

Attachment I

31.1 New York Comprehensive System Planning Process (“CSPP”)

31.1.1 Definitions

Throughout Sections 31.1 through 31.10, the following capitalized terms shall have the meanings set forth in this subsection:

Affected TO: The Transmission Owner who receives written notification of a dispute related to a Local Transmission Planning Process pursuant to Section 31.2.1.4.1.

Bounded Region: A Load Zone or Zones within an area that is isolated from the rest of the NYCA as a result of constrained interface limits.

CARIS: The Congestion Assessment and Resource Integration Study for economic planning developed by the ISO in consultation with the Market Participants and other interested parties pursuant to Section 31.3 of this Attachment Y.

CRP: The Comprehensive Reliability Plan as approved by the ISO Board of Directors pursuant to this Attachment Y.

CSPP: The Comprehensive System Planning Process set forth in this Attachment Y, and in the Interregional Planning Protocol, which covers reliability planning, economic planning, Public Policy Requirements planning, cost allocation and cost recovery, and the interregional planning process.

Developer: A person or entity, including a Transmission Owner, sponsoring or proposing a project pursuant to this Attachment Y.

ESPWG: The Electric System Planning Work Group, or any successor work group or committee designated to fulfill the functions assigned to the ESPWG in this tariff.

Gap Solution: A temporary solution to a Reliability Need that may become a permanent solution and shall strive to be compatible with permanent market-based and regulated solutions, as applicable. A permanent regulated solution, if appropriate, may proceed in parallel with a Gap Solution.

Generator Deactivation Assessment: The ISO’s analysis, in coordination with the Responsible Transmission Owner(s), of whether a Reliability Need will result from a Generator becoming Retired, entering into a Mothball Outage, or being unavailable due to an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage.

Generator Deactivation Assessment Start Date: The date on which: (i) the ISO issues a written notice to a Market Participant pursuant to Section 31.2.11.2.2 indicating that the Generator Deactivation Notice for its Generator is complete, or (ii) a Market Participant’s

Generator enters into an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage pursuant to Section 5.18.2.1 of the ISO Services Tariff.

Generator Deactivation Notice: The form set forth in Section 31.8 (Appendix E) of this Attachment Y.

Initiating Generator: A Generator 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 Gap Solution process requirements in Section 31.2.11.

Interregional Planning Protocol: The Amended and Restated Northeastern ISO/RTO Planning Coordination Protocol, or any successor to that protocol.

Interregional Transmission Project: A transmission facility located in two or more transmission planning regions that is evaluated under the Interregional Planning Protocol and proposed to address an identified Reliability Need, congestion identified in the CARIS, or a transmission need driven by a Public Policy Requirement pursuant to Order No. 1000 and the provisions of this Attachment Y.

IPTF: The Interregional Planning Task Force, or any successor ISO stakeholder working group or committee, designated to fulfill the functions assigned to the IPTF in this tariff.

ISO/RTO Region: One or more of the three ISO or RTO regions known as PJM, ISO-New England, and NYISO, which are the “Parties” to the Interregional Planning Protocol.

LCR: An abbreviation for the term Locational Minimum Installed Capacity Requirement, as defined in the ISO Open Access Transmission Tariff.

Loss of Load Expectation (“LOLE”): A measure used to determine the amount of resources needed to minimize the possibility of an involuntary loss of firm electric load on the New York State Bulk Power Transmission Facilities.

LTP: The Local Transmission Owner Plan, developed by each Transmission Owner, which describes its respective plans that may be under consideration or finalized for its own Transmission District.

LTP Dispute Resolution Process (“DRP”): The process for resolution of disputes relating to a Transmission Owner’s LTP set out in Section 31.2.1.3.

LTPP: The Local Planning Process conducted by each Transmission Owner for its own Transmission District.

Management Committee: The standing committee of the ISO of that name created pursuant to the ISO Agreement.

Market Party: shall mean 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.

Net CONE: The value representing the cost of new entry, net of energy and ancillary services revenues, utilized by the ISO in establishing the ICAP Demand Curves pursuant to Section 5 of the ISO Market Services Tariff.

New York State Bulk Power Transmission Facilities (“BPTFs”): The facilities identified as the New York State Bulk Power Transmission Facilities in the annual Area Transmission Review submitted to NPCC by the ISO pursuant to NPCC requirements.

NPCC: The Northeast Power Coordinating Council, or any successor organization.

NYCA Free Flow Test: A NYCA unconstrained internal transmission interface test, performed by the ISO to determine if a Reliability Need is the result of a statewide resource deficiency or a transmission limitation.

NYDPS: The New York State Department of Public Service, as defined in the New York Public Service Law.

NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report: As defined in Section 25 of the ISO OATT.

NYPSC: The New York Public Service Commission, as defined in the New York Public Service Law.

Operating Committee: The standing committee of the NYISO of that name created pursuant to the ISO Agreement.

Order No. 1000: The Final Rule entitled Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation by Transmission Owning and Operating Public Utilities, issued by the Commission on July 21, 2011, in Docket RM10-23-001, as modified on rehearing, or upon appeal. (See FERC Stats & Regs. ¶ 31,323 (2011) (“Order No. 1000”), on reh’g and clarification, 139 FERC ¶ 61,132 (“Order No. 1000-A”), on reh’g and clarification, 141 FERC ¶ 61,044 (2012) (“Order No. 1000-B”).

Other Developer: A Developer, other than a Transmission Owner, sponsoring or proposing to sponsor a regulated economic project, a Public Policy Transmission Project, an Other Public Policy Project, or a regulated solution to a Reliability Need.

Other Public Policy Project: A non-transmission project or a portfolio of transmission and non-transmission projects proposed by a Developer to satisfy an identified Public Policy Transmission Need.

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; or (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. 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.

Public Policy Transmission Planning Process: The process by which the ISO solicits needs for transmission driven by Public Policy Requirements, evaluates all proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects and Other Public Policy Projects on a comparable basis, and selects the more efficient or cost effective Public Policy Transmission Project, if any, for eligibility for cost allocation under the ISO Tariffs.

Public Policy Transmission Need: A transmission need identified by the NYPSC that is driven by a Public Policy Requirement pursuant to Sections 31.4.2.1 through 31.4.2.3.

Public Policy Transmission Planning Report: The report approved by the ISO Board of Directors pursuant to this Attachment Y on the ISO's evaluation of all Public Policy Transmission Projects and Other Public Policy Projects proposed to satisfy an identified Public Policy Transmission Need pursuant to Section 31.4.6 and the ISO's selection of a proposed Public Policy Transmission Project, if any, that is the more efficient or cost effective solution to the identified Public Policy Transmission Need pursuant to Section 31.4.8.

Public Policy Requirement: A federal or New York State statute or regulation, including a NYPSC order adopting a rule or regulation subject to and in accordance with the State Administrative Procedure Act, any successor statute, or any duly enacted law or regulation passed by a local governmental entity in New York State, that may relate to transmission planning on the BPTFs.

Public Policy Transmission Project: A transmission project or a portfolio of transmission projects proposed by Developer(s) to satisfy an identified Public Policy Transmission Need and for which the Developer(s) seek to be selected by the ISO for purposes of allocating and recovering the project's costs under the ISO OATT.

Reliability Criteria: The electric power system planning and operating policies, standards, criteria, guidelines, procedures, and rules promulgated by the North American Electric Reliability Corporation ("NERC"), Northeast Power Coordinating Council ("NPCC"), and the New York State Reliability Council ("NYSRC"), as they may be amended from time to time.

Reliability Need: A condition identified by the ISO as a violation or potential violation of one or more Reliability Criteria and, for purposes of administering the Gap Solution process in Section 31.2.11, applicable local criteria.

Responsible Transmission Owner: The Transmission Owner or Transmission Owners designated by the ISO: (i), pursuant to Section 31.2.4.3, to prepare a proposal for a regulated backstop solution to a Reliability Need or to proceed with a regulated solution to a Reliability Need, or (ii) pursuant to Section 31.2.11.3, to prepare a Gap Solution and a conceptual

permanent solution to a Reliability Need. The Responsible Transmission Owner will normally be the Transmission Owner in whose Transmission District the ISO identifies a Reliability Need.

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

RNA: The Reliability Needs Assessment as approved by the ISO Board under this Attachment.

RNA Base Case: The model(s) representing the New York State Power System over the Study Period.

Site Control: Documentation reasonably demonstrating: (1) ownership of, a leasehold interest in, or a right to develop a site or right of way for the purpose of constructing a proposed project; (2) an option to purchase or acquire a leasehold site or right of way for such purpose; or (3) an exclusivity or other business relationship between the Transmission Owner, or Other Developer, and the entity having the right to sell, lease, or grant the Transmission Owner, or Other Developer, the right to possess or occupy a site or right of way for such purpose.

Study Period: The ten-year time period evaluated in the RNA and the CRP.

Target Year: The calendar year in which a Reliability Need arises, as determined by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.2.

TPAS: The Transmission Planning Advisory Subcommittee, or any successor work group or committee designated to fulfill the functions assigned to TPAS pursuant to this Attachment.

Trigger Date: The date by which the ISO must request implementation of a regulated backstop solution or an alternative regulated solution pursuant to Section 31.2.8 in order to meet a Reliability Need.

Viability and Sufficiency Assessment: The results of the ISO's assessment of the viability and sufficiency of proposed solutions to a Reliability Need under Section 31.2.5 or a Public Policy Transmission Need under Section 31.4.6, as applicable.

Viable and Sufficient Gap Solution: A proposed Gap Solution pursuant to Section 31.2.11.3 or a Generator identified by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.2.11.4 that the ISO has determined in accordance with Section 31.2.11.6 to be viable and sufficient to satisfy the identified Reliability Need individually or in conjunction with other solutions.

All other capitalized terms shall have the meanings provided for them in the ISO's Tariffs.

31.1.2 Reliability Planning Process

Sections 31.2.1 through 31.2.13 of this Attachment Y describe the process that the ISO, the Transmission Owners, and Market Participants and other interested parties shall follow for local transmission planning, planning to meet the Reliability Needs of the BPTFs, and addressing the need for Gap Solutions. The objectives of the process are to: (1) evaluate the Reliability Needs of the BPTFs pursuant to Reliability Criteria (2) identify, through the development of appropriate scenarios, factors and issues that might adversely impact the reliability of the BPTFs; (3) provide a process whereby solutions to identified needs are proposed, evaluated on a comparable basis, and implemented in a timely manner to ensure the reliability of the system; (4) provide a process by which the ISO will select the more efficient or cost effective regulated transmission solution to satisfy the Reliability Need for eligibility for cost allocation under the ISO Tariffs; (5) provide an opportunity first for the implementation of market-based solutions while ensuring the reliability of the BPTFs; and (6) coordinate the ISO's reliability assessments with neighboring Control Areas. To the extent the ISO cannot timely satisfy an identified Reliability Need in its biennial reliability planning process, the ISO will commence the Gap Solution process in Section 31.2.11 to address the Reliability Need.

The ISO will provide, through the analysis of historical system congestion costs, information about historical congestion including the causes for that congestion so that Market Participants and other stakeholders can make appropriately informed decisions. See Appendix A.

31.1.3 Transmission Owner Planning Process

The Transmission Owners will continue to plan for their transmission systems, including the BPTFs and other NYS Transmission System facilities. The planning process of each

Transmission Owner is referred to herein as the LTPP, and the plans resulting from the LTPP are referred to herein as LTPs, whether under consideration or finalized. Each Transmission Owner will be responsible for administering its LTPP and for making provisions for stakeholder input into its LTPP. The ISO's role in the LTPP is limited to the procedural activities described in this Attachment Y.

The finalized portions of the LTPs periodically prepared by the Transmission Owners will be used as inputs to the CSPP described in this Attachment Y. Each Transmission Owner will prepare an LTP for its transmission system in accordance with the procedures described in Section 31.2.1.

31.1.4 Economic Planning Process

Sections 31.3.1 and 31.3.2 of this Attachment Y describe the process that the ISO, the Transmission Owners, and Market Participants shall follow for economic planning to identify and reduce current and future projected congestion on the BPTFs. The objectives of the economic planning process are to: (1) project congestion on the BPTFs over the ten-year planning period of this CSPP, (2) identify, through the development of appropriate scenarios, factors that might produce or increase congestion, (3) provide a process whereby projects to reduce congestion identified in the economic planning process are proposed and evaluated on a comparable basis in a timely manner, (4) provide an opportunity for the development of market-based solutions to reduce the congestion identified, and (5) coordinate the ISO's congestion assessments and economic planning process with neighboring Control Areas.

31.1.5 Public Policy Transmission Planning Process

Section 31.4 of this Attachment Y describes the planning process that the ISO, and all interested parties, shall follow to consider Public Policy Requirements that drive the need for

expansions or upgrades to BPTFs. The objectives of the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process are to: (1) allow Market Participants and other interested parties to propose transmission needs that they believe are being driven by Public Policy Requirements and for which transmission solutions should be evaluated, (2) provide a process by which the NYPSC will, with input from the ISO, Market Participants, and other interested parties, identify the transmission needs, if any, for which transmission solutions should be evaluated, (3) provide a process whereby Public Policy Transmission Projects and Other Public Policy Projects are proposed to satisfy each identified Public Policy Transmission Need and are evaluated by the ISO on a comparable basis, (4) provide a process by which the ISO will select the more efficient or cost effective regulated Public Policy Transmission Project, if any, to satisfy each identified Public Policy Transmission Need for eligibility for cost allocation under the ISO Tariffs; (5) provide a cost allocation methodology for regulated Public Policy Transmission Projects that have been selected by the ISO, and (6) coordinate the ISO's Public Policy Transmission Planning Process with neighboring Control Areas.

31.1.6 Interregional Planning Process

The ISO, the Transmission Owners, and Market Participants and other interested parties shall coordinate system planning activities with neighboring planning regions (*i.e.*, the ISO/RTO Regions and adjacent portions of Canada). The Interregional Planning Protocol includes a description of the committee structure, processes, and procedures through which system planning activities are openly and transparently coordinated by the ISO/RTO Regions. The objective of the interregional planning process is to contribute to the on-going reliability and the enhanced operational and economic performance of the ISO/RTO Regions through: (1) exchange of relevant data and information; (2) coordination of procedures to evaluate certain interconnection

and transmission service requests; (3) periodic comprehensive interregional assessments; (4) identification and evaluation of potential Interregional Transmission Projects that can address regional needs in a manner that may be more efficient or cost-effective than separate regional solutions, in accordance with the requirements of Order No. 1000; (5) allocation of costs among the ISO/RTO Regions of Interregional Transmission Projects, identified in accordance with the Interregional Planning Protocol and approved by each region, pursuant to the cost allocation methodology set forth in Section 31.5.7 herein. The planning activities of the ISO/RTO Regions shall be conducted consistent with the planning criteria of each ISO/RTO Region's regional reliability organization(s) as well as the relevant local reliability entities. The ISO/RTO Regions shall periodically produce a Northeastern Coordinated System Plan that integrates the system plans of all of the ISO/RTO Regions.

31.1.7 Enrollment in the ISO's Transmission Planning Region

For purposes of any matter addressed by this Attachment Y, participation in the ESPWG, IPTF and TPAS shall be open to any interested entity, irrespective of whether that entity has become a Party to the ISO Agreement. Any entity may enroll in the ISO's transmission planning region in order to fully participate in the ISO's governance process by becoming a Party to the ISO Agreement, as set forth in Section 2.02 of the ISO Agreement. An owner of transmission in New York State may become a Transmission Owner by: (i) satisfying the definition of a Transmission Owner in Article 1 of the ISO Agreement and (ii) executing the ISO/TO Agreement or an agreement with the ISO under terms comparable to the ISO/TO Agreement and turning over operational control of its transmission facilities to the ISO. As of October 15, 2013, the Transmission Owners are: (1) Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation, (2) Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc., (3) New York State Electric & Gas Corporation, (4)

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid, (5) Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc., (6) Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, (7) the Power Authority of the State of New York, and (8) Long Island Lighting Company d/b/a LIPA.

31.1.8 ISO Implementation and Administration

31.1.8.1 The ISO shall adopt procedures for the implementation and administration of the CSPP set forth in this Attachment Y and the Interregional Planning Protocol, and shall revise those procedures as and when necessary. Such procedures will be incorporated in the ISO's manuals. The ISO Procedures shall provide for the open and transparent coordination of the CSPP to allow Market Participants and all other interested parties to have a meaningful opportunity to participate in each stage of the CSPP through the meetings conducted in accordance with the ISO system of collaborative governance. Confidential Information and Critical Energy Infrastructure Information exchanged through the CSPP shall be subject to the protections for such information contained in the ISO's tariffs and procedures, including this Attachment Y and Attachment F of the ISO OATT.

31.1.8.2 The ISO Procedures shall include a schedule for the collection and submission of data and the preparation of models to be used in the studies contemplated under this tariff. That schedule shall provide for a rolling two-year cycle of studies and reports conducted in each of the ISO planning processes (reliability, economic and public policy) as part of the Comprehensive System Planning Process. Each cycle commences with the LTPP providing input into the reliability planning process. The CARIS study under Section 31.3 of this

Attachment Y will commence upon completion of the viability and sufficiency analysis performed pursuant to Section 31.2.5.7, as part of the CRP process. The Public Policy Transmission Planning Process will to the extent practicable run in parallel with the reliability planning process, provided that the NYPSC's issuance of a written statement pursuant to Section 31.4.2.1 will occur after the draft RNA study results are posted. If the CRP cannot be completed within a two-year cycle, the ISO will notify stakeholders and provide an estimated completion date and an explanation of the reasons the additional time is required. As further detailed in Sections 31.2, 31.3, 31.4, and 31.5, the interregional planning process shall be conducted in parallel with the reliability planning process, the economic planning process, and the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process to identify and evaluate Interregional Transmission Projects that may more efficiently or cost-effectively meet the needs of the region than a regional transmission project.

31.1.8.3 The ISO Procedures shall be designed to allow the coordination of the ISO's planning activities with those of the ISO/RTO Regions, NERC, NPCC, the NYSRC, and other regional reliability organizations so as to develop consistency of the models, databases, and assumptions utilized in making reliability and economic determinations.

31.1.8.4 The ISO Procedures shall facilitate the timely identification and resolution of all substantive and procedural disputes that arise out of the CSPP. Any party participating in the CSPP and having a dispute arising out of the CSPP may seek to have its dispute resolved in accordance with ISO governance procedures during the course of the CSPP. If the party's dispute is not resolved in this manner as a

part of the plan development process, the party may invoke formal dispute resolution procedures administered by the ISO that are the same as those available to Transmission Customers under Section 11 of the ISO Market Administration and Control Area Services Tariff. Disputes arising out of the LTPP shall be addressed by the LTPP set forth in Section 31.2.1.4 of this Attachment Y.

31.1.8.5 Except for those cases where the ISO OATT provides that an individual customer shall be responsible for the cost, or a specified share of the cost, of an individually requested study related to interconnection or to system expansion or to congestion and resource integration, the study costs incurred by the ISO as a result of its administration of the CSPP will be recovered from all customers through and in accordance with Rate Schedule 1 of the ISO OATT.

31.1.8.6 The ISO shall make reasonable efforts to meet all deadlines provided in this Attachment Y; *provided, however*, that the ISO must meet all deadlines set forth in a development agreement entered into pursuant to this Attachment Y in accordance with the terms of that agreement. If the ISO cannot meet a deadline set forth in this Attachment Y and an extension of that deadline will not result in a reliability violation, the ISO may extend the deadline, provided that it shall notify Market Participants and other interested parties, explain the reason for the failure to meet the deadline, and provide an estimated time by which it will complete the applicable action.

31.1.8.7 With the exception of the deadlines set forth in a development agreement entered into pursuant to this Attachment Y, the ISO may extend, at its discretion, a deadline applicable to another party under this Attachment Y for a reasonable

period of time if the extension: (i) is applied equally to all parties that are required to meet the deadline, and (ii) will not result in a reliability violation.

31.4 Public Policy Transmission Planning Process

31.4.1 General

The Public Policy Transmission Planning Process shall consist of three steps: (1) identification of Public Policy Transmission Needs; (2) requests for proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects and Other Public Policy Projects to address those Public Policy Transmission Needs and the evaluation of those projects; and (3) selection of the more efficient or cost-effective Public Policy Transmission Project, if any, to satisfy each Public Policy Transmission Need to be eligible for cost allocation under the ISO OATT. Sections 31.4.2.1 through 31.4.2.3 provide for the identification of transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements and warranting evaluation by the ISO. The ISO shall request and evaluate proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects and Other Public Policy Projects to address such needs. The ISO shall select the more efficient or cost-effective Public Policy Transmission Project, if any, to satisfy each need. The Public Policy Transmission Planning Process will be conducted on a two-year cycle, unless requested by the NYPSC to be conducted out of that cycle. If the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process cannot be completed in the two-year cycle, the ISO will notify stakeholders and provide an estimated completion date and an explanation of the reasons the additional time is required. The NYPSC's issuance of a written statement pursuant to Section 31.4.2.1 below will occur after the draft RNA study results are posted.

31.4.2 Identification and Posting of Proposed Transmission Needs Driven by Public Policy Requirements

At the start of each cycle for the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process, the ISO will provide a 60-day period to allow any stakeholder or interested party to submit to the ISO, or

for the ISO on its own initiative to identify, any proposed transmission need(s) that it believes are being driven by Public Policy Requirement(s) and for which transmission solutions should be requested and evaluated. Each submittal will identify the Public Policy Requirement(s) that the party believes is driving the need for transmission, propose criteria for the evaluation of transmission solutions to that need, and describe how the construction of transmission will fulfill the Public Policy Requirement(s).

For submittals to identify transmission needs pursuant to Section 31.4.2.1, the ISO will post all submittals on its website after the end of the 60-day period, and will submit to the NYPSC all submittals proposed by stakeholders, other interested parties, and any additional transmission needs and criteria identified by the ISO. For submittals to identify transmission needs that require a physical modification to transmission facilities in the Long Island Transmission District pursuant to Section 31.4.2.3, the ISO will post all submittals on its website after the end of the 60-day period, and will provide to the NYPSC and the Long Island Power Authority all submittals proposed by stakeholders, other interested parties, and any additional transmission needs and criteria identified by the ISO.

31.4.2.1 Identification and Determination of Transmission Needs Driven by Public Policy Requirements

The NYPSC will review all proposed transmission need(s) and, with input from the ISO and interested parties, identify the transmission needs, if any, for which specific transmission solutions should be requested and evaluated. The NYPSC will maintain procedures to govern the process by which it will review proposed transmission need(s), which procedures shall: ensure that such process is open and transparent, provide the ISO and interested parties a meaningful opportunity to participate in such process, provide input regarding the NYPSC's considerations, and result in the development of a written determination as required by law,

inclusive of the input provided by the ISO and interested parties. In addition, the NYPSC may, on its own, identify a transmission need driven by a Public Policy Requirement. Any such transmission need identified by the NYPSC on its own shall be described by the NYPSC in accordance with the requirements for stakeholder submittals set forth in Section 31.4.2, and shall be identified and posted to the ISO's website prior to NYPSC's issuance of the required written statement discussed below in this Section 31.4.2.1 so as to provide the ISO and interested parties an opportunity to provide input to the NYPSC relating thereto.

The ISO shall assist the NYPSC in its analyses as requested. The NYPSC may also request that the ISO, pursuant to Section 3.8.1 of the ISO OATT, conduct an evaluation of alternative options to address the transmission needs.

