need. The sign (positive or negative) of the nodal distribution factor represents the direction of flow.

#### **38.22.2.2 Calculation of Nodal Flow**

The ISO will calculate the nodal megawatt flow, defined as Nodal Flow, for each load bus modeled in the power flow case by multiplying the amount of Load in megawatts for the bus, defined as Nodal Load, by the nodal distribution factor for the bus. Nodal Flow represents the number of megawatts that flow across the facility subject to the Short-Term Reliability Process Need due to the Load.

### 38.22.2.3 Calculation of Contributing Load and Contributing Flow

The Nodal Load for a load bus with a positive nodal distribution factor is a contributing Load, defined as CLoad, and the Nodal Flow for that Load is contributing flow, defined as CFlow. To identify contributing Loads that have a material impact on the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, the ISO will calculate a contributing materiality threshold, defined as CMT, as follows:

$$CMT = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{Lk=1}^n CFlow_{Lk}}{\sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{Lk=1}^n CLoad_{Lk}}$$

Where  $m$  is for the total number of Subzones and  $n$  is for the total number of load buses in a given Subzone.

### 38.22.2.4 Calculation of Helping Load and Helping Flow

The Nodal Load for a load bus with a negative or zero nodal distribution factor is a helping Load, defined as HLoad, and the Nodal Flow for that Load is helping flow, defined as HFlow. To identify helping Loads that have a material impact on the Short-Term Reliability Process Need, the ISO will calculate a helping materiality threshold, defined as HMT, as follows:

$$HMT = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{Lk=1}^n HFlow_{Lk}}{\sum_{k=1}^m \sum_{Lk=1}^n HLoad_{Lk}}$$

Where  $m$  is for the total number of Subzones and  $n$  is for the total number of load buses in a given Subzone.

### 38.22.2.5 Calculation of Net Material Flow for Each Subzone

The ISO will identify material Nodal Flow for each Subzone and calculate the net material flow for each Subzone. For each load bus, the Nodal Flow will be identified as material flow, defined as MFlow, if the nodal distribution factor is (i) greater than or equal to CMT, or (ii)

less than or equal to HMT. The net material flow for each Subzone, defined as SZ\_NetFlow, is calculated as follows:

$$SZ\_NetFlow_j = \sum_{Lj=1}^n MFlow_{Lj}$$

Where  $j$  is for each Subzone and  $n$  is for the total number of load buses in a given Subzone.

#### **38.22.2.6 Identification of Allocated Flow for Each Subzone**

The ISO will identify the allocated flow for each Subzone and verify that sufficient contributing flow is being allocated costs. For each Subzone, if the SZ\_NetFlow is greater than zero, that Subzone has a net material contribution to the Short-Term Reliability Process Need and the SZ\_NetFlow is identified as allocated flow, defined as SZ\_AllocFlow. If the SZ\_NetFlow is less than or equal to zero, that Subzone does not have a net material contribution to the Generator Deactivation Reliability Need and the SZ\_AllocFlow is zero for that Subzone. If the total SZ\_AllocFlow for all Subzones is less than 60% of the total CFlow for all Subzones, then the CMT will be reduced and SZ\_NetFlow recalculated until the total SZ\_AllocFlow for all Subzones is at least 60% of the total CFlow for all Subzones.

#### **38.22.2.7 Cost Allocation for a Single BPTF Thermal Transmission Security Issue**

For a single solution that addresses only a BPTF thermal transmission security issue, the equation for cost allocation would reduce to:

$$BPTF\ Thermal\ Cost\ Allocation_j = \frac{SZ\_AllocFlow_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m SZ\_AllocFlow_k} \times \frac{SolnBTSdef}{Soln\_Size}$$

Where  $j$  is for each Subzone;  $m$  is for the total number of Subzones; SZ\_AllocFlow is the allocated flow for each Subzone; SolnBTSdef is the number of compensatory MW for the BPTF

thermal transmission security issue for the applicable project; and Soln\_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the applicable project.

#### **38.22.2.8 Cost Allocation for Multiple BPTF Thermal Transmission Security Issues**

If a single solution addresses multiple BPTF thermal transmission security issues, the ISO will calculate weighting factors based on the ratio of the present value of the estimated costs for individual solutions to each BPTF thermal transmission security issue. The present values of the estimated costs for the individual solutions shall be based on a common base date that will be the beginning of the calendar month in which the cost allocation analysis is performed (the “Base Date”). The ISO will apply the weighting factors to the cost allocation calculated for each Subzone for each individual BPTF thermal transmission security issue. The following example illustrates the cost allocation for such a solution:

- A cost allocation analysis for the selected solution is to be performed during a given month establishing the beginning of that month as the Base Date.
- The ISO has identified two BPTF thermal transmission security issues, Overload X and Overload Y, and the ISO has selected a single solution (Project Z) to address both BPTF thermal transmission security issues.
- The cost of a solution to address only Overload X (Project X) is  $\text{Cost}(X)$ , provided in a given year’s dollars. The number of years from the Base Date to the year associated with the cost estimate of Project (X) is  $N(X)$ .
- The cost of a solution to address only Overload Y (Project Y) is  $\text{Cost}(Y)$ , provided in a given year’s dollars. The number of years from the Base Date to the year associated with the cost estimate of Project Y is  $N(Y)$ .

