

25 Attachment S – Rules To Allocate Responsibility for the Cost of New Interconnection Facilities

25.1 Introduction

25.1.1 Purpose of the Rules

The purpose of these rules is (1) to allocate responsibility among Developers and Transmission Owners and Load Serving Entities (“LSEs”), as described herein, for the cost of the new interconnection facilities that are required for the reliable interconnection of Projects to the New York State Transmission System and to the Distribution System in compliance with the requirements of the type of interconnection service elected by the Developer; and (2) allocate responsibility for the cost of interconnection facilities required for Capacity Resource Interconnection service (“CRIS”) and interconnection in compliance with the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard. Section 25.6 of this Attachment S describes the rules to estimate and allocate responsibility for the cost of the interconnection facilities required for Energy Resource Interconnection Service (“ERIS”) and interconnection in compliance with the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard. Section 25.7 of this Attachment S describes the rules to estimate and allocate responsibility for the cost of interconnection facilities required for CRIS and interconnection in compliance with the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard. Every Developer is responsible for the cost of the new interconnection facilities required for the reliable interconnection of its Project in compliance with the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard, as that responsibility is determined by these rules. In addition, every Developer electing CRIS is also responsible for the cost of the interconnection facilities required pursuant to the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard, as that responsibility is determined by these rules.

The rules in this Attachment S to the ISO OATT cover (i) Large Facilities greater than 20 MW subject to the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures set out in Attachment X to the ISO

OATT (“LFIP”), (ii) Small Generating Facilities no larger than 20 MW subject to the Small Generator Interconnection Procedures set out in Attachment Z to the ISO OATT (“SGIP”) that are required to enter a Class Year Study pursuant to Section 32.3.5.3.2 of the SGIP, and (iii) facilities greater than 2 MW, regardless of whether the interconnection is subject to the SGIP or LFIP, that seek to obtain or increase CRIS beyond the levels permitted by this Attachment S, Section 30.3.2.6 of the LFIP and Section 32.4.11.1 of the SGIP, as applicable (each a “Project” and collectively, “Projects” for purposes of this Attachment S).

As described herein, the intent is that each Developer be held responsible for the net impact of the interconnection of its Project on the reliability of the New York State Transmission System. A Developer is held responsible for the cost of the interconnection facilities that are required by its Project, facilities that would not be required but for its Project. However, a Developer is not responsible for the cost of facilities that are, without considering the impact of its Project, required to maintain the reliability of the New York State Transmission System. Transmission Owners are, in accordance with the ISO OATT and FERC precedent, responsible for the cost of the facilities that are, without considering the impact of the Developer’s Project, required to maintain the reliability of the New York State Transmission System.

25.1.2 Definitions

Unless defined here in Section 25.1.2 of this Attachment S, the definition of each defined term used in this Attachment S shall be the same as the definition for that term set forth in Section 1 of the ISO Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”), Section 30.1 of Attachment X to the ISO OATT, Attachment Z to the ISO OATT, or Section 2 of the ISO Services Tariff.

Acceptance Notice: The notice by which a Developer communicates to the ISO its decision to accept a Project Cost Allocation or Revised Project Cost Allocation.

Additional SDU Study: A study that a Developer may elect to pursue if the Class Year Deliverability Study identifies the need for a new System Deliverability Upgrade (*i.e.*, a System Deliverability Upgrade not previously identified and cost allocated in a Class Year Study and not substantially similar to a System Deliverability Upgrade previously identified and cost allocated in a Class Year Study) that requires additional study.

Affected System: An electric system other than the transmission system owned, controlled or operated by the Connecting Transmission Owner that may be affected by the proposed interconnection.

Affected System Operator: The entity that operates an Affected System.

Affected Transmission Owner: The New York public utility or authority (or its designated agent) other than the Connecting Transmission Owner that (i) owns facilities used for the transmission of Energy in interstate commerce and provides Transmission Service under the Tariff, and (ii) owns, leases or otherwise possesses an interest in a portion of the New York State Transmission System where System Deliverability Upgrades, System Upgrade Facilities, or Network Upgrade Facilities are or will be installed pursuant to Attachment P, Attachment X, Attachment S or Attachment Z to the OATT.

Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment (“ATBA”): An assessment conducted by the ISO staff in cooperation with Market Participants, to identify the System Upgrade Facilities that Transmission Owners are expected to need during the time period covered by the Assessment to comply with Applicable Reliability Requirements, and reliably meet the load growth and changes in load pattern projected for the New York Control Area.

Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment (“ATRA”): An assessment, conducted by the ISO staff in cooperation with Market Participants, to determine the System Upgrade Facilities required for each Project included in this Assessment to interconnect to the New York State Transmission System in compliance with Applicable Reliability Requirements and the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard.

Applicable Reliability Requirements: The NYSRC Reliability Rules and other criteria, standards and procedures, as described in Section 25.6.1.1.1.1 of this Attachment S, applied when conducting the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment and the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment to determine the System Upgrade Facilities needed to maintain the reliability of the New York State Transmission System. The Applicable Reliability Requirements applied are those in effect when the particular assessment is commenced.

Article VII Certificate: The certificate of environmental compatibility and public need required under Article VII of the New York State Public Service Law for the siting and construction of any new transmission facility of a size and type specified in the statute.

Article 10 Certificate: The certificate of environmental compatibility and public need required under Article 10 of the New York State Public Service Law for the siting and construction of electric generating facilities with greater than 25 megawatts of capacity.

Attachment Facilities: The Connecting Transmission Owner's Attachment Facilities and the Developer's Attachment Facilities. Collectively, Attachment Facilities include all facilities and equipment between the Large Generating Facility or Class Year Transmission Project and the Point of Interconnection, including any modification, additions or upgrades that are necessary to physically and electrically interconnect the Large Facility to the New York State Transmission System. Attachment Facilities are sole use facilities and shall not include Stand Alone System Upgrade Facilities, Distribution Upgrades, System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades.

Byway: All transmission facilities comprising the New York State Transmission System that are neither Highways nor Other Interfaces. All transmission facilities in Zone J and Zone K are Byways.

Capacity Region: One of four subsets of the Installed Capacity statewide markets comprised of: (1) Rest of State (*i.e.*, Load Zones A through F); (2) Lower Hudson Valley (*i.e.*, Load Zones G, H and I); (3) New York City (*i.e.*, Load Zone J); and (4) Long Island (*i.e.*, Zone K), except for Class Year Interconnection Facility Studies conducted prior to Class Year 2012, for which "Capacity Region" shall be defined as set forth in Section 25.7.3 of this Attachment S.

Capacity Resource Interconnection Service ("CRIS"): The service provided by the ISO to Developers that satisfy the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard or that are otherwise eligible to receive CRIS in accordance with this Attachment S; such service being one of the eligibility requirements for participation as an ISO Installed Capacity Supplier.

Class Year: The group of Projects included in any particular Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study (Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment and Class Year Deliverability Study), in accordance with the criteria specified in this Attachment S and in Attachment Z for including such Projects.

Class Year CRIS Project: A Class Year Project with an executed Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement entering a Class Year Study for a CRIS evaluation, that thereby becomes one of the group of Class Year Projects included in the Class Year Deliverability Study. A Class Year CRIS Project may be a "CRIS-only" Project that is entering a Class Year Study only for a CRIS evaluation, or it may be a Project seeking both ERIS and CRIS.

