

Attachment III

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.

Development Agreement: The agreement between the ISO and the Developer concerning the timely development and construction of: (i) a regulated transmission solution selected and/or triggered by the ISO to address a Reliability Need that the parties are required to enter into pursuant to Section 31.2.8.1.6 of this Attachment Y and is in the form set forth in Appendix C of this Attachment Y, or (ii) a Public Policy Transmission Project selected by the ISO to address a Public Policy Transmission Need that the parties are required to enter into pursuant to Section 31.4.12.2 of this Attachment Y and is in the form set forth in Appendix D of 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.

ISO/TO Reliability Agreement: The Agreement Between the New York Independent System Operator, Inc. and the New York Transmission Owners on the Comprehensive Planning Process for Reliability Needs.

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 Agreement: An agreement between the ISO and a non-incumbent owner of transmission facilities in the New York Control Area concerning the operation of the transmission facilities in the form of the agreement set forth in Appendix H (Section 31.11) of this Attachment Y.

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

31.1.7.1 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.

31.1.7.2. An owner of transmission in New York State may become a Transmission Owner by executing the ISO/TO Agreement or an Operating Agreement as provided for in Section 31.1.7.3.

31.1.7.3 A transmission owner that is not a party to the ISO/TO Agreement or an Operating Agreement and will own transmission facilities in the New York Control Area over which Transmission Service will be provided under the ISO Tariffs must enter into an Operating Agreement prior to energizing its transmission facilities. The ISO will tender a draft Operating Agreement as soon as practicable following its selection of the transmission owner's transmission facilities under the CSPP in this Attachment Y. If the transmission owner's transmission facilities were not selected under the CSPP, the transmission owner shall request that the ISO tender the draft Operating Agreement as soon as practicable after receiving its Article VII certification or other applicable siting permits or authorizations under New York State law. The draft Operating Agreement will be completed by the ISO to the extent practicable for review and completion by the transmission owner. The draft shall be in the form of the ISO's Commission-approved Operating Agreement, which is located in Appendix H in Section 31.11 of this Attachment Y. The ISO and the transmission owner shall finalize and negotiate concerning any disputed provisions. Unless otherwise

agreed by the ISO and the transmission owner, the transmission owner must execute the Operating Agreement within three (3) months of the ISO's tendering of the draft Operating Agreement; *provided, however*, if, during the negotiation period, the ISO or the transmission owner determines that negotiations are at an impasse, the ISO may file the Operating Agreement in unexecuted form with the Commission on its own or following the transmission owner's request in writing that the agreement be filed unexecuted.

31.1.7.4 If the Operating Agreement resulting from the negotiation between the ISO and the transmission owner does not conform with the Commission-approved standard form in Appendix H in Section 31.11 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 Operating Agreement by both parties. If the transmission owner requests that the Operating 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 transmission owner. The ISO will draft to the extent practicable the portions of the Operating 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 transmission owner will provide in a separate filing any comments that it has on the unexecuted agreement, including any alternative positions it may have with respect to the disputed provisions.

31.1.7.5 Upon the ISO's and the transmission owner's execution of the Operating Agreement or the ISO's filing of an unexecuted Operating Agreement with the

Commission, the ISO and the transmission owner shall perform their respective obligations in accordance with the terms of the Operating Agreement that are not in dispute, subject to modification by the Commission.

31.1.7.6 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 The ISO may extend, at its discretion, the deadlines indicated below that are applicable to all parties participating in a given process 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. The deadlines eligible for extension are:

- Sixty (60) day deadline in Section 31.2.5.1 for interested Developers to propose solutions in response to the ISO's solicitation for solutions to a Reliability Need;
- Thirty (30) day deadline in Section 31.2.6.1 for Developers of viable and sufficient transmission solutions to submit project information in response to ISO request;
- Sixty (60) day deadline in Section 31.4.2 for stakeholders and interested parties to submit proposed transmission needs in response to ISO solicitation for proposed needs;
- Sixty (60) day deadline in Sections 31.4.3.1 and 31.4.4.3.1 for Developers to propose solutions to a Public Policy Transmission Need in response to ISO solicitation for solutions;
- Sixty (60) day deadline in Section 31.4.4.4 for Developers of Public Policy Transmission Projects to execute study agreement, provide study deposit, and provide application fee in response to ISO solicitation for solutions; and
- Deadlines in Sections 31.4.6.6 and 31.4.6.7 for Developers to inform NYISO following Viability and Sufficiency Assessment that their viable and sufficient Public Policy Transmission Projects will proceed to be evaluated by the ISO for purposes of selection.

