



INDEPENDENT POWER PRODUCERS OF NEW YORK, INC

Independent Power Producers of New York, Inc.
194 Washington Avenue, Suite 315, Albany, NY 12210
P: 518-436-3749 F:518-436-0369

www.ippny.org
Christopher@ippny.org

To: David Allen
From: Chris LaRoe
Date: 9/14/15
Re: IPPNY Questions Concerning NYISO RMR Proposal

- 1) Proposed OATT, Attachment Y, Section 31.2.11.2.1 states that a generator must submit the Generator Deactivation Notice and all information required by that form.
 - a. When will the Notice be provided?
 - b. Is the data to be submitted at the beginning of the process intended to be the information set forth in Section 23.4.8 or only some subset of that information. If the former, can you please cross-reference this section in Section 31.2.11.2.1 what information is being required? If the latter, please provide more details on such information. Will the Notice include a cost template/form and, if so, when will this template be provided to MPs?
 - c. If the NYISO determines more information is required than is initially submitted with the Notice, Section 31.2.11.2.2 states that the NYISO will “promptly review” the additional information subsequently submitted. However, given that the NYISO proposes to trigger the 12 month review period based on the “deemed complete” determination, why isn’t a “within 10 business day” rule also being applied in this case?
 - d. Section 31.2.11.5 states that the NYISO may direct a unit already in a Mothball Outage or IIFO to submit information. When will this information be requested and how long will the generator be given to submit this information? Given that the NYISO has established a “voluntary” RMR program, on what basis is a mothballed unit that will not elect to enter into an RMR agreement nevertheless required to provide data?

- 2) The NYISO has stated that it may review units in a Mothball Outage or an IIFO to determine whether they would also meet the reliability need. The NYISO also has stated that a unit in a Mothball Outage or an IIFO will not be required to enter into an RMR agreement to address the need and, if the unit elects to forego return, the NYISO will default to the next solution. Where has the NYISO captured this point in the tariff language?
- 3) Section 31.2.11.2.3 states that the NYISO will first consider whether operating protocols or LTPs can address an identified reliability need and will issue the results of the Generator Deactivation Assessment.
 - a. During stakeholder meetings, the NYISO has confirmed that the TOs could not enter into an RSSA-type arrangement with a generator as part of an LTP. Why has the ISO limited the agreements that are prohibited to just those with the generator seeking to leave the system or an IIFO or Mothballed generator? What, if any, are the other types of agreements that the ISO contemplates would be permissible parts of LTP-driven solutions?
 - b. When the ISO issues its Assessment, will it specify that a need was identified but it was addressed by an operating protocol or an LTP much like the NYISO does currently in the RNA/CRP process?
- 4) The NYISO has repeatedly stated that its RMR proposal is voluntary and the generator seeking to leave the system can elect to seek full cost of service rate recovery by submitting a Section 205 filing with the FERC. Section 31.2.11.2.3 specifies that the NYISO will issue a reliability need determination within 90 days of the Generator Deactivation Assessment Start Date. Please specify that, upon the identification of a reliability need, the generator may submit its FERC Section 205 filing any time after the end of this 90 day process.
 - a. If FERC does not accept the Full COS filing, can the generator opt not to participate in the RMR since it is a voluntary program? Please include tariff language to clarify.
 - b. If the “noticing generator” elects to leave the system and no other viable alternatives are identified by the NYISO, what will happen?
- 5) The NYISO has acknowledged that a generator is entitled to seek full cost of service to provide continued service as a reliability unit. When the ISO considers proposed solutions to a reliability need, what costs will the NYISO consider for a generator? How will the timing of the NYISO’s “swim lanes” work if the NYISO selects a mothballed generator based on GFCs plus APR and that unit indicates that it will instead file for a COS rate? Will the NYISO then select another potential solution(s)? If the NYISO selects other potential solutions, what effect does that have on the generator that files for a COS rate?

While this process is underway, is the generator that filed the retirement notice permitted to retire?

- 6) Section 23.4.5.8.3(B)(b) provides that the unit will be required to bid its GFCs into the capacity market if there is a lower cost viable and sufficient transmission or demand response alternative. What if the unit in question is over-sized or is proposed to remain under contract for a term beyond the time needed for an alternative to be implemented to address the reliability need? Shouldn't the same GFC bidding rule be applied to guide conduct?
- 7) What effective date will be proposed for these revisions?
- 8) Does the NYISO anticipate establishing any default term length for an RMR contract? If so, what is this term length based on?