Class Year Deliverability Study: An assessment, conducted by the ISO staff in cooperation with Market Participants, to determine whether System Deliverability Upgrades are required for Class Year CRIS Projects under the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard.

Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study ("Class Year Study") shall mean a study conducted by the ISO or a third party consultant for the Developer to determine a list of facilities (including Connecting Transmission Owner's Attachment Facilities, Distribution Upgrades, System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades as identified in the Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study), the cost of those facilities, and the time required to interconnect the Large Generating Facility or Class Year Transmission Project with the New York State Transmission System or with the Distribution System. The scope of the

study is defined in Section 30.8 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X to the ISO OATT.

Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement (“Class Year Study Agreement”) shall mean the form of agreement contained in Appendix 2 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X to the ISO OATT for conducting the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study.

Class Year Project: An Eligible Class Year Project with an executed Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement that thereby becomes one of the group of Projects included in any particular Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study (Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment and/or Class Year Deliverability Study), in accordance with the criteria specified in this Attachment S and in Attachment Z for including such Projects.

Class Year Start Date: The deadline for Eligible Class Year Projects to enter a Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study, determined in accordance with Section 25.5.9 of this Attachment S.

Class Year Transmission Project shall mean a Developer’s proposed new transmission facility that will interconnect to the New York State Transmission System or a proposed upgrade—an improvement to, addition to, or replacement of a part of an existing transmission facility—to the New York State Transmission System, for which (1) the Developer is eligible to request and does request Capacity Resource Interconnection Service, subject to the eligibility requirements set forth in the ISO Procedures; or (2) the Developer requests only Energy Resource Interconnection Service and the transmission facility for which it requests Energy Resource Interconnection Service is a transmission facility over which power flow can be directly controlled by power flow control devices directly connected to the Class Year Transmission Project without having to re-dispatch generation. Class Year Transmission Projects shall not include Attachment Facilities, Network Upgrade Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades.

Connecting Transmission Owner: The New York public utility or authority (or its designated agent) that (i) owns facilities used for the transmission of Energy in interstate commerce and provides Transmission Service under the Tariff, (ii) owns, leases or otherwise possesses an interest in the portion of the New York State Transmission System or Distribution System at the Point of Interconnection, and (iii) is a Party to the Standard Large Generator Interconnection Agreement.

Contingent Facilities shall mean those Attachment Facilities and System Upgrade Facilities and/or System Deliverability Upgrades associated with Class Year Projects upon which the Large Facility’s Class Year Project Cost Allocations are dependent, and if delayed or not built, could impact the actual costs and timing of the Large Facility’s Project Cost Allocation for System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades.

Contribution Percentage: The ratio of aProject’s measured impact or pro rata contribution to a System Upgrade Facility identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, to the

sum of the measured impacts or pro rata contributions of all the Projects in the same Class Year that have at least a *de minimus* impact or contribution to the System Upgrade Facility.

Developer: For purposes of this Attachment S, references to Developer(s) include any of the following: (i) Developer(s) of Large Facilities, (ii) Interconnection Customers of Small Generating Facilities subject to the Rules in this Attachment S pursuant to Section 32.1.1.7 and/or Section 32.3.5.3.2 of Attachment Z to the OATT; and (iii) developers of existing facilities (*i.e.*, facilities that have completed the applicable interconnection studies and have an effective interconnection agreement) seeking to obtain or increase CRIS as permitted by this Attachment S.

Distribution System: The Transmission Owner's facilities and equipment used to distribute electricity that are subject to FERC jurisdiction, and are subject to the ISO's Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X to the ISO OATT or Small Generator Interconnection Procedures in Attachment Z to the ISO OATT under FERC Order Nos. 2003 and/or 2006. The term Distribution System shall not include LIPA's distribution facilities.

Distribution Upgrades: The modifications or additions to the existing Distribution System at or beyond the Point of Interconnection that are required for the proposed Project to connect reliably to the system in a manner that meets the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard. Distribution Upgrades do not include Interconnection Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities, or System Deliverability Upgrades.

Eligible Class Year Project: Any Developer or Interconnection Customer that (i) satisfies the criteria for inclusion in the next Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study, as those criteria are specified in Sections 25.5.9 and 25.6.2.3.1 of this Attachment S, Section 32.1.1.7 of Attachment Z to the OATT and/or Section 32.3.5.3.2 of Attachment Z to the OATT; or (ii) that seeks evaluation in a Class Year Study to obtain or increase CRIS as permitted by this Attachment S and satisfies the criteria for inclusion in the next Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study specified in Section 25.5.9 of this Attachment S.

Energy Resource Interconnection Service ("ERIS"): For proposed interconnections subject to the LFIP or SGIP, the service provided by the ISO to interconnect the Developer's Large Generating Facility, Class Year Transmission Project, or Small Generating Facility required to participate in a Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study under Section 32.3.5.3 of Attachment Z to the New York State Transmission System or to the Distribution System, in accordance with the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard, to enable the New York State Transmission System to receive Energy and Ancillary Services from the Large Generating Facility, Class Year Transmission Project or Small Generating Facility ~~required to participate in a Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study under Section 32.3.5.3 of Attachment Z,~~ pursuant to the terms of the ISO OATT. For proposed interconnections not subject to the SGIP pursuant to Section 32.1.1 of Attachment Z to the OATT, ERIS is the service provided by the ISO to interconnect a generating facility that is qualified to participate in a NYISO market pursuant to applicable ISO Procedures, to enable the New York State Transmission System to receive Energy and Ancillary Services from the generating facility.

Existing System Representation: The representation of the New York State Power System developed as specified in Section 25.5.5 of this Attachment S.

Expedited Deliverability Study: A study conducted by the ISO or a third party consultant to determine the extent to which an existing or proposed facility satisfies the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard at its requested CRIS level without the need for System Deliverability Upgrades. The schedule and scope of the study is defined in Sections 25.5.9.2.1 and 25.7.1.2 of this Attachment S.

External CRIS Rights: A determination of deliverability within the Rest of State Capacity Region (*i.e.*, Load Zones A – F), awarded by the ISO for a term of five (5) years or longer, to a specified number of Megawatts of External Installed Capacity that satisfy the requirements set forth in Section 25.7.11 of this Attachment S to the ISO OATT, and that can be certified in a Bilateral Transaction used for the NYCA and not a Locality, or sold into the NYCA for an Installed Capacity auction and not in an Installed Capacity auction for a Locality.

External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights: The meaning set forth in Section 2.5 of the Services Tariff.

Final Decision Round: The round of ISO-communicated cost estimates and Developer responses for a Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study, in which all remaining eligible Developers issue an Acceptance Notice and post Security.

Financial Settlement: The Settlement Agreement approved by FERC in Docket Nos. EL02-125-000 and EL02-125-001 addressing the financial issues raised in those proceedings.

Headroom: The functional or electrical capacity of the System Upgrade Facility or the electrical capacity of the System Deliverability Upgrade that is in excess of the functional or electrical capacity actually used by the Developer's Project.