31.2 Reliability Planning Process

31.2.1 Local Transmission Owner Planning Process

31.2.1.1 Scope

31.2.1.1.1 Criteria, Assumptions and Data

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

31.2.1.1.2 Consideration of Transmission Needs Driven by Public Policy Requirements

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

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

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

31.2.1.1.2.2 Determination of Local Transmission Needs Driven by Public Policy Requirements

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

31.2.1.1.2.3 Evaluation of Proposed Local Transmission Solutions

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

31.2.1.2 Process Timeline

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

31.2.1.4 LTP Dispute Resolution Process

31.2.1.4.1 Disputes Related to the LTPP; Objective; Notice

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

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

31.2.1.4.2 Review by the ESPWG/TPAS

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

31.2.1.4.3 Information Discussions

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

31.2.1.4.4 Alternative Dispute Resolution

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

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

31.2.1.4.5 Notice of Results of Dispute Resolution

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

31.2.1.4.6 Rights Under the Federal Power Act

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

31.2.1.4.7 Confidentiality

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

31.2.2 Reliability Needs Assessment

31.2.2.1 General

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

31.2.2.2 Interested Party Participation in the Development of the RNA

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

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

31.2.2.3 Preparation of the Reliability Needs Assessment

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

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

details of the development of the RNA Base Case are contained in the ISO Procedures. The RNA Base Case shall also include Interregional Transmission Projects that have been approved by the NYPSC transmission siting process and meet the base case inclusion requirements in the ISO Procedures.

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

31.2.2.4 Planning Participant Data Input

31.2.2.4.1 At the ISO's request, Market Participants, Developers, and other parties shall provide, in accordance with the schedule set forth in the ISO Procedures, the data necessary for the development of the RNA. This data will include but not be limited to (1) existing and planned additions to the New York State Transmission System (to be provided by Transmission Owners and municipal electric utilities); (2) proposals for merchant transmission facilities (to be provided by merchant

Developers); (3) generation additions and retirements (to be provided by generator owners and Developers); (4) demand response programs (to be provided by demand response providers); and (5) any long-term firm transmission requests made to the ISO.

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

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

31.2.2.5 Reliability Scenario Development

The ISO, in consultation with the ESPWG and TPAS, shall develop reliability scenarios addressing the Study Period. Variables for consideration in the development of these reliability scenarios include but are not limited to: load forecast uncertainty, fuel prices and availability, new resources, retirements, transmission network topology, and limitations imposed by proposed environmental or other legislation.

31.2.2.6 Evaluation of Reliability Scenarios

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

31.2.2.7 Consequences for Other Regions

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

31.2.2.8 Reliability Needs Assessment Report Preparation

Once all the analyses described above have been completed, ISO staff will prepare a draft of the RNA including discussion of its assumptions, Reliability Criteria, and results of the analyses and, if necessary, designate the Responsible Transmission Owner. One or more compensatory MW/ Load adjustment scenarios will be developed by the ISO as a guide to the development of proposed solutions to meet the identified Reliability Need.

31.2.3 RNA Review Process

31.2.3.1 Collaborative Governance Process

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

31.2.3.2 Board Action

Following the Management Committee vote, the draft RNA, with working group, Operating Committee, and Management Committee input, will be forwarded to the ISO Board for review and action. Concurrently, the draft RNA will be provided to the Market Monitoring Unit for its review and consideration of whether market rules changes are necessary to address an identified failure, if any, in one of the ISO's competitive markets. The Board may approve the RNA as submitted, or propose modifications on its own motion. If any changes are proposed

by the Board, the revised RNA shall be returned to the Management Committee for comment. The Board shall not make a final determination on a revised RNA until it has reviewed the Management Committee comments. Upon approval by the Board, the ISO shall issue the final RNA to the marketplace by posting it on its web site.

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

31.2.3.3 Needs Assessment Disputes

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

31.2.3.4 Public Information Sessions

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

31.2.4 Development of Solutions to Reliability Needs

31.2.4.1 Eligibility and Qualification Criteria for Developers and Projects

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

31.2.4.1.1 Developer Qualification and Timing

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

31.2.4.1.1.1 Developer Qualification Criteria

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

31.2.4.1.1.2 Developer Qualification Determination

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

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

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

31.2.4.2 Interregional Transmission Projects

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

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

31.2.4.3 Regulated Backstop Solutions

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

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

31.2.4.4 Qualifications for Regulated Backstop Solutions

31.2.4.4.1 The submission of a regulated backstop solution to a Reliability Need for purposes of the ISO's evaluation under Section 31.2.5 of the viability and sufficiency of the proposed solution and the determination of the Trigger Date for the proposed solution shall include, at a minimum, the following details: (1) contact information; (2) the lead time necessary to complete the project, including, if available, the construction windows in which the Responsible Transmission Owner can perform construction and what, if any, outages may be required during these periods; (3) a description of the project, including type, size, and geographic and electrical location, as well as planning and engineering specifications and drawings as appropriate; (4) evidence of a commercially viable

technology, (5) a major milestone schedule; (6) the schedule for obtaining any permits and other certifications, if available; (7) status of ISO interconnection studies and interconnection agreement, if available; and (8) status of equipment availability and procurement, if available.