The NYPSC shall issue a written statement that identifies the relevant Public Policy Requirements driving transmission needs and explains why it has identified the Public Policy Transmission Needs for which transmission solutions will be requested by the ISO. The statement shall also explain why transmission solutions to other suggested transmission needs should not be requested. The NYPSC's statement may also provide: (i) additional criteria for the evaluation of transmission solutions and non-transmission projects, (ii) the required timeframe, if any, for completion of the proposed solution, and (iii) the type of analyses that it will request from the ISO.

If the NYPSC does not identify any transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements, it will provide confirmation of that conclusion to the ISO, and the ISO shall not request solutions. The ISO shall post the NYPSC's statement on the ISO's website.

31.4.2.2 Disputes of NYPSC Determinations

In the event that a dispute is raised solely within the NYPSC's jurisdiction relating to any NYPSC decision to either accept or deny a proposed transmission need as one for which transmission solutions should be requested, the dispute shall be addressed through judicial review in the courts of the State of New York pursuant to Article 78 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules.

31.4.2.3 Identification and Determination of Transmission Needs Within the Long Island Transmission District Driven by Public Policy Requirements

The Long Island Power Authority, pursuant to its jurisdiction under Title 1-A of Article 5 (§1020 et seq.) of the Public Authorities Law of the State of New York, shall identify and determine whether a Public Policy Requirement drives the need for a physical modification to transmission facilities in the Long Island Transmission District. The identification and determination of such transmission needs shall be consistent with Section 31.4.2.1, as further supplemented by this Section 31.4.2.3. The Long Island Power Authority shall have no authority to identify a transmission need outside of the Long Island Transmission District.

Based on the information provided by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.4.2, the Long Island Power Authority shall review whether a proposed Public Policy Requirement drives the need for a physical modification to transmission facilities in the Long Island Transmission District. In addition, the following requirements shall apply to the Long Island Power Authority:

- (i) The Long Island Power Authority shall consult with the NYDPS on the identification of transmission needs driven by a Public Policy Requirement solely within the Long Island Transmission District;
- (ii) Upon completion of its review, the Long Island Power Authority shall issue a written statement explaining whether a Public Policy Requirement does or does

not drive the need for a physical modification to transmission facilities solely within the Long Island Transmission District, and describing the consultation undertaken with the NYDPS;

- (iii) In conjunction with the issuance of its written statement, the Long Island Power Authority shall transmit to the NYPSC and request that it review and determine whether a transmission need solely within the Long Island Transmission District identified by the Long Island Power Authority as being driven by a Public Policy Requirement should be considered a Public Policy Transmission Need for purposes of the evaluation of solutions by the ISO and the potential eligibility of transmission solutions for selection and regional cost allocation under the ISO OATT. Any transmission need within the Long Island Transmission District that has been identified by the Long Island Power Authority, but which the NYPSC has not determined to be a Public Policy Transmission Need that would be evaluated by the ISO, shall be addressed under the Long Island Power Authority's Local Transmission Plan.
- (iv) The determination of whether there is a transmission need solely within the Long Island Transmission District is the sole responsibility of the Long Island Power Authority;
- (v) The NYDPS and Long Island Power Authority shall consult and coordinate on procedures to be adopted by the NYPSC and Long Island Power Authority to ensure that their respective determinations under this Section 31.4.2.3, including any NYPSC determination that there is a Public Policy Transmission Need within the Long Island Transmission District for which solutions should be evaluated by

the ISO, are completed, publicly posted and transmitted to the ISO at the same time as the NYPSC makes its final determinations pursuant to Section 31.4.2.1; and

- (vi) In the event that a dispute is raised solely within the Long Island Power Authority's jurisdiction relating to a decision by the Long Island Power Authority to either accept or deny a proposed transmission need solely within the Long Island Transmission District, the dispute shall be addressed through judicial review in the courts of the State of New York pursuant to Article 78 of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules.

31.4.3 Request for Proposed Solutions

The ISO will request proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects, including Interregional Transmission Projects, to satisfy each Public Policy Transmission Need identified pursuant to Sections 31.4.2.1 through 31.4.2.3. An Interregional Transmission Project shall be: (i) evaluated in accordance with the applicable requirements of the Public Policy Transmission 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. The ISO shall also accept specific proposed Other Public Policy Projects to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need identified pursuant to Sections 31.4.2.1 through 31.4.2.3.

31.4.3.1 Timing of ISO Request for Proposed Solutions

Following posting of a determination pursuant to Sections 31.4.2.1 through 31.4.2.3, the ISO will provide a 60-day period for Developers to propose specific solutions, whether Public Policy Transmission Project(s) or Other Public Policy Project(s), to satisfy each identified Public

Policy Transmission Need in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 31.4.4.3.

Any proposed transmission needs that are under appeal pursuant to Section 31.4.2.2 or Section 31.4.2.3(vi) may be addressed with proposed solutions, if required, except where the NYPSC order has been stayed pending the resolution of that appeal.

31.4.3.2 NYPSC and LIPA Requests for Solutions

To ensure that there will be a response to a Public Policy Transmission Need, the NYPSC may request the appropriate Transmission Owner(s) or Other Developer, as identified by the NYPSC, to propose a Public Policy Transmission Project. With respect to a transmission need identified by the Long Island Power Authority and determined to be a Public Policy Transmission Need by the NYPSC pursuant to Section 31.4.2.3, the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees may request that an appropriate Transmission Owner(s) or Other Developer propose a Public Policy Transmission Project or Other Public Policy Project. A request for the provision of a Public Policy Transmission Project or Other Public Policy Project by either the NYPSC or the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees, pursuant to this section, is supplementary to, and not to the exclusion of, the submission of proposed projects pursuant to Section 31.4.3.1. Costs incurred by a Transmission Owner or Other Developer in preparing a proposed transmission solution in response to a request under this Section 31.4.3.2 will be recoverable under Section 31.5.6.

31.4.4 Eligibility and Qualification Criteria for Developers and Projects

For purposes of fulfilling the requirements of the Developer qualification criteria in this Section 31.4.4 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 31.4.4.1.1, the Affiliate(s) shall provide to the ISO: (i) the information required in Section 31.4.4.1.1 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.

31.4.4.1 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 Public Policy Transmission Project. The ISO shall consider the qualification of each Developer in an evenhanded and non-discriminatory manner, treating Transmission Owners and Other Developers alike.

31.4.4.1.1 Developer Qualification Criteria

The ISO shall make a determination on the qualification of a Developer to propose to develop a Public Policy Transmission Project based on the following criteria:

- 31.4.4.1.1.1 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;

31.4.4.1.1.2 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

31.4.4.1.1.3 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, if available;
- (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 Public Policy Transmission Need.

31.4.4.1.1.4 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.

31.4.4.1.2 Developer Qualification Determination

Any Developer seeking to be 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 31.4.4.1.1.3 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 Public Policy Transmission Project and shall be eligible to use the cost allocation and cost recovery mechanism for regulated Public Policy Transmission Projects set forth in Section 31.5 of this Attachment Y and the appropriate rate schedule for any approved project.

31.4.4.3 Timing for Submittal of Project Information and Developer Qualification Information and Opportunity to Provide Additional Information

31.4.4.3.1 The Developer of a Public Policy Transmission Project or an Other Public Policy Project proposed to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need shall submit to the ISO within 60 days of the ISO's request for solutions to a Public Policy Transmission Need the project information required under Section 31.4.5. If: (i) the ISO determines that the Developer's submission of its project information is incomplete, or (ii) the ISO determines at any time in the planning process that additional project information is required, the ISO shall request that the Developer provide additional project information within the timeframe set forth in Section 31.4.4.3.4. A Developer's failure to provide the data requested by the ISO within the timeframes provided in Sections 31.4.4.3.1 and 31.4.4.3.4 of this Attachment Y will result in the rejection of the Developer's proposed Public Policy

Transmission Project or Other Public Policy Project from further consideration during that planning cycle.

31.4.4.3.2 Any Developer that the ISO has determined under Section 31.4.4.1.2 of this Attachment Y to be qualified to propose to develop a transmission project as a transmission solution to a Public Policy Transmission Need may submit the required project information for its proposed Public Policy Transmission Project; *provided, however*, that based on the actual identified need that requires resolution, the ISO may request that the qualified Developer provide additional Developer qualification information within the timeframe set forth in Section 31.4.4.3.4.

31.4.4.3.3 Any Developer that has not been determined by the ISO to be qualified, but that wants to propose to develop a Public Policy Transmission Project, must submit to the ISO the information required for Developer qualification under Section 31.4.4.1 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 and request that the Developer provide additional Developer qualification information within the timeframe set forth in Section 31.4.4.3.4. The ISO shall notify a Developer that has submitted the requested Developer qualification information whether it is qualified to propose to develop a Public Policy Transmission Project to be considered in that planning cycle.

31.4.4.3.4 The Developer shall submit additional Developer qualification information or project information required by the ISO within 15 days of the ISO's request.

31.4.4.3.5 If a Developer fails to timely submit the additional Developer qualification information requested by the ISO, the Developer will not be eligible for its proposed Public Policy Transmission Project to be considered in that planning cycle.

31.4.4.4. Application Fee and Study Deposit for Proposed Regulated Public Policy Transmission Project

Within sixty (60) days of the ISO's request for solutions to a Public Policy Transmission Need, a Developer that proposes a Public Policy Transmission Project shall, at the same time that it provides project information pursuant to Section 31.4.4.3.1, (i) execute a study agreement with the ISO for purposes of the ISO's evaluation of the proposed Public Policy Transmission Project under Sections 31.4.7, 31.4.8, 31.4.9, and 31.4.10, and (ii) submit to the ISO: (A) a non-refundable application fee of \$10,000, and (B) a study deposit of \$100,000, which shall be applied to study costs and subject to refund as described in this Section 31.4.4.4.

The ISO shall charge, and a Developer proposing a regulated Public Policy Transmission Project shall pay, the actual costs of the ISO's evaluation of the Developer's proposed Public Policy Transmission Project for purposes of the ISO's selection of the more efficient or cost effective Public Policy Transmission Project to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission 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 Public Policy Transmission Project under Sections 31.4.7, 31.4.8, 31.4.9, and 31.4.10 and any

supplemental evaluation or re-evaluation of the proposed Public Policy Transmission Project. If the ISO or its subcontractors perform study work for multiple proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects 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 Public Policy Transmission Projects 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 Public Policy Transmission Project and may disqualify the Developer's proposed Public Policy Transmission Project from further consideration. After the conclusion of the ISO's evaluation of the Developer's proposed Public Policy Transmission Project or if the Developer: (i) withdraws its proposed Public Policy Transmission Project or (ii) fails to pay an invoiced amount and the ISO halts its evaluation of the proposed Public Policy Transmission Project, 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 31.4.4.4 that exceeds

outstanding amounts that the ISO has incurred in evaluating that Developer's proposed Public Policy Transmission Project, 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.

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 Public Policy Transmission Project.

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.

31.4.5 Project Information Requirements

31.4.5.1 Requirements for Public Policy Transmission Projects

31.4.5.1.1 A Developer proposing a Public Policy Transmission Project to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need must provide, 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 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 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 such control; (8) status of any contracts (other than an interconnection agreement) that are under negotiations or in place, including any contracts with third-party contractors; (9) status of ISO interconnection studies and interconnection agreement; (10) status of equipment availability and procurement; (11) evidence of financing or ability to finance the project; (12) capital cost estimates for the project; (13) 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 (14) any other information requested by the ISO.

31.4.5.1.2 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.”

31.4.5.1.3 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.

31.4.5.1.4 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) 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.

31.4.5.2 Requirements for Other Public Policy Projects

31.4.5.2.1 A Developer proposing an Other Public Policy Project to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need must provide, 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, as applicable; (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.

31.4.5.2.2 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.”

31.4.5.2.3 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.

31.4.5.2.4 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.

31.4.6 ISO Evaluation of Proposed Solutions to Public Policy Transmission Needs

31.4.6.1 Evaluation Time Period

The ISO will study proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects and Other Public Policy Projects using: (i) the most recent base case from the reliability planning process, (ii) updates in accordance with ISO Procedures, and (iii) compensatory MWs as needed to resolve the Reliability Needs over the ten-year Study Period. The ISO will extend the most recent reliability and economic planning models for modeling solutions for Public Policy Transmission Needs by up to an additional twenty years following the Study Period, as appropriate based upon the Public Policy Requirement and the identified Public Policy Transmission Need.

31.4.6.2 Comparable Evaluation of All Proposed Solutions

The ISO shall evaluate any proposed Public Policy Transmission Project or Other Public Policy Project submitted by a Developer to a Public Policy Transmission Need. The ISO will evaluate whether each proposed solution is viable pursuant to Section 31.4.6.3 below and is

sufficient to satisfy the Public Policy Transmission Need pursuant to Section 31.4.6.4. The proposed solution may include multiple components and resource types. When evaluating proposed solutions to a Public Policy Transmission Need from any Developer, the ISO shall consider all resource types – including generation, transmission, demand response, or a combination of these resource types – on a comparable basis as potential solutions. All solutions will be evaluated in the same general time frame.

31.4.6.3 Evaluation of Viability of Proposed Solution

The ISO will determine the viability of a Public Policy Transmission Project or Other Public Policy Project – whether transmission, generation, demand response, or a combination of these resource types – proposed to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need. For purposes of its analysis, the ISO will consider: (i) the Developer qualification data provided pursuant to Section 31.4.4 and the project information data provided under Section 31.4.5; (ii) whether the proposed solution is technically practicable; (iii) the Developer’s possession of, or approach for acquiring, any necessary rights-of-way, property, and facilities that will make the proposal reasonably feasible in the required timeframe; and (iv) whether the proposed solution can be completed in the required timeframe, if any. If the ISO determines that the proposed solution is not viable, the ISO shall reject the proposed solution from further consideration during that planning cycle.

31.4.6.4 Evaluation of Sufficiency of Proposed Solution

The ISO will perform a comparable analysis of each proposed Public Policy Transmission Project or Other Public Policy Project – whether transmission, generation, demand response, or a combination of these resource types – to confirm that the proposed solution satisfies the Public Policy Transmission Need. The ISO will evaluate each solution to measure

the degree to which the proposed solution independently satisfies the Public Policy Transmission Need, including the evaluation criteria provided by the NYPSC. If the ISO determines that the proposed solution is not sufficient, the ISO shall reject the proposed solution from further consideration during that planning cycle.

31.4.6.5 Viability and Sufficiency Assessment

The ISO will present its Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to stakeholders, interested parties, and the NYPSC for comment. The ISO shall report in the Public Policy Transmission Planning Report the results of its evaluation under this Section 31.4.6 of whether each proposed Public Policy Transmission Project or Other Public Policy Project is viable and is sufficient to satisfy the identified Public Policy Transmission Need.

31.4.6.6 Developer's Determination to Proceed

Within 30 Calendar Days following the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment pursuant to Section 31.4.6.5, the Developer of a proposed Public Policy Transmission Project that the ISO has determined satisfies the viability and sufficiency requirements in this Section 31.4.6 shall notify the ISO whether it intends for its project to proceed to be evaluated by the ISO for purposes of the ISO's selection of the more efficient or cost effective Public Policy Transmission Project to satisfy an identified Public Policy Transmission Need. To proceed, the Developer must include with its notification to the ISO under this Section 31.4.6.6 its consent to the ISO's disclosure of the details of its proposed Public Policy Transmission Project in the Public Policy Transmission Planning Report, except for the information that shall remain confidential in accordance with Section 31.4.15. If a Developer: (i) notifies the ISO that it does not intend for its proposed Public Policy Transmission Project to proceed to be evaluated for purposes of the ISO's selection, or (ii) does not provide the

required notification to the ISO under this Section 31.4.6.6, the ISO will remove the project from further consideration during that planning cycle.

31.4.6.7 NYPSC Determination on Whether to Proceed with Evaluation of Transmission Solutions to a Public Policy Transmission Need

Following the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment, the NYPSC will review the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment and will issue an order, subject to and in accordance with the State Administrative Procedure Act, explaining whether the ISO should continue to evaluate transmission solutions to a Public Policy Transmission Need or whether non-transmission solutions should be pursued. If the NYPSC concludes that non-transmission solutions should be pursued, the NYPSC will indicate in its order that there is no longer a transmission need driven by a Public Policy Requirement that requires the ISO's evaluation of potential transmission solutions. In such case, the ISO will not perform an evaluation, or make a selection of, a more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution under Sections 31.4.7 through 31.4.11 for that planning cycle.

31.4.7 Evaluation of Regional Public Policy Transmission Projects to Address Local and Regional Needs Driven by Public Policy Requirements More Efficiently or More Cost Effectively Than Local Transmission Solutions

The ISO will review the LTPs as they relate to the BPTFs. The ISO will include the results of its analysis in its Public Policy Transmission Planning Report, as approved by the ISO Board.

31.4.7.1 Evaluation of Regional Public Policy Transmission Projects to Address Local Needs Driven By Public Policy Requirements Identified in Local Transmission Plans More Efficiently or More Cost Effectively than Local Transmission Solutions

The ISO, using engineering judgment, will determine whether any proposed regional Public Policy Transmission Project on the BPTFs more efficiently or cost-effectively satisfies any needs driven by a Public Policy Requirement identified in the LTPs. If the ISO identifies that a regional Public Policy Transmission Project has the potential to more efficiently or cost effectively satisfy the needs driven by a Public Policy Requirement identified in the LTPs, it will perform a sensitivity analysis to determine whether the proposed regional Public Policy Transmission Project on the BPTFs would satisfy the needs driven by a Public Policy Requirement identified in the LTPs. If the ISO determines that the proposed regional Public Policy Transmission Project would satisfy the need, the ISO will evaluate the proposed regional Public Policy Transmission Project using the metrics set forth in Section 31.4.8.1 below to determine whether it may be a more efficient or cost effective solution on the BPTFs to the needs driven by a Public Policy Requirement identified in the LTPs than the local solutions proposed in the LTPs.

31.4.7.2 Evaluation of Regional Public Policy Transmission Project to Address Regional Public Policy Transmission 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 Public Policy Transmission Project might more efficiently or more cost effectively satisfy an identified regional Public Policy Transmission 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 that such transmission solutions are included to address local transmission needs driven by Public Policy Requirements.

31.4.8 ISO Selection of More Efficient or Cost Effective Public Policy Transmission Project to Satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need

A proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Project submitted by a Developer that the ISO has determined has provided the required notification to proceed under Section 31.4.6.6 shall be eligible under this Section 31.4.8 for selection in the Public Policy Transmission Planning Report for the purpose of cost allocation under the ISO Tariffs. The ISO shall evaluate any proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Projects that are eligible for selection in the planning cycle of the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process using the metrics set forth in Section 31.4.8.1 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. 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 Public Policy Transmission Planning Report for cost allocation purposes the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need in the manner set forth in Section 31.4.8.2 below.

31.4.8.1 Metrics for Evaluating More Efficient or Cost Effective Regulated Public Policy Transmission Project to Satisfy Public Policy Transmission Need

In determining which of the eligible proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Projects is the more efficient or cost effective solution to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need, the ISO will consider, and will consult with the NYDPS regarding, the metrics set forth below in this Section 31.4.8.1 and rank each proposed project based on the quality of its satisfaction of these metrics:

31.4.8.1.1 The capital cost estimates for the proposed regulated Public Policy

Transmission Project, including the accuracy of the proposed estimates. For this evaluation, the Developer shall provide the ISO with credible capital cost estimates for its proposed project, 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 Public Policy Transmission Need. To the extent information is available, the Developer 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 Developer 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, (ii) interconnection facilities (including Attachment Facilities and Direct Assignment Facilities), and (iii) System Upgrade Facilities, System Deliverability Upgrades, Network Upgrades, and Distribution Upgrades.

31.4.8.1.2 The cost per MW ratio of the proposed regulated Public Policy

Transmission Project. For this evaluation, the ISO will first determine the present

worth, in dollars, of the total capital cost of the proposed project in current year dollars. The ISO will then determine the cost per MW ratio by dividing the capital cost by the MW value of increased transfer capability.

31.4.8.1.3 The expandability of the proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Project. The ISO will consider the impact of the proposed project on future construction. The ISO will also consider the extent to which any subsequent expansion will continue to use this proposed project within the context of system expansion.

31.4.8.1.4 The operability of the proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Project. The ISO will consider how the proposed project 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 project 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.

31.4.8.1.5 The performance of the proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Project. The ISO will consider how the proposed project may affect the utilization of the system (e.g. interface flows, percent loading of facilities).

31.4.8.1.6 The extent to which the Developer of a proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Project has the property rights, or ability to obtain the property rights, required to implement the project. The ISO will consider whether the

Developer: (i) already possesses the rights of way necessary to implement the project; (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.

31.4.8.1.7 The potential issues associated with delay in constructing the proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Project consistent with the major milestone schedule and the schedule for obtaining any permits and other certifications as required to timely meet the need.

31.4.8.1.8 The ISO shall apply any criteria specified by the Public Policy Requirement or provided by the NYPSC and perform the analyses requested by the NYPSC, to the extent compliance with such criteria and analyses are feasible.

31.4.8.1.9 The ISO, in consultation with stakeholders, shall, as appropriate, consider other metrics in the context of the Public Policy Requirement, such as: change in production costs; LBMP; losses; emissions; ICAP; TCC; congestion; impact on transfer limits; and deliverability.

31.4.8.2 ISO Selection of More Efficient or Cost Effective Regulated Public Policy Transmission Project to Satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need

The ISO shall identify under this Section 31.4.8 the proposed regulated Public Policy Transmission Project, if any, that is the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution proposed in the planning cycle for the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process to satisfy a Public Policy Transmission Need. The ISO shall include the more efficient or cost effective

transmission solution in the Public Policy Transmission Planning Report. The Developer of a regulated Public Policy Transmission Project shall be eligible to recover costs for the project only if the project is selected by the ISO, except as otherwise provided in Section 31.4.3.2 or as otherwise determined by the Commission. Costs will be recovered when the project is completed pursuant to a rate schedule filed with and accepted by the Commission in accordance with the cost recovery requirements set forth in Section 31.5.6.5, or as otherwise determined by the Commission. Actual project cost recovery, including any issues related to cost recovery and project cost overruns, will be submitted to and decided by the Commission.

Any selection of a Public Policy Transmission Project by the ISO under Section 31.4.8, including but not limited to the selection of a project that involves the physical modification of facilities within the Long Island Transmission District, shall not affect the obligation and responsibility of the Developer to apply for, and receive, all necessary authorizations or permits required by federal or state law for such project.

31.4.9 Consequences for Other Regions

The ISO will coordinate with the ISO/RTO Regions to identify the consequences of a transmission solution driven by Public Policy Requirements on neighboring ISO/RTO Regions using the respective planning criteria of such ISO/RTO Regions. The ISO shall report the results in its Public Policy Transmission Planning Report. The ISO shall not bear the costs of required upgrades in another region.

31.4.10 Evaluation of Impact of Proposed Public Policy Transmission Project on ISO Wholesale Electricity Markets

The ISO shall evaluate using the metrics set forth in Section 31.4.8.1.9 the impacts on the ISO-administered wholesale electricity markets of a proposed Public Policy Transmission

Project that the ISO has determined under Section 31.4.6 is viable and sufficient. The ISO shall include the results of its analysis in the Public Policy Transmission Planning Report.

31.4.11 Public Policy Transmission Planning Report

Following the ISO's evaluation of the proposed solutions to Public Policy Transmission Need(s), the ISO will prepare a draft Public Policy Transmission Planning Report that sets forth the ISO's assumptions, inputs, methodologies and the results of its analyses. The draft Public Policy Transmission Planning Report will reflect any input from the NYDPS.