Highway: 115 kV and higher transmission facilities that comprise the following NYCA interfaces: Dysinger East, West Central, Volney East, Moses South, Central East/Total East, and UPNY-ConEd, and their immediately connected, in series, Bulk Power System facilities in New York State. Each interface shall be evaluated to determine additional "in series" facilities, defined as any transmission facility higher than 115 kV that (a) is located in an upstream or downstream zone adjacent to the interface and (b) has a power transfer distribution factor (DFAX) equal to or greater than five percent when the aggregate of generation in zones or systems adjacent to the upstream zone or zones which define the interface is shifted to the aggregate of generation in zones or systems adjacent to the downstream zone or zones which define the interface. In determining "in series" facilities for Dysinger East and West Central interfaces, the 115 kV and 230 kV tie lines between NYCA and PJM located in LBMP Zones A and B shall not participate in the transfer. Highway transmission facilities are listed in ISO Procedures.

Initial Decision Period: The 30 calendar day period within which a Developer must provide an Acceptance Notice or Non-Acceptance Notice to the ISO in response to the first Project Cost Allocation issued by the ISO to the Developer.

Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study (“SRIS”): An engineering study that evaluates the impact of the proposed Large Generation Facility or Class Year Transmission Project on the safety and reliability of the New York State Transmission System and, if applicable, an Affected System, to determine what Attachment Facilities, Distribution Upgrades and System Upgrade Facilities are needed for the proposed Large Generation Facility or Class Year Transmission Project of the Developer to connect reliably to the New York State Transmission System or to the Distribution System in a manner that meets the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard for ERIS. The scope of the SRIS is defined in Section 7.3 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X to the ISO OATT.

Large Facility: A Large Generating Facility or a Class Year Transmission Project.

NERC Planning Standards: The transmission system planning standards of the North American Electric Reliability Council.

Non-Acceptance Notice: The notice by which a Developer communicates to the ISO its decision not to accept a Project Cost Allocation or Revised Project Cost Allocation.

Non-Financial Settlement: The Settlement Agreement approved by FERC in Docket Nos. EL02-125-000 and EL01-125-001 addressing non-financial issues for future cost allocations.

NPCC Basic Design and Operating Criteria: The transmission system design and operating criteria of the Northeast Power Coordinating Council.

NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard: The standard that must be met, unless otherwise provided for by this Attachment S, by (i) any generation facility larger than 2 MW in order for that facility to obtain CRIS (ii) any Class Year Transmission Project; (iii) any entity requesting External CRIS Rights, and (iv) any entity requesting a CRIS transfer pursuant to Section 25.9.5 of this Attachment S. To meet the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard, the Developer must, in accordance with these rules, fund or commit to fund any System Deliverability Upgrades identified for its Project in the Class Year Deliverability Study.

NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report: The annual ISO survey of power demand and supply in New York State, published pursuant to Section 6-106 of the Energy Law of New York State.

NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard: The reliability standard described in Section 25.2 of this Attachment S that must be met by any Project that is subject to ISO’s Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X to the ISO OATT or the ISO’s Small Generator Interconnection Procedures in Attachment Z to the ISO OATT, that is proposing to connect to the New York State Transmission System or to the Distribution System to obtain ERIS. The Standard is designed to ensure reliable access by the proposed Project to the New York State Transmission System or to the Distribution System, as applicable. The Standard does not impose any deliverability test or deliverability requirement on the proposed Project.

NYSRC Reliability Rules: The reliability rules of the New York State Reliability Council.

Open Class Year: Class Year open for new members pursuant to the Class Year Start Date deadline specified in Section 25.5.9 of this Attachment S.

Other Interfaces: The following Interfaces into Capacity Regions: Lower Hudson Valley [*i.e.*, Rest of State (Load Zones A-F) to Lower Hudson Valley (Load Zones G, H and I)]; New York City [*i.e.*, Lower Hudson Valley (Load Zones G, H and I) to New York City (Load Zone J)]; and Long Island [*i.e.*, Lower Hudson Valley (Load Zones G, H and I) to Long Island (Load Zone K)], and the following Interfaces between the NYCA and adjacent Control Areas: PJM to NYISO, ISO-NE to NYISO, Hydro-Quebec to NYISO, and Norwalk Harbor (Connecticut) to Northport (Long Island) Cable.

Overage Cost: The dollar amount by which the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment exceeds the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities considered in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment for the same Class Year.

Overage Cost Percentage: The ratio of the Overage Cost to the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment.

Project: The proposed facility as described in a single Interconnection Request, to the extent permitted by Attachment X or Attachment Z to the ISO OATT, as applicable. For facilities not subject to the ISO's Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X to the ISO OATT or Small Generator Interconnection Procedures in Attachment Z to the ISO OATT, the Project refers to the facility as described in a single Class Year Study Agreement or Expedited Deliverability Studies Agreement, to the extent permitted by Attachment S to the ISO OATT.

Project Cost Allocation: The dollar figure estimate for a Developer's share of the cost of the System Upgrade Facilities required for the reliable interconnection of its Project to the New York State Transmission System or to the Distribution System and/or the share of the cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades required for the Developer's Project to meet the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard.

Revised Project Cost Allocation: The revised dollar figure cost estimate and related information provided by the ISO to a Developer following receipt by the ISO of a Non-Acceptance Notice, or upon the occurrence of a Security Posting Default by another member of the respective Class Year.

Security: Under the interconnection facilities cost allocation rules set out in this Attachment S, a Developer must signify its willingness to pay the Connecting Transmission Owner and Affected Transmission Owner(s) for the Developer's share of the required System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades by posting Security for the full amount of the Developer's share within a specified time frame. The Security can be a bond, irrevocable letter of credit, parent company guarantee or other form of security from an entity with an investment grade rating, executed for the benefit of the Connecting Transmission Owner and Affected Transmission Owner(s), meeting the requirements of this Attachment S, and meeting the commercially reasonable requirements of the Connecting Transmission Owner and Affected Transmission Owner(s).

Security Posting Default: A failure by one or more Developers to post Security as required by this Attachment S.

Subsequent Decision Period: A seven calendar day period within which a Developer must provide an Acceptance Notice or Non-Acceptance Notice to the ISO in response to the Revised Project Cost Allocation issued by the ISO to the Developer.

System Deliverability Upgrades: The least costly configuration of commercially available components of electrical equipment that can be used, consistent with Good Utility Practice and Applicable Reliability Requirements, to make the modifications or additions to Byways and Highways and Other Interfaces on the existing New York State Transmission System that are required for the proposed Project to connect reliably to the system in a manner that meets the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard at the requested level of Capacity Resource Interconnection Service.

System Upgrade Facilities: The least costly configuration of commercially available components of electrical equipment that can be used, consistent with Good Utility Practice and Applicable Reliability Requirements, to make the modifications to the existing transmission system that are required to maintain system reliability due to: (i) changes in the system, including such changes as load growth, and changes in load pattern, to be addressed in accordance with Section 25.4.1 of this Attachment S; and (ii) proposed interconnections. In the case of proposed interconnections, System Upgrade Facilities are the modifications or additions to the existing New York State Transmission System that are required for the proposed Project to connect reliably to the system in a manner that meets the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard.

25.2 Minimum Interconnection Standard

25.2.1 Scope and Purpose of Standard

Each Large Facility and each Small Generating Facility subject to this Attachment S pursuant to Section 32.3.5.3.2 of Attachment Z must be evaluated under the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard in a Class Year Study. A Transmission Owner that has constructed a reliability-based transmission or distribution system upgrade, or an upgrade pursuant to an order issued by a regulatory body requiring such construction, will not be deemed to be a Developer under these rules because of the construction of that upgrade.