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

A Responsible Transmission Owner shall submit the following information to indicate the status of any contracts: (i) copies of all final contracts the ISO determines are relevant to its consideration, or (ii) where one or more contracts are pending, a timeline on the status of discussions and negotiations

with the relevant documents and when the negotiations are expected to be completed. The final contracts shall be submitted to the ISO when available. The ISO shall treat on a confidential basis in accordance with the requirements of its Code of Conduct in Attachment F of the ISO OATT any contract that is submitted to the ISO and is designated by the Responsible Transmission Owner as “Confidential Information.”

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

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

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

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

31.2.4.5 Market-Based Responses

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

under this section. Such responses will be open on a comparable basis to all resources, including generation, demand response providers, and merchant transmission Developers.

31.2.4.6 Qualifications for a Valid Market-Based Response

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

31.2.4.7 Alternative Regulated Responses

31.2.4.7.1 The ISO will request alternative regulated responses to Reliability Needs at the same time that it requests market-based responses and regulated backstop

solutions. Such proposals may include reasonable alternatives that would effectively address the identified Reliability Need.

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

31.2.4.8 Qualifications for Alternative Regulated Solutions

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

specifications and drawings as appropriate; (4) evidence of a commercially viable technology; (5) a major milestone schedule; (6) the schedule for obtaining any permits and other certifications, if available; (7) status of ISO interconnection studies and interconnection agreement, if available; and (8) status of equipment availability and procurement, if available.

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

An Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall submit the following information to indicate the status of any contracts: (i) copies of all final contracts the ISO determines are relevant to its consideration, or (ii) where one or more

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

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

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

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

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

31.2.4.8.3 Failure to provide any data requested by the ISO within the timeframe provided in Sections 31.2.5.1 and 31.2.6.1 of this Attachment Y will result in the rejection of the proposed alternative regulated solution from further consideration during that planning cycle. A proponent of a proposed alternative regulated solution must notify the ISO immediately of any material change in status of a proposed alternative regulated solution. For purposes of this provision, a material change includes, but is not limited to, a change in the financial viability of the developer, a change in the siting status of the project, or a change in a major element of the project's development. If the ISO, at any time, learns of a material change in the status of a proposed alternative regulated solution, it may, at that time, make a determination as to the continued viability of the proposed alternative regulated solution.

31.2.4.9 Additional Solutions

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

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

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

Within 60 days after a request for solutions to a Reliability Need is made by the ISO after completion of the RNA, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7, all Developers proposing solutions to an identified Reliability Need shall submit to the ISO for purposes of its evaluation the project information, as applicable, for: (i) a proposed regulated backstop solution under Section 31.2.4.4.1, (ii) a proposed market-based solution under Section 31.2.4.6, or (iii) a proposed alternative regulated solution under Section 31.2.4.8.1 of this Attachment Y. In response to a solicitation for a solution to a Reliability Need identified after the 2014-2015 planning cycle, the Developer of a proposed transmission solution must also demonstrate to the ISO, simultaneous with its submission of project information, that it has submitted a valid Transmission Interconnection Application or Interconnection Request, as applicable.

Any Developer that the ISO has determined under Section 31.2.4.1.1.2 or as set forth in this Section 31.2.5.1 below to be qualified to propose to develop a project as a transmission solution to an identified Reliability Need may submit the required project information; *provided, however*, that: (i) the Developer shall provide a non-refundable application fee of \$10,000 and

(ii) based on the actual identified need, the ISO may request that the qualified Developer provide additional Developer qualification information. Any Developer that has not been determined by the ISO to be qualified, but that wants to propose to develop a project, must submit to the ISO the information required for Developer qualification under Section 31.2.4.1.1 within 30 days after a request for solutions is made by the ISO. The ISO shall within 30 days of a Developer's submittal of its Developer qualification information, notify the Developer if this information is incomplete. The Developer shall submit additional Developer qualification information or project information required by the ISO within 15 days of the ISO's request. A Developer that fails to submit the additional Developer qualification information or the required project information will not be eligible for its project to be considered in that planning cycle.

31.2.5.2 Comparable Evaluation of All Proposed Solutions

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

31.2.5.3 Evaluation of Viability of Proposed Solution

The ISO will determine the viability of a solution – transmission, generation, demand response, or a combination of these resource types – proposed to satisfy a Reliability Need. For purposes of its analysis, the ISO will evaluate whether: (i) the Developer has provided the required Developer qualification data pursuant to Section 31.2.4.1 and the required project information data under Sections 31.2.4.4.1, 31.2.4.6, or 31.2.4.8.1; (ii) the proposed solution is technically practicable; (iii) the Developer has indicated possession of, or an approach for acquiring, any necessary rights-of-way, property, and facilities that will make the proposal reasonably feasible in the required timeframe; and (iv) the proposed solution can be completed in the required timeframe. If the ISO determines that the proposed solution is not viable and, for regulated solutions, the Developer does not address any identified deficiency pursuant to Section 31.2.5.6, the ISO shall reject the proposed solution from further consideration during that planning cycle.

