



HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
1900 K STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-1109

TEL 202 • 955 • 1500  
FAX 202 • 778 • 2201

TED J. MURPHY  
DIRECT DIAL: 202-955-1588  
EMAIL: [tmurphy@hunton.com](mailto:tmurphy@hunton.com)

October 5, 2007

**By Hand**

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary  
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
888 First Street N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20426

Consensus Deliverability Plan of the  
New York Independent System Operator, Inc.  
and the New York Transmission Owners  
In Docket Nos. ER04-449-003, ER04-449-007, and ER04-449-008

Dear Ms. Bose:

Pursuant to the Commission's August 6, 2004, and June 2, 2005, orders in the above-captioned proceedings,<sup>1</sup> the New York Independent System Operator, Inc. ("NYISO") and the New York Transmission Owners<sup>2</sup> (collectively, the "Joint Filing Parties") hereby respectfully submit to the Commission the Consensus Deliverability Plan of the New York Independent System Operator, Inc. and New York Transmission Owners ("Deliverability Plan") regarding the implementation of a second level of interconnection service with a deliverability component in the New York Control Area ("NYCA").<sup>3</sup> The Joint Filing Parties respectfully request that the Commission approve the proposed Deliverability Plan described herein and in the attached document.<sup>4</sup> The Joint Filing Parties intend to work with stakeholders to develop

---

<sup>1</sup> *New York Independent System Operator, Inc., et al.*, 108 FERC ¶ 61,159 at P 28 (August 6, 2004) ("August 6 Order"); *New York Independent System Operator, Inc., et al.*, 111 FERC ¶ 61,347 at P 14 (June 2, 2005) ("June 2 Order").

<sup>2</sup> Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation, Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. ("Con Edison"), LIPA, New York Power Authority, New York State Electric & Gas Corporation, Orange & Rockland Utilities, Inc. ("O&R"), Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation, and New York Mohawk Power Corporation, a National Grid Company. Con Edison's and O&R's support for the consensus proposal is contingent upon the refinement of the deliverability test methodology and the definition of highways facilities as established in a subsequent filing with the Commission.

<sup>3</sup> Capitalized terms that are not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning specified in Article 2 of the NYISO Market Administration and Control Area Services Tariff.

<sup>4</sup> The Commission has previously approved a conceptual proposal prior to the submission of tariff language. See, e.g., *California Independent System Operator Corporation, Proposal for Honoring Existing Transmission Contracts under the California Independent System Operator Corporation's Amended Comprehensive Market*

Kimberly D. Bose

October 5, 2007

Page 2

detailed tariff sheets consistent with the Deliverability Plan to be filed with the Commission upon their completion.

The NYISO and its stakeholders have conducted extensive discussions to determine the best method of integrating the interconnection service requirements in Commission Order No. 2003 with the unique characteristics of the NYISO-administered markets.<sup>5</sup> In this filing, the Joint Filing Parties provide the conceptual proposal developed with NYISO stakeholders through the Interconnection Issues Task Force as a framework for adding a second level of interconnection service with a deliverability component to the NYISO Open Access Transmission Tariff ("OATT") to satisfy the Joint Filing Parties filing obligation.<sup>6</sup> Upon the Commission's approval or modification of the conceptual proposal, the Joint Filing Parties will continue working with stakeholders to develop and submit detailed tariff language.

## **I. LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED**

The NYISO submits the following documents:

1. This filing letter, and
2. Consensus Deliverability Plan of the New York Independent System Operator, Inc. and New York Transmission Owners (Attachment I).

## **II. BACKGROUND**

In its Order No. 2003, the Commission established standard interconnection procedures and a standard interconnection agreement.<sup>7</sup> Order No. 2003 required "all public utilities that own, control, or operate facilities used for transmitting electric energy in interstate commerce" to file such procedures and agreement.<sup>8</sup> In its order, the Commission contemplated two levels of interconnection service: (i) Energy Resource Interconnection Service ("ERIS"), which would provide an Interconnection Customer with a basic connection to a network capable of transmitting energy, and (ii) Network Resource Interconnection Service ("NRIS"), which

---

*Design Proposal*, Docket No. ER02-1656-021 (December 8, 2004); *California Independence System Operator Corporation, Guidance Order on Conceptual Proposal for Honoring of Existing Transmission Contracts*, 110 FERC ¶ 61,113 (February 10, 2005).

<sup>5</sup> See *Standardization of Generator Interconnection Agreements and Procedures, Order Number 2003*, 104 FERC ¶ 61,103 (July 24, 2003) ("Commission Order No. 2003").

<sup>6</sup> *August 6 Order* at P 28; *June 2 Order* at P 14.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* at P 1.