Except as otherwise provided in the confidentiality requirements in Section 31.4.15, the ISO will include in the draft Public Policy Transmission Planning Report: (i) the list of Developers and their proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects and Other Public Policy Projects that qualify pursuant to Sections 31.4.4 and 31.4.5; (ii) the proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects and Other Public Policy Projects that the ISO has determined under Section 31.4.6 are viable and sufficient to satisfy the identified Public Policy Transmission Need(s); and (iii) the regulated Public Policy Transmission Project, if any, that the ISO staff recommends for selection for cost allocation purposes pursuant to Section 31.4.8 as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy each identified Public Policy Transmission Need. The draft Public Policy Transmission Planning Report will also include the results of the ISO's analysis of the LTPs consistent with Section 31.4.7.

The draft Public Policy Transmission Planning Report shall include a comparison of a proposed Public Policy Transmission Project to an Interregional Transmission Project proposed in the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process, if any, identified and evaluated under the "Analysis and Consideration of Interregional Transmission Projects" section of the Interregional Planning Protocol. An Interregional Transmission Project proposed in the ISO's Public Policy

Transmission Planning Process may be selected as a regulated Public Policy Transmission Project under the provisions of this process.

31.4.11.1 Collaborative Governance Process

The draft Public Policy Transmission Planning Report shall be submitted to both TPAS and the ESPWG for review and comment. Concurrently, the draft report will be provided to the Market Monitoring Unit for its review and consideration. The Market Monitoring Unit's evaluation will be provided to the Management Committee prior to the Management Committee's advisory vote. The ISO shall make available to any interested party sufficient information to replicate the results of the draft Public Policy Transmission Planning Report. 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 that review, the draft report reflecting the revisions resulting from the TPAS and ESPWG review shall be forwarded to the Business Issues Committee and the Management Committee for discussion and an advisory vote.

31.4.11.2 Board Review, Consideration, and Approval of Public Policy Transmission Planning Report

Following the Management Committee vote, the draft Public Policy Transmission Planning Report, with Business Issues Committee and Management Committee input, will be forwarded to the ISO Board for review and action. Concurrently, the Market Monitoring Unit's evaluation will be provided to the Board. The Board may approve the Public Policy Transmission Planning Report as submitted or propose modifications on its own motion, including a determination not to select a Public Policy Transmission Project to satisfy a Public

Policy Transmission Need. If any changes are proposed by the Board, the revised report shall be returned to the Management Committee for comment. The Board shall not make a final determination on a revised report until it has reviewed the Management Committee comments, including comments regarding the Market Monitoring Unit's evaluation. Upon approval by the Board, the ISO shall issue the report to the marketplace by posting it on its website. If the ISO Board determines not to select a Public Policy Transmission Project under this Section 31.4.11.2, the Board shall state the reasons for its determination.

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 30.4.6.8.5 of the Market Monitoring Plan, Attachment O to the ISO Services Tariff.

31.4.12 Developer's Responsibilities Following Selection of Its Public Policy Transmission Project

31.4.12.1 Developer's Responsibility to Obtain Necessary Approvals and Authorizations

Upon its selection of a Public Policy Transmission Project, the ISO will inform the Developer that it should submit the selected Public Policy 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. In response to the ISO's request, the Developer 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.

If the appropriate federal, state or local agency(ies) either rejects a necessary authorization, or approves and later withdraws authorization, for the selected Public Policy Transmission Project, 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, will be recoverable by the Developer. The ISO shall allocate these costs among Load Serving Entities in accordance with Section 31.5.5.4.3, except as otherwise determined by the Commission. The ISO shall recover such costs in accordance with Section 31.5.6.5.

31.4.12.2 Development Agreement

As soon as reasonably practicable following the ISO's selection of the proposed project, the ISO shall tender to the Developer that proposed the selected Public Policy Transmission Project a draft Development Agreement with draft appendices 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 D in Section 31.7 of this Attachment Y. The ISO and the Developer, as applicable, shall finalize the Development Agreement and appendices and negotiate concerning any disputed provisions. Unless otherwise agreed by the ISO and the Developer, the Developer 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 Developer determines that negotiations are at an impasse, it may request in writing that the ISO file the Development Agreement in unexecuted form with the Commission. If the Development Agreement resulting from the negotiation between the ISO and the Developer does not conform with the Commission-approved standard form in Appendix D 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 Developer 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

Developer. 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 Developer 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 Developer's execution of the Development Agreement or the ISO's filing of an unexecuted Development Agreement with the Commission, the ISO and the Developer 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.

31.4.12.3 Process for Addressing Inability of Developer to Complete Selected Public Policy Transmission Project

31.4.12.3.1 If one of the following events occur: (i) the Developer that proposed the selected Public Policy 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 31.4.12.2, or (ii) an effective Development Agreement is terminated under the terms of the agreement prior to the completion of the term of the agreement, the ISO may take the following actions as soon as practicable after the occurrence of the event:

31.4.12.3.1.1 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.

31.4.12.3.1.2 The ISO may: (i) submit a report to the NYPSC and/or the Commission, as appropriate, for its consideration and determination of whether action is appropriate under state or federal law, and (ii) take such action as it reasonably considers is appropriate, following consultation with the NYPSC, to ensure that the Public Policy Transmission Need is satisfied,

including, but not limited to, revoking its selection of the Public Policy Transmission Project and the eligibility of the Developer to recover its costs for the project; *provided, however*, the Developer may recover its costs to the extent provided in Sections 31.4.3.2 and 31.4.12.1 or as otherwise determined by the Commission.

31.4.12.4 Execution of ISO/TO Agreement or Comparable Agreement

The Developer of a selected Public Policy Transmission Project shall execute the ISO/TO Agreement or an agreement with the ISO under terms comparable to the ISO/TO Agreement prior to energizing the Public Policy Transmission Project.

31.4.13 ISO Monitoring of Selected Public Policy Transmission Projects

The ISO shall monitor Public Policy Transmission Projects selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solutions to Public Policy Transmission Needs to confirm that they continue to develop consistent with the conditions, actions, or schedules for the projects.

31.4.14 Posting of Approved Solutions

The ISO shall post on its website a list of all Developers who have accepted the terms and conditions of an Article VII certificate under the New York Public Service Law, or any successor statute, or any other applicable permits to build a Public Policy Transmission Project in response to a need driven by a Public Policy Requirement.

31.4.15 Confidentiality of Solutions

31.4.15.1 The term “Confidential Information” shall include all proposed solutions to Public Policy Transmission Needs that are submitted to the ISO in response to a request for solutions under Section 31.4.3 of this Attachment Y if the Developer

of that solution designates the solution as “Confidential Information”; *provided, however,* that “Confidential Information” shall not include: (i) the identity of the Developer, (ii) the proposed facility type, (iii) the proposed facility size, (iv) the proposed location of the facility, and (v) the proposed in-service date for the facility.

31.4.15.2 The ISO shall maintain the confidentiality of the Developer’s proposed solution and plans designated as “Confidential Information” until the ISO determines that the Developer’s proposed solution and plans are viable and sufficient to meet the Public Policy Transmission Need and the Developer provides its consent to the ISO’s inclusion of the proposed solution in the Public Policy Transmission Planning Report under Section 31.4.6.6. Thereafter, the ISO shall disclose the proposed solution and plans to Market Participants and other interested parties; *provided, however,* any preliminary cost estimates that may have been provided to the ISO, any non-public financial qualification information provided under Section 31.4.4.1.2, and any contract provided under Sections 31.4.5.1.2 or 31.4.5.2.2 that is designated as “Confidential Information” shall not be disclosed.

31.5 Cost Allocation and Cost Recovery

31.5.1 The Scope of Attachment Y Cost Allocation

31.5.1.1 Regulated Responses

The cost allocation principles and methodologies in this Attachment Y cover regulated transmission solutions to Reliability Needs, Generators operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution to Reliability Needs, regulated transmission responses to congestion identified in the CARIS, and regulated Public Policy Transmission Projects whether proposed by a Responsible Transmission Owner or a Transmission Owner or Other Developer. The cost allocation principles and methodology for: (i) regulated transmission solutions to Reliability Needs or Generators operating under an RMR Agreement are contained in Sections 31.5.3.1 and 31.5.3.2 of this Attachment Y, (ii) regulated transmission responses to congestion identified in the CARIS are contained in Sections 31.5.4.1 and 31.5.4.2 of this Attachment Y, and (iii) regulated Public Policy Transmission Projects are contained in Sections 31.5.5 and 31.5.6 of this Attachment Y.

31.5.1.2 Market-Based Responses

The cost allocation principles and methodologies in this Attachment Y do not apply to market-based solutions to Reliability Needs, to market-based responses to congestion identified in the CARIS, or to Other Public Policy Projects. The cost of a market-based project shall be the responsibility of the developer of that project.

31.5.1.3 Interconnection Cost Allocation

The cost allocation principles and methodologies in this Attachment Y do not apply to the interconnection costs of generation and merchant transmission projects. Interconnection costs are determined and allocated in accordance with Attachment S, Attachment X and Attachment Z

of the ISO OATT. Costs related to the deliverability of a resource will be addressed under the ISO's deliverability procedures in Attachment S of the ISO OATT.

31.5.1.4 Individual Transmission Service Requests

The cost allocation principles and methodologies in this Attachment Y do not apply to the cost of transmission expansion projects undertaken in connection with an individual request for Transmission Service. The cost of such a project is determined and allocated in accordance with Section 3.7 or Section 4.5 of the ISO OATT.

31.5.1.5 LTP Facilities

The cost allocation principles and methodologies in this Attachment Y do not apply to the cost of transmission projects included in LTPs or LTP updates. Each Transmission Owner will recover the cost of such transmission projects in accordance with its then existing rate recovery mechanisms.

31.5.1.6 Regulated Non-Transmission Projects

With the exception of Generators operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution to a Reliability Need, costs related to regulated non-transmission projects will be recovered by Responsible Transmission Owners, Transmission Owners and Other Developers in accordance with the provisions of New York Public Service Law, New York Public Authorities Law, or other applicable state law. Nothing in this section shall affect the Commission's jurisdiction over the sale and transmission of electric energy subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

31.5.1.7 Eligibility for Cost Allocation and Cost Recovery

Any entity, whether a Responsible Transmission Owner, Other Developer, or Transmission Owner, shall be eligible for cost allocation and cost recovery as set forth in Section

31.5 of this Attachment Y and associated rate schedules, as applicable, for any transmission project proposed to satisfy an identified Reliability Need, Generator operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution to a Reliability Need, regulated economic transmission project, or Public Policy Transmission Project that is determined by the ISO to be eligible under Sections 31.2, 31.3, or 31.4, as applicable. Interregional Transmission Projects identified in accordance with the Interregional Planning Protocol, and that have been accepted in each region's planning process, shall be eligible for interregional cost allocation and cost recovery, as set forth in Section 31.5 of this Attachment Y and associated rate schedules. The ISO's share of the cost of an Interregional Transmission Project selected pursuant to this Attachment Y to meet a Reliability Need, congestion identified in the CARIS, or a Public Policy Transmission Need shall be eligible for cost allocation consistent with the cost allocation methodology applicable to the type of regional transmission project that would be replaced through the construction of such Interregional Transmission Project.

31.5.2 Cost Allocation Principles Required Under Order No. 1000

31.5.2.1 In compliance with Commission Order No. 1000, the ISO shall implement the specific cost allocation methodology in Section 31.5.3.2, 31.5.4.4, and 31.5.5.4 in accordance with the following Regional Cost Allocation Principles ("Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles"):

Regional Cost Allocation Principle 1: The ISO shall allocate the cost of transmission facilities to those within the transmission planning region that benefit from those facilities in a manner that is at least roughly commensurate with estimated benefits. In determining the beneficiaries of transmission facilities, the ISO's CSPP will consider benefits including, but not limited to, the

extent to which transmission facilities, individually or in the aggregate provide for maintaining reliability and sharing reserves, production cost savings and congestion relief, and/or meeting Public Policy Requirements.

Regional Cost Allocation Principle 2: The ISO shall not involuntarily allocate any of the costs of transmission facilities to those that receive no benefit from transmission facilities.

Regional Cost Allocation Principle 3: In the event that the ISO adopts a benefit to cost threshold in its CSPP to determine which transmission facilities have sufficient net benefits to be selected in a regional transmission plan for the purpose of cost allocation, such benefit to cost threshold will not be so high that transmission facilities with significant positive net benefits are excluded from cost allocation. If the ISO chooses to adopt such a threshold in its CSPP it will not include a ratio of benefits to costs that exceeds 1.25 unless the ISO justifies and the Commission approves a higher ratio.

Regional Cost Allocation Principle 4: The ISO's allocation method for the cost of a transmission facility selected pursuant to the process in the CSPP shall allocate costs solely within the ISO's transmission planning region unless another entity outside the region or another transmission planning region voluntarily agrees to assume a portion of those costs. Costs for an Interregional Transmission Project must be assigned only to regions in which the facility is physically located. Costs cannot be assigned involuntarily to another region. The ISO shall not bear the costs of required upgrades in another region.

Regional Cost Allocation Principle 5: The ISO's cost allocation method and data requirements for determining benefits and identifying beneficiaries for a transmission facility shall be transparent with adequate documentation to allow a stakeholder to determine how they were applied to a proposed transmission facility, as consistent with confidentiality requirements set forth in this Attachment Y and the ISO Code of Conduct in Attachment F of the OATT.

Regional Cost Allocation Principle 6: The ISO's CSPP provides a different cost allocation method for different types of transmission facilities in the regional transmission plan and each cost allocation method is set out clearly and explained in detail in this Section 31.5.

31.5.2.2 In compliance with Commission Order No. 1000, the ISO shall implement the specific cost allocation methodology in Section 31.5.7 of this Attachment Y in accordance with the following Interregional Cost Allocation Principles:

Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 1: The ISO shall allocate the cost of new Interregional Transmission Projects to each region in which an Interregional Transmission Project is located in a manner that is at least roughly commensurate with estimated benefits of the Interregional Transmission Project in each of the regions. In determining the beneficiaries of Interregional Transmission Projects, the ISO will consider benefits including, but not limited to, those associated with maintaining reliability and sharing reserves, production cost savings and congestion relief, and meeting Public Policy Requirements.

Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 2: The ISO shall not involuntarily allocate any of the costs of an Interregional Transmission Project to a region that

receives no benefit from an Interregional Transmission Project that is located in that region, either at present or in a likely future scenario.

Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 3: In the event that the ISO adopts a benefit-cost threshold ratio to determine whether an Interregional Transmission Project has sufficient net benefits to qualify for interregional cost allocation, this ratio shall not be so large as to exclude an Interregional Transmission Project with significant positive net benefits from cost allocation. If the ISO chooses to adopt such a threshold, they will not include a ratio of benefits to costs that exceeds 1.25 unless the Parties justify and the Commission approves a higher ratio.

Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 4: The ISO's allocation of costs for an Interregional Transmission Project shall be assigned only to regions in which the Interregional Transmission Project is located. The ISO shall not assign costs involuntarily to a region in which that Interregional Transmission Project is not located. The ISO shall, however, identify consequences for other regions, such as upgrades that may be required in a third region. The ISO's interregional cost allocation methodology includes provisions for allocating the costs of upgrades among the beneficiaries in the region in which the Interregional Transmission Project is located to the transmission providers in such region that agree to bear the costs associated with such upgrades.

Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 5: The ISO's cost allocation methodology and data requirements for determining benefits and identifying beneficiaries for an Interregional Transmission Project shall be transparent with adequate documentation to allow a stakeholder to determine how they were

applied to a proposed Interregional Transmission Project, as consistent with the confidentiality requirements set forth in this Attachment Y and the ISO Code of Conduct in Attachment F of the OATT.

Interregional Cost Allocation Principle 6: Though Order No. 1000 allows the ISO to provide a different cost allocation methodology for different types of interregional transmission facilities, such as facilities needed for reliability, congestion relief, or to achieve Public Policy Requirements, the ISO has chosen to adopt one interregional cost allocation methodology for all Interregional Transmission Planning Projects. The interregional cost allocation methodology is set out clearly and explained in detail in Section 31.5.7 of this Attachment Y. The share of the cost related to any Interregional Transmission Project assigned to the ISO shall be allocated as described in Section 31.5.7.1.

31.5.3 Regulated Responses to Reliability Needs

31.5.3.1 Cost Allocation Principles

The ISO shall implement the specific cost allocation methodology in Section 31.5.3.2 of this Attachment Y in accordance with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles as set forth in Section 31.5.2.1. This methodology shall apply to cost allocation for: (i) a regulated transmission solution to an identified Reliability Need, including the ISO's share of the costs of an Interregional Transmission Project proposed as a regulated transmission solution to an identified Reliability Need allocated in accordance with Section 31.5.7 of this Attachment Y, and (ii) a Generator operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution to an identified Reliability Need.

The specific cost allocation methodology in Section 31.5.3.2 incorporates the following elements:

- 31.5.3.1.1 The focus of the cost allocation methodology shall be on solutions to Reliability Needs.
- 31.5.3.1.2 Potential impacts unrelated to addressing the Reliability Needs shall not be considered for the purpose of cost allocation for regulated solutions.
- 31.5.3.1.3 Primary beneficiaries shall initially be those Load Zones or Subzones identified as contributing to the reliability violation.
- 31.5.3.1.4 The cost allocation among primary beneficiaries shall be based upon their relative contribution to the need for the regulated solution.
- 31.5.3.1.5 The ISO will examine the development of specific cost allocation rules based on the nature of the reliability violation (*e.g.*, thermal overload, voltage, stability, resource adequacy and short circuit).
- 31.5.3.1.6 Cost allocation shall recognize the terms of prior agreements among the Transmission Owners, if applicable.
- 31.5.3.1.7 Consideration should be given to the use of a materiality threshold for cost allocation purposes.
- 31.5.3.1.8 The methodology shall provide for ease of implementation and administration to minimize debate and delays to the extent possible.
- 31.5.3.1.9 Consideration should be given to the “free rider” issue as appropriate.
The methodology shall be fair and equitable.
- 31.5.3.1.10 The methodology shall provide cost recovery certainty to investors to the extent possible.

31.5.3.1.11 The methodology shall apply, to the extent possible, to Gap Solutions.

31.5.3.1.12 Cost allocation is independent of the actual triggered project(s), except when allocating cost responsibilities associated with meeting a Locational Minimum Installed Capacity Requirement (“LCR”), and is based on a separate process that results in NYCA meeting its LOLE requirement.

31.5.3.1.13 Cost allocation for a solution that meets the needs of a Target Year assumes that backstop solutions of prior years have been implemented.

31.5.3.1.14 Cost allocation will consider the most recent values for LCRs. LCRs must be met for the Target Year.

31.5.3.2 Cost Allocation Methodology

The cost allocation mechanism under this Section 31.5.3.2 sets forth the basis for allocating costs associated with: (i) a Responsible Transmission Owner’s regulated backstop solution or its transmission solution identified pursuant to Section 31.2.11.9 as a Gap Solution to be implemented to address a Reliability Need, (ii) an Other Developer’s or Transmission Owner’s alternative regulated transmission solution selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to an identified Reliability Need or identified pursuant to Section 31.2.11.9 as a Gap Solution to be implemented to address a Reliability Need, or (iii) a Generator operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution to an identified Reliability Need.

The formula is not applicable to that portion of a project beyond the size of the solution needed to provide the more efficient or cost effective solution appropriate to the Reliability Need identified in the RNA. Nor is the formula applicable to that portion of the cost of a regulated transmission reliability project that is, pursuant to Section 25.7.12 of Attachment S to the ISO

OATT, paid for with funds previously committed by or collected from Developers for the installation of System Deliverability Upgrades required for the interconnection of generation or merchant transmission projects. This Section 31.5.3.2 establishes the allocation of the costs related to resolving Reliability Needs resulting from resource adequacy, BPTF thermal transmission security, local transmission security, dynamic stability, and short circuit issues. Costs will be allocated in accordance with the following hierarchy: (i) resource adequacy pursuant to Section 31.5.3.2.1, (ii) BPTF thermal transmission security pursuant to Section 31.5.3.2.2, (iii) BPTF voltage security pursuant to Section 31.5.3.2.3, (iv) local transmission security pursuant to Section 31.5.3.2.4, (v) dynamic stability pursuant to Section 31.5.3.2.5, and (vi) short circuit pursuant to Section 31.5.3.2.6.

31.5.3.2.1 Resource Adequacy Reliability Solution Cost Allocation Formula

For purposes of solutions eligible for cost allocation under this Section 31.5.3.2, 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:

$$\text{Resource Adequacy Cost Allocation}_i = \left[\frac{\text{LCRdef}_i}{\text{Soln Size}} + \left(\frac{\text{Coincident Peak}_i * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_i)}{\sum_{k=1}^n \text{Coincident Peak}_k * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_k)} * \frac{\text{Soln STWdef}}{\text{Soln Size}} \right) \right]$$

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

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_i 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 31.5.3.2.

Three step cost allocation methodology for regulated reliability solutions:

31.5.3.2.1.1 Step 1 - LCR Deficiency

31.5.3.2.1.1.1 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 $\text{LOLE} \leq 0.1$ 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.

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

31.5.3.2.1.2 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.

31.5.3.2.1.2.1 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.

31.5.3.2.1.2.2 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:

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

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.

31.5.3.2.1.3 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.

31.5.3.2.1.3.1 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.

31.5.3.2.1.3.2 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.

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

31.5.3.2.1.3.4 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.

31.5.3.2.1.3.5 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.

31.5.3.2.1.3.6 The CIdef 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:

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

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, SolnCidef is the CIdef for the applicable project and Soln_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the applicable project.

31.5.3.2.2 BPTF Thermal Transmission Security Cost Allocation Formula

For purposes of solutions eligible for cost allocation under this Section 31.5.3.2, 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 31.5.3.2.1, 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.

31.5.3.2.2.1 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 Reliability 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 Reliability Need. The sign (positive or negative) of the nodal distribution factor represents the direction of flow.

31.5.3.2.2.2 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 Reliability Need due to the Load.

31.5.3.2.2.3 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 Reliability 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.

31.5.3.2.2.4 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 Reliability 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.

31.5.3.2.2.5 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.

31.5.3.2.2.6 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 Reliability 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 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.

31.5.3.2.2.7 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:

$$BPTF \text{ Thermal Cost Allocation}_j = \frac{SZ_AllocFlow_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m SZ_AllocFlow_k} \times \frac{SolnBTSdef}{Soln_Size}$$

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.

31.5.3.2.2.8 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 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)^{N(X)}
 - Present Value of Cost (Y) = PV Cost (Y) = Cost (Y) / (1+D)^{N(Y)}
 - 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 =

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

31.5.3.2.2.9 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%.

31.5.3.2.3 BPTF Voltage Security Cost Allocation

If, after consideration of the compensatory MW identified in the resource adequacy cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.1 and BPTF thermal transmission security cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.2, 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:

$$BPTF \text{ Voltage Cost Allocation}_j = \frac{Coincident \text{ Peak}_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m Coincident \text{ Peak}_k} \times \frac{SolnBVSdef}{Soln_Size}$$

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.

31.5.3.2.4 Local Transmission Security Cost Allocation

If, after consideration of the compensatory MW identified in the resource adequacy cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.1, the BPTF thermal transmission security cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.2, and BPTF voltage security cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.3, there remains a non-BPTF thermal security issue or a non-BPTF voltage security issue and the solution is an RMR Agreement, the ISO will allocate the costs of resolving the local security issue(s) to the Subzones that contribute to the local security issue(s).