31.2.5.4 Evaluation of Sufficiency of Proposed Solution

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

31.2.5.5 Establishment of Trigger Date of Proposed Regulated Solutions

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

31.2.5.6 Resolution of Deficiencies

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

31.2.5.7 ISO Report of Evaluation Results

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

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

31.2.6 ISO Evaluation and Selection of Proposed Regulated Transmission Solutions

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

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

make a selection of a more efficient or cost effective regulated solution under this Section 31.2.6 for that planning cycle.

The ISO will make its request, if necessary, for project information under this Section 31.2.6.1 sufficiently in advance of the earliest Trigger Date of the viable and sufficient regulated solutions to enable the ISO to evaluate and select the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution. Upon the ISO's request for project information, the Developers shall submit such information for their regulated transmission solutions within thirty (30) days, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7. A Developer must include with its project information a demonstration that it has an executed System Impact Study Agreement or System Reliability Impact Study Agreement, as applicable. The Developer shall submit additional project information required by the ISO within 15 days of the ISO's request. A Developer that fails to submit the required project information will not be eligible for its project to be considered in that planning cycle.

31.2.6.2 Study Deposit for Proposed Regulated Transmission Solutions

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

The ISO shall charge, and a Developer proposing a regulated backstop transmission solution or an alternative regulated transmission solution shall pay, the actual costs of the ISO's evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution for purposes of the ISO's selection of the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy a Reliability Need for cost

allocation purposes, including costs associated with the ISO's use of subcontractors. The ISO will track its staff and administrative costs, including any costs associated with using subcontractors, that it incurs in performing the evaluation of a Developer's proposed transmission solution under this Section 31.2.6 and any supplemental evaluation or re-evaluation of the proposed transmission solution. If the ISO or its subcontractors perform study work for multiple proposed transmission solutions on a combined basis, the ISO will allocate the costs of the combined study work equally among the applicable Developers. The ISO shall invoice the Developer monthly for study costs incurred by the ISO in evaluating the Developer's proposed transmission solution as described above. Such invoice shall include a description and an accounting of the study costs incurred by the ISO and estimated subcontractor costs. The Developer shall pay the invoiced amount within thirty (30) calendar days of the ISO's issuance of the monthly invoice. The ISO shall continue to hold the full amount of the study deposit until settlement of the final monthly invoice; *provided, however*, if a Developer: (i) does not pay its monthly invoice within the timeframe described above, or (ii) does not pay a disputed amount into an independent escrow account as described below, the ISO may draw upon the study deposit to recover the owed amount. If the ISO must draw on the study deposit, the ISO shall provide notice to the Developer, and the Developer shall within thirty (30) calendar days of such notice make payments to the ISO to restore the full study deposit amount. If the Developer fails to make such payments, the ISO may halt its evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution and may disqualify the Developer's proposed transmission solution from further consideration. After the conclusion of the ISO's evaluation of the Developer's proposed transmission solution or if the Developer: (i) withdraws its proposed transmission solution or (ii) fails to pay an invoiced amount and the ISO halts its evaluation of the proposed transmission

solution, the ISO shall issue a final invoice and refund to the Developer any portion of the Developer's study deposit submitted to the ISO under this Section 31.2.6.2 that exceeds outstanding amounts that the ISO has incurred in evaluating that Developer's proposed transmission solution, including interest on the refunded amount calculated in accordance with Section 35.19a(a)(2) of FERC's regulations. The ISO shall refund the remaining portion within sixty (60) days of the ISO's receipt of all final invoices from its subcontractors and involved Transmission Owners.

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

31.2.6.3 Evaluation of System Impact of Proposed Regulated Transmission Solution

A proposed regulated transmission solution that will have a significant adverse impact on the reliability of the New York State Transmission System shall not be eligible for selection by the ISO under Section 31.2.6.5. The ISO shall evaluate the system impacts for the entire Study Period of a proposed regulated transmission solution that the ISO has determined under Section 31.2.5 is viable and sufficient. As part of this evaluation, the ISO shall give due consideration to the results of any completed System Impact Study or System Reliability Impact Study, as

applicable. The ISO shall perform power flow and short circuit studies for the proposed regulated transmission solutions and additional studies, as appropriate. If the ISO identifies a significant adverse impact based on these studies, the ISO shall request that the Developer make an adjustment to its proposed regulated transmission solution to address this impact and remain eligible for selection. The Developer shall submit the adjustment within 30 days of the ISO's notification.

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

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

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

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

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

regional transmission solution on the BPTFs would satisfy the reliability needs identified in the LTPs. If the ISO determines that the proposed regional transmission solutions on the BPTFs would satisfy the reliability need, the ISO will evaluate the proposed regional transmission solution using the metrics set forth in Section 31.2.6.5.1 to determine whether it may be a more efficient or cost effective solution on the BPTFs to satisfy the reliability needs identified in the LTPs than the local solutions proposed in the LTPs.