- The discount rate, D, to be used for the present value analysis shall be the current after-tax weighted average cost of capital for the Transmission Owners.
- Based on the foregoing assumptions, the following formulas will be used:
  - Present Value of Cost (X) = PV Cost (X) = Cost (X) / (1+D)<sup>N(X)</sup>
  - Present Value of Cost (Y) = PV Cost (Y) = Cost (Y) / (1+D)<sup>N(Y)</sup>
  - Overload X weighting factor = PV Cost (X)/[PV Cost (X) + PV Cost (Y)]
  - Overload Y weighting factor = PV Cost (Y)/[PV Cost (X) + PV Cost (Y)]
- Applying those formulas, if:

Cost (X) = \$100 Million and N(X) = 6.25 years

Cost (Y) = \$25 Million and N(Y) = 4.75 years

D = 7.5% per year

Then:

PV Cost (X) =  $100/(1+0.075)^{6.25} = 63.635$  Million

PV Cost (Y) =  $25/(1+0.075)^{4.75} = 17.732$  Million

Overload X weighting factor =  $63.635 / (63.635 + 17.732) = 78.21\%$

Overload Y weighting factor =  $17.732 / (63.635 + 17.732) = 21.79\%$

- Applying those weighing factors, if:

Subzone A cost allocation for Overload X is 15%

Subzone A cost allocation for Overload Y is 70%

Then:

Subzone A cost allocation % for Project Z =

$$(15\% * 78.21\%) + (70\% * 21.79\%) = 26.99\%$$

### 38.22.2.9 Exclusion of Subzone(s) Based on *De Minimis* Impact

If a Subzone is assigned a BPTF thermal transmission security cost allocation less than a *de minimis* dollar threshold of the total project costs, that Subzone will not be allocated costs; *provided however*, that the total *de minimis* Subzones may not exceed 10% of the total BPTF thermal transmission security cost allocation. The *de minimis* threshold is initially \$10,000. If the total allocation percentage of all *de minimis* Subzones is greater than 10%, then the *de minimis* threshold will be reduced until the total allocation percentage of all *de minimis* Subzones is less than or equal to 10%.

### 38.22.3 BPTF Voltage Security Cost Allocation

If, after consideration of the compensatory MW identified in the resource adequacy cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.1 and BPTF thermal transmission security cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.2, there remains a BPTF voltage security issue, the ISO will allocate the costs of the portion of the solution attributable to resolving the BPTF voltage security issue(s) to the Subzones that contribute to the BPTF voltage security issue(s). The cost responsibility for the portion (MW or MVAR) of the solution attributable to resolving the BPTF voltage security issue(s), defined as SolnBVSdef, will be allocated on a Load-ratio share to each Subzone to which each bus with a voltage issue is connected, as follows:

$$BPTF \text{ Voltage Cost Allocation}_j = \frac{Coincident \ Peak_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m Coincident \ Peak_k} \times \frac{SolnBVSdef}{Soln\_Size}$$

Where  $j$  is for each Subzone;  $m$  is for the total number of Subzones that are subject to BPTF voltage cost allocation; Coincident Peak is for the total peak Load for each Subzone; SolnBVSdef is for the portion of the solution necessary to resolve the BPTF voltage security issue(s); and Soln\_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the applicable project.

#### 38.22.4 Local Transmission Security Cost Allocation

If, after consideration of the compensatory MW identified in the resource adequacy cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.1, the BPTF thermal transmission security cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.2, and BPTF voltage security cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.3, there remains a non-BPTF thermal security issue or a non-BPTF voltage security issue, the ISO will allocate the costs of resolving the local security issue(s) to the Subzones that contribute to the local security issue(s). This local transmission security step will only apply for the allocation of the costs of a Short-Term Reliability Process Solution to a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need.

38.22.4.1 The Subzone in which the receiving terminal of the non-BPTF facility is located is assigned cost responsibility for the megawatt portion of the solution needed to eliminate the non-BPTF thermal issue(s), defined as LocalThermalMW. If multiple non-BPTF thermal issues in multiple Subzones are addressed by the solution, the LocalThermalMW will be allocated on a Load-ratio share to each identified Subzone as follows:

$$\text{Local Thermal Cost Allocation}_j = \frac{\text{Coincident Peak}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m \text{Coincident Peak}_k} \times \frac{\text{LocalThermalMW}}{\text{Soln\_Size}}$$

Where  $j$  is for each Subzone;  $m$  is for the total number of Subzones that are subject to local thermal cost allocation; Coincident Peak is for the total peak load for each Subzone; LocalThermalMW is for the megawatt portion of the solution needed to eliminate the non-BPTF thermal issue(s); and Soln\_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the solution.

