

25.10 Miscellaneous Provisions

25.10.1 Non-financial Settlement of 2004

Notwithstanding any foregoing provisions to the contrary, the following provisions apply to the resumption of the cost allocation process after the approval by FERC of the Non-Financial Settlement.

- 25.10.1.1 Upon the study start date specified in the Non-Financial Settlement (“Study Start Date”), the ISO shall resume the cost allocation process set forth herein.
- 25.10.1.2 Except as provided below, the initial cost allocation shall determine the System Upgrade Facilities required for the reliable interconnection of all Developer projects that have met the milestones identified in Section IV.G.6.c.1, above, on or before the Study Start Date. The ISO shall prepare an ATRA with respect to these Developer projects as a single class (the “Catch Up Class Year”). The Catch Up Class Year shall not include (1) Class Year 2001 Developer projects that have accepted their Project Cost Allocation prior to the Study Start Date, or (2) Class Year 2002 Developer Projects that have accepted their Project Cost Allocation pursuant to the terms of the Non-Financial Settlement.
- 25.10.1.3 The ISO shall use the 2004 Load and Capacity Data Report for the Catch Up Class Year cost allocation studies, unless the Study Start Date is later than January 1, 2005 in which event the ISO shall use the 2005 Load and Capacity Data Report. The Catch Up Class Year cost allocation studies shall identify system needs for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2005. In the event the Study Start Date is later than January 1, 2005 the Catch Up Class Year cost

allocation studies shall identify system needs for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2006. The ISO shall present the results of the Catch Up Class Year cost allocation studies to the Operating Committee for approval as provided in Section IV.F.8 of these rules.

25.10.1.4 The ISO shall represent the NYPA Poletti project in the ATBA and ATRA for the Catch Up Class Year as connected to the Astoria West Substation.

25.10.1.5 Once all Developers in the Catch Up Class Year have either (i) accepted their Project Cost Allocation, or (ii) dropped out of the class, the ISO shall resume annual cost allocations with respect to individual Class Years in accordance with the time frames set out in these rules.

25.10.1.6 All Developer projects in the Catch Up Class Year who do not accept their Project Cost Allocation shall be included in the ATRA in the next Class Year cost allocation process.

25.10.1.7 The ISO shall finalize the results of the Class Year 2002 cost allocation (including headroom issues) in accordance with the provisions of the Non-Financial Settlement.

25.10.2 Combined Study of Class Years 2009 and 2010

Notwithstanding any foregoing provisions to the contrary, the following special provisions apply to the Interconnection Facilities Studies for Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010. These provisions provide that Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will be performed on a combined basis. However, cost allocation for these two Class Years will be calculated separately, as described herein. All provisions of this Attachment S that are not inconsistent with the special provisions of this Section 25.10.2 shall apply as they normally do to projects in Class

Year 2009 and Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.1 A single ATBA under the Minimum Interconnection Standard for the Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will be developed using the 2010 NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report and will be the same ATBA as would otherwise be developed for the 2010 Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study absent the combination of Class Year 2010 with Class Year 2009. This ATBA will be the starting point for a single deliverability baseline used under the Deliverability Interconnection Standard for Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010. For purposes of this Section 25.10.2, “ATBA-Deliverability” refers to the deliverability baseline developed for Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 pursuant to this Section, and “ATRA-Deliverability” refers to the ATBA-Deliverability with the relevant Class Year projects added, as described below.

25.10.2.2 There will be two ATRAs and two ATRAs-Deliverability in the combined Class Year study: an ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2009, as well as an ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.2.1 The ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2009 will be the ATBA and ATBA-Deliverability, respectively, developed pursuant to Section 25.10.2.1 above, plus the projects that qualified for Class Year 2009 on or before March 1, 2009 and entered Class Year 2009.

25.10.2.2.2 The ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2010 will be the ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2009, plus the projects that qualified for Class Year 2010 on or before March 1, 2010 and entered Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.3 Cost Allocation for the Two Class Years

25.10.2.3.1 The cost allocation for Class Year 2009 System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades will be calculated based on the incremental impact of the Class Year 2009 projects (i.e., the 2009 ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability) over the ATBA and ATBA-Deliverability, respectively, developed pursuant to Section 25.10.2.1 above.