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

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

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

A proposed regulated transmission solution – including a regulated backstop transmission solution submitted by a Responsible Transmission Owner pursuant to Section 31.2.4.3 and an alternative regulated transmission solution submitted by a Transmission Owner or Other Developer pursuant to Section 31.2.4.7 – that the ISO has determined satisfies the viability and sufficiency requirements in Section 31.2.5 and the system impact requirements in Section 31.2.6.3 shall be eligible under this Section 31.2.6.5 for selection in the CRP for the purpose of cost allocation and recovery under the ISO Tariffs. The ISO shall evaluate any eligible proposed

regulated transmission solutions for the planning cycle using the metrics set forth in Section 31.2.6.5.1 below. For purposes of this evaluation, the ISO will review the information submitted by the Developer and determine whether it is reasonable and how such information should be used for purposes of the ISO evaluating each metric. In its review, the ISO will give due consideration to the status of, and any available results of, any applicable interconnection or transmission expansion studies concerning the proposed regulated transmission solution performed in accordance with Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments X or P of the ISO OATT. The ISO may engage an independent consultant to review the reasonableness and comprehensiveness of the information submitted by the Developer and may rely on the independent consultant's analysis in evaluating each metric. The ISO shall select in the CRP for cost allocation purposes the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy a Reliability Need in the manner set forth in Section 31.2.6.5.2 below.

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

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

31.2.6.5.1.1 The capital cost estimates for the proposed regulated transmission solutions, including the accuracy of the proposed estimates. For this evaluation, the Developer shall provide the ISO with credible capital cost estimates for its proposed solution, with itemized supporting work sheets that identify all material and labor cost assumptions, and related drawings to the extent applicable and

available. The work sheets should include an estimated quantification of cost variance, providing an assumed plus/minus range around the capital cost estimate.

The estimate shall include all components that are needed to meet the Reliability Need throughout the Study Period. 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 solution, 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) Network Upgrade Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities, System Deliverability Upgrades, Network Upgrades, and Distribution Upgrades.

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

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

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

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

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

31.2.6.5.2 ISO Selection of More Efficient or Cost Effective Regulated Transmission Solution to Satisfy Reliability Need

The ISO shall select under this Section 31.2.6.5.2 the proposed regulated transmission solution, if any, that is the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution proposed in the planning cycle to satisfy the identified Reliability Need. The ISO shall report the selected regulated transmission solution in the CRP. The selected regulated transmission solution reported in the CRP shall be eligible to be triggered by the ISO to satisfy the identified Reliability Need pursuant to Section 31.2.8 at any point within thirty-six months of the date of the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG. An Other Developer or Transmission Owner of an alternative regulated transmission project shall not be eligible for cost allocation and cost recovery under the ISO OATT for its project unless its project is selected pursuant to this Section 31.2.6.5.2. Once such project is selected, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall be eligible for cost allocation and cost recovery under the ISO OATT for its project. Within thirty (30) days of the ISO's selection of an alternative regulated transmission solution, the Other Developer or Transmission Owner shall submit to the ISO for the ISO's approval a proposed schedule and scope of work that describe the preparation work, if any, that the Developer must perform prior to the Trigger Date of the project, including a good faith estimate of the costs of such work. Costs will be recovered when the project is

completed or halted in accordance with the cost recovery requirements set forth in Rate Schedule 10 of the ISO OATT, 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.

31.2.7 Comprehensive Reliability Plan

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

The ISO will include in the draft CRP the list of Developers that qualify pursuant to Section 31.2.4.1 and will identify the proposed solutions that it has determined under Section 31.2.5 are viable and sufficient to satisfy the identified Reliability Need(s) by the need date. The ISO will identify in the CRP the regulated backstop solution that the ISO has determined will meet the Reliability Need by the need date and the Responsible Transmission Owner. If the ISO determines at the time of the issuance of the CRP that sufficient market-based solutions will not be available in time to meet a Reliability Need, and finds that it is necessary to take action to ensure reliability, it will state in the CRP that the development of regulated solutions (regulated backstop or alternative regulated solution) is necessary. The draft CRP will also include the results of the ISO's analysis of the LTPs consistent with Section 31.2.6.4.

The draft CRP shall indicate whether the ISO has determined that the Trigger Date to any proposed regulated solution will occur within thirty-six months of the date of ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment to the ESPWG. If the Trigger Date of any proposed regulated solution will occur within the thirty-six month period and the ISO makes a selection of the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution under Section 31.2.6.5.2, the draft CRP shall include the regulated transmission solution selected for cost allocation purposes pursuant to Section 31.2.6.5.2 as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy the Reliability Need(s) and shall indicate whether that transmission solution should be triggered. The draft CRP shall also indicate the date by which a solution must be in-service to satisfy the Reliability Need.