25.2.1.1 The NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard is designed to ensure reliable access by the proposed project to the New York State Transmission System and to the Distribution System. The NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard does not impose any deliverability test or deliverability requirement on the proposed project. Application of these rules, including the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment and the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, to allocate responsibility for the cost of new transmission facilities to permit interconnection is not intended to affect the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard.

25.2.1.1.1 Consequently, the Minimum Interconnection Standard is not intended to address in any way the allocation of responsibility for the cost of upgrades and other new facilities associated with transmission service and the delivery of power across the Transmission System, the reduction of Congestion, economic transmission system upgrades, or the mitigation of Transmission System overloads associated with the delivery of power.

25.2.1.1.2 It is not anticipated that the installation of any interconnection facilities covered by the Minimum Interconnection Standard will improve the deliverability of power, reduce Congestion, or mitigate overloads associated with the delivery of power. If the installation of any facilities by a Developer does improve deliverability, reduce Congestion and create Incremental Transmission Congestion Contracts, or mitigate overloads, then that situation will be handled in accordance with the relevant provisions of the ISO OATT, including Sections 3.7 and 4.5, and applicable FERC precedent.

25.3 Deliverability Interconnection Standard

25.3.1 Scope and Purpose of Standard

Each proposed or existing facility larger than 2 MW, and each facility with CRIS that requests an increase to its CRIS, must meet the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard before it can receive CRIS or Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights, unless otherwise provided for in this Attachment S. For purposes of this Section 25.3.1, a facility comprised of multiple Generators is a single “facility.”

Pursuant to Section 32.1.1.7 of Attachment Z to the OATT, a Small Generating Facility 2 MW or smaller may obtain CRIS in accordance with ISO Procedures without being evaluated for deliverability under the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard. A facility 2 MW or smaller interconnecting to the Distribution System that is not subject to the SGIP pursuant to Section 32.1.1 of Attachment Z to the OATT may obtain CRIS in accordance with ISO Procedures without being evaluated for deliverability under the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard. The requirement that a facility not subject to the ISO’s Large Facility Interconnection Procedures or Small Generator Interconnection Procedures must meet the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard to become a qualified Installed Capacity Supplier first applies on May 19, 2016, subject to the transition rule specified in Section 25.9.3.4.1 of this Attachment S.

Any facility with an established CRIS value may, at a later date, without submitting a new Interconnection Request, ask the ISO to reevaluate the facility for a higher level of MW of Installed Capacity, not to exceed the permissible levels of CRIS that may be requested pursuant to Section 25.8.1 of this Attachment S, by entering a Class Year Study or Expedited Deliverability Study to identify requested increase in CRIS MW is deliverable. Any facility with

an established CRIS value may, without such evaluation and without submitting a new Interconnection Request, increase its existing CRIS value by a total of no more than 2 MW of Installed Capacity during the operating life of the facility; provided however, for Projects comprised of multiple Generators, this CRIS increase up to 2 MW is permitted only at the facility (*i.e.*, Project) level, not at the individual Generator level. A facility that receives this up to 2 MW CRIS increase, to the extent it later combines with another facility or Project to become a multi-Generator co-located resource (*e.g.*, a Co-located Storage Resource or Distributed Energy Resource), is not eligible for any additional CRIS increase above 2 MW, including the MW of CRIS increase already received pursuant to this Section 25.3.1, without proceeding through a deliverability evaluation in a Class Year Study or Expedited Deliverability Study.

Pursuant to Section 30.3.2.6 of Attachment X to the ISO OATT, an “established CRIS value” for facilities subject to a CRIS set and reset period pursuant to Sections 25.9.3.3, 25.9.3.1.4.1, 25.9.3.1.4.2, or 25.9.3.5 of this Attachment S is the final CRIS value established after the termination of the CRIS set and reset period.

As defined in Section 25.1 of this Attachment S, the term “Large Facility” includes a Class Year Transmission Project. A Class Year Transmission Project, as such term is defined in Section 25.1 of this Attachment S, includes any proposed new transmission facility that will interconnect to the New York State Transmission System or a proposed upgrade—an improvement to, addition to, or replacement of a part of an existing transmission facility—to the New York State Transmission System, for which (1) the Developer is eligible to request and does request CRIS—in the form of Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights or External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights, as applicable, subject to the eligibility requirements set forth in the ISO Procedures; or (2) the Developer requests only ERIS and the transmission facility for which it

requests ERIS is a transmission facility over which power flow can be directly controlled by power flow control devices directly connected to the Class Year Transmission Project without having to re-dispatch generation. Class Year Transmission Projects shall not include Attachment Facilities, Network Upgrade Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades.

25.3.1.1 The NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard is designed to ensure that the Project is deliverable throughout the New York Capacity Region where the Project will interconnect or is interconnected. The NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard is also designed to ensure that the Developer of the Project restores the transfer capability of any Other Interfaces degraded by its interconnection.

25.3.1.2. Each Project electing CRIS will be allowed to become an Installed Capacity Supplier, or will be allowed to receive Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights or External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights, in accordance with the rules of the New York Installed Capacity market, up to the amount of its deliverable capacity, as that amount is determined in accordance with the rules in this Attachment S, once the Developer of the Project has funded or committed to fund any required System Deliverability Upgrades in accordance with the rules in this Attachment S.

25.4 Interconnection Facilities Covered by Attachment S

25.4.1 Interconnection Standards

The interconnection facilities covered by these cost allocation rules are (i) those required for the proposed project to reliably interconnect to the New York State Transmission System or to the Distribution System in a manner that meets the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard for ERIS, and (ii) those required for the project to meet the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard for CRIS.

25.4.2 Interconnection Facilities

The interconnection facilities covered by these cost allocation rules are comprised of the following types of facilities: Attachment Facilities, Distribution Upgrades, System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades.

25.5 Class Year Study and Expedited Deliverability Study Processes

25.5.1 Side Agreements

These cost allocation rules will not preclude or supersede any binding cost allocation agreements that are executed between or among Developers, Connecting Transmission Owners and/or Affected Transmission Owners; provided, however, that no such agreements will increase the cost responsibility or cause a material adverse change in the circumstances as determined by these rules of any Developer or Transmission Owner who is not a party to such agreement.

25.5.2 Costs Covered By Attachment S

The interconnection facility cost allocated by these rules is comprised of all costs and overheads associated with the design, procurement and installation of the new interconnection facilities. These rules do not address in any way the allocation of responsibility for the cost of operating and maintaining the new interconnection facilities once they are installed. Nor do these rules address in any way the ownership of the new interconnection facilities.

25.5.3 Dispatch Costs

Developers, Connecting Transmission Owners and Affected Transmission Owners will not be charged directly for any redispatch cost that may be caused by the temporary removal of transmission facilities from service to install new interconnection facilities, as such cost is reflected in Locational Based Marginal Prices. Nor will existing generators be paid for any lost opportunity cost that may be incurred when their units are dispatched down or off in connection with the installation of new interconnection facilities.