Kimberly D. Bose

October 5, 2007

Page 3

would provide an Interconnection Customer with a “higher level of service” that would provide the basic network connection and “the infrastructure necessary for the Interconnection Customer’s power to flow to multiple places on the network.”<sup>9</sup>

On January 20, 2004, the Joint Filing Parties submitted the standardized procedures and standard interconnection agreement with certain modifications to conform to regional differences within the NYCA and then current NYISO practice.<sup>10</sup> The Joint Filing Parties proposed to include a single interconnection service in the NYISO’s OATT - the Network Access Interconnection Service (“NAIS”).<sup>11</sup> NAIS was consistent with the NYISO’s existing tariff and practice, but it did not include a deliverability component.<sup>12</sup>

In its August 6, 2004 Order, the Commission conditionally accepted the procedures and agreement submitted by the Joint Filing Parties.<sup>13</sup> The Commission accepted NAIS; however, it directed the NYISO to work with its stakeholders to determine how to integrate two levels of interconnection services, including a deliverability component.<sup>14</sup> The Commission stated that the inclusion of two levels of interconnection service, including a deliverability component, were crucial aspects of its Order No. 2003.<sup>15</sup> However, the Commission acknowledged that the Joint Filing Parties had to account for the unique regional differences within the NYCA.<sup>16</sup> In a June 2, 2005 Order, in response to clarification requests, the Commission again stated the importance of providing two levels of interconnection service, including a deliverability component.<sup>17</sup> However, the Commission also reiterated its recognition that “each independent system operator faces unique challenges that require unique solutions.”<sup>18</sup> The Commission, therefore, directed the NYISO to continue its stakeholder process regarding this issue and declined to prejudge the outcome of the NYISO stakeholder process.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> *August 6 Order* at P 20, fn. 21; *Commission Order No. 2003* at PP 751-794.

<sup>10</sup> *Docket No. RM02-1-000 Compliance Filing*, Docket No. ER04-449-000 (January 20, 2004) (“January 20 Filing”). The Joint Filing Parties submitted revised procedures and agreement on April 26, 2004, to reflect changes arising under Order No. 2003-A. *Docket No. ER04-449-002 Compliance Filing*, Docket No. ER04-449-002 (April 26, 2004).

<sup>11</sup> *January 20 Filing* at pp 9-10.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *August 6 Order* at P 1.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at PP 24-28.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> *June 2 Order* at PP 13-14.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at P 14.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at P 13-14.

Kimberly D. Bose

October 5, 2007

Page 4

Consistent with the Commission's orders, the NYISO has worked with the New York Transmission Owners and other stakeholders through an Interconnection Issues Task Force to determine the best method to reconcile the interconnection service requirements prescribed by the Commission with the unique characteristics of the NYISO-administered markets.<sup>20</sup> Through the Interconnection Issues Task Force, the Joint Filing Parties have developed, with significant input from stakeholders, a conceptual framework for providing a second level of interconnection service with a deliverability component within the NYISO OATT.

### **III. INTERCONNECTION SERVICE AND DELIVERABILITY PROPOSAL**

The Joint Filing Parties submit the proposed conceptual framework developed with stakeholders through the Interconnection Issues Task Force for the Commission's review. The Deliverability Plan, is attached hereto as Attachment I. Key aspects of the proposal include:

#### **A. Two Levels of Interconnection Service**

Under the Deliverability Plan, a Generator being studied in the NYISO's interconnection process may elect from two levels of interconnection service: the Energy Resource Interconnection Service ("ERIS") and the Capacity Resource Interconnection Service ("CRIS").<sup>21</sup> ERIS is a basic interconnection service and limits a Generator to participation in only the NYISO's Energy and applicable Ancillary Services markets.<sup>22</sup> In order to qualify for ERIS, the Generator must satisfy the NYISO's current interconnection requirements under the Minimum Interconnection Standard. CRIS, on the other hand, provides both basic interconnection service and enables the Generator to participate in the NYISO's Installed Capacity market to the extent of the Generator's deliverable capacity. In order to qualify for CRIS, a generator must (1) be found to be deliverable or (2) fund or commit to fund upgrades to the transmission system necessary to make the Generator deliverable.

---

<sup>20</sup> The NYISO has provided the Commission with periodic status reports and work plans regarding the progress of the stakeholder process in formulating a deliverability component. See e.g., *New York Independent System Operator, Inc. Docket Nos. ER04-449-003, ER04-449-007 and ER04-449-008; Status of Work to Address Deliverability of Generating Capacity*, Docket Nos. ER04-449-003, ER04-449-007, & ER04-449-008 (March 20, 2007).

<sup>21</sup> The NYISO's interconnection procedures accommodate merchant transmission projects as well as generation projects. As used herein and in Attachment I, the term "Generator" includes a proposed new Generator, an increase in the capacity of an existing Generator, and a new controllable transmission facility seeking Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights.

<sup>22</sup> A Generator may elect partial ERIS and CRIS service for a given unit. Moreover, a Generator that elects ERIS can later ask the NYISO to reevaluate its eligibility for CRIS.

Kimberly D. Bose

October 5, 2007

Page 5

Deliverability is broadly defined in the proposal as the ability to deliver the aggregate of NYCA capacity resources to the aggregate of the NYCA load under summer peak load conditions. A Generator that selects CRIS will be subject to a deliverability test. The NYISO will declare a Generator “deliverable” if the Generator can demonstrate deliverability of its required capacity within the New York capacity market, or region, in which the Generator intends to participate. The NYISO, for example, will determine whether a Generator located in the Rest-Of-State region is capable of deliverability of its required capacity throughout that region, but not outside of that region.<sup>23</sup> To the extent that the Generator is not deliverable, the NYISO will identify the smallest feasible, least-cost upgrade required to make the Generator deliverable.

