

BIC - Action Item List

Dear Business Issues Committee Members,

Please review the attached Business Issues Committee Action Item List.

Items marked “**Pending Closure**” in the Status Field are considered complete by the NYISO and will be closed after this BIC meeting if no comments are received to the contrary.

Items marked “**Complete**” are action items that the BIC agreed could be closed when they were presented at our last meeting. For each BIC meeting, I will provide this report and include the items closed from the previous month for your reference.

Items marked “**Ongoing**” are tasks that are expected to span multiple months.

Please forward any comments to:

Frank Francis
NYISO Business Issues Committee Liaison
(518) 356-7606
(518) 701-1679
ffrancis@nyiso.com



All Open Items: Business Issues Committee

▼ Open

▼ HQ 7040 - Energy Sink

What would it take to sink energy across the HQ 7040 into NY?

Initial Action: In order to allow energy in excess of 1200MW to sink in NY, software modifications and actions by the NYS Reliability Council would need to be taken. SCUC and RTS software systems would need to be modified to be able to economically determine, with the objective of minimizing total bid production costs, the optimal 10-minute spin, 10-minute total, and 30-minute operating reserve requirements that would be a function of HQ imports to NYCA. Such interaction between HQ imports greater than 1200MW and the cost of increased NYCA operating reserves would need to be developed as an explicitly priced transmission constraint so that HQ proxy bus prices would reflect HQ proxy bus schedules. Additionally, the NYS Reliability Council Rule that defines the minimum operating reserve requirement would need to be modified to reflect the proposed economic analysis for requiring incremental 10-minute spin, 10-minute total, and 30-minute operating reserves to be maintained in excess of the most severe energy loss within the NYCA.

Comments: 1/17/2007 - There are no fatal flaws in undertaking however, a lengthy software upgrade effort would be required to accomplish this task.

Action Item #: 88.03 *Status:* **Open**
Meeting Date: 07/12/2006 *Due Date:* **n/a**
Initial_Response: 12/08/2006 *Assigned To:* **Frank_Francis**
Completion Date: n/a *Requested_By:* **Franey,_Bart**

Closing Action:

▼ Pending Closure

▼ IRM and RNA Base Cases

Is there any difference in IRM and RNA base cases , particularly concerning transmission limits, for the 2007/2008 capability year. If so, what are they?

Initial Action:

Comments: This issue is also being tracked under the Operating Committee.

2/06/2007 - For the 2007 RNA specifically, the assumptions were identical to the latest IRM except for slight differences in the transmission model. The transmission model consists of a topology definition (area definition and interfaces between areas) and the actual interface limits.

1) The only difference in the transmission topology between the IRM study and the RNA study for all years of RNA study is the inclusion of the Neptune PJM to LI interface.

Action Item #: 88.05 *Status:* **Pending_Closure**
Meeting Date: 12/06/2006 *Due Date:* **n/a**
Initial_Response: n/a *Assigned To:* **Frank_Francis**
Completion Date: n/a *Requested_By:* **Haake,_Glenn**

2) Area G to PJM interface limit was reduced from 500 to approximately 0 MW (to NY) to reflect updated limits from PJM.

3) The F to G limit was reduced by 270 MW to reflect an update in New England bypass and updated UPNY/SENY joint interface.

(This had no impact as the F to G limit is a component of the UPNY/SENY limit and the UPNY/SENY limit is more limiting

The UPNY/SENY limits were identical for the two studies)

4) The Dunwoodie South Interface limit changes through time, initially increasing because of new facilities (M29) and then decreasing thereafter.

Closing Action:
