

**From:** Kenneth Lotterhos  
**Sent:** Monday, November 22, 2010 12:35 PM  
**To:** wcoste@iso-ne.com  
**Cc:** Eckels, Deborah; Lamanna, William; Schuff, Arnie; Yuri.Fishman@us.ngrid.com  
**Subject:** Comments of NYISO Stakeholders on IREMM Modeling  
**Importance:** High

Wayne,

Again, I want to extend my thanks to you on behalf of the NY stakeholders for participating in the NYISO Inter-regional Planning Task Force call today and answering the questions of some of our stakeholders.

Here is the list of items to address that I recall from my notes.

Modeling Changes:

- Update PJM area model to reflect replacement of the Branchburg-Roseland-Hudson line with the alternate two 230 kV upgrades.
- Remove NYPA contract flow from NY\_F to WMA (85 MW) from model.
- Model the NNC cable at 200 MW (NYISO has approved scheduling on this cable to 200 MW) and on CSC model at the given 300 MW (this is supported by historical flow data over the past year). Please call Y.Fishman (representing LIPA) if you have any questions.
- Model Ceders transaction separate from Châteauguay transaction based on historical deliveries which are lower in the winter. Also, when Nine Mile 2 is increased to 1360 MW, the Châteauguay to NY limit should also be increased to 1360 MW.
- Model the HTP line (PJM to NYC) in the IREMM analysis. This has been confirmed with NYPA, please contact A.Schuff (NYPA) if you have any questions regarding modeling specifics.
- On Slide 8 – correct arithmetic error on PJM DR total.
- A call will be arranged between NYISO (W.Lamanna), ISO-NE (W. Coste) and Con Ed representatives to discuss Con Ed modeling concerns.

I am glad to hear that none of these concerns will affect the project timeline and I wish you the best in performing the analysis.

Sincerely,

Ken  
Chair – NYISO IPTF