The deliverability of external resources will be considered through the annual process of setting import rights.<sup>24</sup>

#### **B. Cost Allocation**

The Deliverability Plan contains a detailed methodology for allocating the costs of upgrades necessary to make a Generator deliverable. This cost allocation will depend on whether the transmission facilities that require upgrades are “Highways” or “Byways.” Highways are the transmission facilities associated with a number of major inter-zonal Interfaces.<sup>25</sup>

Additionally, this cost allocation methodology recognizes that even the smallest feasible Highway upgrade could be larger than necessary to make a specific Generator deliverable. Accordingly, the percentage of the Highway upgrade cost allocated to a Developer will depend on the percentage of the smallest feasible Highway upgrade (measured in megawatts) required to make the Generator deliverable. If the portion of the smallest feasible Highway upgrade required to make a Generator deliverable is 90% or more of the total size of the upgrade, the Generator will be allocated 100% of the costs of the total upgrade. If

---

<sup>23</sup> The NYISO has three distinct capacity regions: New York City, Long Island, and Rest of State.

<sup>24</sup> External resources are entities outside of the NYCA that may participate in the NYCA Installed Capacity market. The maximum amount of capacity that can be provided by resources outside of the NYCA is allocated through Import Rights. *See generally* New York Independent System Operator Installed Capacity Manual § 4.9, available at: [http://www.nyiso.com/public/webdocs/products/icap/icap\\_manual/icap\\_mnl.pdf](http://www.nyiso.com/public/webdocs/products/icap/icap_manual/icap_mnl.pdf) (revised on July 11, 2007).

<sup>25</sup> The NYCA has eleven zones. Highways are 115 kV through 345 kV transmission facilities that comprise the following NYCA Interfaces: Dysinger East, West Central, Volney East, Moses South, Central East/Total East, UPNY-SENY, and UPNY-ConEd, and their immediately connected, in series, Bulk Power System facilities in New York State.

Kimberly D. Bose

October 5, 2007

Page 6

the portion of the smallest feasible upgrade required to make the Generator deliverable is less than 90% of the total size of the upgrade, the Generator will be allocated its proportionate share of the project cost. In cases where a Generator is allocated only its proportionate share, the Highway upgrade will be constructed only when Generator(s) have committed to fund at least 60% of the most current estimate for the Highway upgrade. The remainder would be funded by Load Serving Entities, which will be eligible for reimbursement from subsequent projects.

Byways include all transmission facilities that are not Highways. A Generator will pay 100% of the cost of upgrading a Byway. The Generator or Transmission Owner can elect to construct an upgrade larger than the smallest feasible upgrade; such party will be responsible for the difference in costs.

**C. Deliverability Status and Effective Date**

Under the Deliverability Plan, the proposed deliverability requirement will be applied to projects in the Class Year 2007 and thereafter, as well as to controllable transmission projects that request Unforced-Capacity Deliverability Rights ("UDRs"). The proposed deliverability requirements will not apply to projects prior to the Class Year 2007.<sup>26</sup> Generators that qualify for CRIS may retain their CRIS status provided that the unit remains capable of operating and the capacity level studied is not deactivated. Capacity rights from an existing Generator can be transferred on a bilateral basis to a new Generator if the new Generator meets deliverability requirements.

---

<sup>26</sup> The NYISO is separately seeking clarification of a prior FERC order with regard to the application of a deliverability requirement to a pending UDR request from a Class Year 2006 merchant transmission project.

Kimberly D. Bose

October 5, 2007

Page 7

**IV. COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE**

Copies of correspondence concerning this filing should be served on:

**For the NYISO:**

Robert E. Fernandez, General Counsel and Secretary

Elaine D. Robinson, Director of Regulatory Affairs

\*Karen Georgenson Gach, Senior Attorney

New York Independent System Operator, Inc.

10 Krey Boulevard

Rensselaer, NY 12144

Tel: (518) 356-6000

Fax: (518) 356-4702

rfernandez@nyiso.com

erobinson@nyiso.com

kgach@nyiso.com

\*Ted J. Murphy

Hunton & Williams LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Suite 1200

Washington, D.C. 20006-1109

Tel: (202) 955-1500

Fax: (202) 778-2201

tmurphy@hunton.com

\*Kevin W. Jones<sup>27</sup>

Hunton & Williams LLP

951 East Byrd Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Tel: (804) 788-8200

Fax: (804) 344-7999

kjones@hunton.com

\* -- Persons designated for service.

**For the New York Transmission Owners:**

Elias G. Farrah, Esq.

T. Randolph McEvoy, Esq.

Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP

1101 New York Avenue N.W.

Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20005-4213

efarrah@dl.com

rmcevoy@dl.com

Paul L. Gioia, Esq.

Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP

One Commerce Plaza

99 Washington Avenue

Suite 2020

Albany, NY 12210-2820

pgioia@dl.com

---

<sup>27</sup> The NYISO respectfully requests waiver of 18 C.F.R. § 385.203(b)(3) (2006) to permit service on counsel for the NYISO in both Washington, D.C. and Richmond, Virginia.



Kimberly D. Bose  
October 5, 2007  
Page 8

**Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation**

Donald K. Dankner, Esq.  
Raymond B. Wuslich, Esq.  
Winston & Strawn  
1700 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
ddankner@winston.com  
rwuslich@winston.com

John W. Watzka  
Section Engineer - Transmission Planning &  
Design  
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation  
284 South Avenue  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601  
jwatzka@cenhud.com

**Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. and  
Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc.**

Neil H. Butterklee, Esq.  
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.  
4 Irving Place  
Room 1815-s  
New York, NY 10003  
butterkleen@coned.com

Stuart Nachmias, Director  
Energy Markets Policy Group  
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.  
4 Irving Place  
Room 1138  
New York, NY 10003  
Nachmiass@coned.com

**LIPA**

David P. Yaffe, Esq.  
Joseph Nelson, Esq.  
Van Ness Feldman, P.C.  
1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20007  
dpy@vnf.com  
JBN@vnf.com

Roni Epstein, Esq.  
Long Island Power Authority  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard  
Suite 403  
Uniondale, NY 11553  
repstein@lipower.org





Kimberly D. Bose  
October 5, 2007  
Page 9

**New York Power Authority**

William Palazzo  
Manager - NYISO Market Policy  
New York Power Authority  
123 Main Street  
White Plains, NY 10601-3170  
palazzo.w@nypa.gov

Carlos E. Gutierrez, Esq.  
Arnie Schuff  
Rajee Mustafa  
New York Power Authority  
123 Main Street  
White Plains, NY 10601-3170  
carlos.gutierrez@nypa.gov  
rajee.mustafa@nypa.gov  
arnie.schuff@nypa.gov

**New York State Electric & Gas Corporation**

Catherine P. McCarthy, Esq.  
Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP  
1101 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4213  
catherine.mccarthy@dl.com

Raymond P. Kinney  
Manager - Programs/Projects  
New York State Electric & Gas Corporation  
Corporate Drive  
Kirkwood Industrial Park  
P.O. Box 5224  
Binghamton, NY 13902-5224  
rpkinney@nyseg.com

**Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, a National Grid Company**

Daniel Galaburda, Esq.  
Senior Attorney  
National Grid USA Service Company, Inc.  
25 Research Drive  
Westborough, MA 01582  
daniel.galaburda@us.ngrid.com

Jerry Ancona  
Manager, Market Development  
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a  
National Grid  
300 Erie Boulevard West  
Syracuse, NY 13202  
jerry.ancona@us.ngrid.com



Kimberly D. Bose  
October 5, 2007  
Page 10

**Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation**

Catherine P. McCarthy, Esq.  
Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP  
1101 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4213  
catherine.mccarthy@dl.com

Marjorie L. Perlman  
Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation  
89 East Avenue  
Rochester, NY 14649-0001  
marjorie\_perlman@rge.com

**V. SERVICE LIST**

The NYISO will electronically send a link to this filing to the official representative of each of its customers, to each participant on its stakeholder committees, to the New York Public Service Commission, and to the electric utility regulatory agencies of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. In addition, the complete filing will be posted on the NYISO's website at [www.nyiso.com](http://www.nyiso.com). The NYISO will also make a paper copy available to any interested party that requests one. To the extent necessary, the NYISO requests waiver of the requirements of Section 35.2(d) of the Commission's Regulations (18 C.F.R. § 35.2(d) (2006)) to permit it to provide service in this manner.

**VI. CONCLUSION**

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Joint Filing Parties respectfully request that the Commission accept the proposed conceptual framework described in this filing. Upon the Commission's acceptance or modification of this proposed conceptual framework, the Joint Filing Parties will continue working with stakeholders to develop and submit revised tariff sheets accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

New York Transmission Owners

/s/ Elias G. Farrah  
Elias G. Farrah  
Counsel

Elias G. Farrah, Esq.  
T. Randolph McEvoy, Esq.  
Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP  
1101 New York Avenue N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-4213

Paul L. Gioia, Esq.  
Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP  
One Commerce Plaza  
99 Washington Avenue  
Suite 2020  
Albany, NY 12210-2820

New York Independent System Operator, Inc.