31.5.3.2.4.1 The Subzone in which the receiving terminal of the non-BPTF facility is located is assigned cost responsibility for the megawatt portion of the RMR Agreement 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 RMR Agreement, the LocalThermalMW will be allocated on a Load-ratio share to each identified Subzone as follows:

$$Local\ Thermal\ Cost\ Allocation_j = \frac{Coincident\ Peak_j}{\sum_{k=1}^m Coincident\ Peak_k} \times \frac{LocalThermalMW}{Soln_Size}$$

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 RMR Agreement needed to eliminate the non-BPTF thermal issue(s); and Soln_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the RMR Agreement.

31.5.3.2.4.2 If there remains a voltage issue after consideration of LocalThermalMW, then the cost responsibility for the megawatt portion of the RMR Agreement 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 RMR Agreement.

31.5.3.2.5 Dynamic Stability Cost Allocation

If, after consideration of the compensatory MW identified in the resource adequacy cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.1, BPTF thermal transmission security cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.2, BPTF voltage security cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.3, and local transmission security cost allocation in accordance with Section 31.5.3.2.4, 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.

31.5.3.2.6 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.

31.5.4 Regulated Economic Projects

31.5.4.1 The Scope of Section 31.5.4

As discussed in Section 31.5.1 of this Attachment Y, the cost allocation principles and methodologies of this Section 31.5.4 apply only to regulated economic transmission projects (“RETPs”) proposed in response to congestion identified in the CARIS.

This Section 31.5.4 does not apply to generation or demand side management projects, nor does it apply to any market-based projects. This Section 31.5.4 does not apply to regulated backstop solutions triggered by the ISO pursuant to the CSPP, provided, however, the cost allocation principles and methodologies in this Section 31.5.4 will apply to regulated backstop solutions when the implementation of the regulated backstop solution is accelerated solely to reduce congestion in earlier years of the Study Period. The ISO will work with the ESPWG to develop procedures to deal with the acceleration of regulated backstop solutions for economic reasons.

Nothing in this Attachment Y mandates the implementation of any project in response to the congestion identified in the CARIS.

31.5.4.2 Cost Allocation Principles

The ISO shall implement the specific cost allocation methodology in Section 31.5.4.4 of this Attachment Y in accordance with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles as set forth in Section 31.5.2.1. The specific cost allocation methodology in Section 31.5.4.4 incorporates the following elements:

- 31.5.4.2.1 The focus of the cost allocation methodology shall be on responses to specific conditions identified in the CARIS.
- 31.5.4.2.2 Potential impacts unrelated to addressing the identified congestion shall not be considered for the purpose of cost allocation for RETPs.
- 31.5.4.2.3 Projects analyzed hereunder as proposed RETPs may proceed on a market basis with willing buyers and sellers at any time.
- 31.5.4.2.4 Cost allocation shall be based upon a beneficiaries pay approach. Cost allocation under the ISO tariff for a RETP shall be applicable only when a super majority of the beneficiaries of the project, as defined in Section 31.5.4.6 of this Attachment Y, vote to support the project.
- 31.5.4.2.5 Beneficiaries of a RETP shall be those entities economically benefiting from the proposed project. The cost allocation among beneficiaries shall be based upon their relative economic benefit.
- 31.5.4.2.6 Consideration shall be given to the proposed project's payback period.
- 31.5.4.2.7 The cost allocation methodology shall address the possibility of cost overruns.
- 31.5.4.2.8 Consideration shall be given to the use of a materiality threshold for cost allocation purposes.

- 31.5.4.2.9 The methodology shall provide for ease of implementation and administration to minimize debate and delays to the extent possible.
- 31.5.4.2.10 Consideration should be given to the “free rider” issue as appropriate. The methodology shall be fair and equitable.
- 31.5.4.2.11 The methodology shall provide cost recovery certainty to investors to the extent possible.
- 31.5.4.2.12 Benefits determination shall consider various perspectives, based upon the agreed-upon metrics for analyzing congestion.
- 31.5.4.2.13 Benefits determination shall account for future uncertainties as appropriate (e.g., load forecasts, fuel prices, environmental regulations).
- 31.5.4.2.14 Benefits determination shall consider non-quantifiable benefits as appropriate (*e.g.*, system operation, environmental effects, renewable integration).

31.5.4.3 Project Eligibility for Cost Allocation

The methodologies in this Section 31.5.4.3 will be used to determine the eligibility of a proposed RETP to have its cost allocated and recovered pursuant to the provisions of this Attachment Y.

- 31.5.4.3.1 The ISO will evaluate the benefits against the costs (as provided by the Developer) of each proposed RETP over a ten-year period commencing with the proposed commercial operation date for the project. The Developer of each project will pay the cost incurred by the ISO to conduct the ten-year benefit/cost analysis of its project. The ISO, in conjunction with the ESPWG, will develop methodologies for extending the most recently completed CARIS database as necessary to evaluate the benefits and costs of each proposed RETP.

31.5.4.3.2 The benefit metric for eligibility under the ISO's benefit/cost analysis will be expressed as the present value of the annual NYCA-wide production cost savings that would result from the implementation of the proposed project, measured for the first ten years from the proposed commercial operation date for the project.

31.5.4.3.3 The cost for the ISO's benefit/cost analysis will be supplied by the Developer of the project, and the cost metric for eligibility will be expressed as the present value of the first ten years of annual total revenue requirements for the project, reasonably allocated over the first ten years from the proposed commercial operation date for the project.

31.5.4.3.4 For informational purposes only, the ISO will also calculate the present value of the annual total revenue requirement for the project over a 30 year period commencing with the proposed commercial operation date of the project.

31.5.4.3.5 To be eligible for cost allocation and recovery under this Attachment Y, the benefit of the proposed project must exceed its cost measured over the first ten years from the proposed commercial operation date for the project, and the requirements of section 31.5.4.2 must be met. The total capital cost of the project must exceed \$25 million. In addition, a super-majority of the beneficiaries must vote in favor of the project, as specified in Section 31.5.4.6 of this Attachment Y.

31.5.4.3.6 In addition to calculating the benefit metric as defined in Section 31.5.4.3.2, the ISO will calculate additional metrics to estimate the potential benefits of the proposed project, for information purposes only, in accordance with Section 31.3.1.3.5, for the applicable metric. These additional metrics shall

include those that measure reductions in LBMP load costs, changes to generator payments, ICAP costs, Ancillary Service costs, emissions costs, and losses. TCC revenues will be determined in accordance with Section 31.5.4.4.2.3. The ISO will provide information on these additional metrics to the maximum extent practicable considering its overall resource commitments.

31.5.4.3.7 In addition to the benefit/cost analysis performed by the ISO under this Section 31.5.4.3, the ISO will work with the ESPWG to consider the development and implementation of scenario analyses, for information only, that shed additional light on the benefit/cost analysis of a proposed project. These additional scenario analyses may cover fuel and load forecast uncertainty, emissions data and the cost of allowances, pending environmental or other regulations, and alternate resource and energy efficiency scenarios. Consideration of these additional scenarios will take into account the resource commitments of the ISO.

31.5.4.4 Cost Allocation for Eligible Projects

As noted in Section 31.5.4.2 of this Attachment Y, the cost of a RETP will be allocated to those entities that would economically benefit from implementation of the proposed project. This methodology shall apply to cost allocation for a RETP, including the ISO's share of the costs of an Interregional Transmission Project proposed as a RETP allocated in accordance with Section 31.5.7 of this Attachment Y.

31.5.4.4.1 The ISO will identify the beneficiaries of the proposed project over a ten-year time period commencing with the proposed commercial operation date for the project. The ISO, in conjunction with the ESPWG, will develop

methodologies for extending the most recently completed CARIS database as necessary for this purpose.

31.5.4.4.2 The ISO will identify beneficiaries of a proposed project as follows:

31.5.4.4.2.1 The ISO will measure the present value of the annual zonal LBMP load savings for all Load Zones which would have a load savings, net of reductions in TCC revenues, and net of reductions from bilateral contracts (based on available information provided by Load Serving Entities to the ISO as set forth in subsection 31.5.4.4.2.5 below) as a result of the implementation of the proposed project. For purposes of this calculation, the present value of the load savings will be equal to the sum of the present value of the Load Zone's load savings for each year over the ten-year period commencing with the project's commercial operation date. The load savings for a Load Zone will be equal to the difference between the zonal LBMP load cost without the project and the LBMP load cost with the project, net of reductions in TCC revenues and net of reductions from bilateral contracts.

31.5.4.4.2.2 The beneficiaries will be those Load Zones that experience net benefits measured over the first ten years from the proposed commercial operation date for the project. If the sum of the zonal benefits for those Load Zones with load savings is greater than the revenue requirements for the project (both load savings and revenue requirements measured in present value over the first ten years from the commercial operation date of the project), the ISO will proceed with the development of the zonal cost allocation information to inform the beneficiary voting process.

31.5.4.4.2.3 Reductions in TCC revenues will reflect the forecasted impact of the project on TCC auction revenues and day-ahead residual congestion rents allocated to load in each zone, not including the congestion rents that accrue to any Incremental TCCs that may be made feasible as a result of this project. This impact will include forecasts of: (1) the total impact of that project on the Transmission Service Charge offset applicable to loads in each zone (which may vary for loads in a given zone that are in different Transmission Districts); (2) the total impact of that project on the NYPA Transmission Adjustment Charge offset applicable to loads in that zone; and (3) the total impact of that project on payments made to LSEs serving load in that zone that hold Grandfathered Rights or Grandfathered TCCs, to the extent that these have not been taken into account in the calculation of item (1) above. These forecasts shall be performed using the procedure described in Appendix B to this Attachment Y.

31.5.4.4.2.4 Estimated TCC revenues from any Incremental TCCs created by a proposed RETP over the ten-year period commencing with the project's commercial operation date will be added to the Net Load Savings used for the cost allocation and beneficiary determination.

31.5.4.4.2.5 The ISO will solicit bilateral contract information from all Load Serving Entities, which will provide the ISO with bilateral energy contract data for modeling contracts that do not receive benefits, in whole or in part, from LBMP reductions, and for which the time period covered by the contract is within the ten-year period beginning with the commercial operation date of the project. Bilateral contract payment information that is not provided to the ISO will not be

included in the calculation of the present value of the annual zonal LBMP savings in section 31.5.4.4.2.1 above.

31.5.4.4.2.5.1 All bilateral contract information submitted to the ISO must identify the source of the contract information, including citations to any public documents including but not limited to annual reports or regulatory filings

31.5.4.4.2.5.2 All non-public bilateral contract information will be protected in accordance with the ISO's Code of Conduct, as set forth in Section 12.4 of Attachment F of the ISO OATT, and Section 6 of the ISO Services Tariff.

31.5.4.4.2.5.3 All bilateral contract information and information on LSE-owned generation submitted to the ISO must include the following information:

- (1) Contract quantities on an annual basis:
 - (a) For non-generator specific contracts, the Energy (in MWh) contracted to serve each Zone for each year.
 - (b) For generator specific contracts or LSE-owned generation, the name of the generator(s) and the MW or percentage output contracted or self-owned for use by Load in each Zone for each year.
- (2) For all Load Serving Entities serving Load in more than one Load Zone, the quantity (in MWh or percentage) of bilateral contract Energy to be applied to each Zone, by year over the term of the contract.
- (3) Start and end dates of the contract.
- (4) Terms in sufficient detail to determine that either pricing is not indexed to LBMP, or, if pricing is indexed to LBMP, the manner in which prices are connected to LBMP.

- (5) Identify any changes in the pricing methodology on an annual basis over the term of the contract.

31.5.4.4.2.5.4 Bilateral contract and LSE-owned generation information will be used to calculate the adjusted LBMP savings for each Load Zone as follows:

$AdjLBMP_{y,z}$, the adjusted LBMP savings for each Load Zone z in each year y , shall be calculated using the following equation:

$$AdjLBMP_{y,z} = \max \left[0, TL_{y,z} - \sum_{b \in B_{y,z}} \left(BCL_{b,y,z} * (1 - Ind_{b,y,z}) \right) - SG_{y,z} \right] * (LBMP1_{y,z} - LBMP2_{y,z})$$

Where:

$TL_{y,z}$ is the total annual amount of Energy forecasted to be consumed by Load in year y in Load Zone z ;

$B_{y,z}$ is the set of blocks of Energy to serve Load in Load Zone z in year y that are sold under bilateral contracts for which information has been provided to the ISO that meets the requirements set forth elsewhere in this Section 31.5.4.4.2.5

$BCL_{b,y,z}$ is the total annual amount of Energy sold into Load Zone z in year y under bilateral contract block b ;

$Ind_{b,y,z}$ is the ratio of (1) the increase in the amount paid by the purchaser of Energy, under bilateral contract block b , as a result of an increase in the LBMP in Load Zone z in year y to (2) the increase in the amount that a purchaser of that amount of Energy would pay if the purchaser paid the LBMP for that Load Zone in that year for all of that Energy (this ratio shall be zero for any bilateral contract block of Energy that is sold at a fixed price or for which the cost of Energy purchased under that contract otherwise insensitive to the LBMP in Load Zone z in year y);

$SG_{y,z}$ is the total annual amount of Energy in Load Zone z that is forecasted to be served by LSE-owned generation in that Zone in year y ;

$LBMP1_{y,z}$ is the forecasted annual load-weighted average LBMP for Load Zone z in year y , calculated under the assumption that the project is not in place; and

$LBMP2_{y,z}$ is the forecasted annual load-weighted average LBMP for Load Zone z in year y , calculated under the assumption that the project is in place.

31.5.4.4.2.6 NZS_z , the Net Zonal Savings for each Load Zone z resulting from a given project, shall be calculated using the following equation:

$$NZS_z = \max \left[0, \sum_{y=PS}^{PS+9} \left((AdjLBMP_{S_{y,z}} - TCCRevImpact_{y,z}) * DF_y \right) \right]$$

Where:

PS is the year in which the project is expected to enter commercial operation;

$AdjLBMP_{S_{y,z}}$ is as calculated in Section 31.5.4.4.2.5;

$TCCRevImpact_{y,z}$ is the forecasted impact of TCC revenues allocated to Load Zone z in year y , calculated using the procedure described in Appendix B in Section 31.7 of this Attachment Y; and

DF_y is the discount factor applied to cash flows in year y to determine the present value of that cash flow in year PS .

31.5.4.4.3 Load Zones not benefiting from a proposed RETP will not be allocated any of the costs of the project under this Attachment Y. There will be no “make whole” payments to non-beneficiaries.

31.5.4.4.4 Costs of a project will be allocated to beneficiaries as follows:

31.5.4.4.4.1 The ISO will allocate the cost of the RETP based on the zonal share of total savings to the Load Zones determined pursuant to Section 31.5.4.4.2 to be beneficiaries of the proposed project. Total savings will be equal to the sum of load savings for each Load Zone that experiences net benefits pursuant to Section 31.5.4.4.2. A Load Zone's cost allocation will be equal to the present value of the following calculation:

$$\text{Zonal Cost Allocation} = \text{Project Cost} * \left(\frac{(\text{Zonal Benefits})}{\text{Total Zonal Benefits for zone with positive net benefits}} \right)$$

31.5.4.4.4.2 Zonal cost allocation calculations for a RETP will be performed prior to the commencement of the ten-year period that begins with the project's commercial operation date, and will not be adjusted during that ten-year period.

31.5.4.4.4.3 Within zones, costs will be allocated to LSEs based on MWhs calculated for each LSE for each zone using data from the most recent available 12 month period. Allocations to an LSE will be calculated in accordance with the following formula:

$$\text{LSE Intrazonal Cost Allocation} = \text{Zonal Cost Allocation} * \left(\frac{\text{LSE Zonal MWh}}{\text{Total Zonal MWh}} \right)$$

31.5.4.4.5 Project costs allocated under this Section 31.5.4.4 will be determined as follows:

31.5.4.4.5.1 The project cost allocated under this Section 31.5.4.4 will be based on the total project revenue requirement, as supplied by the Developer of the project, for the first ten years of project operation. The total project revenue requirement will be determined in accordance with the formula rate on file at the Commission. If there is no formula rate on file at the Commission, then the Developer shall

provide to the ISO the project-specific parameters to be used to calculate the total project revenue requirement.

31.5.4.4.5.2 Once the benefit/cost analysis is completed the amortization period and the other parameters used to determine the costs that will be recovered for the project should not be changed, unless so ordered by the Commission or a court of applicable jurisdiction, for cost recovery purposes to maintain the continued validity of the benefit/cost analysis.

31.5.4.4.5.3 The ISO, in conjunction with the ESPWG, will develop procedures to allocate the risk of project cost increases that occur after the ISO completes its benefit/cost analysis under this Attachment Y. These procedures may include consideration of an additional review and vote prior to the start of construction and whether the developer should bear all or part of the cost of any overruns.

31.5.4.4.6 The Commission must approve the cost of a proposed RETP for that cost to be recovered through the ISO OATT. The developer's filing with the Commission must be consistent with the project proposal evaluated by the ISO under this Attachment Y in order to be cost allocated to beneficiaries.

31.5.4.5 Collaborative Governance Process and Board Action

31.5.4.5.1 The ISO shall submit the results of its project benefit/cost analysis and beneficiary determination to the ESPWG and TPAS, and to the identified beneficiaries of the proposed RETP for comment. The ISO shall make available to any interested party sufficient information to replicate the results of the benefit/cost analysis and beneficiary determination. 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 review by the ESPWG and TPAS of the project benefit/cost analysis, the ISO's analysis reflecting any revisions resulting from the TPAS and ESPWG review shall be forwarded to the Business Issues Committee and Management Committee for discussion and action.

31.5.4.5.2 Following the Management Committee vote, the ISO's project benefit/cost analysis and beneficiary determination will be forwarded, with the input of the Business Issues Committee and Management Committee, to the ISO Board for review and action. In addition, the ISO's determination of the beneficiaries' voting shares will be forwarded to the ISO Board for review and action. The Board may approve the analysis and beneficiary determinations as submitted or propose modifications on its own motion. If any changes to the benefit/cost analysis or the beneficiary determinations are proposed by the Board, the revised analysis and beneficiary determinations shall be returned to the Management Committee for comment. If the Board proposes any changes to the ISO's voting share determinations, the Board shall so inform the LSE or LSEs impacted by the proposed change and shall allow such an LSE or LSEs an opportunity to comment on the proposed change. The Board shall not make a final determination on the project benefit/cost analysis and beneficiary determination until it has reviewed the Management Committee comments. Upon final approval of the Board, project benefit/cost analysis and beneficiary determinations shall be posted by the

ISO on its website and shall form the basis of the beneficiary voting described in Section 31.5.4.6 of this Attachment Y.

31.5.4.6 Voting by Project Beneficiaries

31.5.4.6.1 Only LSEs serving Load located in a beneficiary zone determined in accordance with the procedures in Section 31.5.4.4 of this Attachment Y shall be eligible to vote on a proposed project. The ISO will, in conjunction with the ESPWG, develop procedures to determine the specific list of voting entities for each proposed project.

31.5.4.6.2 The voting share of each LSE shall be weighted in accordance with its share of the total project benefits, as allocated by Section 31.5.4.4 of this Attachment Y.

31.5.4.6.3 The costs of a RETP shall be allocated under this Attachment Y if eighty percent (80%) or more of the actual votes cast on a weighted basis are cast in favor of implementing the project.

31.5.4.6.4 If the proposed RETP meets the required vote in favor of implementing the project, and the project is implemented, all beneficiaries, including those voting “no,” will pay their proportional share of the cost of the project.

31.5.4.6.5 The ISO will tally the results of the vote in accordance with procedures set forth in the ISO Procedures, and report the results to stakeholders. Beneficiaries voting against approval of a project must submit to the ISO their rationale for their vote within 30 days of the date that the vote is taken. Beneficiaries must provide a detailed explanation of the substantive reasons underlying the decision, including, where appropriate: (1) which additional benefit metrics, either

identified in the tariff or otherwise, were used; (2) the actual quantification of such benefit metrics or factors; (3) a quantification and explanation of the net benefit or net cost of the project to the beneficiary; and (4) data supporting the metrics and other factors used. Such explanation may also include uncertainties, and/or alternative scenarios and other qualitative factors considered, including state public policy goals. The ISO will report this information to the Commission in an informational filing to be made within 60 days of the vote. The informational filing will include: (1) a list of the identified beneficiaries; (2) the results of the benefit/cost analysis; and (3) where a project is not approved, whether the developer has provided any formal indication to the ISO as to the future development of the project.

31.5.5 Regulated Transmission Solutions to Public Policy Transmission Needs

31.5.5.1 The Scope of Section 31.5.5

As discussed in Section 31.5.1 of this Attachment Y, the cost allocation principles and methodologies of this Section 31.5.5 apply only to regulated Public Policy Transmission Projects. This Section 31.5.5 does not apply to Other Public Policy Projects, including generation or demand side management projects, or any market-based projects. This Section 31.5.5 does not apply to regulated reliability solutions implemented pursuant to the reliability planning process, nor does it apply to RETPs proposed in response to congestion identified in the CARIS.

A regulated solution shall only utilize the cost allocation methodology set forth in Section 31.5.3 where it is: (1) a Responsible Transmission Owner's regulated backstop solution, (2) an alternative regulated transmission solution selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost

effective regulated transmission solution to satisfy a Reliability Need, or (3) seeking cost recovery where it has been halted or cancelled pursuant to the provisions of Section 31.2.8.2, (4) a transmission project identified pursuant to Section 31.2.11.9 as a Gap Solution to be implemented to address a Reliability Need, or (5) a Generator operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution to an identified Reliability Need. A regulated economic transmission solution proposed in response to congestion identified in the CARIS, and approved pursuant to Section 31.5.4.6, shall only be eligible to utilize the cost allocation principles and methodologies set forth in Section 31.5.4.

31.5.5.2 Cost Allocation Principles

The ISO shall implement the specific cost allocation methodology in Section 31.5.5.4 of this Attachment Y in accordance with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles as set forth in Section 31.5.2.1. The specific cost allocation methodology in Section 31.5.5.4 incorporates the following elements:

- 31.5.5.2.1 The focus of the cost allocation methodology shall be on regulated Public Policy Transmission Projects.
- 31.5.5.2.2 Projects analyzed hereunder as Public Policy Transmission Projects may proceed on a market basis with willing buyers and sellers at any time.
- 31.5.5.2.3 Cost allocation shall be based on a beneficiaries pay approach.
- 31.5.5.2.4 Project benefits will be identified in accordance with Section 31.5.5.4.
- 31.5.5.2.5 Identification of beneficiaries for cost allocation and cost allocation among those beneficiaries shall be according to the methodology specified in Section 31.5.5.4.

31.5.5.3 Project Eligibility for Cost Allocation

The Developer of a Public Policy Transmission Project will be eligible for cost allocation in accordance with the process set forth in Section 31.5.5.4 when its project is selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost effective regulated Public Policy Transmission Project; *provided, however*, that if the appropriate federal, state, or local agency(ies) rejects the selected project's necessary authorizations, or such authorizations are withdrawn, the costs the Developer is eligible to recover under Section 31.4.12.1 shall be allocated in accordance with Section 31.5.5.4.3, except as otherwise determined by the Commission. The Developer of the selected regulated transmission solution may recover its costs in accordance with Section 31.5.6.

31.5.5.4 Cost Allocation for Eligible Projects

As noted in Section 31.5.5.2 of this Attachment Y, the identification of beneficiaries for cost allocation and the cost allocation of a selected Public Policy Transmission Project will be conducted in accordance with the process described in this Section 31.5.5.4. This Section will also apply to the allocation within New York of the ISO's share of the costs of an Interregional Transmission Project proposed as a solution to a Public Policy Transmission Need allocated in accordance with Section 31.5.7 of this Attachment Y. The establishment of a cost allocation methodology and rates for a proposed solution that is undertaken by LIPA or NYPA as an Unregulated Transmitting Utility to a Public Policy Transmission Need as determined in Sections 31.4.2.1 through 31.4.2.3, as applicable, or an Interregional Transmission Project shall occur pursuant to Section 31.5.5.4.4 through 31.5.5.4.6, as applicable. Nothing herein shall deprive a Transmission Owner or Other Developer of any rights it may have under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act to submit filings proposing any other cost allocation methodology to the Commission or create any Section 205 filing rights for any Transmission Owner, Other

Developer, the ISO, or any other entity. The ISO shall apply the cost methodology accepted by the Commission.

