

DRAFT**NYISO Business Issues Committee Meeting Minutes****May 12, 2014****10:00 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.**

1. Introductions, Meeting Objectives, and Chairman's Report

The chair of the Business Issues Committee (BIC), Mr. Brad Kranz (NRG) called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. by welcoming the members of the BIC. The members of the BIC identified themselves and attendance was recorded. A quorum was determined.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – April, 2014**Motion #1:**

Motion to approve the Minutes of the April 16, 2014 BIC meeting.

Motion passed unanimously with an abstention.

3. Market Operations Report/Seams Report

Mr. Rana Mukerji (NYISO) reviewed the Market Operations report included with the meeting material. Mr. Mukerji also reviewed the seams report included with the meeting material.

4. Planning Update

Mr. John Buechler (NYISO) reported that NYISO reliability and economic planning process manuals are scheduled for stakeholder approval this month at the BIC and the Operating Committee. In addition, he reported on the latest status of both the EIPC non-grant studies which is focusing on two scenarios: update of the roll-up case to reflect resource changes and the extreme weather cases suggested by EISPC. He also provided an update on the EIPC DOE gas electric study, noting the completion of Target 1, and current focus of activity on Target 2—the adequacy analysis—which is just getting underway. The Gas-Electric Study analysis is scheduled to continue through the end of the year and is scheduled for completion in mid-2015. Mr. Howard Fromer (PSEG) asked if the gas electric study would capture the impact of any natural policy change regarding exports of natural gas to other countries. He noted there would be substantial impacts of fuel prices and availability. Mr. Buechler said that the study could consider a sensitivity case to address that issue. In response to a question from Elizabeth Grisar (NYS DPS), Mr. Buechler said that the gas-electric study analysis is focusing on 2018 and 2023.

5. TCC Markets - Revisions to OATT Attachment L

Ms. Lisa Travalay (NYISO) reviewed the presentation included with the meeting material. In response to a question the NYISO indicated the proposal would be taken to the MC and the Board even if the BIC did not approve it.

Motion #2

The Business Issues Committee (BIC) recommends that the Management Committee authorize the NYISO staff to file under Section 205 of the Federal Power Act, amendments to the NYISO's OATT Section 18 as described in the presentation entitled "TCC Markets OATT ATT L Revisions", made at the May 12th BIC meeting.

The motion was approved by show of hands with two abstentions.

6. ICAP Buyer-Side Mitigation Modifications Repowering and Increased CRIS

Mr. Randy Wyatt (NYISO) reviewed the presentation included with the meeting material. The proposal would establish: (1) a different buyer-side mitigation test for repowering existing capacity in a mitigated capacity zone and for new projects that replace existing capacity in a mitigated capacity zone but lack the qualifications of a repowering, and (2) rules by which the NYISO would evaluate requests for increased CRIS for existing facilities.

Ms. Doreen Saia (Entergy) observed that section 23.4.4.5.7.7.1 lacked language stating that an “existing facility will not be able to participate in the market.” That limitation was discussed at the ICAP Working Group, but was not included in the posted tariff language. Mr. David Allen (NYISO) said that the NYISO would incorporate the language before the Management Committee acts on the proposal.

Mr. Garrett Bissell (Multiple Intervenors) said that the City of NY strongly supported rules for repowering which were first discussed several years ago. The City of NY supports the concept, absent the clause that would allow the re-use of equipment. Mr. Paul Tartaglia (NYPA) said NYPA’s position is contrary to the City of New York, and that the proposal’s rules on the equipment at the facilities are overreaching and we should allow the environmental and permitting agencies to manage those issues.

Ms. Saia said that she agreed with Mr. Bissell’s concerns and said that the re-use of equipment undercut the proposal. She added that the proposed tariff language does not specifically address whether a reliability need determination should be made after the facility study is done. If it happens before, then you do not need the exception to the mitigation rule limitation. In addition, she expressed a concern that there is no limitation on the energy sales. When a unit replaces another, but there is a reliability need, it is possible to limit the operations to the times when the reliability need exists. She said Entergy appreciated that we cannot let the system go dark, but the unit cannot run 24/7 because it has an RMR contract and has “no costs.” Mr. Fromer said if we are creating an RMR arrangement, the tariff could provide circumstances when the retention would be permitted to maintain reliability by the NYISO. He asked if the NYISO had an issue with agreeing to restrict the energy operations of an RMR situation to the circumstances that necessitate the need to run that unit.

