

# **Phase II: NYISO COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROCESS FOR RELIABILITY NEEDS Summary of Interventions**

Prepared By  
John P. Buechler

ESPWG Meeting  
September 15, 2004  
Albany

# Interventions Filed on Sept 10<sup>th</sup>

- **10 Interventions/comments/protests have been filed**
  - *All filings support the need for a comprehensive reliability planning process for the NYISO*
  
- **Supporting the NYISO Filing**
  - *NY Transmission Owners*
  - *Department of Public Service*
  - *Pace University*
  - *Niagara Mohawk Supplemental Comments*
    - ▶ Asks FERC to require filing on economic upgrades in six months
    - ▶ Asks FERC to require cost allocation procedures to be filed by January 1, 2005

# Comments

## ➤ Keyspan Ravenswood

- *Supports the NYISO role in reliability planning as an appropriate initial priority*
- *Urges the NYISO to continue to enhance market efficiency while developing a planning process to address potential market failures*
- *Objects to the PSC role and states that FERC is the regulator best suited to oversee the NYISO planning process*
- *States that parties should have the opportunity to seek FERC intervention if the execution of the NYISO CRP skews the balance in favor of regulated projects*

# Protests

## ➤ NY Municipals

- *Opposed to a “separate rate mechanism” for TO cost recovery*
- *Planning Process should address all transmission facilities in the New York Control Area*
- *FERC’s oversight of the planning process needs to be strengthened*
- *Planning Process should include a stronger obligation to build on the part of the TOs*

# Protests (Cont'd)

## ➤ NYMPA

- *Procedural Complaint: MC should not have been asked to vote prior to tariff language being finalized*
- *FERC, not the PSC, should have jurisdiction over NYISO determinations under the Planning Process*
- *Opposed to a separate rate mechanism for TO cost recovery*

# Protests (Cont'd)

## ➤ NRG

- *NYISO should include possible solutions in the RNA*
- *The IMA's review of the RNA should not be limited to only "identified market failures"*
- *The requirement for mandatory PSC review of disputes should be eliminated*
- *The provision that the PSC must first review non-TO alternative regulated proposals is discriminatory*

# Protests (Cont'd)

## ➤ PSEG

- *Tariff must be amended to provide FERC with the ultimate authority to oversee the NYISO Planning Process—instead of the NYSPSC and NY Courts*
  - ▶ FERC must have authority to independently review NYSPSC decisions
- *Calls for clarification of Section 2.02 of the NYISO-TO Agreement to require the TOs to cooperate to facilitate projects constructed by other developers that are designated as part of the NYISO's reliability planning process*

# PJM Comments

- PJM filed a series of comments comparing the proposed NYISO planning process with the current PJM planning process--apparently aimed at providing consistency between the ISOs' planning procedures in order to avoid creating seams
- Questions whether the NYISO has sufficient independence and authority
- Opposes the PSC's role in dispute resolution
- Criticizes the fact that various implementation provisions still need to be developed



## **PJM Comments (Cont'd)**

- States that the NYISO should propose specific reinforcements in the RNA and not just identify criteria violations
- States that the RNA & CRP should provide a method for choosing between proposals
- States that the NYISO planning process should also accommodate economic proposals
- Claims that the NYISO Planning Process does not reference the NYISO interconnection process