38.22.4.2 If there remains a voltage issue after consideration of LocalThermalMW, then the cost responsibility for the megawatt portion of the solution necessary to

resolve the voltage issue(s), defined as LocalVoltageMW, will be allocated on a Load-ratio share to each Subzone to which each bus with a voltage issue is connected, as follows:

$$Local\ Voltage\ Cost\ Allocation_j = \frac{Coincident\ Peak_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m Coincident\ Peak_k} \times \frac{LocalVoltageMW}{Soln\_Size}$$

Where  $j$  is for each Subzone;  $m$  is for the total number of Subzones that are subject to local voltage cost allocation; Coincident Peak is for the total peak Load for each Subzone; LocalVoltageMW is for the megawatt portion of the RMR Agreement necessary to resolve the voltage issue(s); and Soln\_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the solution.

### 38.22.5 Dynamic Stability Cost Allocation

If, after consideration of the compensatory MW identified in the resource adequacy cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.1, BPTF thermal transmission security cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.2, BPTF voltage security cost allocation in accordance with Section 38.22.3, and local transmission security cost allocation for a Generator Deactivation Reliability Need in accordance with Section 38.22.4, there remains a dynamic stability issue, the ISO will allocate the costs of the portion of the solution attributable to resolving the dynamic stability issue(s) to all Subzones in the NYCA on a Load-ratio share basis, as follows:

$$Dynamic\ Stability\ Cost\ Allocation_j = \frac{Coincident\ Peak_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m Coincident\ Peak_k} \times \frac{DynamicMW}{Soln\_Size}$$

Where  $j$  is for each Subzone;  $m$  is for the total number of Subzones; Coincident Peak is for the total peak Load for each Subzone; DynamicMW is for the megawatt portion of the

solution necessary to resolve the dynamic stability issue(s) for the applicable project; and  
Soln\_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the applicable project.

### **38.22.6 Short Circuit Issues**

If, after the completion of the prior reliability cost allocation steps, there remains a short circuit issue, the short circuit issue will be deemed a local issue and related costs will not be allocated under this process.

### **38.23 Cost Recovery for Short-Term Reliability Process**

38.23.1 A Designated Entity of a Designated Short-Term Transmission Project designated pursuant to Section 38.10.2.1.3 or 38.10.5 of the ISO OATT to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need and Designated Network Upgrade Facilities identified for the interconnection of such Designated Short-Term Transmission Project in accordance with Attachment FF, if applicable, shall be entitled to full recovery of all reasonably incurred costs, including a reasonable return on investment and any applicable incentives, related to the development, construction, operation and maintenance of the transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and Designated Network Upgrade Facilities, if applicable. The Responsible Transmission Owner shall also be entitled to recover its costs for developing its proposed transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and, if applicable, its conceptual permanent Short-Term Reliability Process Solution, whether or not such solutions were selected by the ISO. The Designated Entity or Responsible Transmission Owner will recover its costs in accordance with Schedule 16 of this ISO OATT, or as determined by the Commission. The period for cost recovery will be determined by the Commission and will begin if and when the Designated Short-Term Transmission Project, together with the Designated Network Upgrade Facilities identified for the interconnection of such Designated Short-Term Transmission Project in accordance with Attachment P (if applicable), is completed or halted, or as otherwise determined by the Commission. The NYISO does not provide cost recovery related to projects undertaken by Transmission Owners through their

Local Transmission Owner Planning Processes pursuant to Sections 31.1.3 and 31.2.1 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT.

38.23.2. If a selected regulated transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution is halted by the ISO, all of the costs incurred and commitments made by the Designated Entity for its Designated Short-Term Transmission Project that is, or is a part of, the selected transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and Designated Network Upgrade Facilities identified for the interconnection of such Designated Short-Term Transmission Project (if applicable), up to that point, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, will be recoverable by the Designated Entity in accordance with Schedule 16 of the ISO OATT.

38.23.3 If the appropriate federal, state or local agency(ies) either rejects a necessary authorization, or approves and later withdraws authorization, for a Designated Short-Term Reliability Project that is, or is a part of, the selected transmission Short-Term Reliability Process Solution and Designated Network Upgrade Facilities identified for the interconnection of such Designated Short-Term Transmission Project (if applicable), the Designated Entity may recover all of the necessary and reasonable costs incurred and commitments made up to the final federal, state or local regulatory decision, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, to the extent permitted by the Commission in accordance with its regulations. The ISO shall recover such costs in accordance with Schedule 16 of the ISO OATT.

38.23.4 If a Market Participant's Generator is operating under an RMR Agreement pursuant to Section 38.11 to address a Short-Term Reliability Process Need, the Market Participant will be paid in accordance with Rate Schedule 8 of the ISO Services Tariff. The ISO will recover costs related to RMR Agreements from LSEs in accordance with Schedule 14 of the ISO OATT.

38.23.5 With the exception of a Generator operating under an RMR Agreement, costs related to non-transmission regulated Short-Term Reliability Process Solutions to Short-Term Reliability Process Needs will be recovered by Responsible Transmission Owners or Developers in accordance with the provisions of New York Public Service Law, New York Public Authorities Law, or other applicable state law.