/s/ Ted J. Murphy  
Ted J. Murphy  
Counsel

Robert E. Fernandez, General Counsel and Secretary  
Elaine D. Robinson, Director of Regulatory Affairs  
\*Karen Georgenson Gach, Senior Attorney  
New York Independent System Operator, Inc.  
10 Krey Boulevard  
Rensselaer, NY 12144

Ted J. Murphy  
Hunton & Williams LLP  
1900 K Street, NW  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20006

\*Kevin W. Jones  
Hunton & Williams LLP  
951 East Byrd Street  
Richmond, VA 23219



Kimberly D. Bose  
October 5, 2007  
Page 12

**Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation**

Donald K. Dankner, Esq.  
Raymond B. Wuslich, Esq.  
Winston & Strawn  
1700 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
ddankner@winston.com  
rwuslich@winston.com

John W. Watzka  
Section Engineer - Transmission Planning &  
Design  
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation  
284 South Avenue  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601  
jwatzka@cenhud.com

**Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. and  
Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc.**

Neil H. Butterklee, Esq.  
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.  
4 Irving Place  
Room 1815-s  
New York, NY 10003  
butterkleen@coned.com

Stuart Nachmias, Director  
Energy Markets Policy Group  
Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc.  
4 Irving Place  
Room 1138  
New York, NY 10003  
Nachmiass@coned.com

**LIPA**

David P. Yaffe, Esq.  
Joseph Nelson, Esq.  
Van Ness Feldman, P.C.  
1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20007  
dpy@vnf.com  
JBN@vnf.com

Roni Epstein, Esq.  
Long Island Power Authority  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard  
Suite 403  
Uniondale, NY 11553  
repstein@lipower.org



Kimberly D. Bose  
October 5, 2007  
Page 13

**New York Power Authority**

William Palazzo  
Manager - NYISO Market Policy  
New York Power Authority  
123 Main Street  
White Plains, NY 10601-3170  
palazzo.w@nypa.gov

Carlos E. Gutierrez, Esq.  
Arnie Schuff  
Rajee Mustafa  
New York Power Authority  
123 Main Street  
White Plains, NY 10601-3170  
carlos.gutierrez@nypa.gov  
rajee.mustafa@nypa.gov  
arnie.schuff@nypa.gov

**New York State Electric & Gas Corporation**

Catherine P. McCarthy, Esq.  
Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP  
1101 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4213  
catherine.mccarthy@dl.com

Raymond P. Kinney  
Manager - Programs/Projects  
New York State Electric & Gas Corporation  
Corporate Drive  
Kirkwood Industrial Park  
P.O. Box 5224  
Binghamton, NY 13902-5224  
rpkinney@nyseg.com

**Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation, a National Grid Company**

Daniel Galaburda, Esq.  
Senior Attorney  
National Grid USA Service Company, Inc.  
25 Research Drive  
Westborough, MA 01582  
daniel.galaburda@us.ngrid.com

Jerry Ancona  
Manager, Market Development  
Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a  
National Grid  
300 Erie Boulevard West  
Syracuse, NY 13202  
jerry.ancona@us.ngrid.com



Kimberly D. Bose

October 5, 2007

Page 14

**Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation**

Catherine P. McCarthy, Esq.  
Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP  
1101 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005-4213  
catherine.mccarthy@dl.com

Marjorie L. Perlman  
Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation  
89 East Avenue  
Rochester, NY 14649-0001  
marjorie\_perlman@rge.com

cc: Shelton M. Cannon  
Larry Gasteiger  
Connie Caldwell  
Michael A. Bardee  
Kathleen E. Nieman  
Dean Wight  
Lance Hinrichs

## **Attachment I**

## **New York Transmission Owners and NYISO Consensus Deliverability Plan**

The following is an outline of the basic components of a consensus generator deliverability process.

1. The deliverability test methodology will be part of the interconnection study process performed as part of the NYISO's Interconnection Feasibility Study, Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study ("SRIS") and Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study. A generator can elect to study Energy Resource Interconnection Service ("ERIS"), Capacity Resource Interconnection Service ("CRIS") or both at the time of the interconnection request but must finalize its decision when the Facilities Study Agreement is executed (conforms to FERC pro forma language section 3.2). The time periods for completion of the interconnection studies provided in the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures ("LFIP") may need to be adjusted to accommodate the expanded scope of the studies. Developers are responsible for interconnection study costs, including the deliverability analysis.
2. The generator deliverability test will be applied within each New York capacity region.<sup>1</sup> To be declared deliverable, a generator<sup>2</sup> must be deliverable throughout the relevant NYISO Capacity Region. By way of example, a generator located in the rest-of-state (ROS) region, would be required to demonstrate deliverability throughout the ROS region, but not be required to demonstrate deliverability to the locationally constrained markets, currently limited to the New York City and Long Island localities; a generator located in the New York City locality would be required to demonstrate deliverability within that locality, but not outside that locality.
3. New generators, or an increase in capacity to an existing generator (above a specified threshold), will be required to elect CRIS in order to participate in a particular NYISO capacity market. The amount of CRIS requested by a new generator cannot exceed the nameplate rating of the generator. Where a new generator elects CRIS, the NYISO will evaluate deliverability in the interconnection studies to identify necessary upgrades, if any, to address deliverability, and by funding or committing to fund the identified upgrades, as described below in paragraphs 9 and 10, the generator will be eligible to participate in the appropriate NYISO capacity market to the extent of its deliverable capability.

---

<sup>1</sup> The NYISO operates three distinct Installed Capacity markets: A statewide market and locational markets for New York City and Long Island. Within these markets, there are three capacity regions that are subsets of the statewide market: Rest of State (zones A through I), Long Island (zone K), and New York City (zone J) ("Capacity Regions").