25.5.4 Transmission Owners' Cost Recovery

Any Connecting or Affected Transmission Owner implementation and construction of (i) System Upgrade Facilities as identified in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment or Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, or (ii) System Deliverability Upgrades as identified in the Class Year Deliverability Study, shall be in accordance with the ISO OATT, Commission-approved ISO Related Agreements, the Federal Power Act and Commission precedent, and therefore shall be subject to the Connecting or Affected Transmission Owner's right to recover, pursuant to appropriate financial arrangements contained in agreements or Commission-approved tariffs, all reasonably incurred costs, plus a reasonable return on investment.

25.5.5 Existing System Representation

The ISO shall include in the Existing System Representation for purposes of the ATBA and ATRA for a given Class Year Study or Expedited Deliverability Study:

25.5.5.1 For Class Years subsequent to Class Year 2017: (i) the following facilities included in the ISO's most recent NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report: all generation identified as existing and all transmission facilities identified as existing and/or firm, excluding those facilities that are subject to Class Year cost allocation but for which Class Year cost allocations have not been accepted; (ii) all proposed Projects, together with their associated System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades, that have accepted their cost allocation in a prior Class Year cost allocation process; provided however, that System Deliverability Upgrades where construction has been deferred pursuant to Sections 25.7.12.2 and 25.7.12.3 of this Attachment S will only be

included if construction of the System Deliverability Upgrades has been triggered under Section 25.7.12.3 of this Attachment S; (iii) all generation and transmission retirements and derates identified in the Load and Capacity Data Report as scheduled to occur during the five-year cost allocation study planning period; and (iv) Transmission Projects that are proposed under Attachments Y or FF of the ISO OATT and have met the following milestones prior to the Class Year Start Date: (1) have been triggered under the Reliability Planning Process, selected under the Short-Term Reliability Process, selected under the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process, or approved by beneficiaries under the Economic Planning Process); and (2) have a completed System Impact Study; (3) have a determination pursuant to Article VII that the Article VII application filed for the facility is in compliance with Public Service Law §122 (*i.e.*, “deemed complete”) (if applicable); and (4) are making reasonable progress under the applicable OATT Attachments Y or FF planning process; (v) Transmission Projects that are not proposed under Attachments Y or FF to the ISO OATT that have completed a Facilities Study and posted Security for Network Upgrade Facilities as required in Section 22.11.1 of Attachment P to the ISO OATT and have a determination pursuant to Article VII that the Article VII application filed for the facility is in compliance with Public Service Law §122 (*i.e.*, “deemed complete”) (if applicable); (vi) transmission projects not subject to the Transmission Interconnection Procedures or the Attachment X and S interconnection procedures (*i.e.*, new transmission facilities or upgrades proposed by a Transmission Owner in its Local Transmission Owner Plan or NYPA

transmission plan) identified as “firm” by the Connecting Transmission Owner and either (1) have commenced a Facilities Study (if applicable) and have an Article VII application deemed complete (if applicable); or (2) are under construction and scheduled to be in-service within 12 months after the Class Year Start Date and (vii) all other changes to existing facilities, other than changes that are subject to Class Year cost allocation but that have not accepted their Class Year cost allocation, that are identified in the Load and Capacity Data Report or reported by Market Participants to the ISO as scheduled to occur during the five year cost allocation study planning period. Facilities in a Mothball Outage, an ICAP Ineligible Forced Outage, or Inactive Reserves will be modeled as in, and not removed from, the Existing System Representation. If the ISO has triggered multiple Transmission Projects under its Reliability Planning Process, the ISO will include in the base case the selected Transmission Project until or unless that project is halted or its Development Agreement is terminated, in which case the ISO will include in the base case the regulated backstop solution. The point of interconnection of a Retired generator with a terminated interconnection agreement is available to proposed facilities on a non-discriminatory basis pursuant to the ISO’s applicable interconnection and transmission expansion processes and procedures. A Retired generator with an interconnection agreement that remains in effect after it is Retired will retain its right to the specific point of interconnection as provided for in the interconnection agreement and access to this point will not be available for new facilities.

25.5.5.2 The System Upgrade Facilities listed on Exhibit A to the Financial Settlement shall be included in the Existing System Representation. Such System Upgrade Facilities shall be shown as in service in the first year of the five-year cost allocation study planning period and in each subsequent year, unless such System Upgrade Facilities are cancelled or otherwise not in service by January 1, 2010; provided that if such facilities are expected to be in service after January 1, 2010, starting with the Class Year 2010, the ISO shall independently determine such later date when the System Upgrade Facilities are expected to be in service and represent them according to the ISO's determination.

25.5.5.3 System Upgrade Facilities not listed on Exhibit A to the Financial Settlement, but for which cost allocations have been accepted in a prior Class Year cost allocation process, shall be represented in the Existing System Representation for subsequent cost allocation studies in the year of their anticipated in-service date.

25.5.6 Attachment Facilities

Each Developer is responsible for 100% of the cost of the Attachment Facilities required for the reliable interconnection of its Project in compliance with the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard, as that responsibility is determined by these rules.

25.5.7 Distribution Upgrades

Each Developer is responsible for 100% of the cost of the Distribution Upgrades required for the reliable interconnection of its Project in compliance with the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard, as that responsibility is determined by these rules.

25.5.8 No Prioritization of Class Year Projects or Projects in an Expedited Deliverability Study

There will be no prioritization of (1) the Projects grouped and studied together in a Class Year; or (2) the Projects grouped and studied together in an Expedited Deliverability Study. Each Project in a Class Year Study will, with other Projects in the same Class Year, share in the then currently available functional or electrical capability of the transmission system, and share in the cost of the System Upgrade Facilities required to interconnect its respective Project and, for Developers seeking CRIS, System Deliverability Upgrades required under the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard, in accordance with the rules set forth herein. Each Project in an Expedited Deliverability Study will, with other Projects in the same Expedited Deliverability Study, share in the then currently available functional or electrical capability of the transmission system in accordance with the rules set forth herein. For purposes of this Section 25.5.8, the “then currently available functional or electrical capability of the transmission system” is the functional or electrical capability of the transmission system currently available in the applicable base case.

25.5.9 Class Year and Expedited Deliverability Study Start Date, Entry Requirements and Schedule

25.5.9.1 Class Year Start Date, Entry Requirements and Schedule

The Class Year Study will begin on the Class Year Start Date, which will be the first Business Day after thirty (30) Calendar Days following the completion of the prior Class Year Study.

The ISO will provide notice of the Class Year Study Start Date by (1) sending notice of the start date to those registered through the ISO to be on the distribution lists for the NYISO

Operating Committee and its subcommittees; and (2) posting notice of the Class Year Study Start Date.

In order to become an Eligible Class Year Project, a Developer must:

- (1) elect to enter the applicable Class Year by providing notice to the ISO, together with (i) a demonstration that the Project satisfies the applicable regulatory milestones described in Section 25.6.2.3.1.1 of Attachment S or (ii) notice that it will submit a qualifying contract pursuant to Section 25.6.2.3.1 of this Attachment S or a two-part deposit consisting of \$100,000 plus \$3,000/MW deposit as required by Section 25.6.2.3.1, no later than five (5) Business Days following the ISO's posting of the Class Year Start Date; and
- (2) satisfy the criteria for inclusion in the next Class Year, on or before the Class Year Start Date, as those criteria are specified in Section 25.6.2.3.1 of this Attachment S, Section 32.1.1.7 of Attachment Z to the OATT or Section 32.3.5.3.2 of Attachment Z to the OATT, as applicable; and
- (3) if requesting only CRIS, have completed one of the following on or before the Class Year Start Date, as applicable: a Class Year Study for ERIS, a System Impact Study under the Small Generator Interconnection Procedures, or a utility interconnection study if the Project is not subject to the ISO interconnection procedures under Attachments X and Z.

