

NYISO Comprehensive Planning Process for Reliability Needs

Proposed Changes Submitted by Doreen Saia, Mirant

To: EGrisaru@nyiso.com; JBuechler@nyiso.com; lbullock@nyiso.com; RStalter@nyiso.com

Cc: GBrown@nyiso.com

Subject: Fwd: ESPWG - Stakeholder Comments on the Proposed Tariff Language for Comprehensive Planning Process for Reliability Needs

John/Liz: I have reviewed the NYISO draft just now and believe that most of the changes to Sections 6 and 7 are in line with what was discussed at the meeting. However, a couple changes as identified below go a bit too far. As you know, the whole discussion of the regulated solution and alternatives to it has been a very delicate balance. The changes that I am proposing, I believe, brings that balance back in line and are as follows:

Section 6: First line, change "The first time any Reliability Need..." to "The first time a Reliability Need."

Section 6: Three lines up from the bottom, revise to provide "...for implementation of the proposed potential backstop solution."

Section 6.2.1: Four lines down, delete "backstop."

Section 7.2.2: Third and fourth lines, delete "backstop" and revise fourth line as follows: "...also identify in the CRP (1) the potential regulated solutions that will resolve the Reliability Need..."

Section 7.2.3: Second line, delete "backstop."

Section 8.4: First line, delete "backstop."

All of these changes are needed to convey the fact that all of the alternative proposals, including the backstop proposal, are on an equal footing as far as which may be chosen. With these changes, the tariff language is consistent with the MC motion and is acceptable.

Doreen Saia