<sup>2</sup> When used in this document, the term "generator" shall be understood to include a controllable transmission facility seeking UDRs. The quantity of UDRs awarded to a controllable transmission facility will be reduced (potentially to zero) if it is found not to be fully deliverable.



4. Small generators (20 MW or less), above a possible threshold size, will be subject to the deliverability requirement if they elect CRIS.
5. Where the pre-existing system (existing transmission and generation prior to the implementation of this deliverability requirement) demonstrates deliverability issues, a new interconnecting generator electing CRIS need only address the incremental deliverability of its interconnecting facility, not the deliverability of the pre-existing system. Likewise, Transmission Owners will not be responsible for curing any pre-existing issues related to the deliverability of generation.
6. A generator that elects to interconnect under the ERIS requirements (and limit the interconnection costs that it is responsible for) will not be a CRIS and will not be eligible to participate in the applicable NYISO capacity markets. Rather, such a generator will be eligible to participate only in the energy and applicable ancillary service markets. When a generator elects ERIS, the generator may at a later date ask the NYISO to reevaluate the generator's CRIS eligibility by including the generator in the deliverability study conducted as part of the next Class Year Facilities Study process to identify necessary upgrades, if any, to address deliverability, and by funding or committing to fund the identified upgrades, as described in paragraphs 9 and 10 below, the generator will be eligible to participate in the appropriate NYISO capacity market to the extent of its deliverable capability.
7. To ensure the greatest flexibility for generators, generators may elect partial ERIS/CRIS service for a given unit. Generators qualifying for CRIS will have two CRIS values: one for the summer capability period and one for the winter capability period. The CRIS value for the summer capability period will be set using the deliverability test methodology and procedures described below. The CRIS value for the winter capability period will be set at a value that will maintain the same proportion of CRIS to ERIS as the summer capability period.
8. For purposes of the deliverability test, transmission facilities will be designated Byways or Highways. "Byways" are all transmission facilities that are not "Highways". However, Byways will not include ties between Capacity Regions nor ties to control areas external to the NYISO.
9. A proposed new generator will pay 100% of the cost to upgrade a Byway when necessary to make a generator deliverable.
  - a.) The smallest feasible upgrade (consistent with good utility practice) of the Byway to allow a generator to be deliverable will be identified by the NYISO with input from the relevant Transmission Owners ("TO").
  - b.) A generator paying to upgrade a Byway will be eligible to receive headroom payments, if headroom is created.

- c.) In cases where headroom is created, a subsequent generator will pay its proportionate share of the final cost of the upgrade to the generator(s) that funded the upgrade (consistent with current Attachment S provisions)
  - d.) A generator paying to upgrade a Byway will receive any incremental TCCs created.
  - e.) A subsequent generator paying headroom will receive corresponding TCCs, if any.
10. "Highways" are major inter-zonal interfaces, but not ties between Capacity Regions nor ties to control areas external to the NYISO, and shall be treated as follows:
- a.) Highways are 115 kV through 345 kV transmission facilities that comprise the following NYCA interfaces: Dysinger East, West Central, Volney East, Moses South, Central East/Total East, UPNY-SENY and UPNY-ConEd, and their immediately connected, in series, Bulk Power System facilities in the New York State. Highways will also include 115 kV through 345 kV transmission facilities identified through a threshold sensitivity analysis to be "in series" with the interfaces identified above.
  - b.) A proposed new generator that is determined to require an increase in transfer limits on a Highway or Highways to achieve deliverability will be allocated costs for the upgrades under the threshold mechanism described in Paragraphs 10(d) and (e).
  - c.) The smallest feasible upgrade (consistent with good utility practice) of a Highway to allow a generator to be deliverable will be identified by the NYISO with input from the relevant TO.
  - d.) If the portion of the smallest feasible Highway upgrade (measured in MWs) required to make the generator deliverable is 90% or more of the total size of the upgrade, the generator will pay 100% of the cost of the upgrade.
  - e.) If the portion of the smallest feasible upgrade required to make the generator deliverable is less than 90% of the total size of the Highway upgrade, the generator will be required to pay or commit to pay for its proportionate share of the project cost. The generator may either (1) make a cash payment of its proportionate share of the upgrade, which will be held by the relevant TO in an interest bearing account; or (2) post Security (as defined in Attachment S) meeting the commercially reasonable requirements of the relevant TO for the generator's proportionate share of the cost of the upgrade. If the generator chooses to provide Security, its allocated cost will be increased by an annual construction-focused inflation index. The generator will update its Security on an annual basis to reflect this increase. Except for this adjustment for inflation, the cost allocated to the generator will not be increased if the estimated cost of

the project increases. However, the costs allocated to subsequent generators will be based on a current cost estimate of the upgrade.