Upon a Developer's satisfaction of the Class Year Study eligibility criteria specified in this 25.5.9.1, the ISO will tender a Class Year Study Agreement to the Developer pursuant to Section 30.8.1 of Attachment X to the OATT. An Eligible Class Year Project that satisfies the requirements of Section 30.8.1 of Attachment X to the OATT as it relates to completion of a

Class Year Study Agreement, submission of required technical data and updated In-Service Date, Initial Synchronization Data and Commercial Operation Date, and submission of required deposits, all within 10 Business Days of the tender of the Class Year Study Agreement, will become a Class Year Project.

An Eligible Class Year Project that elects to enter a Class Year Study pursuant to this Section 25.5.9.1 but retracts its election prior to the ISO's tender of the Class Year Study Agreement will not become a member of the Class Year Study. An Eligible Class Year Project that elects to enter a Class Year Study pursuant to this Section 25.5.9.1 but retracts its election after the ISO's tender of the Class Year Study Agreement prior to or after the deadline for execution of the Class Year Study Agreement will not become a member of the Class Year Study; however, such retraction will count as one of the two Class Year Studies that a Project may enter pursuant to Section 25.6.2.3.4 of this Attachment S.

All parties engaged in performing study work as part of the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment and Class Year Deliverability Study (collectively, the Class Year Study) are required to use Reasonable Efforts to complete the basic required evaluations and cost estimates for Connecting Transmission Owner's Attachment Facilities, Distribution Upgrades, System Upgrade Facilities, and System Deliverability Upgrades in order that the Class Year Study can be presented to the Operating Committee for approval within twelve (12) months from the Class Year Start Date.

Through the Interconnection Projects Facilities Study Working Group and/or the Transmission Planning Advisory Subcommittee distribution lists, the ISO will provide the anticipated Class Year Schedule, including the status of and anticipated completion date of the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment study cases.

25.5.9.2 Expedited Deliverability Study Process

25.5.9.2.1 Study Start Date, Entry Requirements and Schedule

The start date for the first Expedited Deliverability Study will be the first Business Day after thirty (30) Calendar Days following February 18, 2020. After the completion of the initial Expedited Deliverability Study, each Expedited Deliverability Study will begin the first Business Day after thirty (30) Calendar Days following the completion of the prior Expedited Deliverability Study; provided however, an Expedited Deliverability Study may not commence during the period between the posting of the draft Class Year Study report for Operating Committee approval and commencement of the next Class Year Study. If the first Business Day after thirty (30) Calendar Days following the completion of the prior Expedited Deliverability Study falls on a date within the above-described Class Year decision and settlement period, the Expedited Deliverability Study will begin on the first Business Day after ten (10) Calendar Days following the Class Year Study Start Date immediately following the above-described Class Year decision and settlement period.

The ISO will provide notice of the Expedited Deliverability Study start date by (1) sending notice of the start date to those registered through the ISO to be on the distribution lists for the NYISO Operating Committee and its subcommittees; and (2) posting notice of the Expedited Deliverability Study start date.

In order to become eligible to enter an Expedited Deliverability Study, a Developer must (1) elect to enter the Expedited Deliverability Study by providing notice to the ISO by the Expedited Deliverability Study start date; (2) must have satisfied the data submission requirements set forth in Section 23.4.5.7.3.6 of the ISO Services Tariff required for Class Year Projects requesting CRIS in a Mitigated Capacity Zone and have such data submission deemed complete by the ISO by the Expedited Deliverability Study start date; and (3) must be in service

or have completed one of the following, as applicable: a Class Year Study for ERIS, a System Impact Study under the Small Generator Interconnection Procedures, or a utility interconnection study if the facility is not subject to the ISO interconnection procedures under Attachments X and Z. A Project that satisfies the eligibility requirements for an Expedited Deliverability Study will become a member of the Expedited Deliverability Study if it satisfies the requirements of Section 25.5.9.2.2 of this Attachment S as it relates to completion of an Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement, submission of the required deposit, and submission of required technical data.

All parties engaged in performing study work as part of the Expedited Deliverability Study are required to use Reasonable Efforts to complete the basic required evaluations in order for the Expedited Deliverability Study to be presented to the NYISO Operating Committee for approval within four (4) months from the date that the ISO confirms receipt of all of the following: (1) the executed Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement; (2) the \$30,000 Expedited Deliverability Study deposit required by Section 25.5.9.2.2 of this Attachment S; and (3) the technical data required by Section 25.5.9.2.2 of this Attachment S.

25.5.9.2.2 Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement

As soon as practicable after a Developer has notified the ISO of its request to enter the next Expedited Deliverability Study, the ISO shall tender an Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement in the form of Appendix 2 to this Attachment S. When the ISO tenders an Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement to a Developer, the ISO shall, at the same time, also provide one to the applicable Connecting Transmission Owner. The Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement shall provide that the Developer shall compensate the ISO for the actual cost of the Expedited Deliverability Study. When the ISO tenders the Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement to the requesting Developer, the ISO shall provide to the Developer a non-binding

good faith estimate of the cost and timeframe for completing the Expedited Deliverability Study. Within ten (10) Business Days after the ISO tenders the Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement, the Developer shall complete the Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement and deliver the completed agreement to the ISO. Developer shall indicate, in the data form attached to the Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement, the MW level of requested CRIS up to the levels permitted by Section 25.8.1 of this Attachment S. Developer shall, with the completed Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement, deliver to the ISO (1) the required technical data and (2) a study deposit of \$30,000. The Developer, ISO and Connecting Transmission Owner shall execute the Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement no later than ten (10) Calendar Days after the ISO confirms receipt of the executed Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement, the required technical data and required deposit from the Developer. The ISO shall provide a copy of the fully executed Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement to the Developer and Connecting Transmission Owner. The ISO shall invoice the Expedited Deliverability Study Developer on a monthly basis for the work conducted on the Expedited Deliverability Study. Each Developer shall pay an equal share of the actual cost of the combined Expedited Deliverability Study. The Developer shall pay invoiced amounts within thirty (30) Calendar Days of receipt of invoice. The ISO shall continue to hold the amounts on deposit in an interest bearing account associated with the Developer until settlement of the final invoice.

25.5.9.2.3 Expedited Deliverability Study Procedures

The ISO shall coordinate the Expedited Deliverability Study and shall utilize existing studies to the extent practicable in performing the Expedited Deliverability Study. The ISO may request additional information from the Developer and Connecting Transmission Owner as may reasonably become necessary consistent with Good Utility Practice during the course of the

Expedited Deliverability Study. Upon request from the ISO for additional information required for or related to the Expedited Deliverability Study, the Developer and Connecting Transmission Owner shall provide such additional information in a prompt manner.

Within ten (10) Business Days of providing a draft Expedited Deliverability Study report to an Expedited Deliverability Study Developer, the ISO, Connecting Transmission Owner, and Affected System Operator(s) shall meet with the Developer to discuss the results of the Expedited Deliverability Study.