25.10.2.3.2 The cost allocation for Class Year 2010 System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades will be calculated based on the incremental impact of the Class Year 2010 projects (i.e., the 2010 ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability) over the Class Year 2009 ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability, respectively, as described fully below.

25.10.2.3.3 If Class Year 2010 projects use Headroom on System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades identified for Class Year 2009 projects, the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study for Class Year 2010 will identify the Headroom use payments that must be made by Class Year 2010 projects to Class Year 2009 projects.

25.10.2.3.4 In the event that a System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade identified for Class Year 2009 is replaced in the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study for Class Year 2010 by a more capable System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade required for projects in Class Year 2010, the cost allocation for Class Year 2009 will be based on the System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade identified for Class Year 2009, and the cost allocation to Class Year 2010 will be based on the more

capable replacement System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade.

25.10.2.4 Operating Committee Approval, Project Cost Allocation Decision Process and Class Year Settlement.

25.10.2.4.1 The initial Project Cost Allocation contained in the ATRA and Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2009 will be based upon all projects in Class Year 2009. The initial Project Cost Allocation contained in the ATRA and Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2010 will be based upon all projects in Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010, except as described below in Section 25.10.2.4.4.3.

25.10.2.4.2 The ISO will undertake to complete the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2009 and the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010 in parallel so that both study reports are ready to be presented at the same Operating Committee meeting. However, if at any time, the ISO determines that the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2009 is ready for presentation to the Operating Committee (following applicable working group and subcommittee review), the ISO will present that study report to the Operating Committee regardless of the status of the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010. The Operating Committee will separately vote to approve the study report for Class Year 2009 and the study report for Class Year 2010, even if both study reports are presented at the same Operating Committee meeting.

25.10.2.4.3 If the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Reports for Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 are both approved at the same Operating Committee

meeting, the Project Cost Allocation decision process will commence at that time and be conducted in parallel for the projects in both Class Years, as described in Section 25.10.2.4.5 below.

25.10.2.4.4 If the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2009 is approved at an Operating Committee meeting where either (1) the study report for Class Year 2010 is not presented for approval, or (2) the study report for Class Year 2010 is presented for approval but not approved, the following process will be followed:

25.10.2.4.4.1 The Project Cost Allocation decision process for Class Year 2009 will not commence until the following Operating Committee meeting (“Second Operating Committee Meeting”), held not more than forty-five (45) days after the Operating Committee meeting where the study report for Class Year 2009 was approved.

25.10.2.4.4.2 If the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010 is approved at the Second Operating Committee Meeting, the Project Cost Allocation decision process for the projects in both Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will commence at that time and be conducted in parallel for the projects in both Class Years as described in Section 25.10.2.4.5 below.

25.10.2.4.4.3 If the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010 is not approved at the Second Operating Committee Meeting, the Project Cost Allocation decision process for the projects in Class Year 2009 will commence immediately upon the Second Operating Committee Meeting and will follow the existing Project Cost Allocation decision process described in Sections 25.8.1-25.8.4 of Attachment S, with initial Acceptance Notices and/or Non-

Acceptance Notices due 30 days after the Second Operating Committee Meeting.

When the Project Cost Allocation decision process for the projects in Class Year 2009 is completed, and the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010 has been revised to reflect the final settlement of Class Year 2009 and is otherwise complete, the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010 will be presented to the Operating Committee meeting for approval. Upon Operating Committee approval of the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010, the Project Cost Allocation decision process for the projects in Class Year 2010 will begin.