Mr. Allen said the exception to allow a unit to continue to operate in the energy market is narrow and the NYISO would determine if it would be needed to meet a reliability need. The existing capacity facility would need to have a contract with the jurisdictional entity to continue to operate. At this point, the NYISO did not think it was appropriate to include tariff language about terms and contracts. Mr. Fromer asked if the NYISO had concerns about limiting the use of an RMR facility to certain identified load levels. Mr. Allen said the RMR contract would be between the Existing Capacity Facility and the connecting Transmission Owner and the need would need to be identified by the NYISO.

Ms. Saia said she appreciated the NYISO’s work in developing the Economic Viability Test (EVT). When the proposal was introduced, it lacked an EVT test. She said the purpose of the EVT was to ensure that older units went away and newer units replaced them when it made sense. Mr. Kranz said NRG shared the concerns raised by the City of NY. Mr. Rich Miller (Con Edison) said Con Edison believed if NY had a viable Competitive Entry Exemption, a facility that wanted to make a substantial capital investment to increase its efficiency would be able to do so and there would be no need for this exemption.

Mr. Shaun Johnson (NRG) proposed an amendment to the motion that would remove the re-use of the prime mover. The amendment was deemed friendly by the mover and seconder. Ms. Saia noted that the prime mover was not a defined term. Mr. James D’Andrea (TC Ravenswood) asked if the re-use of the prime mover could be used elsewhere in the world. Mr. Bissell said no, that the equipment

could be sold for scrap. Mr. Johnson said the intent would be for the repowering entity to remove the old equipment and dispose the equipment consistent with not re-using the equipment.

Motion #3:

The Business Issues Committee (“BIC”) hereby recommends that the Management Committee approve changes to the NYISO’s ICAP Market Power Mitigation Measures (Services Tariff Section 23, Attachment H) and related provisions in Services Tariff Sections 2.21 (definition of UDR) and 30 (Attachment O) and Open Access Transmission Tariff Sections 14 (Attachment F) and Sections 25 (Attachment S), 32 (Attachment X), and 35 (Attachment Z), regarding repowering, replacement, and increased CRIS, as presented at the BIC on May 12, 2014, **except that references to the re-use of the prime mover are removed. Instead, a requirement will be added requiring the owner of the repowered or replaced unit to certify that the former prime mover equipment will be dismantled and either sold for scrap or disposed of in a landfill or similar facility.**

The motion failed with a 39.9% affirmative vote

After the vote, Mr. David Clarke (LIPA) said that the replacement and increased CRIS provisions should be considered for a future BIC vote. Mr. Miller said he only supported separating the increased CRIS provision and separately voting on it alone. Mr. Fromer suggested that it may be more sensible to return the proposal to the working group for further discussion. Mr. Miller noted the proposal could proceed to the Management Committee.

7. Proposed ICAP Buyer-Side Mitigation Modifications- Competitive Entry Exemption (CEE), Offer Floor Change, Renewable Generator Exemption, and Municipal Utilities/Coop Exemption

Dr. Nicole Bouchez (NYISO) reviewed the proposal included with the meeting material. The NYISO is proposing a CEE/Merchant Exemption, a modified default Offer Floor of 90%, a Renewable Generator Exemption, and a Municipal Utility/Coop Exemption. The NYISO did not propose to include in this proposal an exemption for reliability and will explore the possibility of this exemption at a later date. The proposed effective date of the modifications is for Examined Facilities in Class Years subsequent to Class Year 2012.

Mr. Tartaglia asked how the NYISO arrived at the 90% Offer Floor value. Dr. Bouchez said the number was a compromise in moving to the recommendation of Potomac Economics but there was discomfort moving to 100% in some sectors. Mr. Fromer said the recommendation was to raise it to 100%, but at the last session, the NYISO attempted to seek positive votes for the proposal by lowering it to 90%. Dr. Bouchez noted the proposal has changed over the course of a year. Mr. Fromer said it was awkward for the NYISO to shop for votes since the NYISO is supposed to be neutral. Mr. Miller said Potomac Economics often offers an opinion on proposals and the NYISO is entitled to arrive at a different opinion.

For the renewable exemption, Mr. Nathan Hebel (Lyonsdale Biomass) noted the proposal has a 50 MW limit for renewables (other than wind and solar,) but said that the PURPA QF threshold is 80 MWs. He asked why there was a difference. Dr. Bouchez said the NYISO did not look at the PURPA QF threshold. The NYISO was looking for small units that have a RPS eligible technology, but do not have large impacts on the capacity prices. 50 MW was a price balance for small and large units.