The ISO shall use Reasonable Efforts to complete the study and present the Expedited Deliverability Study report to the Operating Committee within the timeframe set forth in Section 25.5.9.2.1 of this Attachment S; provided, however, an Expedited Deliverability Study report shall not proceed to the Operating Committee between Operating Committee approval of a Class Year Study and commencement of the next Class Year Study. An Expedited Deliverability Study may not proceed to the Operating Committee until after ten (10) Calendar Days following the completion of the Class Year Study. After Operating Committee approval of the Expedited Deliverability Study report, the Expedited Deliverability Study Developers will be subject to the decision process set forth in Section 25.5.9.2.4.

Before Operating Committee approval of the Expedited Deliverability Study, if the pending Class Year Study proceeds to decision and settlement pursuant to Section 25.8 of this Attachment S and a Class Year Project accepts or rejects a Project Cost Allocation that the ISO determines may impact the deliverability of a Project in the Expedited Deliverability Study, the assumptions used in the Expedited Deliverability Study will be updated before the commencement of the next Class Year Study.

At the request of any Expedited Deliverability Study Developer, or at any time the ISO determines that it will not meet the required timeframe for completing the Expedited Deliverability Study, the ISO shall notify the Expedited Deliverability Study Developer as to the schedule status of the Expedited Deliverability Study. If the ISO is unable to complete the Expedited Deliverability Study within the initial schedule, it shall notify the Expedited Deliverability Study Developer and provide an estimated completion date and an explanation of the reasons why additional time is required.

Upon request, the ISO shall provide the Expedited Deliverability Study Developer supporting documentation, workpapers, and databases or data developed in the preparation of the Expedited Deliverability Study, subject to non-disclosure arrangements consistent with Section 30.13.1.

25.5.9.2.4 Expedited Deliverability Study Decision Process

Within 5 Business Days following approval of the Expedited Deliverability Study by the Operating Committee (such 5 Business Day period to be referred to as the “Expedited Deliverability Study Initial Decision Period”), each Developer in the Expedited Deliverability Study shall provide notice to the ISO, in writing and via electronic mail, stating whether it shall accept (an “Expedited Deliverability Study Acceptance Notice”) or not accept (an “Expedited Deliverability Study Non-Acceptance Notice”) the Deliverable MW, if any, reported to it by the ISO in the Expedited Deliverability Study report. Failure to notify the ISO by the prescribed deadline as to whether a Developer accepts or rejects its Deliverable MW, if any, will be deemed an Expedited Deliverability Study Non-Acceptance Notice. As soon as practicable following the end of the Expedited Deliverability Study Initial Decision Period, the ISO shall report to all

Class Year Developers, in writing and via electronic mail, all of the decisions submitted by Developers in the Expedited Deliverability Study.

At the end of the Expedited Deliverability Study Initial Decision Period, if one or more of the Developers provides an Expedited Deliverability Study Non-Acceptance Notice (such event an “Expedited Deliverability Study Non-Acceptance Event”), the Developer that provided the Expedited Deliverability Study Non-Acceptance Notice will be removed from the then current Expedited Deliverability Study and the ISO shall update the Expedited Deliverability Study results for those remaining Developers in the Expedited Deliverability Study to reflect the impact of the Projects withdrawn from the Expedited Deliverability Study. The revised Expedited Deliverability Study report shall include updated Deliverable MW, if any, and shall be issued within 10 Business Days following the occurrence of an Expedited Deliverability Study Non-Acceptance Event. Each remaining Developer shall be deemed to have accepted its respective Deliverable MW identified in the revised Expedited Deliverability Study report.

25.5.10 Additional SDU Studies

25.5.10.1 Notice of SDUs Requiring Additional Studies

If a new System Deliverability Upgrade is identified (*i.e.*, a System Deliverability Upgrade not previously identified and cost allocated in a Class Year Study and not substantially similar to a System Deliverability Upgrade previously identified and cost allocated in a Class Year Study), the ISO will notify all members of the ISO’s Interconnection Projects Facilities Study Working Group that the ISO has made such a determination, such notice to be provided as soon as practicable after the ISO presents the preliminary Class Year Deliverability Study results to stakeholders and the ISO Operating Committee approves such results. This notice will be referred to as the “Notice of SDUs Requiring Additional Study.” At the same time the ISO issues

the Notice of SDUs Requiring Additional Study, the ISO will issue a notice to only those Class Year Project Developers for which the ISO has identified System Deliverability Upgrades requiring additional SDU studies. Each Developer to which such notice is issued shall respond to the ISO within 10 Calendar Days to indicate whether it elects to (1) proceed or not proceed with an Additional SDU Study for the identified System Deliverability Upgrades; or (2) pursue one of multiple System Deliverability Upgrade alternatives identified by the ISO, which option Developer elects to be evaluated in the Additional SDU Study. If the Developer does not elect to pursue an Additional SDU Study for required System Deliverability Upgrades, it may only accept or reject its Deliverable MW, if any, in the Class Year Study. If the ISO does not receive the Developer's election by the deadline, the Developer will be deemed to have (1) notified the ISO that it elects to not proceed with an Additional SDU Study for the identified System Deliverability Upgrades; and (2) will only be permitted to accept or reject its Deliverable MW, if any, in the Class Year Study.

25.5.10.2 Additional SDU Studies

If no Class Year Project Developer to which the Notice of SDUs Requiring Additional Study is issued elects to proceed with such additional studies, the Class Year Study will proceed to the decision and settlement phase set forth in Section 25.8.2 of this Attachment S.

Alternatively, if any Class Year Project Developer to which the Notice of SDUs Requiring Additional Study is issued elects to proceed with such additional studies, the Class Year Study will proceed to the decision and settlement phase set forth in Section 25.8.2 of this Attachment S; however, the Additional SDU Study will be performed separate and apart from the Class Year Study; provided however, pursuant to Section 25.8.2 of this Attachment S, a Developer that elects to proceed with an Additional SDU Study has the option to proceed with the decision and

settlement phase with the rest of the Class Year for its SUF Project Cost Allocation and deliverable MW, if any.

If an Additional SDU Study is completed after the Class Year Study is approved by the NYISO Operating Committee but prior to the time that the ISO completes the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment study cases for the subsequent Class Year Study, a Developer that elected to proceed with an Additional SDU Study may proceed to decision and settlement pursuant to Section 25.8.2(2) of this Attachment S.

If a Developer is part of an Additional SDU Study that does not complete in time for the Developer to proceed to decision and settlement pursuant to Section 25.8.2 of this Attachment S, the following provisions apply:

- (1) The Developer will be required to enter a subsequent Class Year Study (*i.e.*, a Class Year Study subsequent to the one in which the Additional SDU Study was triggered) if it wishes to obtain an SDU Project Cost Allocation for its requested CRIS.
- (2) The Developer's election to enter a subsequent Class Year Study is subject to the applicable entry requirements of Section 25.5.9 and Section 30.8.1 of Attachment X; provided, however, a Developer that elects to enter the first such subsequent Class Year Study (*i.e.*, the first Class Year Study that commences after the Additional SDU Study commences) may provide notice of its election to enter such subsequent Class Year Study on or before completion of the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment study cases for the subsequent Class Year Study.