31.5.5.4.1 If the Public Policy Requirement that results in the identification by the NYPSC of a Public Policy Transmission Need prescribes the use of a particular cost allocation and recovery methodology, then the ISO shall file that methodology with the Commission within 60 days of the issuance by the NYPSC of its identification of a Public Policy Transmission Need. Nothing herein shall deprive a Transmission Owner or Other Developer of any rights it may have under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act to submit filings proposing any other cost allocation methodology to the Commission or create any Section 205 filing rights for any Transmission Owner, Other Developer, the ISO, or any other entity. If the Developer files a different proposed cost allocation methodology under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act, it shall have the burden of demonstrating that its proposed methodology is compliant with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles taking into account the methodology specified in the Public Policy Requirement.

31.5.5.4.2 Subject to the provisions of Section 31.5.5.4.1, the Developer may submit to the NYPSC for its consideration – no later than 30 days after the ISO's selection of the regulated Public Policy Transmission Project – a proposed cost allocation methodology, which may include a cost allocation based on load ratio share, adjusted to reflect, as applicable, the Public Policy Requirement or Public Policy Transmission Need, the party(ies) responsible for complying with the

Public Policy Requirement, and the party(ies) who benefit from the transmission facility.

31.5.5.4.2.1 The NYPSC shall have 150 days to review the Developer's proposed cost allocation methodology and to inform the Developer regarding whether it supports the methodology.

31.5.5.4.2.2. If the NYPSC supports the proposed cost allocation methodology, the Developer shall file that cost allocation methodology with the Commission for its acceptance under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act within 30 days of the NYPSC informing the Developer of its support. The Developer shall have the burden of demonstrating that the proposed cost allocation methodology is compliant with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles.

31.5.5.4.2.3 If the NYPSC does not support the proposed cost allocation methodology, then the Developer shall take reasonable steps to respond to the NYPSC's concerns and to develop a mutually agreeable cost allocation methodology over a period of no more than 60 days after the NYPSC informing the Developer that it does not support the methodology.

31.5.5.4.2.4 If a mutually acceptable cost allocation methodology is developed during the timeframe set forth in Section 31.5.5.4.2.3, the Developer shall file it with the Commission for acceptance under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act no later than 30 days after the conclusion of the 60 day discussion period with the NYPSC. The Developer shall have the burden of demonstrating that the proposed cost allocation methodology is compliant with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles.

31.5.5.4.2.5 If no mutually agreeable cost allocation methodology is developed, the Developer shall file its preferred cost allocation methodology with the Commission for acceptance under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act no later than 30 days after the conclusion of the 60 day discussion period with the NYPSC. The Developer shall have the burden of demonstrating that its proposed methodology is compliant with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles in consideration of the position of the NYPSC. The filing shall include the methodology supported by NYPSC for the Commission's consideration. If the Developer elects to use the load ratio share cost allocation methodology referenced below in Section 31.5.5.4.3, the Developer shall notify the Commission of its intent to utilize the load ratio share methodology and shall include in its notice the NYPSC supported methodology for the Commission's consideration.

31.5.5.4.3. Unless the Commission has accepted an alternative cost allocation methodology pursuant to this Section, the ISO shall allocate the costs of the Public Policy Transmission Project to all Load Serving Entities in the NYCA using the default cost allocation methodology, based upon a load ratio share methodology.

31.5.5.4.4 The NYISO will make any Section 205 filings related to this Section on behalf of NYPA to the extent requested to do so by NYPA. NYPA shall bear the burden of demonstrating that such a filing is compliant with the Order No. 1000 Regional Cost Allocation Principles. NYPA shall also be solely responsible for making any jurisdictional reservations or arguments related to their status as non-

Commission-jurisdictional utilities that are not subject to various provisions of the Federal Power Act.

31.5.5.4.5 The cost allocation methodology and any rates for cost recovery for a proposed solution to a Public Policy Transmission Need undertaken by LIPA, as an Unregulated Transmitting Utility (for purposes of this section a “LIPA project”), shall be established and recovered as follows:

31.5.5.4.5.1 *For costs solely to LIPA customers.* The cost allocation methodology and rates to be established for a LIPA project, for which cost recovery will only occur from LIPA customers, will be established pursuant to Article 5, Title 1-A of the New York Public Authorities Law, Sections 1020-f(u) and 1020-s. Prior to the adoption of any cost allocation mechanism or rates for such a LIPA project, and pursuant to Section 1020-f(u), the Long Island Power Authority’s Board of Trustees shall request that the NYDPS provide a recommendation with respect to the cost allocation methodology and rate that LIPA has proposed and the Board of Trustees shall consider such recommendation in accordance with the requirements of Section 1020-f(u). Upon approval of the cost allocation mechanism and/or rates by the Long Island Power Authority’s Board of Trustees, LIPA shall provide to the ISO, for purposes of inclusion within the ISO OATT and filing with FERC on an informational basis only, a description of the cost allocation mechanism and the rate that LIPA will charge and collect within the Long Island Transmission District.

31.5.5.4.5.2 *For Costs for a LIPA Project That May be Allocated to Other Transmission Districts.* A LIPA project that meets a Public Policy Transmission

Need as determined by the NYPSC pursuant to Section 31.4.2.3(iii) may be allocated to market participants outside of the Long Island Transmission District. The cost allocation methodology and rate for such a LIPA project shall be established in accordance with the following procedures. LIPA's proposed cost allocation methodology and/or rate shall be reviewed and approved by the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees pursuant to Article 5, Title 1-A of the New York Public Authorities Law, Sections 1020-f(u) and 1020-s. Prior to the adoption of any cost allocation mechanism or rates for such project and pursuant to Section 1020-f(u), the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees shall request that the NYDPS provide a recommendation with respect to the cost allocation methodology and rate that LIPA has proposed and the Board of Trustees shall consider such recommendation in accordance with the requirements of Section 1020-f(u). LIPA shall inform the ISO of the cost allocation methodology and rate that has been approved by the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees for filing with the Commission.

Upon approval by the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees, LIPA shall submit and request that the ISO file the LIPA cost allocation methodology for approval with the Commission. Any cost allocation methodology for a LIPA project that allocates costs to market participants outside of the Long Island Transmission District shall be reviewed as to whether there is comparability in the derivation of the cost allocation for market participants such that LIPA has demonstrated that the proposed cost allocation is compliant with the Order No. 1000 cost allocation principles, there are benefits provided by the

project to market participants outside of the Long Island Transmission District, and that the proposed allocation is roughly commensurate to the identified benefits.

Article 5, Title 1-A of the New York Public Authorities Law, Sections 1020-f(u) and 1020-s, requires that LIPA's rates be established at the lowest level consistent with sound fiscal and operating practices of the Long Island Power Authority and which provide for safe and adequate service. Upon approval of a LIPA rate by the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees pursuant to Section 1020-f(u), LIPA shall submit, and request that the ISO file, the LIPA rate with the Commission for review under the same comparability standard as applied to the review of changes in LIPA's TSC under Attachment H of this tariff.

In the event that the cost allocation methodology or rate approved by the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees did not adopt the NYDPS recommendation, the NYDPS recommendation shall be included in the filing for the Commission's consideration.

31.5.5.4.5.3 *Support for Filing.* LIPA shall intervene in support of the filing(s) made pursuant to Section 31.5.5.4.5 at the Commission and shall take the responsibility to demonstrate that: (i) the cost allocation methodology and/or rate approved by the Long Island Power Authority's Board of Trustees meets the applicable standard of comparability, and (ii) the Commission should accept such methodology or rate for filing. LIPA shall also be responsible for responding to, and seeking to resolve, concerns about the contents of the filing that might be raised in such proceeding.

31.5.5.4.5.4 *Billing of LIPA Charges Outside of the Long Island Transmission District.*

For Transmission Districts other than the Long Island Transmission District, the ISO shall bill for LIPA, as a separate charge, the costs incurred by LIPA for a solution to a Public Policy Transmission Need allocated using the cost allocation methodology and rates established pursuant to Section 31.5.5.4.5.2 and accepted for filing by the Commission and shall remit the revenues collected to LIPA each Billing Period in accordance with the ISO's billing and settlement procedures.

31.5.5.4.6 The inclusion in the ISO OATT or in a filing with the Commission of the cost allocation and charges for recovery of costs incurred by NYPA or LIPA related to a solution to a transmission need driven by a Public Policy Requirement or Interregional Transmission Project as provided for in Sections 31.5.5.4.4 and 31.5.5.4.5 shall not be deemed to modify the treatment of such rates as non-jurisdictional pursuant to Section 201(f) of the FPA.

31.5.6 Cost Recovery for Regulated Projects

Responsible Transmission Owners, Transmission Owners and Other Developers will be entitled, if eligible for cost recovery under Section 31.2 of this Attachment Y, 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 regulated transmission solutions, including transmission Gap Solutions, proposed or undertaken pursuant to the provisions of this Attachment Y to meet a Reliability Need. If a Market Participant's Generator is operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution, the Market Participant will be paid in accordance with Rate Schedule 8 of the ISO Services Tariff, and the ISO will recover costs related to RMR Agreements from LSEs in accordance with Schedule 14 of the ISO OATT.

Transmission Owners and Other Developers will be entitled to recovery of costs associated with the implementation of a regulated economic transmission project (“RETP”) in accordance with the provisions of Section 31.5.6 of this Attachment Y. Developers will be entitled to recover the costs, to the extent permitted under Sections 31.4 and 31.5.6.5 of this Attachment Y, associated with the implementation of a regulated Public Policy Transmission Project in accordance with the requirements in Section 31.5.6.5 of this Attachment Y.

31.5.6.1 The Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner or Other Developer will receive cost recovery for a regulated transmission solution it undertakes to meet a Reliability Need pursuant to Section 31.2 of this Attachment Y that is subsequently halted in accordance with the criteria established pursuant to Section 31.2.8.2 of this Attachment Y. Such costs will include reasonably incurred costs through the time of cancellation, including any forward commitments made.

31.5.6.2 The Responsible Transmission Owner, Transmission Owner or Other Developer will recover its costs described in this Section 31.5 incurred with respect to the implementation of a regulated transmission solution to Reliability Needs, including a transmission Gap Solution, in accordance with the provisions of Rate Schedule 10 of this ISO OATT, or as determined by the Commission. Provided further that cost recovery for regulated transmission projects undertaken by a Transmission Owner pursuant to this Attachment Y shall be in accordance with the provisions of the NYISO/TO Reliability Agreement.

31.5.6.3 If a Market Participant’s Generator is operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution, 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. With the exception of a Generator operating under an RMR Agreement as a Gap Solution, costs related to non-transmission regulated solutions to Reliability Needs will be recovered by Responsible Transmission Owners, Transmission Owners and Other Developers in accordance with the provisions of New York Public Service Law, New York Public Authorities Law, or other applicable state law Except as otherwise provided in the Gap Solution process in Section 31.2.11 of this Attachment Y, a Responsible Transmission Owner, a Transmission Owner, or Other Developer may propose and undertake a regulated non-transmission solution, provided that the appropriate state agency(ies) has established cost recovery procedures comparable to those provided in this tariff for regulated transmission solutions to ensure the full and prompt recovery of all reasonably-incurred costs related to such non-transmission solutions. Nothing in this section shall affect the Commission's jurisdiction over the sale and transmission of electric energy subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

31.5.6.4 For a regulated economic transmission project that is approved pursuant to Section 31.5.4.6 of this Attachment Y, the Transmission Owner or Other Developer shall have the right to make a filing with the Commission, under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act, for approval of its costs associated with implementation of the project. The filing of the Transmission Owner or Other Developer must be consistent with its project proposal made to and evaluated by the ISO under Section 31.5.4 of this Attachment Y. Costs will be recovered when

the project is completed pursuant to a rate schedule filed with and accepted by the Commission in accordance with the cost recovery requirements set forth in this Section, or as otherwise determined by the Commission. Upon request by NYPA, the ISO will make a filing on behalf of NYPA.

31.5.6.5 For a regulated Public Policy Transmission Project, the Developer shall have the right to make a filing with the Commission under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act, for approval of its costs eligible for recovery under Section 31.4 and this Section 31.5.6.5.

31.5.6.5.1 The Developer of a Public Policy Transmission Project selected by the ISO as the more efficient or cost-effective Public Policy Transmission Project will 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 selected Public Policy Transmission Project. Such cost recovery will include reasonable costs incurred by the Developer to provide a more detailed study or cost estimate for such project at the request of the NYPSC, and to prepare the application required to comply with New York Public Service Law Article VII, or any successor statute or any other applicable permits, and to seek other necessary authorizations. The filing of the Developer must be consistent with its project proposal submitted to, evaluated by and selected by the ISO under Section 31.4 of this Attachment Y. The period for cost recovery, if any cost recovery is approved, will be determined by the Commission and will begin if and when the project is completed, or as otherwise determined by the Commission.

31.5.6.5.2 If the appropriate federal, state or local agency(ies) either rejects a necessary authorization, or approves and later withdraws authorization, for the selected Public Policy Transmission Project, 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, will be recoverable by the Developer. The period for cost recovery will be determined by the Commission and will begin as determined by the Commission.

31.5.6.5.3 Upon request by NYPA, the ISO will make a filing on behalf of NYPA under this Section 31.5.6.5.

31.5.6.6 To the extent that Incremental TCCs are created as a result of a regulated economic transmission project that has been approved for cost recovery under the NYISO Tariff, those Incremental TCCs that can be sold will be auctioned or otherwise sold by the ISO. The ISO shall determine the amount of Incremental TCCs that may be awarded to an expansion in accordance with the provisions of Section 19.2.2 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT. The ISO will use these revenues to offset the revenue requirements for the project. The Incremental TCCs shall continue to be sold for the depreciable life of the project, and the revenues offset will commence upon the first payment of revenues related to a sale of Incremental TCCs on or after the charge for a specific RETP is implemented.

31.5.7 Cost Allocation for Eligible Interregional Transmission Projects

31.5.7.1 Costs of Approved Interregional Transmission Projects

The cost allocation methodology reflected in this Section 31.5.7.1 shall be referred to as the “Northeastern Interregional Cost Allocation Methodology” (or “NICAM”), and shall not be modified without the mutual consent of the Section 205 rights holders in each region.

The costs of Interregional Transmission Projects, as defined in the Interregional Planning Protocol, evaluated under the Interregional Planning Protocol and selected by ISO-NE, PJM and the ISO in their regional transmission plans for purposes of cost allocation under their respective tariffs shall, when applicable, be allocated to the ISO-NE region, PJM region and the ISO region in accordance with the cost allocation principles of FERC Order No. 1000, as follows:

(a) To be eligible for interregional cost allocation, an Interregional Transmission Project must be selected in the regional transmission plan for purposes of cost allocation in each of the transmission planning regions in which the transmission project is proposed to be located, pursuant to agreements and tariffs on file at FERC for each region. With respect to Interregional Transmission Projects and other transmission projects involving the ISO and PJM, the cost allocation of such projects shall be in accordance with the Joint Operating Agreement (“JOA”) among and between the ISO and PJM. With respect to Interregional Transmission Projects and other transmission projects involving the ISO and ISO-NE, the cost allocation for such projects shall be in accordance with this Section 31.5.7 of Attachment Y of the NYISO Open Access Transmission Tariff and with the respective tariffs of ISO-NE.

(b) The share of the costs of an Interregional Transmission Project allocated to a region will be determined by the ratio of the present value of the estimated costs of such region’s displaced regional transmission project to the total of the present values of the estimated costs of

the displaced regional transmission projects in all regions that have selected the Interregional Transmission Project in their regional transmission plans.

- (i) The present values of the estimated costs of each region's displaced regional transmission project shall be based on a common base date that will be the beginning of the calendar month of the cost allocation analysis for the subject Interregional Transmission Project (the "Base Date").
 - (ii) In order to perform the analysis in this Section 31.5.7.1(b), the estimated cost of the displaced regional transmission projects shall specify the year's dollars in which those estimates are provided.
 - (iii) The present value analysis for all displaced regional transmission projects shall use a common discount rate. The regions having displaced projects will mutually agree, in consultation with their respective transmission owners, and for purposes of the ISO, its other stakeholders, on the discount rate to be used for the present value analysis.
 - (iv) For the purpose of this allocation, cost estimates shall use comparable cost estimating procedures. In the Interregional Planning Stakeholder Advisory Committee review process, the regions having displaced projects will review and determine, in consultation with their respective transmission owners, and for purposes of the NYISO, its other stakeholders, that reasonably comparable estimating procedures have been used prior to applying this cost allocation.
- (c) No cost shall be allocated to a region that has not selected the Interregional Transmission Project in its regional transmission plan.

(d) When a portion of an Interregional Transmission Project evaluated under the Interregional Planning Protocol is included by a region (Region 1) in its regional transmission plan but there is no regional need or displaced regional transmission project in Region 1, and the neighboring region (Region 2) has a regional need or displaced regional project for the Interregional Transmission Project and selects the Interregional Transmission Project in its regional transmission plan, all of the costs of the Interregional Transmission Project shall be allocated to Region 2 in accordance with the NICAM and none of the costs shall be allocated to Region 1. However, Region 1 may voluntarily agree, with the mutual consent of the Section 205 rights holders in the other affected region(s) (including the Long Island Power Authority and the New York Power Authority in the NYISO region) to use an alternative cost allocation method filed with and accepted by the Commission.

(e) The portion of the costs allocated to a region pursuant to the NICAM shall be further allocated to that region's transmission customers pursuant to the applicable provisions of the region's FERC-filed documents and agreements, for the ISO in accordance with Section 31.5.1.7 of Attachment Y of the ISO OATT.

(f) The following example illustrates the cost allocation for such an Interregional Transmission Project:

- A cost allocation analysis of the costs of Interregional Transmission Project Z is to be performed during a given month establishing the beginning of that month as the Base Date.
- Region A has identified a reliability need in its region and has selected a transmission project (Project X) as the preferred solution in its regional plan. The estimated cost of

Project X is: 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: $N(X)$.

- Region B has identified a reliability need in its region and has selected a transmission project (Project Y) as the preferred solution in its Regional Plan. The estimated cost of Project Y is: 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: $N(Y)$.
- Regions A and B, through the interregional planning process have determined that an Interregional Transmission Project (Project Z) will address the reliability needs in both regions more efficiently and cost-effectively than the separate regional projects. The estimated cost of Project Z is: Cost (Z). Regions A and B have each determined that Interregional Transmission Project Z is the preferred solution to their reliability needs and have adopted that Interregional Transmission Project in their respective regional plans in lieu of Projects X and Y respectively. If Regions A and B have agreed to bear the costs of upgrades in other affected transmission planning regions, these costs will be considered part of Cost (Z).
- The discount rate used for all displaced regional transmission projects is: D
- Based on the foregoing assumptions, the following formulas will be used:
 - Present Value of Cost (X) = $PV \text{ Cost (X)} = \text{Cost (X)} / (1+D)^{N(X)}$
 - Present Value of Cost (Y) = $PV \text{ Cost (Y)} = \text{Cost (Y)} / (1+D)^{N(Y)}$
 - Cost Allocation to Region A = $\text{Cost (Z)} \times \text{PV Cost (X)} / [\text{PV Cost (X)} + \text{PV Cost (Y)}]$

- $\text{Cost Allocation to Region B} = \text{Cost (Z)} \times \text{PV Cost (Y)} / [\text{PV Cost (X)} + \text{PV Cost (Y)}]$
- Applying those formulas, if:
 - Cost (X) = \$60 Million and $N(X) = 8.25$ years
 - Cost (Y) = \$40 Million and $N(Y) = 4.50$ years
 - Cost (Z) = \$80 Million
 - $D = 7.5\%$ per year
 - Then:
 - $\text{PV Cost (X)} = 60 / (1 + 0.075)^{8.25} = 33.039$ Million
 - $\text{PV Cost (Y)} = 40 / (1 + 0.075)^{4.50} = 28.888$ Million
 - $\text{Cost Allocation to Region A} = \$80 \times 33.039 / (33.039 + 28.888) = \$42,681$ Million
 - $\text{Cost Allocation to Region B} = \$80 \times 28.888 / (33.039 + 28.888) = \37.319 Million

31.5.7.2 Other Cost Allocation Arrangements

(a) Except as provided in Section 31.5.7.2(b), the NICAM is the exclusive means by which any costs of an Interregional Transmission Project may be allocated between or among PJM, the ISO, and ISO-NE.

(b) Nothing in the FERC-filed documents of ISO-NE, the ISO or PJM shall preclude agreement by entities with cost allocation rights under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act for their respective regions (including the Long Island Power Authority and the New York Power Authority in the ISO region) to enter into separate agreements to allocate the cost-of Interregional Transmission Projects proposed to be located in their regions as an alternative to the NICAM, or other transmission projects identified pursuant to assessments and studies conducted pursuant to Section 6 of the Interregional Planning Protocol. Such other cost-

allocation methodologies must be approved in each region pursuant to the Commission-approved rules in each region, filed with and accepted by the Commission, and shall apply only to the region's share of the costs of an Interregional Transmission Project or other transmission projects pursuant to Section 6 of the Interregional Planning Protocol, as applicable.

31.5.7.3 Filing Rights

Nothing in this Section 31.5.7 will convey, expand, limit or otherwise alter any rights of ISO-NE, the ISO, PJM, each region's transmission owners, market participants, or other entities to submit filings under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act regarding interregional cost allocation or any other matter.

Where applicable, the regions have been authorized by entities that have cost allocation rights for their respective regions to implement the provisions of this Section 31.5.7.

31.5.7.4 Merchant Transmission and Individual Transmission Owner Projects

Nothing in this Section 31.5.7 shall preclude the development of Interregional Transmission Projects that are funded solely by merchant transmission developers or by individual transmission owners.

31.5.7.5 Consequences to Other Regions from Regional or Interregional Transmission Projects

Except as provided herein in Sections 31.5.7.1 and 31.5.7.2, or where cost responsibility is expressly assumed by ISO-NE, the ISO or PJM in other documents, agreements or tariffs on file with FERC, neither the ISO-NE region, the ISO region nor the PJM region shall be responsible for compensating another region or each other for required upgrades or for any other consequences in another planning region associated with regional or interregional transmission facilities, including but not limited to, transmission projects identified pursuant to Section 6 of

the Interregional Planning Protocol and Interregional Transmission Projects identified pursuant to Section 7 of the Interregional Planning Protocol.

31.7 Appendices

APPENDIX A - REPORTING OF HISTORIC AND PROJECTED CONGESTION

1.0 General

As part of its CSPP, the ISO will prepare summaries and detailed analysis of historic and projected congestion across the NYS Transmission System. This will include analysis to identify the significant causes of historic congestion in an effort to help Market Participants and other interested parties distinguish persistent and addressable congestion from congestion that results from one time events or transient adjustments in operating procedures that may or may not recur. This information will assist Market Participants and other stakeholders to make appropriately informed decisions.

2.0 Definition of Cost of Congestion

The ISO will report the cost of congestion as the change in bid production costs that results from transmission congestion. The following elements of congestion-related costs also will be reported: (i) impact on load payments; (ii) impact on generator payments; and (iii) hedged and unhedged congestion payments.