- f.) The generator will be considered deliverable, and eligible for ICAP payments, when it is in service, provided it has paid its share of the total cost or made a satisfactory commitment to do so. Highway upgrades--where the smallest feasible upgrade is below the 90% threshold discussed in paragraph 10(e), above--will be constructed and funded either (i) according to subsections (1) and (2) below, or (ii) according to subsection (3) below.
    - 1) When a threshold of 60% of the most current cost estimate of the upgrade has been paid or posted as Security by generators, the upgrade will be built by the relevant TO; and
    - 2) The cost of the project above that paid for by generators will be funded by LSEs, based on their proportionate share of the ICAP requirement in the ROS region, reflecting locational capacity requirements; or
    - 3) If the NYISO Comprehensive Reliability Planning Process (CRPP) identifies a reliability need requiring a Highway facility to be constructed earlier, the facility will be constructed as determined in the CRPP with funds collected from generators (pursuant to paragraph 10(e), above) used to cover a portion of the regulated solution costs. These funds will be used as an offset to the total upgrade cost, with the remainder of the cost to be allocated per the requirements of the CRPP.
  - g.) Before construction of an identified highway upgrade is commenced, if a generator elects to be retested for deliverability (as described in paragraph 6) and is found to be deliverable without the upgrade, the generator's payment or Security posting will be returned.
  - h.) When the project is built, the resulting TCCs will be distributed to the generators and LSEs in proportion to their funding of the project.
  - i.) As new generators come on line and use the headroom created by a project on a Highway facility, they will pay their proportionate share of the final cost of the project. These payments will be used to reimburse the LSEs who funded a portion of the project. As new generators make these payments, the related TCCs will be transferred to them.
  - j.) A Transmission Owner or the generator being studied can elect to construct an upgrade larger than the smallest feasible upgrade. The party electing to construct the larger upgrade will pay for the incremental cost, *i.e.*, the difference in cost between the smallest feasible upgrade and the larger upgrade.
11. Details regarding the modeling of proposed generators and associated upgrades in interconnection studies for other generators will be developed.

12. The deliverability requirement will be applicable to the 2007 Class Year.<sup>3</sup> No upgrades to address deliverability will be required of pre-2007 generators under these deliverability procedures. A pre-Class Year 2007 generator shall qualify for CRIS service so long as (1) its interconnection agreement is not terminated, and (2) it begins commercial operations within three years of the commercial operation date specified in its interconnection agreement.
13. Going forward, generators qualifying for CRIS will retain their CRIS status at the capacity level found deliverable in the Class Year deliverability study regardless of subsequent changes to the transmission system or the transfer of ownership, provided the unit remains capable of operating at the capacity level studied and is not deactivated. For generators pre-dating Class Year 2007, their CRIS capacity level will be set at the maximum DMNC level achieved over a set period. In the case of a deactivation, CRIS status at the capacity level eligible for CRIS found deliverable terminates three years after deactivation unless the deactivated generator takes one of the following actions before the end of the three-year period: (1) returns to service or (2) transfers capacity deliverability rights to another generator that becomes operational within three years from the deactivation of the original generator.
14. If a generator deactivates an existing unit and commissions a new one at the same location, CRIS status of the deactivated generator at its deliverable capacity level may be transferred to that same electrical location, provided that the new generator becomes operational within three years from deactivation of the original generator. The new generator will only acquire the assigned capacity rights once the new generator becomes operational.
15. Rights may also be transferred on a bilateral basis between an existing generator and a new generator at a different location to the extent that the new generator is found to be deliverable after the existing generator assumes ERIIS status or retires. The new generator may contract with an existing generator (with assigned capacity rights) to transfer some or all of the existing generator's assigned capacity rights. The new generator will be allowed to acquire these rights if it meets the deliverability test executed in the following manner:
  - Prior to the class year study, the new and existing generators involved in the transfer transaction must indicate the MW level of capacity rights to be transferred.
  - The existing generator will be modeled in class year study at reduced generation levels (old level less capacity proposed to be transferred).
  - If deliverability test indicates new generator capacity is fully or partially deliverable under this condition, the new generator will be allowed to acquire full or partial capacity rights as determined by the deliverability test.

---

<sup>3</sup> The NYISO is separately seeking clarification of a prior FERC order with regard to the application of a deliverability requirement to a pending UDR request from a Class Year 2006 project.

- The existing generator will be restricted in future capacity sales up to levels consistent with capacity deliverability rights that were transferred to the new generator.

The new generator will only acquire the assigned capacity rights once the new generator becomes operational.

16. For interfaces into Capacity Regions, currently Zone J and Zone K, and external ties into NYCA, if a proposed generator degrades the transfer capability of the interface below the transfer capability identified in the current ATBA, then 100% of the cost of the transmission upgrade required to restore transfer capability will be paid for by the generator. The generator will be responsible for this cost only to the extent the degradation of transfer capability, compared to that in the ATBA, would not occur but for the generator. The NYISO will also develop a de minimis threshold to apply when evaluating degradation to interface capability.
17. The following deliverability test methodology and definition of NYCA deliverability will be used for both Highways and Byways.

**Definition of NYCA Deliverability** - The NYCA transmission system shall be able to deliver the aggregate of NYCA capacity resources to the aggregate of the NYCA load under summer peak load conditions. This is accomplished through ensuring generator deliverability in the three Capacity Regions in New York State; New York City (Zone J), Long Island (Zone K), or Rest-of-State (ROS, Zones A-I).