Mr. D’Andrea said he would like the NYISO to look at the impact on price taking MW on its markets regardless of the nature of the power technology. It would include renewables, but not be limited to renewables. Dr. Bouchez directed him to the shape of the supply curve for the energy market.

Impacts during unconstrained periods are generally low. In times of constraints when the load is high, there can be large impacts. Mr. D'Andrea noted the NYISO studies the opposite situation for supplier mitigation and said he thought the NYISO should study it for buyer side mitigation.

In response to a question on units partially eligible for RPS, Dr. Bouchez said the NY Renewable Portfolio Standard looks at mixed fuel types based on a MWh basis and the NYISO would grant an exemption on a MW basis. Mr. Fromer asked if the NYISO had a concern that the exemption would swamp a Demand Curve for a small Locality. Dr. Bouchez noted that it would not be a sudden event, as the units would be in the interconnection queue and the marketplace would be aware prior to their joining in the market. Mr. Bissell noted that renewables are not utilized based on deratings on capacity factor and the cost to actually try to exercise market power and the introduction of the renewable has changed. He noted that a large number of wind farms have dropped out of the interconnection queue and behind the meter solar is the only renewable likely to interconnect in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Rich Bolbrock (MEUA) asked why there was a limited exemption under the Municipal Generator Exemption for once every ten years for municipal electric systems. Dr. Bouchez said since a Municipal Generator Exemption required a long term contract of a minimum of 10 years there should not be a need for more than one exemption every 10 years. In addition, the concern is that without such a limitation, a muni could seek multiple exemptions for more than its load which would not be appropriate.

Mr. Fromer asked if the muni exemption would only apply for a Mitigated Capacity Zone. Dr. Bouchez said that was correct. Mr. Fromer said he didn't think there were any munis in Zones G,H,I, and J. Mr. Tom Rudebusch (NYAPP) said there were not and noted there were proposals to extend BSM statewide. Mr. D'Andrea said he was perplexed because when TC Ravenswood proposed to broaden mitigation to Rest of State, it was pushed back because no one saw any a need for it, yet now we are proposing a muni exemption because of the potential of Rest of State mitigation. He asked why are we creating an exemption before there is a mitigation measure. Dr. Bouchez said the muni exemption was first raised when the Lower Hudson Valley capacity zone was being developed, and the exemption was requested by munis a year ago. Ms. Gloria Kavanah (NYISO) added that the Mitigation Capacity Zone rules that FERC accepted apply to any future new capacity zone that is created. Mr. Kranz said the mitigation rules apply to the zones as they exist today and generically applied to any future zone. Mr. D'Andrea said the munis saw a potential for mitigation and want a proactive exemption with the proposal. But when a generator saw the potential for market interference, TC Ravenswood's proposal was treated differently. Mr. Mukerji said the stakeholder process made a decision on TC Ravenswood's proposal and will make a decision on the CEE proposal. Mr. Fromer noted that the munis are not presenting the proposal and it was the NYISO's proposal.

Mr. Fromer asked regarding CEE if the definition of a competitor include any language that requires that the investment be with at-risk money as opposed to someone using regulated ratepayer money to build a project. Dr. Bouchez said the proposal listed the kind of entities excluded from the exemption. Mr. Fromer expressed a concern of foreign governments seeking to suppress prices and undermine the wholesale markets.

Mr. Miller asked the NYISO to state for the minutes its answer to the question of why, in the *de minimis* threshold, once a contract has been determined to be a contract that would be looked at for providing out of market support, why the NYISO would not look at the value over and above fair market value as opposed to the entire fair market value. Con Edison believed it was too narrow instead of too broad. Dr. Bouchez said the intent of the *de minimis* threshold is not to allow up to 5%

of subsidy, it is to be a catch-all to so that any contracts with a prohibited entity that are small or were not anticipated do not immediately discount the developer from receiving the exemption. That was the difference and the NYISO did not see it as a permissible subsidy, but as a catch-all to make it easier to administer and easier for entities to certify. Mr. Miller said it may never happen, but Con Edison would like to express its continuing concern that you could have a contract that is very large in fair market value that would send it above the 5% threshold, but have a very small subsidy included that would keep it below the 5% threshold. Dr. Bouchez acknowledged that could happen.