If: (i) none of the proposed regulated solutions has a Trigger Date within the thirty-six month period, or (ii) the Trigger Date of any proposed regulated solution will occur within the thirty-six month period but the ISO determines in its discretion that it is not necessary at that time to select a more efficient or cost effective transmission solution under Section 31.2.6.5.2 prior to the completion of the CRP, the draft CRP will not select a regulated transmission solution. If: (i) the Trigger Date of any proposed regulated solution will occur within the thirty-six month period, and (ii) the ISO selects a more efficient or cost effective solution subsequent to the completion of the CRP but prior to the completion of that thirty-six month period, the ISO shall issue an updated CRP report pursuant to Section 31.2.7.3 that indicates the regulated transmission solution selected for cost allocation purposes pursuant to Section 31.2.6.5.2 as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy the Reliability Need(s), whether that transmission solution should be triggered, and the date by which a solution must be in-service to satisfy the Reliability Need.

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

31.2.7.1 Collaborative Governance Process

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

31.2.7.2 Board Review, Consideration, and Approval of CRP

Following the Management Committee vote, the draft CRP, with working group, Operating Committee, and Management Committee input, will be forwarded to the ISO Board for review and action. Concurrently, the draft CRP will also be provided to the Market

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

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

31.2.7.3 Updated CRP Report

If, pursuant to Section 31.2.7, the ISO identifies a proposed regulated transmission solution as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution following the completion of the CRP, the ISO will prepare a draft updated CRP report that indicates the regulated transmission solution recommended for selection for cost allocation purposes pursuant to Section 31.2.6.5.2 as the more efficient or cost effective transmission solution to satisfy the Reliability Need(s), whether that transmission solution should be triggered at that time, and the date by which a solution must be in-service to satisfy the Reliability Need. The draft updated CRP report shall be reviewed in accordance with the stakeholder process set forth in Section 31.2.7.1

and will be then forwarded to the ISO Board for its review and action pursuant to Section 31.2.7.2.

31.2.7.4 Reliability Disputes

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

31.2.7.5 Posting of Approved Solutions

The ISO shall post on its website a list of all Developers that have undertaken a commitment to the ISO to build a project (which may be a regulated backstop solution, market-based response, alternative regulated response or gap solution) that is necessary to ensure system reliability, as identified in the CRP and approved by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or authority(ies).

31.4 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, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section

31.1.8.7, to allow any stakeholders or interested parties 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 needs solicitation 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 needs solicitation 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, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7, 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 All Developers of Public Policy Transmission Projects or Other Public Policy Projects 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, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7, the project information required under Section 31.4.5. In response to a solicitation for a solution to a Public Policy Transmission Need identified after the 2014-2015 planning cycle, the Developer of a Public Policy Transmission Project must also demonstrate to the ISO, simultaneous with its submission of project information, that it has submitted a valid Transmission Interconnection Application or Interconnection Request as applicable. If: (i) the ISO determines that a 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, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7, all Developers that propose Public Policy Transmission Projects shall, at the same time that they provide project information pursuant to Section 31.4.4.3.1, (i) execute a study agreement with the ISO in the form set forth in Section 31.12 (Appendix I) of this Attachment Y 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.

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

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, as applicable; (10) the status of equipment availability and procurement, as applicable; (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.

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

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 15 Calendar Days following the NYPSC's issuance of an order in accordance with Section 31.4.6.7 indicating that the ISO should proceed with its evaluation of transmission solutions to a Public Policy Transmission Need, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7, all Developers of proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects that the ISO has determined satisfy the viability and sufficiency requirements in this Section 31.4.6 shall notify the ISO whether they intend for their projects 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, a Developer must include with its notification to the ISO under this Section 31.4.6.6: (i) 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, and (ii) a demonstration that it has an executed System Impact Study Agreement or System Reliability Impact Study Agreement, as applicable. 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

31.4.6.7.1 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 outside of the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process, the NYPSC will indicate in its order that either: (i) there is no longer a transmission need driven by a Public Policy Requirement that requires the ISO's evaluation of potential transmission solutions, or (ii) the transmission need should be modified.

31.4.6.7.2 If the NYPSC concludes that there is no longer a transmission need driven by a Public Policy Requirement in its order as set forth in Section 31.4.6.7.1, 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 the Public Policy Transmission Need initially identified by the NYPSC for that planning cycle pursuant to Section 31.4.2.1.