**NYCA Deliverability Testing Methodology** The appropriate Class Year ATRA will serve as the starting base case for testing (*e.g.*, 2007 ATRA), under summer peak system conditions.

- a.) All proposed projects seeking CRIS will be evaluated on an aggregate basis. Deliverability will be determined through a shift from generation to generation within the Capacity Regions already defined in New York State; New York City (Zone J), Long Island (Zone K), and Rest-of-State (ROS, Zones A-I). Each Capacity Region will be tested on an individual basis.
- b.) A derated generator capacity incorporating availability is used, as opposed to full DMNC capacity. This derated generator capacity is based on the unforced capacity or "UCAP" of each resource and can be referred to as the UCAP Deration Factor ("UCDF"). The EFORD derate used is the average from historic ICAP to UCAP translations on a capacity location basis (*e.g.*, 5.08% ROS, 5.66% zone J, 5.28% zone K). This is approximately the average EFORD, which will be used for all non intermittent ICAP providers. For Intermittent resources, the actual translation will be used (for example, 90% for land based wind) The testing procedure will recognize some level of other generator availability uncertainties that impact the IRM similar to the probabilistic treatment in MARS studies. Other generation availability uncertainties (with approximate capacity impacts) include, for example,

Hydro Derate (1.25%), Intermittent derate (90% lands, 70% off shore), GT temperature derate (1%), and maintenance (.5%).

- c.) Load uncertainties will be addressed by taking the impact of Load Forecast Uncertainty (“LFU”) from the most recent IRM.
- d.) Base Case conditioning steps will be consistent with those used for the IRM, RNA and Facilities Studies transfer limit calculation methodology. These procedures are in the process of being developed.
- e.) Emergency criteria and contingency testing corresponding to that used in NYSRC IRM and NYISO RNA studies will be applied in deliverability testing.<sup>4</sup>
- f.) The monitored facilities in the NYISO’s deliverability analyses will be consistent with those monitored in the IRM and RNA studies as well as the facilities secured by the NYISO.
  - Screening test for monitored elements and contingencies -Harmers and helpers are identified using DFAX for each monitored element. All harmers are put to their maximum output and all helpers are backed off accordingly. The monitored pair loading is calculated from the DFAX. If no overload occurs for the worst case transfer conditions, then this combination does not need to be further considered. If an overload does occur, then it is a potential candidate to be tested using the deliverability test below. In the initial test a particular monitored element may be overloaded for more than one contingency condition (including the normal or pre-contingent condition). These multiple instances are reviewed for the worst monitored element pair as judged by the maximum line flow for the same blend of harmer and helper generators.
  - When performing individual deliverability studies the NYISO may add to the initial list of monitored elements and/or contingencies identified in the screening test described above as potential candidates for a deliverability testing or eliminate from the initial list monitored elements or contingencies where no potential for a deliverability problem is shown. These modifications will be reviewed by stakeholders as part of the SRIS Study approval process.
- g.) Deliverability testing will proceed as follows - The generation/load mix is split into two groups of generation and load, one upstream and one downstream of each tested monitored element. A 4% DFAX threshold for defining the scope of upstream generation will be applied. Flows from generators having a DFAX below 4% will not be considered. If there is excess generation upstream (that is, more upstream generation than is

---

<sup>4</sup> Sections B-R1, B-R2, and B-R3 of the NYSRC Reliability Rules for Planning and Operating the New York State Power System regarding emergency transfers.

necessary to serve the upstream load plus LFU) then the generation excess, taking into account generator probabilistic uncertainties noted above, is assumed to displace downstream generation and imports. If the dispatch of the upstream excess generation causes an overload, this overload is flagged as a potential deliverability problem and will be used to determine the amount of capacity that is assigned CRIS status and the overload mitigation. In essence, this is a test of the amount of bottled generation.

- h.) Voltage limits as interface proxy will be included in the deliverability testing.
  - i.) External system imports will be adjusted as necessary to eliminate or minimize overloads, consistent with paragraph 18, below.
  - j.) Flows associated with generators physically located in the NYCA but selling capacity out of the market will be modeled in the base case.
  - k.) PARS will be adjusted as necessary to eliminate or minimize overloads without creating new ones. PARS controlling external ties may be adjusted from the base case recognizing firm commitments. Internal NYCA PARS may be adjusted in either direction recognizing that new overloads may not be created.
  - l.) For interfaces in ROS designated in paragraph 10(a), a proposed generator, whether or not it is otherwise deliverable, will not be considered deliverable if it degrades the transfer capability of the interface below the transfer capability identified in the ATBA and results in an increase to the NYCA IRM reflected in the base case study results from the last completed IRM study. The generator will be responsible for restoring transfer capability only to the extent the degradation of transfer capability, compared to that in the ATBA, would not occur but for the generator.
18. The deliverability of external resources will be considered through the annual process of setting import rights. Under this process, grandfathered import contract rights and the emergency assistance benefits will be honored. Subject to grandfathered import contract rights and the calculation of emergency assistance benefits, the remaining external ICAP import rights will be subject to the deliverability test.
19. The NYISO staff and market participants will work collaboratively to develop over the next three years criteria for the potential formation of additional locational ICAP zones.