Mr. Bissell said the overall package of exemptions is not complete without a reliability exemption. He would prefer to delay the package until that exemption is ready. He said the lack of that exemption puts Multiple Intervenors in a difficult position to support the package. Multiple Intervenors (MI) appreciates the concerns that have been raised about the competitive entry piece to address burdens that competitive entrants must endure and those changes have a significant impact on how MI viewed the proposal. MI would abstain as the package exists. Mr. Bissell said in the event there was no adequate support to move the proposal forward, the environmental parties and the City of New York would seek a future BIC vote on the renewable exemption at a separate item. Mr. Andrew Antinori (NYPA) agreed with Mr. Bissell and added that public authorities should have a self supply exemption.

Mr. Miller said it was very important to have wholesale competitive markets and that those markets acknowledge that entities that do not receive significant out of market support should be able to compete in our market on an equal basis as an incumbent generator and we should not have a provision that chills new entry into the market.

Mr. Johnson said the intent of the proposal was a good one and that competition should exist in the marketplace. NRG believed all along that competitive entry exists in our market and Potomac Economics has issued recommendations to revise the rules. Modifications to those rules would be a better avenue to approach this topic instead of a "grand package" that is being proposed for the BIC would vote on. NRG cannot support the proposal in its current state. Ms. Saia added that it was disconcerting that various exemptions were being added at the last minute and CEE needed to be appropriately structured. She believed the NYISO did not give a fulsome enough review, but there needed to be appropriate limitations due to recent State initiatives. Ms. Saia said Entergy is not opposed to competition, but the rules need to be clear to avoid price suppression.

Mr. Miller said Con Edison supports a renewable exemption, but the CEE is more important and timely due to issues raised by Potomac Economics and potential reliability needs. Private actors should be able to provide assistance if they make a judgment as to whether they think a generator will retire.

Mr. Bissell proposed the following friendly amendment to the motion:

As part of approving the above-stated recommendation, the BIC hereby also provides conceptual approval for a Reliability Exemption that would provide an exemption from the buyer-side mitigation rules for a new facility developed in response to a NYISO-determined or NYISO-verified bulk or local system reliability need. The BIC hereby directs the NYISO to work with market participants at the Installed Capacity Working Group to develop the details and necessary tariff revisions to implement such a Reliability Exemption and present tariff language relating thereto for consideration by the BIC by the end of 2014.

In response to a question, Mr. Bissell said the BIC would vote on the conceptual approval of a reliability exemption without knowing its parameters. Ms. Saia expressed a procedural concern on a concept vote without having a discussion what a reliability exemption even looked like. She noted the

BIC has done concept votes only when the NYISO was working on market design concepts and sought stakeholder guidance and support by having a conceptual vote. She said it would set a bad precedent.

Mr. Miller said he deemed it friendly on the basis that it was asking for conceptual approval only. Con Edison believed there is a significant debate that remains on how narrow the reliability exemption may be, but Con Edison agreed that a reliability exemption should be developed and tariff language should be presented to stakeholders by the end of the year.

In response to a question, Mr. Bissell said the motion is intended to move forward and allow the reliability exemption to be developed by the end of the year. Mr. Bissell said the NYISO would follow up the RNA process and the NYISO would verify the local system and identify a need and seek a resource to meet the need. Mr. Fromer noted there are all kinds of solutions to meet a reliability need. You could have a 100 MW need, but do you get an exemption with a 500 MW project. Mr. Bissell said that would need to be discussed and the language is vague on purpose.

Mr. Kranz expressed a concern that the motion was specific about the exemptions posted for voting. Ms. Saia added that the presentation listed the exemptions and the second slide of the presentation specifically stated that the reliability exemption would not be part of the discussion and as a point of order, she asked the BIC Chair to say it was an inappropriate amendment because it was not noticed to the Market Participants (MPs). Mr. Bissell disagreed. Mr. Kranz said in the past the BIC has exercised discretion a desire to do further work on something up for action, but it is procedurally deficient to introduce a new concept that is not well defined and asking for a vote on that item by the BIC since it was not noticed for action on the agenda. Mr. Bissell disagreed and said the amendment should not come as a surprise. Ms. Saia said MPs were not sufficiently noticed and the presentation explicitly said the reliability exemption would not be included. She said Mr. Bissell's amendment was prohibited by Robert's Rules. Mr. Kranz said if we could work on the language to work on the reliability exemption proposal without approving a concept, which was not noticed on the agenda, it would address the procedural concerns.

Ms. Marjorie Philips (Hess Energy Marketing LLC) said to approve something conceptually has tremendous consequences. If she was not on the phone call, she wouldn't have known about it and upon discovering it, she would protest at FERC.