31.4.6.7.3 If the NYPSC modifies the transmission need driven by a Public Policy Requirement in its order as set forth in Section 31.4.6.7.1, the ISO will re-start its Public Policy Transmission Planning Process as an out-of-cycle process to evaluate Public Policy Transmission Projects to address the modified Public Policy Transmission Need. This out-of-cycle process will begin with the ISO's solicitation for Public Policy Transmission Projects to

address the modified Public Policy Transmission Need in accordance with Sections 31.4.3 and 31.4.4.3. The ISO shall evaluate the viability and sufficiency of the proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects in accordance with Sections 31.4.6.3 and 31.4.6.4. Within 30 Calendar Days following the ISO's presentation of the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment for the out-of-cycle process, which time period may be extended by the ISO pursuant to Section 31.1.8.7, all Developers of proposed Public Policy Transmission Projects that the ISO has determined satisfy the viability and sufficiency requirements in this Section 31.4.6 shall notify the ISO whether they intend for their projects to proceed to be evaluated for purposes of selection in accordance with the requirements in Section 31.4.6.6. The ISO will then proceed to evaluate the viable and sufficient Public Policy Transmission Projects that have elected to proceed in accordance with Sections 31.4.7 through 31.4.11 for purposes of selecting the more efficient or cost-effective transmission solution to the modified Public Policy Transmission Need. The requirements in Section 31.4.6.7.1 that the NYPSC review the Viability and Sufficiency Assessment and issue an order concerning the Public Policy Transmission Need do not apply in this out-of-cycle process.

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. In its review, the ISO will give due consideration to the status of, and any available results of, any applicable interconnection or transmission expansion studies concerning the proposed Public Policy Transmission Project performed in accordance with Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments X or P of the ISO OATT. The ISO may engage an independent consultant to review the reasonableness and comprehensiveness of the information submitted by the Developer and may rely on the independent consultant's analysis in evaluating each metric. The ISO shall select in the 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) Network Upgrade Facilities, 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 also indicate the date by which the Public Policy Transmission Project must be in-service to address the Public Policy Transmission Need. The in-service date shall be: (i) the date prescribed by the NYPSC in its order identifying the Public Policy Transmission Need as described in Section 31.4.2.1 or in a subsequent order, or (ii) if the NYPSC has not prescribed a date, the date proposed by the Developer and reviewed and accepted by the ISO, which date may be either: (A) the in-service date included in the Developer's project proposal, or (B) such other date accepted by the ISO as reasonable in light of the Public Policy Transmission Need.

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, the Developer may recover all of the necessary and reasonable costs incurred and commitments made up to the final federal, state or local regulatory decision, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, to the extent permitted by the Commission in accordance with its regulations on abandoned plant recovery. 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. For purposes of finalizing the Development Agreement, the ISO and Developer shall develop the description and dates for the milestones necessary to develop and construct the selected project by the required in-service date identified in the Public Policy Transmission Planning Report, including the milestones for obtaining all necessary authorizations. Any milestone that requires action by a Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected System Operator identified pursuant to Attachment P of the ISO OATT to complete must be included as an Advisory Milestone, as that term is defined in the Development Agreement.

Unless otherwise agreed by the ISO and the 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 ISO or the Developer determines that negotiations are at an impasse, the ISO may file the Development Agreement in unexecuted form with the Commission on its own or following the Developer's request in writing that the agreement be filed unexecuted. 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. The Connecting Transmission Owner(s) and Affected System Operator(s) that are identified in Attachment P of the ISO OATT in connection with the selected Public Policy Transmission Project shall act in good faith in timely performing their obligations that are required for the Developer to satisfy its obligations under the Development Agreement.

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

31.4.12.3.1 The ISO may take the actions described in Sections 31.4.12.3.1.1 through 31.4.12.3.1.3 as soon as practicable if one of the following events occur: (i) the Developer that proposed the selected Public Policy Transmission Project and is required to execute the Development Agreement pursuant to Section 31.4.12.2 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) the ISO determines that an effective Development Agreement may be terminated or terminates the Development Agreement under the terms of the agreement prior to the completion of the term of the agreement.

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

31.4.12.3.1.2 The ISO may take one or more of the following actions to address a Public Policy Transmission Need based on the particular circumstances: (i) address the Public Policy Transmission Need in the subsequent planning cycle or, if requested by the NYPSC pursuant to Section 31.4.1, in an out-of-cycle process; (ii) direct the Developer to continue with the development of its Public Policy Transmission Project for completion beyond the in-service date required to address the Public Policy Transmission Need; or (iii) solicit bids from qualified Developers to complete the selected Public Policy Transmission Project in accordance with Section 31.4.12.3.1.3.