The determination of the change in bid production costs and the other elements of congestion will be based upon the difference in costs between the actual constrained system prices computed in the ISO's Day-Ahead Market and a simulation of an unconstrained system. The simulation shall be developed by the use of the PROBE model approved by the ISO Operating Committee on January 22, 2004 or by such other software as may provide the required congestion information.

3.0 Analysis

Each RNA will include the ISO's summaries and detailed analysis of the prior year's congestion across the NYS Transmission System. The ISO's analysis will identify the significant causes of the historic congestion.

Each study of projected congestion for economic planning will include the results of the ISO's analysis conducted in accordance with Section 31.3.1 of this Attachment Y. The ISO's analysis will identify the significant causes of the projected congestion.

4.0 Detailed Cause Analysis for Unusual Events

The ISO will perform an analysis to identify unusual events causing significant congestion levels. Such analysis will include the following elements: (i) identification of major transmission or generation outages; and (ii) quantification of the market impact of relieving historic constraints.

Some of the information necessary to this analysis may constitute critical energy infrastructure information and will need to be handled with appropriate confidentiality limitations to protect national security interests.

5.0 Summary Reports

The ISO will prepare various reports of historic and projected congestion costs. Historic congestion reports will be based upon the actual congestion data from the ISO Day-Ahead Market, and will include summaries, aggregated by month and calendar year, such as: (i) NYCA; (ii) by zone; (iii) by contingency in rank order; (iv) by constraint in rank order; (v) total dollars; and (vi) number of hours. Results of projected congestion studies conducted pursuant to Section 31.3.1 of this Attachment Y will include summaries of selected additional metrics and scenarios.

These reports will be based upon the foregoing definitions of congestion.

APPENDIX B - PROCEDURE FOR FORECASTING THE NET REDUCTIONS IN TCC REVENUES THAT WOULD RESULT FROM A PROPOSED PROJECT

For the purpose of determining the allocation of costs associated with a proposed project as described in Section 31.5.4.4 of this Attachment Y, the ISO shall use the procedure described herein to forecast the net reductions in TCC revenues allocated to Load in each Load Zone as a result of a proposed project.

Definitions

The following definitions will apply to this appendix:

Pre-CARIS Centralized TCC Auction: The last Centralized TCC Auction that had been completed as of the date the input assumptions were determined for the CARIS in which the Project was identified as a candidate for development under the provisions of this Attachment Y.

Project: The proposed transmission project for which the evaluation of the net benefits forecasted for Load in each Load Zone, as described in Section 31.5.4.4.2 of this Attachment Y, is being performed.

TCC Revenue Factor: A factor that is intended to reflect the expected ratio of (1) revenue realized in the TCC auction from the sale of a TCC to (2) the Congestion Rents that a purchaser of that TCC would expect to realize. The value to be used for the TCC Revenue Factor shall be stated in the ISO Procedures.

Steps 1 Through 6 of the Procedure

For each Project, the ISO will perform Steps 1 through 6 of this procedure twice for each of the ten (10) years following the proposed commercial operation date of the Project: once under the assumption that the Project is in place in each of those years, and once under the assumption that the Project is not in place in each of those years.

Forecasting the Value of Grandfathered TCCs and TCC Auction Revenue

Step 1. The ISO shall forecast Congestion Rents collected on the New York electricity system in each year, which shall be equal to:

(a) the product of:

(i) the forecasted Congestion Component of the Day-Ahead LBMP for each hour at each Load Zone or Proxy Generator Bus and

(ii) forecasted withdrawals scheduled in that hour in that Load Zone or Proxy Generator Bus,

summed over all locations and over all hours in that year, minus:

(b) the product of:

(i) the forecasted Congestion Component of the Day-Ahead LBMP for each hour at each Generator bus or Proxy Generator Bus and

(ii) forecasted injections scheduled in that hour at that Generator bus or Proxy Generator Bus,

summed over all locations and over all hours in that year.

Step 2. The ISO shall forecast:

(a) payments in each year associated with any Incremental TCCs that the ISO projects would be awarded in conjunction with that Project (which will be zero for the calculation that is performed under the assumption that the Project is not in place);

(b) payments in each year associated with any Incremental TCCs that the ISO has awarded, or that the ISO projects it would award, in conjunction with other projects that have entered commercial operation or are expected to enter commercial operation before the Project enters commercial operation; and

(c) payments that would be made to holders of Grandfathered Rights and imputed payments that would be made to the Primary Holders of Grandfathered TCCs that would be in effect in each year, under the following assumptions:

(i) all Grandfathered Rights and Grandfathered TCCs expire at their stated expiration dates;

(ii) imputed payments to holders of Grandfathered Rights are equal to the payments that would be made to the Primary Holder of a TCC with the same Point of Injection and Point of Withdrawal as that Grandfathered Right; and

(iii) in cases where a Grandfathered TCC is listed in Table 1 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT, the number of those TCCs held by their Primary Holders shall be set to the number of such TCCs remaining at the conclusion of the ETCNL reduction procedure conducted before the Pre-CARIS Centralized TCC Auction.

Step 3. The ISO shall forecast TCC auction revenues for each year by subtracting:

(a) the forecasted payments calculated for that year in Steps 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c) of this procedure

from:

- (b) the forecasted Congestion Rents calculated for that year in Step 1 of this procedure, and multiplying the difference by the TCC Revenue Factor.

Forecasting the Allocation of TCC Auction Revenues Among the Transmission Owners

Step 4. The ISO shall forecast the following:

- (a) payments in each year to the Primary Holders of Original Residual TCCs and
- (b) payments in each year to the Primary Holders of TCCs that correspond to the amount of ETCNL remaining at the conclusion of the ETCNL reduction procedure conducted before the Pre-CARIS Centralized TCC Auction,

and multiply each by the TCC Revenue Factor to determine the forecasted payments to the Primary Holders of Original Residual TCCs and the Transmission Owners that have been allocated ETCNL.

Step 5. The ISO shall forecast residual auction revenues for each year by subtracting:

- (a) the sum of the forecasted payments for each year to the Primary Holders of Original Residual TCCs and the Transmission Owners that have been allocated ETCNL, calculated in Step 4 of this procedure

from:

- (b) forecasted TCC auction revenues for that year calculated in Step 3 of this procedure.

Step 6. The ISO shall forecast each Transmission Owner's share of residual auction revenue for each year by multiplying:

- (a) the forecast of residual auction revenue calculated in Step 5 of this procedure and
- (b) the ratio of:
 - (i) the amount of residual auction revenue allocated to that Transmission Owner in the Pre-CARIS Centralized TCC Auction to
 - (ii) the total amount of residual auction revenue allocated in the Pre-CARIS Centralized TCC Auction.

Steps 7 Through 10 of the Procedure

The ISO will perform Steps 7 through 10 of this procedure once for each of the ten (10) years following the proposed commercial operation date of the Project, using the results of the preceding calculations performed both under the assumption that the Project is in place in each of those years, and under the assumption that the Project is not in place in each of those years.

Forecasting the Impact of the Project on TSC Offsets and the NTAC Offset

Step 7. The ISO shall calculate the forecasted net impact of the Project on the TSC offset for each megawatt-hour of electricity consumed by Load in each Transmission District (other than the NYPA Transmission District) in each year by:

(a) summing the following, each forecasted for that Transmission District for that year under the assumption that the Project is in place:

(i) forecasted Congestion Rents associated with any Incremental TCCs that the ISO has awarded, or that the ISO projects it would award, as calculated in Step 2(b) of this procedure, in conjunction with other projects that have entered commercial operation or are expected to enter commercial operation before the Project enters commercial operation, if those Congestion Rents would affect the TSC for that Transmission District;

(ii) forecasted Congestion Rents associated with any Grandfathered TCCs and forecasted imputed Congestion Rents associated with any Grandfathered Rights held by the Transmission Owner serving that Transmission District that would be paid to that Transmission Owner for that year, as calculated in Step 2(c) of this procedure, if those Congestion Rents would affect the TSC for that Transmission District;

(iii) the payments that are forecasted to be made for that year to the Primary Holders of Original Residual TCCs and ETCNL that have been allocated to the Transmission Owner serving that Transmission District, as calculated in Step 4 of this procedure; and

(iv) that Transmission District's forecasted share of residual auction revenues for that year, as calculated in Step 6 of this procedure for the Transmission Owner serving that Transmission District;

(b) subtracting the sum of items (i) through (iv) above, each forecasted for that Transmission District for that year under the assumption that the Project is not in place; and

(c) dividing this difference by the amount of Load forecasted to be served in that Transmission District in that year, stated in terms of megawatt-hours, net of any Load served by municipally owned utilities that is not subject to the TSC.

Step 8. The ISO shall calculate the forecasted net impact of the Project on the NTAC offset for each megawatt-hour of electricity consumed by Load in each year by:

(a) summing the following, each forecasted for that year under the assumption that the Project is in place:

(i) forecasted Congestion Rents associated with any Incremental TCCs that the ISO has awarded, or that the ISO projects it would award, as calculated in Step 2(b) of this procedure, in conjunction with other projects that have entered commercial operation

or are expected to enter commercial operation before the Project enters commercial operation, if those Congestion Rents would affect the NTAC;

(ii) forecasted Congestion Rents associated with any Grandfathered TCCs and forecasted imputed Congestion Rents associated with any Grandfathered Rights held by NYPA that would be paid to NYPA for that year, as calculated in Step 2(c) of this procedure, if those Congestion Rents would affect the NTAC;

(iii) the payments that are forecasted to be made for that year to NYPA in association with Original Residual TCCs allocated to NYPA, as calculated in Step 4 of this procedure; and

(iv) NYPA's forecasted share of residual auction revenues for that year, as calculated in Step 6 of this procedure;

(b) subtracting the sum of items (i) through (iv) above, each forecasted for that year under the assumption that the Project is not in place; and

(c) dividing this difference by the amount of Load expected to be served in the NYCA in that year, stated in terms of megawatt-hours, net of any Load served by municipally owned utilities that is not subject to the NTAC.

Forecasting the Net Impact of the Project on TCC Revenues Allocated to Load in Each Zone

Step 9. The ISO shall calculate the forecasted net impact of the Project in each year in each Load Zone on payments made in conjunction with TCCs and Grandfathered Rights that benefit Load but which do not affect TSCs or the NTAC, which shall be the sum of:

(a) Forecasted Congestion Rents paid or imputed to municipally owned utilities serving Load in that Load Zone that own Grandfathered Rights or Grandfathered TCCs that were not included in the calculation of the TSC offset in Step 7(a)(ii) of this procedure or the NTAC offset in Step 8(a)(ii) of this procedure, which the ISO shall calculate by:

(i) summing forecasted Congestion Rents that any such municipally owned utilities serving Load in that Load Zone would be paid for that year in association with any such Grandfathered TCCs and any forecasted imputed Congestion Rents that such a municipally owned utility would be paid for that year in association with any such Grandfathered Rights, as calculated in Step 2(c) of this procedure under the assumption that the Project is in place; and

(ii) subtracting forecasted Congestion Rents that any such municipally owned utilities would be paid for that year in association with any such Grandfathered TCCs, and any forecasted imputed Congestion Rents that such a municipally owned utility would be paid for that year in association with any such Grandfathered Rights, as calculated in Step 2(c) of this procedure under the assumption that the Project is not in place.

(b) Forecasted Congestion Rents collected from Incremental TCCs awarded in conjunction with projects that were previously funded through this procedure, if those Congestion Rents are used to reduce the amount that Load in that Load Zone must pay to fund such projects, which the ISO shall calculate by:

(i) summing forecasted Congestion Rents that would be collected for that year in association with any such Incremental TCCs, as calculated in Step 2(b) of this procedure under the assumption that the Project is in place; and

(ii) subtracting forecasted Congestion Rents that would be collected for that year in association with any such Incremental TCCs, as calculated in Step 2(b) of this procedure under the assumption that the Project is not in place.

Step 10. The ISO shall calculate the forecasted net reductions in TCC revenues allocated to Load in each Load Zone as a result of a proposed Project by summing the following:

(a) the product of:

(i) the forecasted net impact of the Project on the TSC offset for each megawatt-hour of electricity consumed by Load, as calculated for each Transmission District (other than the NYPA Transmission District) in Step 7 of this procedure; and

(ii) the number of megawatt-hours of energy that are forecasted to be consumed by Load in that year, in the portion of that Transmission District that is in that Load Zone, for Load that is subject to the TSC;

summed over all Transmission Districts;

(b) the product of:

(i) the forecasted net impact of the Project on the NTAC offset for each megawatt-hour of electricity consumed by Load, as calculated in Step 8 of this procedure; and

(ii) the number of megawatt-hours of energy that are forecasted to be consumed by Load in that year in that Load Zone, for Load that is subject to the NTAC; and

(c) the forecasted net impact of the Project on payments and imputed payments made in conjunction with TCCs and Grandfathered Rights that benefit Load but which do not affect TSCs or the NTAC, as calculated in Step 9 of this procedure.

Additional Notes Concerning the Procedure

For the purposes of Steps 2(c) and 4(b) of this procedure, the ISO will utilize the currently effective version of Attachment L of the ISO OATT to identify Existing Transmission Agreements and Existing Transmission Capacity for Native Load.

Each Transmission Owner, other than NYPA, will inform the ISO of any Grandfathered Rights and Grandfathered TCCs it holds whose Congestion Rents should be taken into account in Step 7 of this procedure because those Congestion Rents affect its TSC.

NYPA will inform the ISO of any Grandfathered Rights and Grandfathered TCCs it holds whose Congestion Rents should be taken into account in Step 8 of this procedure because those Congestion Rents affect the NTAC.

APPENDIX C – RELIABILITY PLANNING PROCESS DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ARTICLE 1. DEFINITIONS.....	2
ARTICLE 2. EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERM	5
2.1. Effective Date	5
2.2. Filing	6
2.3. Term of Agreement	6
ARTICLE 3. TRANSMISSION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION	6
3.1. Application for Required Authorizations and Approvals	6
3.2. Development and Construction of Transmission Project	6
3.3. Milestones	7
3.4. Modifications to Transmission Project	8
3.5. Billing and Payment	8
3.6. Project Monitoring	9
3.7. Right to Inspect	9
3.8. Exclusive Responsibility of Developer	9
3.9. Subcontractors.....	10
3.10. No Services or Products Under NYISO Tariffs	10
3.11. Tax Status	10
ARTICLE 4. COORDINATION WITH THIRD PARTIES	10
4.1. Interconnection Requirements for Transmission Project	10
4.2. Interconnection with Affected System	11
4.3. Coordination of Interregional Transmission Project	11
ARTICLE 5. OPERATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TRANSMISSION PROJECT ...	11
ARTICLE 6. INSURANCE	11
ARTICLE 7. BREACH AND DEFAULT	14
7.1. Breach	14
7.2. Default.....	14
7.3. Remedies	15
ARTICLE 8. TERMINATION	15
8.1. Termination by the NYISO	15
8.2. Reporting of Inability to Comply with Provisions of Agreement	16
8.3. Transmission Project Transfer Rights Upon Termination	16
ARTICLE 9. LIABILITY AND INDEMNIFICATION	16
9.1. Liability	16
9.2. Indemnity	16
ARTICLE 10. ASSIGNMENT	17
ARTICLE 11. INFORMATION EXCHANGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY	18
11.1. Information Access	18
11.2. Confidentiality	18
ARTICLE 12. REPRESENTATIONS, WARRANTIES AND COVENANTS	18
12.1. General	18
12.2. Good Standing	18
12.3. Authority	19
12.4. No Conflict	19

12.5.	Consent and Approval.....	19
12.6.	Compliance with All Applicable Laws and Regulations	19
ARTICLE 13.	DISPUTE RESOLUTION	20
ARTICLE 14.	SURVIVAL	20
ARTICLE 15.	MISCELLANEOUS	20
15.1.	Notices	20
15.2.	Entire Agreement	20
15.3.	Binding Effect	21
15.4.	Force Majeure	21
15.5.	Disclaimer	21
15.6.	No NYISO Liability for Review or Approval of Developer Materials	21
15.7.	Amendment	21
15.8.	No Third Party Beneficiaries	21
15.9.	Waiver.....	22
15.10.	Rules of Interpretation	22
15.11.	Severability	22
15.12.	Multiple Counterparts	22
15.13.	No Partnership	23
15.14.	Headings	23
15.15.	Governing Law	23
15.16.	Jurisdiction and Venue.....	23
Appendices		

THIS DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (“Agreement”) is made and entered into this ____ day of _____ 20__, by and between _____, a [corporate description] organized and existing under the laws of the State/Commonwealth of _____ (“Developer”), and the New York Independent System Operator, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York (“NYISO”). Developer or NYISO each may be referred to as a “Party” or collectively referred to as the “Parties.”

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the NYISO administers the Comprehensive System Planning Process (“CSPP”) in the New York Control Area pursuant to the terms set forth in Attachment Y of the NYISO’s Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”), as accepted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”);

WHEREAS, as part of the CSPP, the NYISO administers a reliability planning process pursuant to which the reliability of the New York State Bulk Power Transmission Facilities is assessed over a ten-year Study Period; Reliability Need(s) that may arise over this period are identified; proposed solutions to the identified need(s) are solicited by the NYISO; and the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to satisfy the identified need(s) is selected by the NYISO and reported in the NYISO’s Comprehensive Reliability Plan report;

WHEREAS, the Developer has proposed an alternative regulated transmission solution to satisfy an identified Reliability Need (“Transmission Project”);

WHEREAS, the NYISO has selected the Developer’s Transmission Project as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to satisfy an identified Reliability Need and has directed the Developer to proceed with the Transmission Project pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1 of Attachment Y of the OATT;

WHEREAS, the Developer has agreed to obtain the required authorizations and approvals from Governmental Authorities needed for the Transmission Project, to develop and construct the Transmission Project, and to abide by the related requirements in Attachment Y of the OATT, the ISO Tariffs, and the ISO Procedures;

WHEREAS, the Developer and the NYISO have agreed to enter into this Agreement pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6 of Attachment Y of the OATT for the purpose of ensuring that the Transmission Project will be constructed and in service in time to satisfy the Reliability Need (“Required Project In-Service Date”); and

WHEREAS, the Developer has agreed to construct, and the NYISO has requested that the Developer proceed with construction of, the Transmission Project to address the identified Reliability Need by the Required Project In-Service Date.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of and subject to the mutual covenants contained herein, it is agreed:

ARTICLE 1. DEFINITIONS

Whenever used in this Agreement with initial capitalization, the following terms shall have the meanings specified in this Article 1. Terms used in this Agreement with initial capitalization that are not defined in this Article 1 shall have the meanings specified in Section 31.1.1 of Attachment Y of the OATT or, if not therein, in Article 1 of the OATT.

Advisory Milestones shall mean the milestones set forth in the Development Schedule in Attachment C to this Agreement that are not Critical Path Milestones.

Applicable Laws and Regulations shall mean: (i) all duly promulgated applicable federal, state and local laws, regulations, rules, ordinances, codes, decrees, judgments, directives, or judicial or administrative orders, permits and other duly authorized actions of any Governmental Authority, and (ii) all applicable requirements of the ISO Tariffs, ISO Procedures, and ISO Related Agreements.

Applicable Reliability Organizations shall mean the NERC, the NPCC, and the NYSRC.

Applicable Reliability Requirements shall mean the requirements, criteria, rules, standards, and guidelines, as they may be amended and modified and in effect from time to time, of: (i) the Applicable Reliability Organizations, (ii) the Connecting Transmission Owner(s), (iii) *[to insert the name(s) of any other Transmission Owners or developers whose transmission facilities the NYISO has determined may be impacted by the Transmission Project]*, and (iv) any Affected System Operator as defined in Attachment X of the OATT; *provided, however*, that no Party shall waive its right to challenge the applicability or validity of any requirement, criteria, rule, standard, or guideline as applied to it in the context of this Agreement.

Breach shall have the meaning set forth in Article 7.1 of this Agreement.

Breaching Party shall mean a Party that is in Breach of this Agreement.

Business Day shall mean Monday through Friday, excluding federal holidays.

Calendar Day shall mean any day including Saturday, Sunday, or a federal holiday.

Change of Control shall mean a change in ownership of more than 50% of the membership or ownership interests or other voting securities of the Developer to a third party in one or more related transactions, or any other transaction that has the effect of transferring control of the Developer to a third party.

Confidential Information shall mean any information that is defined as confidential by Article 11.2.

Connecting Transmission Owner shall have the meaning set forth in Attachment X of the OATT.

Critical Path Milestones shall mean the milestones identified as such in the Development Schedule in Attachment C to this Agreement that must be met for the Transmission Project to be constructed and operating by the Required Project In-Service Date.

Default shall mean the failure of a Party in Breach of this Agreement to cure such Breach in accordance with Article 7.2 of this Agreement.

Developer shall have the meaning set forth in the introductory paragraph.

Development Schedule shall mean the schedule of Critical Path Milestones and Advisory Milestones set forth in Appendix C to this Agreement.

Distribution System shall mean the Transmission Owner's facilities and equipment used to distribute electricity that are subject to FERC jurisdiction, and are subject to the NYISO's Standard Large Facility Interconnection Procedures or Small Generator Interconnection Procedures under FERC Order Nos. 2003 and/or 2006. The term Distribution System shall not include LIPA's distribution facilities.

Effective Date shall mean the date upon which this Agreement becomes effective as determined in Article 2.1 of this Agreement.

FERC shall mean the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or its successor.

Force Majeure shall mean any cause or occurrence affecting the ability of a Party hereto to perform its obligations under this Agreement, which cause or occurrence is beyond the reasonable control of the Party affected, not reasonably foreseeable by such Party, not due to an act or omission of the Party affected, and which could not have been avoided by the exercise of reasonable diligence.

Good Utility Practice shall mean any of the practices, methods and acts engaged in or approved by a significant portion of the electric industry during the relevant time period, or any of the practices, methods and acts which, in the exercise of reasonable judgment in light of the facts known at the time the decision was made, could have been expected to accomplish the desired result at a reasonable cost consistent with good business practice, reliability, safety and expedition. Good Utility Practice is not intended to be limited to the optimum practice, method, or act to the exclusion of all others, but rather to delineate acceptable practices, methods, or acts generally accepted in the region.

Governmental Authority shall mean any federal, state, local or other governmental regulatory or administrative agency, public authority, court, commission, department, board, or other governmental subdivision, legislature, rulemaking board, tribunal, or other governmental authority having jurisdiction over any of the Parties, their respective facilities, or the respective services they provide, and exercising or entitled to exercise any administrative, executive, police, or taxing authority or power; *provided, however*, that such term does not include the NYISO, the Developer, the Connecting Transmission Owner(s), or any Affiliate thereof.

In-Service Date shall mean that date upon which the Transmission Project is available to transmit electricity consistent with the Project Description set forth in Appendix A to this Agreement and available to provide Transmission Service under the NYISO Tariffs.

ISO/TO Agreement shall mean the Agreement Between the New York Independent System Operator and Transmission Owners, as filed with and accepted by the Commission in *Cent. Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp., et al.*, 88 FERC ¶ 61,138 (1999) in Docket Nos. ER97-1523, *et al.*, and as amended or supplemented from time to time, or any successor agreement thereto.

New York State Transmission System shall mean the entire New York State electrical transmission system, which includes: (i) the Transmission Facilities Under ISO Operational Control; (ii) the Transmission Facilities Requiring ISO Notification; and (iii) all remaining transmission facilities within the New York Control Area.

NERC shall mean the North American Electric Reliability Corporation or its successor organization.

NPCC shall mean the Northeast Power Coordinating Council or its successor organization.

NYSRC shall mean the New York State Reliability Council or its successor organization.