25.10.2.4.4.4 Only in the event that the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010 is not approved at the Second Operating Committee Meeting, as described immediately above in Section 25.10.2.4.4.3, a Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2009 providing a Non-Acceptance Notice for its System Upgrade Facility Project Cost Allocation may, by the due date for providing such notice, elect to enter Class Year 2010, and its project will be placed in Class Year 2010, provided that (a) the project is otherwise eligible under the Class Year re-entry rules, (b) it submits to the ISO an executed Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement, together with the required deposit and data, within ten (10) days of its receipt of the Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement, and (c) cures any deficiency in its submittal within five (5) Business Days after receiving notice from the ISO about such deficiency. A project in Class Year 2009 committing a Security Posting Default may not enter Class Year 2010. Other than as described in this Section 25.10.2.4.4.4, projects in Class Year

2009 may not enter Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.4.5 If both Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Reports are approved by the Operating Committee, either at the same meeting or by the Second Operating Committee Meeting, as described above in Sections 25.10.2.4.2-25.10.2.4.4, the Developers and Interconnection Customers in both Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will have thirty (30) days from the date of Operating Committee approval of the Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010 to provide an Acceptance Notice(s) or Non-Acceptance Notice(s) in accordance with Sections 25.8.1-25.8.4 of Attachment S. If any Developer or Interconnection Customer in either Class Year 2009 or Class Year 2010 provides a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default, the ISO will prepare a revised Class Year Interconnection Facilities Report by the following process:

25.10.2.4.5.1 If any Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2009 provides a Non-Acceptance Notice(s) and/or commits a Security Posting Default, the ISO will notify all Developers and Interconnection Customers in both Class Years as required by Section 25.8.2 of Attachment S, and will prepare (1) a revised ATRA and/or Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2009 to reflect impact of the Non-Acceptance Notice(s) and/or Security Posting Default(s) from Class Year 2009 projects, and (2) a revised ATRA and/or Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2010 to reflect the impact of the Non-Acceptance Notice(s) and/or Security Posting Default(s) from Class Year 2009 project and Class Year 2010 projects. The ISO will prepare and publish the

required ATRAs and/or Class Year Deliverability Study(ies) for both Class Years within four (4) weeks of its receipt of the last Non-Acceptance Notice or its receipt of notice of the last Security Posting Default, whichever is later.

25.10.2.4.5.2 If any Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2010 provides a Non-Acceptance Notice(s) and/or commits a Security Posting Default, but no Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2009 does so, the ISO will notify all Developers and Interconnection Customers in both Class Years as required by Section 25.8.2 of Attachment S, and will prepare and publish a revised ATRA and/or Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2010 within two (2) weeks of its receipt of the last Non-Acceptance Notice or its receipt of notice of the last Security Posting Default, whichever is later. The ISO will not revise the ATRA or the Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2009 as a result of a Non-Acceptance Notice from or a Security Posting Default by a Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.4.5.3 The process described in the foregoing Sections 25.10.2.4.5.1 and/or 25.10.2.4.5.2 will be repeated until either (1) none of the remaining eligible Class Year Developers or Interconnection Customers provides a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default, or (2) all Developers or Interconnection Customers have dropped out of their respective Class Years.

25.10.2.5 Except for projects in Class Year 2009 that elect to enter Class Year 2010 pursuant to the procedures described above in Section 25.10.2.4.4.4, Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will be considered as a single Class Year for purposes of calculating the number of Class Years a project may enter pursuant to Section

25.8.2.3 of Attachment S. A project that was in Class Year 2009 but elects to enter Class Year 2010 under section 25.10.2.4.4 that subsequently provides a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default related to its System Upgrade Facilities for Class Year 2010 will be deemed to have withdrawn its Interconnection Request in accordance with Section 30.3.6 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X of the OATT, or in accordance with Attachment Z of the OATT, as applicable.

25.10.3 ISO Data Requirements

Developers and Transmission Owners shall provide the ISO with all data necessary to make the determinations contemplated by these rules.

25.10.4 Rights Under the Federal Power Act

Nothing in these rules restricts the rights of any person under the OATT, or the right of any person to file a complaint with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under the relevant provisions of the Federal Power Act.

25.10.5 Transmission Service Customer Rights

Nothing in these rules precludes any transmission service customer from receiving transmission service charge credits to the extent the customer is entitled to such credits under FERC policy and precedent.