31.4.12.3.1.3 If the ISO determines in accordance with Section 31.4.12.3.1.2 that an alternative Developer should be identified to complete a selected Public Policy Transmission Project, the ISO shall solicit bids from Developers to finance and complete the development and construction of the project to bring it into service. Any Developer that is qualified at the time of the ISO's solicitation to propose a Public Policy Transmission Project may submit a proposal to complete the Public

Policy Transmission Project. The ISO will specify in its solicitation for bids by Developers those categories of project information described in Section 31.4.5.1.1 that the Developer must submit and will identify the metrics in Section 31.4.8 that the ISO will use to select among the bidding Developers. The ISO will determine the appropriate project information and metrics based on the current status of development of the Public Policy Transmission Project. The ISO will make any selection of an alternative Developer using the selection metrics identified in its solicitation for bids and consistent with the selection processes set forth in Sections 31.4.8 and 31.4.11, including issuing an updated Public Policy Transmission Planning Report. The ISO shall charge, and a Developer bidding for the Public Policy Transmission Project, shall pay the actual costs of the ISO's evaluation of its bid for purposes of selecting a Developer to complete the project consistent with Section 31.4.4.4. Each bidding Developer will reimburse the ISO for its actual study costs consistent with the requirements in Section 31.4.4.4. The selected alternative Developer must enter into a Development Agreement with the ISO in accordance with the requirements in Section 31.4.12.2. The selected alternative Developer will be eligible for cost allocation under the ISO OATT for its development and construction of the Public Policy Transmission Project. The selected alternative Developer and the Developer that initially proposed the selected Public Policy Transmission Project shall work cooperatively with each other to implement the transition, including negotiating in good faith with each other to transfer the project; *provided, however*, that the transfer is subject to: (i) any required approvals by the appropriate governmental agency(ies) and/or

authority(ies), (ii) any requirements or restrictions on the transfer of Developer's rights-of-way under federal or state law, regulation, or contract (including mortgage trust indentures or debt instruments), and (iii) if the Developer is a New York public authority, any requirements or restrictions on the transfer under the New York Public Authorities Law; *provided, further*, that the selected alternative Developer and the initial Developer will address any disputes regarding the transfer of the project in accordance with the dispute resolution provisions in Article 11 of the ISO Services Tariff.

31.4.12.4 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 Operating Agreement in accordance with Section 31.1.7 of this Attachment Y 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, (v) the proposed in-service date for the facility, and (vi) information regarding the proposed facility that the ISO is required to disclose under its interconnection or transmission expansion processes pursuant to Sections 3.7 or 4.5 of the ISO OATT or Attachments X or P of the ISO OATT.

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 P, 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:

$$\text{Resource Adequacy Cost Allocation}_i = \left[\frac{\text{LCRdef}_i}{\text{Soln Size}} + \left(\frac{\text{Coincident Peak}_i * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_i)}{\sum_{k=1}^n \text{Coincident Peak}_k * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_k)} * \frac{\text{Soln STWdef}}{\text{Soln Size}} + \frac{\text{Coincident Peak}_i * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_i)}{\sum_{l=1}^m \text{Coincident Peak}_l * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_l)} * \frac{\text{Soln Cldef}}{\text{Soln Size}} \right) \right] * 100\%$$

Where i is for each applicable zone, n represent the total zones in NYCA, m represents the zones isolated by the binding interfaces, IRM is the statewide reserve margin, and where LCR is defined as the locational capacity requirement in terms of percentage and is equal to zero for those zones without an LCR requirement, LCRdef _{i} is the applicable zonal LCR deficiency, SolnSTWdef is the STWdef for each applicable project, SolnCldef is the Cldef 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, LCRdef_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 LCRdef MW are added.

31.5.3.2.1.2 Step 2 - Statewide Resource Deficiency. If the reliability criterion is not met after the LCRdef has been addressed, that is an $\text{LOLE} > 0.1$, 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 (STWdef), 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:

$$\text{Allocation}_i = \left[\frac{\text{Coincident Peak}_i * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_i)}{\sum_{k=1}^n \text{Coincident Peak}_k * (1 + \text{IRM} - \text{LCR}_k)} * \frac{\text{Soln STWdef}}{\text{Soln Size}} \right] * 100\%$$

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

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

Where i is for each applicable zone, m is for the zones isolated by the binding interfaces, IRM is the statewide reserve margin, and where LCR is defined as the locational capacity requirement in terms of percentage and is equal to zero for those zones without an LCR requirement, SolnCIdf is the CIdf for the

applicable project and Soln_Size represents the total compensatory MW addressed by the applicable project.

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:

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

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:

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

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:

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

Where:

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

$AdjLBMP_{y,z}$ 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. Prior to a vote being conducted, the Developer of the RETP must have a completed System Impact Study or System Reliability Impact Study, as applicable.

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, the Developer may recover all of the necessary and reasonable costs incurred and commitments made up to the final federal, state or local regulatory decision, including reasonable and necessary expenses incurred to implement an orderly termination of the project, to the extent permitted by the Commission in accordance with its regulations on abandoned plant recovery. 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 Cost (X) = Cost (X) / (1+D)^{N(X)}
 - Present Value of Cost (Y) = PV Cost (Y) = Cost (Y) / (1+D)^{N(Y)}

- Cost Allocation to Region A = $\text{Cost (Z)} \times \text{PV Cost (X)} / [\text{PV Cost (X)} + \text{PV Cost (Y)}]$
- 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

Cost Allocation to Region A = $\$80 \times 33.039 / (33.039 + 28.888) = \$42,681$ Million

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.