Mr. Kranz said, after consulting with NYISO counsel and considering the issue, the agenda specifically listed what would be acted on and the presentation listed what would not. The BIC By-Laws state that if the item will be voted on, the description of the agenda item, together with the proposed motion and any supporting material, must be sufficient to provide Members reasonable notice of the item to be considered. Mr. Kranz understood that there has been discussion of a reliability exemption at the working group level, but it has not been noticed in the detail required under the BIC By-Laws. The language about voting on the concept was not properly noticed and he expressed a concern of setting a bad precedent and the BIC should vote on what was clearly put forward for consideration. Mr. Kranz did not allow the amendment.

In response to a question about how to overrule the chair's decision, Mr. Kranz said Robert's Rules would be used and a two-thirds majority would be needed.

Motion #4a

Motion to overrule the BIC Chair's decision to not act on proposed amendments to Motion 4d.

Motion failed with 42% affirmative votes.

Mr. Antinori proposed an amendment to the motion and explained how it differed from Mr. Bissell's amendment. Mr. Antinori said the CEE should not be presented to the Management Committee for action until a reliability exemption and a self supply exemption for public authorities was added to the proposal and discussed through the normal stakeholder process.

Mr. Fromer and Ms. Saia believed it was similar to Mr. Bissell's amendment because NYPA was asking stakeholders to vote on an amendment that was not sufficiently noticed. Mr. David Clarke (LIPA) disagreed and said the BIC would approve these concepts subject to a later vote that would be defined in the future. Mr. Kranz agreed with Mr. Clarke and said nothing would proceed to the MC because if approved, it would be subject to a future vote. Ms. Saia noted that it was procedurally improper because there was no notice. Mr. Kranz disagreed and said that the amendment defers action until the two components requested by NYPA are developed. Mr. Kranz said it should be allowed for a vote. Mr. Mukerji noted that BIC approval is advisory to the MC and any stakeholder could seek to proceed to the MC. Mr. Alan Ackerman (Customized Energy Solutions) said, as MC chair, he would oppose proceeding to the MC without being vetted at the BIC.

Mr. Bissell said he understood that NYPA's amendment differed from his amendment, but expressed a concern with the inconsistency in how the process was managed. Mr. Kranz said the four items were posted for action and NYPA's proposed amendment meant that the BIC was not voting on the concept, but deferring action until the rest of the package became defined at the working group level. Mr. Kranz said Mr. Bissell's amendment was to vote on a concept that was not noticed and NYPA's amendment was essentially a conditional motion to table.

NYPA's amended motion was deemed unfriendly by the mover and seconder.

Motion #4b

The Business Issues Committee ("BIC") hereby recommends that the Management Committee approve changes to the NYISO's ICAP Market Power Mitigation Measures (Services Tariff Section 23, Attachment H) and related provisions in Services Tariff Section 30 (Attachment O) and Open Access Transmission Tariff Section 14 (Attachment F) providing for a Competitive Entry Exemption, Renewable Generator Exemption, Municipal Utilities Exemption, and revisions regarding the Offer Floor, as presented at the BIC on May 12, 2014 (together, the "Proposed ICAP Changes") once the two Additional Exemptions, as defined and discussed below, have been fully developed and included in this package. For purposes of clarity, the Proposed ICAP Changes will not be sent to the Management Committee for approval unless and until the Additional Exemptions have been fully developed and included in this package.

The BIC hereby directs that an exemption from the Buyer's Side Mitigation Rules be developed which would allow public authorities to build and/or procure generation resources up to the amount of their load serving entity obligations, plus the applicable required reserve margin, in order to serve that load ("Self-Supply Exemption").

The BIC hereby directs that an exemption from the Buyer's Side Mitigation Rules be developed for facilities that are needed to meet reliability as determined: (i) by the NYISO in response to a bulk system reliability need; or (ii) by an Order of the New York State Public Service Commission ("Reliability Exemption"). The Self-Supply Exemption and the Reliability Exemption are collectively defined as the "Additional Exemptions."

The BIC requests that the NYISO work with market participants at the Installed Capacity Working Group to develop the necessary tariff revisions to implement the Additional Exemptions and present

them for consideration by the BIC by the end of 2014. For purposes of clarity, the BIC is not substantively approving any of the components herein but rather once all the components have been fully developed BIC will make a decision on the merits of the full package of six components.