OATT shall mean the NYISO's Open Access Transmission Tariff, as filed with the Commission, and as amended or supplemented from time to time, or any successor tariff thereto.

Party or Parties shall mean the NYISO, the Developer, or both.

Point of Interconnection shall mean the point or points at which the Developer's Transmission Project will interconnect to the New York State Transmission System or Distribution System.

Project Description shall mean the description of the Transmission Project set forth in Appendix A to this Agreement that is consistent with the project selected by the NYISO Board of Directors as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to the identified Reliability Need.

Reliability Planning Process Manual shall mean the NYISO's manual adopted by the NYISO stakeholder Operating Committee describing the NYISO's procedures for implementing the reliability planning process component of the NYISO's Comprehensive System Planning Process, as the manual is amended or supplemented from time to time, or any successor manual thereto.

Required Project In-Service Date shall mean the In-Service Date by which the Transmission Project must be constructed and operating to satisfy the Reliability Need, as specified in the Development Schedule set forth in Appendix C to this Agreement.

Services Tariff shall mean the NYISO's Market Administration and Control Area Services Tariff, as filed with the Commission, and as amended or supplemented from time to time, or any successor tariff thereto.

Significant Modification shall mean a Developer's proposed modification to its Transmission Project that: (i) could impair the Transmission Project's ability to meet the identified Reliability Need, (ii) could delay the In-Service Date of the Transmission Project beyond the Required Project In-Service Date, or (iii) would constitute a material change to the project information submitted by the Developer under Attachment Y of the OATT for use by the NYISO in its selection of the Transmission Project as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to meet the identified Reliability Need.

Scope of Work shall mean the description of the work required to implement the Transmission Project as set forth in Appendix B to this Agreement. The Scope of Work shall be drawn from the Developer's submission of the Required Data Submission for Solutions to Reliability Needs, which is set forth in Attachment C of the NYISO Reliability Planning Manual, as may be updated as agreed upon by the Parties, and shall include, but not be limited to, a description of: the acquisition of required rights-of-ways, the work associated with the licensing, design, financing, environmental and regulatory approvals, engineering, procurement of equipment, construction, installation, testing, and commissioning of the Transmission Project; the relevant technical requirements, standards, and guidelines pursuant to which the work will be performed; the major equipment and facilities to be constructed and/or installed in connection with the Transmission Project, and the cost estimates for the work associated with the Transmission Project.

Transmission Owner Technical Standards shall mean the technical requirements and standards (*e.g.*, equipment or facilities electrical and physical capabilities, design characteristics, or construction requirements), as those requirements and standards are amended and modified and in effect from time to time, of: (i) the Connecting Transmission Owner(s), (ii) *[to insert the name(s) of any other Transmission Owners or developers whose transmission facilities the NYISO has determined may be impacted by the Transmission Project]*, and (iii) any Affected System Operator as defined in Attachment X of the OATT.

Transmission Project shall mean Developer's proposed alternative regulated transmission solution selected by the NYISO as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to satisfy a Reliability Need as described in the Project Description set forth in Appendix A to this Agreement..

ARTICLE 2. EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERM

2.1. Effective Date

This Agreement shall become effective on the date it has been executed by all Parties; *provided, however*, if the Agreement is filed with FERC as a non-conforming or an unexecuted agreement pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6 of Attachment Y of the OATT, the Agreement shall become effective on the effective date accepted by FERC.

2.2. Filing

If the Agreement must be filed with FERC pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6 of Attachment Y of the OATT, the NYISO shall file this Agreement for acceptance with FERC within the timeframe set forth for the filing in Section 31.2.8.1.6 of Attachment Y of the OATT. The Developer shall cooperate in good faith with the NYISO with respect to such filing and provide any information requested by the NYISO to comply with Applicable Laws and Regulations. Any Confidential Information shall be treated in accordance with Article 11.2 of this Agreement.

2.3. Term of Agreement

Subject to the termination provisions in Article 8 of this Agreement, this Agreement shall remain in effect from the Effective Date until: (i) the Developer executes an operating agreement with the NYISO, and (ii) the Transmission Project: (A) has been completed in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and (B) is in-service; *provided, however*, that the terms of this Agreement shall continue in effect to the extent provided in Article 14 of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 3. TRANSMISSION PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION

3.1. Application for Required Authorizations and Approvals

The Developer shall timely seek and obtain all authorizations and approvals from Governmental Authorities required to develop, construct, and operate the Transmission Project by the Required Project In-Service Date. The required authorizations and approvals shall be listed in the Scope of Work in Appendix B to this Agreement. The Developer shall seek and obtain the required authorizations and approvals in accordance with the milestones set forth in the Development Schedule in Appendix C to this Agreement. The milestones for obtaining the required authorizations and approvals shall be included in the Development Schedule as Critical Path Milestones and Advisory Milestones, as designated by the Parties under Article 3.3.1. The Developer shall notify the NYISO in accordance with the notice requirements in Article 3.3 if it has reason to believe that it may be unable to timely obtain or is denied an approval or authorization by a Governmental Authority required for the development, construction, or operation of the Transmission Project, or if such approval or authorization is withdrawn or modified.

3.2. Development and Construction of Transmission Project

The Developer shall design, engineer, procure, install, construct, test and commission the Transmission Project in accordance with: (i) the terms of this Agreement, including, but not limited to, the Project Description in Appendix A to this Agreement, the Scope of Work in Appendix B to this Agreement, and the Development Schedule in Appendix C to this Agreement; (ii) Applicable Reliability Requirements; (iii) Applicable Laws and Regulations; (iv) Good Utility Practice; (v) the Transmission Owner Technical Standards, and (vi) any

interconnection agreement(s) entered into by and among the NYISO, Developer, and Connecting Transmission Owner(s) for the Transmission Project to interconnect to the New York State Transmission System or Distribution System.

3.3. Milestones

- 3.3.1. The NYISO shall provide the Developer with the Required Project In-Service Date in accordance with Section 31.2.8.1.6 of Attachment Y of the OATT. Prior to executing and/or filing this Agreement with FERC, the NYISO and the Developer shall agree to the Critical Path Milestones and Advisory Milestones set forth in the Development Schedule in Appendix C to this Agreement for the development, construction, and operation of the Transmission Project by the Required Project In-Service Date in accordance with Section 31.2.8.1.6 of Attachment Y of the OATT.
- 3.3.2. The Developer shall meet the Critical Path Milestones in accordance with the Development Schedule set forth in Appendix C to this Agreement. The Developer's inability or failure to meet a Critical Path Milestone specified in the Development Schedule, as such Critical Path Milestone may be amended with the agreement of the NYISO under this Article 3.3, shall constitute a Breach of this Agreement under Article 7.1.
- 3.3.3. The Developer shall notify the NYISO thirty (30) Calendar Days prior to the date of each Critical Path Milestone specified in the Development Schedule whether it will meet the Critical Path Milestone by the specified date; *provided*, however, that notwithstanding this requirement:
 - (i) the Developer shall notify the NYISO as soon as reasonably practicable, and no later than fifteen (15) Calendar Days, following the Developer's discovery of a potential delay in meeting a Critical Path Milestone, including a delay caused by a Force Majeure event; and
 - (ii) the NYISO may request in writing at any time, and Developer shall submit to the NYISO within five (5) Business Days of the request, a written response indicating whether the Developer will meet, or has met, a Critical Path Milestone and providing all required supporting documentation for its response.
- 3.3.4. The Developer shall not make a change to a Critical Path Milestone without the prior written consent of the NYISO. To request a change to a Critical Path Milestone, the Developer must: (i) inform the NYISO in writing of the proposed change to the Critical Path Milestone and the reason for the change, including the occurrence of a Force Majeure event, (ii) submit to the NYISO a revised Development Schedule containing any necessary changes to Critical Path Milestones and Advisory Milestones that provide for the Transmission Project to be completed and achieve its In-Service Date no later than the Required Project In-Service Date, and (iii) submit a notarized officer's certificate certifying the Developer's capability to complete the Transmission Project in accordance with the modified schedule. If the Developer: (i) must notify the NYISO of a potential delay in meeting a Critical Path Milestone in accordance with one of the notification

requirements in Section 3.3.3 or (ii) is requesting a change to a Critical Path Milestone to cure a Breach in Section 7.2, the Developer shall submit any request to change the impacted Critical Path Milestone(s) within the relevant notification timeframe set forth in Section 3.3.3 or the cure period set forth in Section 7.2, as applicable. The NYISO will promptly review Developer's requested change. The Developer shall provide the NYISO with all required information to assist the NYISO in making its determination and shall be responsible for the costs of any study work the NYISO performs in making its determination. If the Developer demonstrates to the NYISO's satisfaction that the delay in meeting a Critical Path Milestone will not delay the Transmission Project's In-Service Date beyond the Required Project In-Service Date, then the NYISO's consent to extending the Critical Path Milestone date will not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned, or delayed. The NYISO's written consent to a revised Development Schedule proposed by the Developer will satisfy the amendment requirements in Article 15.7, and the NYISO will not be required to file the revised Development Schedule with FERC.

- 3.3.5. Within fifteen (15) Calendar Days of the Developer's discovery of a potential delay in meeting an Advisory Milestone, the Developer shall inform the NYISO of the potential delay and describe the impact of the delay on meeting the Critical Path Milestones. The Developer may extend an Advisory Milestone date upon informing the NYISO of such change; *provided, however*, that if the change to the Advisory Milestone will delay a Critical Path Milestone, the NYISO's written consent to make such change is required as described in Article 3.3.4.

3.4. Modifications to Transmission Project

The Developer shall not make a Significant Modification to the Transmission Project without the prior written consent of the NYISO, including, but not limited to, modifications necessary for the Developer to obtain required approvals or authorizations from Governmental Authorities. The NYISO's determination regarding a Significant Modification to the Transmission Project under this Agreement shall be separate from, and shall not replace, the NYISO's review and determination of Material Modifications to the Transmission Project under Attachment X of the OATT. The Developer may request that the NYISO review whether a modification to the Transmission Project would constitute a Significant Modification. The Developer shall provide the NYISO with all required information to assist the NYISO in making its determination regarding a Significant Modification and shall be responsible for the costs of any study work the NYISO must perform in making its determination. If the Developer demonstrates to the NYISO's satisfaction that its proposed Significant Modification: (i) does not impair the Transmission Project's ability to satisfy the identified Reliability Need, (ii) does not delay the In-Service Date of the Transmission Project beyond the Required Project In-Service Date, and (iii) does not change the grounds upon which the NYISO selected the Transmission Project as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to the identified Reliability Need, the NYISO's consent to the Significant Modification will not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned, or delayed. The NYISO's performance of this review shall not constitute its consent to delay the completion of any Critical Path Milestone.

3.5. Billing and Payment

The NYISO shall charge, and the Developer shall pay, the actual costs of: (i) any study work performed by the NYISO or its subcontractor(s) under Articles 3.3 and 3.4, or (ii) any assessment of the Transmission Project by the NYISO or its subcontractor(s) under Article 3.7. The NYISO will invoice Developer on a monthly basis for the expenses incurred by the NYISO each month, including estimated subcontractor costs, computed on a time and material basis. The Developer shall pay invoiced amounts to the NYISO within thirty (30) Calendar Days of the NYISO's issuance of a monthly invoice. In the event the Developer disputes an amount to be paid, the Developer shall pay the disputed amount to the NYISO, pending resolution of the dispute. To the extent the dispute is resolved in the Developer's favor, the NYISO will net the disputed amount, including interest calculated from Developer's date of payment at rates applicable to refunds under FERC regulations, against any current amounts due from the Developer and pay the balance to the Developer. This Article 3.5 shall survive the termination, expiration, or cancellation of this Agreement.

3.6. Project Monitoring

The Developer shall provide regular status reports to the NYISO in accordance with the monitoring requirements set forth in the Development Schedule, the Reliability Planning Process Manual and Attachment Y of the OATT.

3.7. Right to Inspect

Upon reasonable notice, the NYISO or its subcontractor shall have the right to inspect the Transmission Project for the purpose of assessing the progress of the development and construction of the Transmission Project and satisfaction of milestones. The exercise or non-exercise by the NYISO or its subcontractor of this right shall not be construed as an endorsement or confirmation of any element or condition of the development or construction of the Transmission Project, or as a warranty as to the fitness, safety, desirability or reliability of the same. Any such inspection shall take place during normal business hours, shall not interfere with the construction of the Transmission Project and shall be subject to such reasonable safety and procedural requirements as the Developer shall specify.

3.8. Exclusive Responsibility of Developer

As between the Parties, the Developer shall be solely responsible for all planning, design, engineering, procurement, construction, installation, management, operations, safety, and compliance with Applicable Laws and Regulations, Applicable Reliability Requirements, and Transmission Owner Technical Standards associated with the Transmission Project, including, but not limited to, scheduling, meeting Critical Path Milestones and Advisory Milestones, timely requesting review and consent to any project modifications, and obtaining all necessary permits, siting, and other regulatory approvals. The NYISO shall have no responsibility and shall have no liability regarding the management or supervision of the Developer's development of the

Transmission Project or the compliance of the Developer with Applicable Laws and Regulations, Applicable Reliability Requirements, and Transmission Owner Technical Standards. The NYISO shall cooperate with the Developer in good faith in providing information to assist the Developer in obtaining all approvals and authorizations from Governmental Authorities required to develop, construct, and operate the Transmission Project by the Required Project In-Service Date, including information describing the NYISO's basis for selecting the Transmission Project as the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to satisfy an identified Reliability Need.

3.9. Subcontractors

- 3.9.1. Nothing in this Agreement shall prevent a Party from using the services of any subcontractor as it deems appropriate to perform its obligations under this Agreement; provided, *however*, that each Party shall require, and shall provide in its contracts with its subcontractors, that its subcontractors comply with all applicable terms and conditions of this Agreement in providing such services; *provided, further*, that each Party shall remain primarily liable to the other Party for the performance of such subcontractor.
- 3.9.2. The creation of any subcontractor relationship shall not relieve the hiring Party of any of its obligations under this Agreement. The hiring Party shall be fully responsible to the other Party for the acts or omissions of any subcontractor the hiring Party hires as if no subcontract had been made.

3.10. No Services or Products Under NYISO Tariffs

This Agreement does not constitute a request for, nor agreement by the NYISO to provide, Transmission Service, interconnection service, Energy, Ancillary Services, Installed Capacity, Transmission Congestion Contracts or any other services or products established under the ISO Tariffs. If Developer wishes to receive or supply such products or services, the Developer must make application to do so under the applicable provisions of the ISO Tariffs, ISO Related Agreements, and ISO Procedures.

3.11. Tax Status

Each Party shall cooperate with the other Party to maintain each Party's tax status to the extent the Party's tax status is impacted by this Agreement. Nothing in this agreement is intended to affect the tax status of any Party.

ARTICLE 4. COORDINATION WITH THIRD PARTIES

4.1. Interconnection Requirements for Transmission Project

The Developer shall satisfy all requirements set forth in Attachments X and S of the OATT applicable to a "Merchant Transmission Facility" to interconnect the Transmission

Project to the New York State Transmission System or Distribution System by the Required Project In-Service Date, including, but not limited to, submitting an Interconnection Request, participating in all necessary studies, and executing, and/or requesting the NYISO to file for FERC acceptance, an interconnection agreement; *provided, however*, if the Developer is a Transmission Owner, the Developer shall instead satisfy all applicable transmission expansion requirements set forth in Sections 3.7 and 4.5 of the OATT.

If the NYISO determines that the proposed interconnection of a Large Generating Facility, Small Generating Facility, or Merchant Transmission Facility under Attachments X or Z of the OATT could affect the Transmission Project, the Developer shall participate in the interconnection process as an Affected System Operator in accordance with the requirements set forth in Section 30.3.5 of Attachment X of the OATT. If the NYISO determines that a proposed transmission expansion under Sections 3.7 and 4.5 of the OATT could affect the Transmission Project, the Developer shall participate in the transmission expansion process as an affected Transmission Owner in accordance with the requirements set forth in Sections 3.7 and 4.5 of the OATT.

4.2. Interconnection with Affected System

If part of the Transmission Project will affect the facilities of an Affected System as defined in Attachment X of the OATT, the Developer shall satisfy the requirements of the Affected System Operator, as defined in Attachment X of the OATT, for the interconnection of the Transmission Project.

4.3. Coordination of Interregional Transmission Project

If the Transmission Project is or seeks to become an Interregional Transmission Project selected by the NYISO and by the transmission provider in one or more neighboring transmission planning region(s) to address an identified Reliability Need, the Developer shall coordinate its development and construction of the Transmission Project in New York with its responsibilities in the relevant neighboring transmission planning region(s) and must satisfy the applicable planning requirements of the relevant transmission planning region(s).

ARTICLE 5. OPERATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE TRANSMISSION PROJECT

If the Developer is a Transmission Owner, the Developer shall comply with the operating requirements set forth in the ISO/TO Agreement. If the Developer is not a Transmission Owner, the Developer shall: (i) execute, and/or obtain a FERC accepted, interconnection agreement for the Transmission Project in accordance with the requirements in Attachment X of the OATT; (ii) satisfy the applicable requirements set forth in the interconnection agreement and ISO Procedures for the safe and reliable operation of the Transmission Project consistent with the Project Description set forth in Appendix A by the In-Service Date, including satisfying all applicable testing, metering, communication, system protection, switching, start-up, and synchronization requirements; (iii) enter into required operating protocols as determined by the NYISO; (iv) register with NERC as a Transmission Owner and be certified as a Transmission

Operator, and comply with all NERC Reliability Standards and Applicable Reliability Requirements applicable to Transmission Owners and Transmission Operators; and (v) prior to energizing the Transmission Project, execute an operating agreement with the NYISO.

ARTICLE 6. INSURANCE

The Developer shall, at its own expense, maintain in force throughout the period of this Agreement, and until released by the NYISO, the following minimum insurance coverages, with insurers authorized to do business in the state of New York and rated “A- (minus) VII” or better by A.M. Best & Co. (or if not rated by A.M. Best & Co., a rating entity acceptable to the NYISO):

- 6.1 Workers’ Compensation and Employers’ Liability Insurance providing statutory benefits in accordance with the laws and regulations of New York State under NCCI Coverage Form No. WC 00 00 00, as amended or supplemented from time to time, or an equivalent form acceptable to the NYISO; *provided, however*, if the Transmission Project will be located in part outside of New York State, Developer shall maintain such Employers’ Liability Insurance coverage with a minimum limit of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000).
- 6.2 Commercial General Liability Insurance – under ISO Coverage Form No. CG 00 01 (04/13), as amended or supplemented from time to time, or an equivalent form acceptable to the NYISO – with minimum limits of Two Million Dollars (\$2,000,000) per occurrence/Four Million Dollars (\$4,000,000) aggregate combined single limit for personal injury, bodily injury, including death and property damage.
- 6.3 Commercial Business Automobile Liability Insurance – under ISO Coverage Form No. CA 00 01 10 13, as amended or supplemented from time to time, or an equivalent form acceptable to the NYISO – for coverage of owned and non-owned and hired vehicles, trailers or semi-trailers designed for travel on public roads, with a minimum, combined single limit of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000) per occurrence for bodily injury, including death, and property damage.
- 6.4 Umbrella/Excess Liability Insurance over and above the Employers’ Liability, Commercial General Liability, and Commercial Business Automobile Liability Insurance coverage, with a minimum combined single limit of Twenty-Five Million Dollars (\$25,000,000) per occurrence/Twenty-Five Million Dollars (\$25,000,000) aggregate.
- 6.5 Builder’s Risk Insurance in a reasonably prudent amount consistent with Good Utility Practice.
- 6.6 The Commercial General Liability Insurance, Commercial Business Automobile Liability Insurance and Umbrella/Excess Liability Insurance policies of the Developer shall name the NYISO and its respective directors, officers, agents, servants and employees (“NYISO Parties”) as additional insureds. For Commercial General Liability Insurance, the Developer shall name the NYISO Parties as additional insureds under the following ISO form numbers, as amended or supplemented from time to time, or an equivalent form acceptable to the NYISO: (i) ISO Coverage Form No. CG 20 37 04 13 (“Additional

Insured – Owners, Lessees or Contractors – Completed Operations”) and (ii) (A) ISO Coverage Form No. CG 20 10 04 13 (“Additional Insured – Owner, Lessees or Contractors – Scheduled Person or Organization”), or (B) ISO Coverage Form No. CG 20 26 04 13 (“Additional Insured – Designated Person or Organization”). For Commercial Business Automobile Liability Insurance, the Developer shall name the NYISO Parties as additional insureds under ISO Coverage Form No. CA 20 48 10 13 (“Designated Insured for Covered Autos Liability Coverage”), as amended or supplemented from time to time, or an equivalent form acceptable to the NYISO.

- 6.7 All policies shall contain provisions whereby the insurers waive all rights of subrogation in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement against the NYISO Parties and provide thirty (30) Calendar days advance written notice to the NYISO Parties prior to non-renewal, cancellation or any material change in coverage or condition.
- 6.8 The Commercial General Liability Insurance, Commercial Business Automobile Liability Insurance and Umbrella/Excess Liability Insurance policies shall contain provisions that specify that the policies are primary and shall apply to such extent without consideration for other policies separately carried and shall state that each insured is provided coverage as though a separate policy had been issued to each, except the insurer’s liability shall not be increased beyond the amount for which the insurer would have been liable had only one insured been covered. The Developer shall be responsible for its respective deductibles or retentions.
- 6.9 The Commercial General Liability Insurance, Commercial Business Automobile Liability Insurance and Umbrella/Excess Liability Insurance policies, if written on a Claims First Made Basis in a form acceptable to the NYISO, shall be maintained in full force and effect for two (2) years after termination of this Agreement, which coverage may be in the form of an extended reporting period (ERP) or a separate policy, if agreed by the Developer and the NYISO.
- 6.10 The requirements contained herein as to the types and limits of all insurance to be maintained by the Developer are not intended to and shall not in any manner, limit or qualify the liabilities and obligations assumed by the Developer under this Agreement.
- 6.11 The Developer shall provide certification of all insurance required in this Agreement, executed by each insurer or by an authorized representative of each insurer: (A) within ten (10) days following: (i) execution of this Agreement, or (ii) the NYISO’s date of filing this Agreement if it is filed unexecuted with FERC, and (B) as soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year or at the renewal of the insurance policy and in any event within thirty (30) days thereafter.
- 6.12 Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Developer may self-insure to meet the minimum insurance requirements of Articles 6.2 through 6.10 to the extent it maintains a self-insurance program; *provided that*, the Developer’s senior debt is rated at investment grade, or better, by Standard & Poor’s and that its self-insurance program meets the minimum insurance requirements of Articles 6.2 through 6.10. For any period of time that the Developer’s senior debt is unrated by Standard & Poor’s or is rated at less than

investment grade by Standard & Poor's, the Developer shall comply with the insurance requirements applicable to it under Articles 6.2 through 6.11. In the event that the Developer is permitted to self-insure pursuant to this Article 6.12, it shall notify the NYISO that it meets the requirements to self-insure and that its self-insurance program meets the minimum insurance requirements in a manner consistent with that specified in Article 6.11.

- 6.13 The Developer and the NYISO agree to report to each other in writing as soon as practical all accidents or occurrences resulting in injuries to any person, including death, and any property damage arising out of this Agreement.
- 6.14 Notwithstanding the minimum insurance coverage types and amounts described in this Article 6, the Developer: (i) shall also maintain any additional insurance coverage types and amounts required under Applicable Laws and Regulations, including New York State law, and under Good Utility Practice for the work performed by the Developer and its subcontractors under this Agreement, and (ii) shall satisfy the requirements set forth in Articles 6.6 through 6.13 with regard to the additional insurance coverages, including naming the NYISO Parties as additional insureds under these policies.

