

NYISO Comprehensive Reliability Planning Process Summary of Stakeholder Comments

By
John P. Buechler

ESPWG Meeting
March 29, 2004
Albany

Stakeholder Comments Received

- Calpine
- Central Hudson
- Con Edison
- LIPA
- NGrid
- NYPA
- NYSEG/RGE
- PSC Staff
- PSEG

Summary of Comments

- Most comments were incorporated into revised draft issued by NYISO on March 26th
- “Issues List” Was Prepared
 - *To respond to comments which were not directly incorporated into the revised draft*
 - *Some topics were already covered in other sections*
 - *To provide explanations of various provisions*
 - *To respond to stakeholder questions*
 - *To identify issues for further discussion*

General Issues for Discussion

- Identification of transmission facilities to be included in the NYISO's Planning Process (Various)
- Continued role for ESPWG
 - *Formation of a Planning Committee* (NYSEG)
 - *Should BIC members have a vote on Needs Assessment and/or Final Plan?* (LIPA)
- Should reporting historic congestion costs be a part of the Comprehensive Reliability Planning Process
 - *Or included in a separate process* (PSC/PSEG)
- Should changes in market rules be considered in parallel with other resource solutions (Calpine)

Section-Specific Comments

- **Section 3.2.1: Reliability Needs Assessment**
 - *Mitigation of reliability needs through “alternate system and/or operational modes”* (Con Ed)
- **Section 6.2: Regulated Responses (Various)**
 - *Role of the PSC*
 - *Role of the NYISO*
 - *Consideration of “all feasible alternatives”*
- **Section 7.3: “Gap Solutions”**
 - *Decision by NYISO or TO?* (NYSEG)

Other Questions/Comments?

- RE: March 26th Revised Draft?
- RE: Issues List?
- RE: Other parties' changes?
- Submit any additional written comments by April 5th