Motion failed with 18.6% affirmative votes.

After the amended motion failed, Mr. Antinori asked to table the original motion posted with the meeting material.

Motion #4c

Motion to table motion 4d.

Motion failed with 18.6% affirmative votes.

After the motion to table failed, the BIC voted on the original motion that was posted with the meeting materials.

Motion #4d:

The Business Issues Committee (“BIC”) hereby recommends that the Management Committee approve changes to the NYISO’s ICAP Market Power Mitigation Measures (Services Tariff Section 23, Attachment H) and related provisions in Services Tariff Section 30 (Attachment O) and Open Access Transmission Tariff Section 14 (Attachment F) providing for a Competitive Entry Exemption, Renewable Generator Exemption, Municipal Utilities Exemption, and revisions regarding the Offer Floor, as presented at the BIC on May 12, 2014.

Motion failed with 35.19% affirmative votes.

After the vote, Mr. Bissell said that the renewable exemption was an important component and his parties would proceed to bring it for BIC action at the next meeting. Mr. Chris LaRoe (IPPNY) asked if the NYISO would inform stakeholders on how it would proceed to the MC. Mr. Mukerji said the NYISO would take the BIC vote into consideration and would require further internal discussion. Mr. Ackerman said he would prefer any substantive changes be discussed first at the working group level prior to advancing to the MC.

8. Economic Planning Process Manual Update

Mr. Tim Duffy (NYISO) reviewed the presentation included with the meeting material. Mr. Johnson asked about when the mothballing/outage states rules would be incorporated into the planning process. Mr. Duffy said discussion regarding how to incorporate such rules would be discussed after the proposed tariff language is filed with FERC. Mr. Miller agreed with Mr. Duffy and said there was no point for the NYISO to revise its planning process until FERC ruled on the new outage states definitions. Mr. Howard Tarler (NYISO) added that NYISO anticipates discussing the topic at the ESPWG in July.

Motion #5:

The Business Issues Committee (BIC) hereby approves the proposed changes to the Economic Planning Process Manual as presented and described at the May 12, 2014 BIC meeting.

Motion passed unanimously with abstentions.

9. Working Group Updates

- a. *Billing and Accounting Working Group* – Mr. Dave Hoke (NYPA) reported that the NYISO is working on the EQR DSS report and the NYISO will provide updates to the BAWG on the status of the new rollout of the EQR report expected in the coming weeks.

- b. *Credit Policy Working Group* – Mr. Norman Mah (Con Ed Solutions) reported that the credit management system will receive new upgrades in June. WebEx will be available in early June for training. The enhancements include: the ability to view additional data, management minimum participation criteria, and funding request. He further added that the CPWG discussed Credit Policy Enhancements: Projected True-Up Exposure. The NYISO requested comments from stakeholders and will return to the CPWG, prior to a BIC and MC vote later this summer. The NYISO will target a Q1 2015 implementation.
- c. *Electric System Planning Working Group* – Mr. Aydemir Nehrozoglu (Con Edison) reported that the ESPWG was in the process of finalizing scenarios for the RNA. NYISO has proposed a stressed winter scenario. Assumptions for this scenario are currently being evaluated by the ESPWG. The RNA MARS transmission topology was presented to the ESPWG during the last joint meeting with TPAS on May 8th. NYISO is still refining some of the interface limits for firm transmission projects coming into service during the study horizon. The group worked on the final version of the RPP manual and it will be acted by the OC on May 15th.
- d. *Installed Capacity Working Group* – Mr. Chris LaRoe (IPPNY) reported that the ICAPWG reviewed the proposals discussed at the BIC today.
- e. *Inter-regional Planning Task Force* – No update.
- f. *Load Forecasting Task Force* – No update.
- g. *Market Issues Working Group* – Ms. Patti Caletka (NYSEG) reported MIWG discussed the TCC market revisions to Attachment L. The MIWG also discussed behind the meter generation in the DADRP program. The NYISO presented on physical withholding error. The NYISO did analysis of it and the NYISO will request an exemption from doing the analysis from the prior timeframe that error occur. The NYISO presented a design proposal for scarcity pricing and are seeking a design concept approval at the June BIC. The NYISO also proposed to eliminate non-firm transactions to its market rules and will return to the MIWG in June with the tariff changes. The NYISO also came to respond to MP comments on frequency regulation compensation. The NYISO has a filing obligation no later than August 26, 2014.
- h. *Price Responsive Load Working Group* – No update.

10. New Business

No new business.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.