ARTICLE 7. BREACH AND DEFAULT

7.1. Breach

A Breach of this Agreement shall occur when: (i) the Developer notifies the NYISO in writing that it will not proceed to develop the Transmission Project for reasons other than those set forth in Articles 8.1(i) through (iv); (ii) the Developer fails to meet a Critical Path Milestone, as the milestone may be extended with the agreement of the NYISO under Article 3.3.4 of this Agreement, set forth in the Development Schedule in Appendix C to this Agreement; (iii) the Developer makes a Significant Modification to the Transmission Project without the prior written consent of the NYISO; (iv) the Developer fails to pay a monthly invoice within the timeframe set forth in Article 3.5; (v) the Developer misrepresents a material fact of its representations and warranties set forth in Article 12; (vi) a Party assigns this Agreement in a manner inconsistent with the terms of Article 10 of this Agreement; (vii) the Developer fails to comply with any other material term or condition of this Agreement; (viii) a custodian, receiver, trustee or liquidator of the Developer, or of all or substantially all of the assets of the Developer, is appointed in any proceeding brought by the Developer; or (ix) any such custodian, receiver, trustee, or liquidator is appointed in any proceeding brought against the Developer that is not discharged within ninety (90) Days after such appointment, or if the Developer consents to or acquiesces in such appointment.

7.2. Default

Upon a Breach, the non-Breaching Party shall give written notice of the Breach to the Breaching Party describing in reasonable detail the nature of the Breach and, where known and applicable, the steps necessary to cure such Breach, including whether and what such steps must

be accomplished to complete the Transmission Project by the Required Project In-Service Date. The Breaching Party shall have thirty (30) Calendar Days from receipt of the Breach notice to cure the Breach, or such other period of time as may be agreed upon by the Parties; *provided, however*, that if the Breach is the result of a Developer's inability or failure to meet a Critical Path Milestone, the Developer may only cure the Breach if either: (i) it meets the Critical Path Milestone within the cure period and demonstrates to the NYISO's satisfaction that, notwithstanding its failure to timely meet the Critical Path Milestone, the Transmission Project will achieve its In-Service Date no later than the Required Project In-Service Date, or (ii) the Developer requests in writing within the cure period, and the NYISO consents to, a change to the missed Critical Path Milestone in accordance with Article 3.3.4. If the Breach is cured within such timeframe, the Breach specified in the notice shall cease to exist. If the Breaching Party does not cure its Breach within this timeframe or cannot cure the Breach in a manner that provides for the Transmission Project to be completed by the Required Project In-Service Date, the non-Breaching Party shall have the right to declare a Default and terminate this Agreement pursuant to Article 8.1.

7.3. Remedies

Upon the occurrence of an event of Default, the non-defaulting Party shall be entitled: (i) to commence an action to require the defaulting Party to remedy such Default and specifically perform its duties and obligations hereunder in accordance with the terms and conditions hereof; and (ii) to exercise such other rights and remedies as it may have in equity or at law; *provided, however*, the NYISO's liability under this Agreement shall be limited to the extent set forth in Article 9.1. No remedy conferred by any provision of this Agreement is intended to be exclusive of any other remedy and each and every remedy shall be cumulative and shall be in addition to every other remedy given hereunder or now or hereafter existing at law or in equity or by statute or otherwise. The election of any one or more remedies shall not constitute a waiver of the right to pursue other available remedies. This Article 7.3 shall survive the termination, expiration, or cancellation of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 8. TERMINATION

8.1. Termination by the NYISO

The NYISO may terminate this Agreement by providing written notice of termination to the Developer in the event that: (i) the Transmission Project is halted pursuant to Section 31.2.8.2.2 of Attachment Y of the OATT; (ii) the Developer notifies the NYISO that it is unable to or has not received the required approvals or authorizations by Governmental Authorities required to develop, construct, and operate the Transmission Project by the Required Project In-Service Date; (iii) the Developer notifies the NYISO that its required approvals or authorizations by Governmental Authorities have been withdrawn by the Governmental Authorities; (iv) the Developer cannot complete the Transmission Project by the Required Project In-Service Date for any reason, including the occurrence of a Force Majeure event; or (v) the NYISO declares a default pursuant to Article 7.2 of this Agreement. The NYISO will provide the written notice of termination within fifteen (15) Business Days of its determination under Articles 8.1 (i), (iv), or

(v) or its receipt of notice from the Developer under Articles 8.1(ii) or (iii), which notice will specify the date of termination. If the Agreement was filed and accepted by FERC pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6 of Attachment Y of the OATT, the NYISO will, following its provision of a notice of termination to the Developer, promptly file with FERC for its acceptance a notice of termination of this Agreement.

In the event of termination under Articles 8.1(i), (ii), or (iii), the Developer may be eligible for cost recovery under the OATT in the manner set forth in Attachment Y and Schedule 10 of the OATT. In the event of termination under Articles 8.1(iv) or (v), the Developer must seek any cost recovery from FERC. In the event of termination for any reason under this Article 8.1, the Developer shall use commercially reasonable efforts to mitigate the costs, damages, and charges arising as a consequence of termination and any transfer or winding up of the Transmission Project.

8.2. Reporting of Inability to Comply with Provisions of Agreement

Notwithstanding the notification requirements in Article 3 and this Article 8 of this Agreement, each Party shall notify the other Party promptly upon the notifying Party becoming aware of its inability to comply with any provision of this Agreement. The Parties agree to cooperate with each other and provide necessary information regarding such inability to comply, including the date, duration, reason for inability to comply, and corrective actions taken or planned to be taken with respect to such inability to comply.

8.3. Transmission Project Transfer Rights Upon Termination

If the NYISO terminates this Agreement pursuant to Article 8.1, the NYISO shall have the right, but shall not be required, to request an entity other than the Developer to complete the Transmission Project. The NYISO may exercise this right by providing the Developer with written notice within sixty (60) days after the date on which this Agreement is terminated. If the NYISO exercises its right under this Article 8.3, the Developer shall work cooperatively with the NYISO's designee pursuant to the requirements set forth in Section 31.2.10.1.4 of Attachment Y of the OATT to implement the transition, including entering into good faith negotiations with the NYISO's designee to transfer the Transmission Project to the NYISO's designee. All liabilities under this Agreement existing prior to such transfer shall remain with the Developer, unless otherwise agreed upon by the Developer and the NYISO's designee as part of their good faith negotiations regarding the transfer. This Article 8.3 shall survive the termination, expiration, or cancellation of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 9. LIABILITY AND INDEMNIFICATION

9.1. Liability

Notwithstanding any other provision in the NYISO's tariffs and agreements to the contrary, the NYISO shall not be liable, whether based on contract, indemnification, warranty,

equity, tort, strict liability, or otherwise, to the Developer or any Transmission Owner, NYISO Market Participant, third party or any other person for any damages whatsoever, including, without limitation, direct, incidental, consequential (including, without limitation, attorneys' fees and litigation costs), punitive, special, multiple, exemplary, or indirect damages arising or resulting from any act or omission in any way associated with this Agreement, except in the event the NYISO is found liable for gross negligence or intentional misconduct in the performance of its obligations under this Agreement, in which case the NYISO's liability for damages shall be limited only to direct actual damages. This Article 9.1 shall survive the termination, expiration, or cancellation of this Agreement.

9.2. Indemnity

Notwithstanding any other provision in the NYISO's tariffs and agreements to the contrary, the Developer shall at all times indemnify and save harmless, as applicable, the NYISO, its directors, officers, employees, trustees, and agents or each of them from any and all damages (including, without limitation, any consequential, incidental, direct, special, indirect, exemplary or punitive damages and economic costs), losses, claims, including claims and actions relating to injury to or death of any person or damage to property, liabilities, judgments, demands, suits, recoveries, costs and expenses, court costs, attorney and expert fees, and all other obligations by or to third parties, arising out of, or in any way resulting from, or associated with, this Agreement, *provided, however*, that the Developer shall not have any indemnification obligation under this Article 9.2 with respect to any loss to the extent the loss results from the gross negligence or intentional misconduct of the NYISO. This Article 9.2 shall survive the termination, expiration, or cancellation of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 10. ASSIGNMENT

This Agreement may be assigned by a Party only with the prior written consent of the other Party; *provided that*:

- (i) any Change of Control shall be considered an assignment under this Article 10 and shall require the other Party's prior written consent;
- (ii) an assignment by the Developer shall be contingent upon the Developer or assignee demonstrating to the satisfaction of the NYISO prior to the effective date of the assignment that: (A) the assignee has the technical competence, financial ability, and materials, equipment, and plans to comply with the requirements of this Agreement and to construct and place in service the Transmission Project by the Required Project In-Service Date consistent with the assignor's cost estimates for the Transmission Project; and (B) the assignee satisfies the requirements for a qualified developer pursuant to Section 31.2.4.1.1 of Attachment Y of the OATT; and
- (iii) the Developer shall have the right to assign this Agreement, without the consent of the NYISO, for collateral security purposes to aid in providing financing for the Transmission Project and shall promptly notify the NYISO of any such assignment; *provided, however*, that such assignment shall be subject to the following: (i) prior to or

upon the exercise of the secured creditor's, trustee's, or mortgagee's assignment rights pursuant to said arrangement, the secured creditor, the trustee, or the mortgagee will notify the NYISO of the date and particulars of any such exercise of assignment right(s), and (ii) the secured creditor, trustee, or mortgagee must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the NYISO that any entity that it proposes to complete the Transmission Project meets the requirements for the assignee of a Developer described in Article 10(ii).

For all assignments by any Party, the assignee must assume in a writing, to be provided to the other Party, all rights, duties, and obligations of the assignor arising under this Agreement, including the insurance requirements in Article 6 of this Agreement. Any assignment under this Agreement shall not relieve a Party of its obligations, nor shall a Party's obligations be enlarged, in whole or in part, by reasons thereof, absent the written consent of the other Party. Where required, consent to assignment will not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned, or delayed. Any attempted assignment that violates this Article 10 is void and ineffective, is a Breach of this Agreement under Article 7.1 and may result in the termination of this Agreement under Articles 8.1 and 7.2.

ARTICLE 11. INFORMATION EXCHANGE AND CONFIDENTIALITY

11.1. Information Access

Subject to Applicable Laws and Regulations, each Party shall make available to the other Party information necessary to carry out obligations and responsibilities under this Agreement and Attachment Y of the OATT. The Parties shall not use such information for purposes other than to carry out their obligations or enforce their rights under this Agreement or Attachment Y of the OATT.

11.2. Confidentiality

11.2.1 Confidential Information shall mean: (i) all detailed price information and vendor contracts; (ii) any confidential and/or proprietary information provided by one Party to the other Party that is clearly marked or otherwise designated "Confidential Information"; and (iii) information designated as Confidential Information by the NYISO Code of Conduct contained in Attachment F of the OATT; *provided, however*, that Confidential Information does not include information: (i) in the public domain or that has been previously publicly disclosed; (ii) required by an order of a Governmental Authority to be publicly submitted or divulged (after notice to the other Party); or (iii) necessary to be divulged in an action to enforce this Agreement.

11.2.2 The NYISO shall treat any Confidential Information it receives in accordance with the requirements of the NYISO Code of Conduct contained in Attachment F of the OATT. If the Developer receives Confidential Information, it shall hold such information in confidence, employing at least the same standard of care to protect the Confidential Information obtained from the NYISO as it employs to protect its own Confidential Information. Each Party shall not disclose the other Party's Confidential Information to

any third party or to the public without the prior written authorization of the Party providing the information, except: (i) to the extent required for the Parties to perform their obligations under this Agreement, the ISO Tariffs, ISO Related Agreements, or ISO Procedures, or (ii) to fulfill legal or regulatory requirements, provided that if the Party must submit the information to a Governmental Authority in response to a request by the Governmental Authority on a confidential basis, the Party required to disclose the information shall request under applicable rules and regulations that the information be treated as confidential and non-public by the Governmental Authority.

ARTICLE 12. REPRESENTATIONS, WARRANTIES, AND COVENANTS

12.1. General

The Developer makes the following representations, warranties, and covenants, which are effective as to the Developer during the full time this Agreement is effective:

12.2. Good Standing

The Developer is duly organized, validly existing and in good standing under the laws of the state in which it is organized, formed, or incorporated, as applicable. The Developer is qualified to do business in the state or states in which the Transmission Project is located. The Developer has the corporate power and authority to own its properties, to carry on its business as now being conducted and to enter into this Agreement and carry out the transactions contemplated hereby and to perform and carry out covenants and obligations on its part under and pursuant to this Agreement.

12.3. Authority

The Developer has the right, power, and authority to enter into this Agreement, to become a Party hereto, and to perform its obligations hereunder. This Agreement is a legal, valid, and binding obligation of the Developer, enforceable against the Developer in accordance with its terms, except as the enforceability thereof may be limited by applicable bankruptcy, insolvency, reorganization, or other similar laws affecting creditors' rights generally and by general equitable principles (regardless of whether enforceability is sought in a proceeding in equity or at law).

12.4. No Conflict

The execution, delivery and performance of this Agreement does not violate or conflict with the organizational or formation documents, or bylaws or operating agreement, of the Developer, or any judgment, license, permit, order, material agreement or instrument applicable to or binding upon the Developer or any of its assets.

12.5. Consent and Approval

The Developer has sought or obtained, or, in accordance with this Agreement will seek or obtain, such consent, approval, authorization, order, or acceptance by any Governmental Authority in connection with the execution, delivery and performance of this Agreement, and it will provide to any Governmental Authority notice of any actions under this Agreement that are required by Applicable Laws and Regulations.

12.6. Compliance with All Applicable Laws and Regulations

The Developer will comply with all Applicable Laws and Regulations, including all approvals, authorizations, orders, and permits issued by any Governmental Authority; all Applicable Reliability Requirements, and all applicable Transmission Owner Technical Standards in the performance of its obligations under this Agreement.

ARTICLE 13. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

If a dispute arises under this Agreement, the Parties shall use the dispute resolution process described in Article 11 of the NYISO's Services Tariff, as such process may be amended from time to time. Notwithstanding the process described in Article 11 of the NYISO's Services Tariff, the NYISO may terminate this Agreement in accordance with Article 8 of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 14. SURVIVAL

The rights and obligations of the Parties in this Agreement shall survive the termination, expiration, or cancellation of this Agreement to the extent necessary to provide for the determination and enforcement of said obligations arising from acts or events that occurred while this Agreement was in effect. The remedies and rights and obligation upon termination provisions in Articles 7.3 and 8.3 of this Agreement, the liability and indemnity provisions in Article 9, and the billing and payment provisions in Article 3.5 of this Agreement shall survive termination, expiration, or cancellation of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 15. MISCELLANEOUS

15.1. Notices

Any notice or request made to or by any Party regarding this Agreement shall be made to the Parties, as indicated below:

NYISO:

[Insert contact information.]

Developer:

[Insert contact information.]

15.2. Entire Agreement

Except as described below in this Section 15.2, this Agreement, including all Appendices attached hereto, constitutes the entire agreement between the Parties with reference to the subject matter hereof, and supersedes all prior and contemporaneous understandings of agreements, oral or written, between the Parties with respect to the subject matter of this Agreement. There are no other agreements, representations, warranties, or covenants that constitute any part of the consideration for, or any condition to, either Party's compliance with its obligation under this Agreement.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Agreement is in addition to, and does not supersede or limit the Developer's and NYISO's rights and responsibilities, under any interconnection agreement(s) entered into by and among the NYISO, Developer, and Connecting Transmission Owner(s) for the Transmission Project to interconnect to the New York State Transmission System or Distribution System, as such interconnection agreements may be amended, supplemented, or modified from time to time.

15.3. Binding Effect

This Agreement, and the rights and obligations hereof, shall be binding upon and shall inure to the benefit of the successors and permitted assigns of the Parties hereto.

15.4. Force Majeure

The occurrence of a Force Majeure event shall not excuse non-performance of any obligations under this Agreement.

15.5. Disclaimer

Except as provided in this Agreement, the Parties make no other representations, warranties, covenants, guarantees, agreements or promises regarding the subject matter of this Agreement.

15.6. No NYISO Liability for Review or Approval of Developer Materials

No review or approval by the NYISO or its subcontractor(s) of any agreement, document, instrument, drawing, specifications, or design proposed by the Developer nor any inspection carried out by the NYISO or its subcontractor(s) pursuant to this Agreement shall relieve the Developer from any liability for any negligence in its preparation of such agreement, document,

instrument, drawing, specification, or design, or its carrying out of such works; or for its failure to comply with the Applicable Laws and Regulations, Applicable Reliability Requirements, and Transmission Owner Technical Standards with respect thereto, nor shall the NYISO be liable to the Developer or any other person by reason of its or its subcontractor's review or approval of an agreement, document, instrument, drawing, specification, or design or such inspection.

15.7. Amendment

The Parties may by mutual agreement amend this Agreement, including the Appendices to this Agreement, by a written instrument duly executed by both of the Parties. If the Agreement was filed and accepted by FERC pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6 of Attachment Y of the OATT, the NYISO shall promptly file the amended Agreement for acceptance with FERC.

15.8. No Third Party Beneficiaries

With the exception of the indemnification rights of the NYISO's directors, officers, employees, trustees, and agents under Article 9.2, this Agreement is not intended to and does not create rights, remedies, or benefits of any character whatsoever in favor of any persons, corporations, associations, or entities other than the Parties, and the obligations herein assumed are solely for the use and benefit of the Parties, their successors in interest and their permitted assigns.

15.9. Waiver

The failure of a Party to this Agreement to insist, on any occasion, upon strict performance of any provision of this Agreement will not be considered a waiver of any obligation, right, or duty of, or imposed upon, such Party. Any waiver at any time by either Party of its rights with respect to this Agreement shall not be deemed a continuing waiver or a waiver with respect to any other failure to comply with any other obligation, right, or duty of this Agreement. Any waiver of this Agreement shall, if requested, be provided in writing.

15.10. Rules of Interpretation

This Agreement, unless a clear contrary intention appears, shall be construed and interpreted as follows: (1) the singular number includes the plural number and vice versa; (2) reference to any person includes such person's successors and assigns but, in the case of a Party, only if such successors and assigns are permitted by this Agreement, and reference to a person in a particular capacity excludes such person in any other capacity or individually; (3) reference to any agreement (including this Agreement), document, instrument or tariff means such agreement, document, instrument, or tariff as amended or modified and in effect from time to time in accordance with the terms thereof and, if applicable, the terms hereof; (4) reference to any Applicable Laws and Regulations means such Applicable Laws and Regulations as amended, modified, codified, or reenacted, in whole or in part, and in effect from time to time, including, if applicable, rules and regulations promulgated thereunder; (5) unless expressly stated

otherwise, reference to any Article, Section or Appendix means such Article of this Agreement, such Appendix to this Agreement, or such Section of this Agreement, as the case may be; (6) “hereunder”, “hereof”, “herein”, “hereto” and words of similar import shall be deemed references to this Agreement as a whole and not to any particular Article or other provision hereof or thereof; (7) “including” (and with correlative meaning “include”) means including without limiting the generality of any description preceding such term; and (8) relative to the determination of any period of time, “from” means “from and including”, “to” means “to but excluding” and “through” means “through and including”.

15.11. Severability

Each provision of this Agreement shall be considered severable and if, for any reason, any provision is determined by a court or regulatory authority of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remaining provisions of this Agreement shall continue in full force and effect and shall in no way be affected, impaired, or invalidated, and such invalid, void, or unenforceable provision should be replaced with valid and enforceable provision or provisions that otherwise give effect to the original intent of the invalid, void, or unenforceable provision.

15.12. Multiple Counterparts

This Agreement may be executed in two or more counterparts, each of which is deemed an original, but all constitute one and the same instrument.

15.13. No Partnership

This Agreement shall not be interpreted or construed to create an association, joint venture, agency relationship, or partnership among the Parties or to impose any partnership obligation or partnership liability upon any Party. No Party shall have any right, power, or authority to enter into any agreement or undertaking for, or act on behalf of, or to act as or be an agent or representative of, or otherwise bind, any other Party.

15.14. Headings

The descriptive headings of the various Articles and Sections of this Agreement have been inserted for convenience of reference only and are of no significance in the interpretation or construction of this Agreement.

15.15. Governing Law

This Agreement shall be governed, as applicable, by: (i) the Federal Power Act, and (ii) the substantive law of the State of New York, without regard to any conflicts of laws provisions thereof (except to the extent applicable, Sections 5-1401 and 5-1402 of the New York General Obligations Law).

15.16. Jurisdiction and Venue

Any legal action or judicial proceeding regarding a dispute arising out of or relating to this Agreement or any performance by either Party pursuant thereto that: (i) is within the primary or exclusive jurisdiction of FERC shall be brought in the first instance at FERC, or (ii) is not within the primary or exclusive jurisdiction of FERC shall be brought in, and fully and finally resolved in, either, as applicable, the courts of the State of New York situated in Albany County, New York or the United States District Court of the Northern District of New York situated in Albany, New York.

IN WITNESS WHEREFORE, the Parties have executed this Agreement in duplicate originals, each of which shall constitute an original Agreement between the Parties.

NYISO

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

[Insert name of Developer]

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Appendix A
Project Description

Appendix B
Scope of Work

Appendix C Development Schedule

[To be prepared by Developer consistent with the Developer's project information submission, pursuant to Attachment C of the Reliability Planning Process Manual, and subject to acceptance by the NYISO, as required by Article 3.3 of this Agreement.]

The Developer shall demonstrate to the NYISO that it timely meets the following Critical Path Milestones and Advisory Milestones and that such milestones remain in good standing.

Critical Path Milestones: *[To be developed with consideration of each of the work plan requirements submitted by the Developer pursuant to Attachment C to the Reliability Planning Process Manual and presented herein according to the sequence of the critical path. The NYISO anticipates that the Developer's critical path schedule will include many of the example milestones set forth below and that most of the other example milestones will be included as Advisory Milestones. The composition and sequence of the Critical Path Milestones will differ depending on the Developer's Transmission Project and schedule.]*

Advisory Milestones: *[To include in Development Schedule other milestones (e.g., periodic project review meetings) that are not determined to be on the critical path, but that will be monitored by the Developer and reported to NYISO.]*

[Example Milestones:

- *Interconnection studies (e.g. Interconnection Feasibility Study, SIS, SRIS, Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study)*
- *Siting activities (e.g. locating line routing, access roads, and substation site location options)*
- *Environmental impact studies (relative to siting options)*
- *Engineering (initial)*
- *Permitting and regulatory activities (e.g. Certificate of Environmental Compatibility and Public Need)*
- *Public outreach plan*
- *Initiation of negotiation of key contracts and financing*
- *Acquisition of all necessary approvals and authorizations of Governmental Authorities, including identification of all required regulatory approvals*
- *Closing of project financing*
- *Completion of key contracts*

- *Engineering (detailed)*
- *Procurement of major equipment and materials*
- *Environmental management & construction plan (for Article VII certification)*
- *Acquisition of [all or %] required rights of way and property / demonstration of site control*
- *Surveying and geotechnical assessment (relative to line and station layouts)*
- *Execution, or filing of unexecuted version, of interconnection agreement*
- *Engineering (completed)*
- *Delivery of major electrical equipment*
- *Line and substation site work including milestones for foundations, towers, conductor stringing, equipment delivery and installation, substation controls and communication, security, etc.*
- *Construction outage and restoration coordination plan*
- *Completion, verification and testing*
- *Operating and maintenance agreements and instructions*
- *In-Service Date*
- *Required Project In-Service Date]*

APPENDIX D – PUBLIC POLICY TRANSMISSION PLANNING PROCESS DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

This Appendix is reserved for future use.