- (3) Election to enter into a subsequent Class Year Study will not constitute one of the two Class Years a Project may enter under Section 25.6.2.3.4 of Attachment S; provided, however, if the Developer enters a subsequent Class Year Study but rejects its SDU Project Cost Allocation for its requested CRIS, such action will constitute one of the two Class Years;
- (4) In a subsequent Class Year Study to evaluate the Developer's requested CRIS, the Additional SDU Studies will continue; provided, however, the base case used in the Additional SDU Studies will be updated based on the base case inclusion rules for that Class Year Study determined in accordance with Section 25.5.5.1 of this Attachment S.

If a Developer in Additional SDU Study accepted its SUF Project Cost Allocation pursuant to Section 25.8.2 of this Attachment S prior to the completion of the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment study cases for the subsequent Class Year Study, the Project and its SUF will be included in the Existing System Representation for the subsequent Class Year Study.

For purposes of determining the Class Year Start Date for the next Class Year Study, a Class Year Study is complete on the date upon which the Final Decision Round completes for the Class Year Study decision period commenced in accordance with Section 25.8 of this Attachment S; the date an Additional SDU Study is completed does not impact the Class Year Start Date for the next Class Year Study. The next Class Year Study may commence prior to completion of an Additional SDU Study if the Additional SDU Study has not completed before the Initial Decision Period commences for the Class Year Study in accordance with Section 25.8.2(1) of this Attachment S.

25.6 Class Year Study Cost Allocation Methodology For ERIS

25.6.1 Cost Allocation Between Developers and Connecting Transmission Owners (ATBA)

The cost of System Upgrade Facilities is first allocated between Developers and Connecting Transmission Owners, in accordance with the rules that are discussed below in this Section 25.6.1.

25.6.1.1 The cost of System Upgrade Facilities is allocated between Developers and Connecting Transmission Owners based upon the results of an Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment of the five-year need for System Upgrade Facilities. The Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment, as described in these rules, will be conducted by the ISO staff in cooperation with Market Participants. No Market Participant will have decisional control over any determinative aspect of the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment. The ISO and its staff will have decisional control over the entire Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment. If, at any time, the ISO staff decides that it needs specific expert services from entities such as Market Participants, consultants or engineering firms for it to conduct the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment, then the ISO will enter into appropriate contracts with such entities for such input. As it conducts each Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment, the ISO staff will provide regularly scheduled status reports and working drafts, with supporting data, to the Operating Committee to ensure that all affected Market Participants have an opportunity to contribute whatever information and input they believe might be helpful to the process. Each completed Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment will be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee. Each

Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment is reviewable by the ISO Board of Directors in accordance with provisions of the Commission-approved ISO Agreement.

25.6.1.1.1 The purpose of the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment is to identify the System Upgrade Facilities that Transmission Owners are expected to need during the five-year period covered by the Assessment to reliably meet the load growth and changes in the load pattern projected for the New York Control Area, with cost estimates for the System Upgrade Facilities.

25.6.1.1.1.1 Procedure for Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment

The procedure used to identify the System Upgrade Facilities that will ensure that New York State Transmission System facilities are sufficient to reliably serve existing load and meet load growth and changes in load patterns in compliance with NYSRC Reliability Rules, NPCC Basic Design and Operating Criteria, NERC Planning Standards, ISO rules, practices and procedures, and the Connecting Transmission Owner criteria included in FERC Form No. 715 (collectively “Applicable Reliability Requirements”). In order for the ISO to recognize any revisions to Connecting Transmission Owner criteria as Applicable Reliability Requirements under this Attachment S or Applicable Reliability Standards under Attachments X and Z, the Connecting Transmission Owner shall present proposed revisions to such criteria to the Operating Committee or one of its subcommittees. To the extent such revised criteria are not inconsistent with Order No. 2003 or the ISO’s interconnection procedures set forth in Attachments S, X and Z to the OATT, the ISO will accept such revised criteria. The procedure will use the Applicable Reliability Requirements in effect when the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment is commenced. The procedure will be:

- 25.6.1.1.1.1.1 The ISO staff will first develop the Existing System Representation.
- 25.6.1.1.1.1.2 The ISO staff will then utilize the Existing System Representation to develop existing system improvement plans with each Transmission Owner. These improvement plans will use ISO data from the annual NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report to project system load growth and changes in load patterns, including those that reflect demand side management, and will identify the System Upgrade Facilities needed year-by-year for the existing system to reliably serve projected load in the Transmission Owner’s Transmission District for a five-year period. The ISO staff will integrate these existing system improvement plans into the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment to ensure that the System Upgrade Facilities needed for a five-year period are identified on a New York State Transmission System-wide basis. The Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment will identify each anticipated System Upgrade Facility project, its estimated cost, its anticipated in-service date, and the status of the project (in construction, budget approval received, budget approval pending).
- 25.6.1.1.1.1.3 The ISO will identify in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment the System Upgrade Facilities needed to reliably meet projected load growth and changes in load pattern without the interconnection of any proposed Developer Projects, except for those proposed Projects included in the Existing System Representation pursuant to Section 25.5.5.
- 25.6.1.1.1.1.4 ISO staff will perform thermal, voltage, and stability analyses, as appropriate, to determine the normal and emergency transfer capabilities of the

statewide existing system. To the extent local thermal, voltage, and stability analyses were performed during a Large Facility's SRIS, such analyses will be relied upon in the Class Year Study, including the identification of System Upgrade Facilities required to mitigate adverse impacts under the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard. Estimates for the cost and timing to construct System Upgrade Facilities identified in the SRIS to mitigate local thermal, voltage or stability issues will be refined in the Class Year Study.

25.6.1.1.1.1.5 ISO staff will rely on the most recent resource reliability analysis of the existing system. If no Reliability Needs are required under the study assumptions used in the most recent resource reliability analysis, the existing system will be deemed to meet Applicable Reliability Requirements for purposes of the Class Year Study.

25.6.1.1.1.1.6 If the transmission and generation facilities included in the Existing System Representation, combined with previously approved and accepted System Upgrade Facilities, are insufficient to meet Applicable Reliability Requirements on a year by year basis, then the ISO staff will develop feasible generic solutions that satisfy the Applicable Reliability Requirements, in accordance with Section 25.6.1.2, below.

25.6.1.1.1.1.7 If the existing system meets Applicable Reliability Requirements, the ISO staff will perform short circuit analysis to determine whether there is sufficient interrupting capability in the existing system. If there are any breaker overloads, the ISO staff will determine the System Upgrade Facilities needed to mitigate the short circuit overloads.

- 25.6.1.1.1.1.8 A reassessment of Sections 25.6.1.1.1.1.4 through 25.6.1.1.1.1.6 shall be reassessed and, to the extent required by Good Utility Practice, repeated if the improvement plan impacts the transmission transfer capability of the system. The results of the short circuit analysis will be treated in the same manner as the results of thermal, voltage and stability analyses for all purposes under these cost allocation rules.
- 25.6.1.1.1.1.9 Each Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment conducted by ISO staff will be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee, and its effectiveness will be subject to the approval of the Operating Committee. In its report to the Operating Committee, the ISO shall explain its reasons for all of its recommendations.
- 25.6.1.1.1.1.10 Each most recently completed Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment will be reviewed the following year by the ISO staff and updated, as necessary, following the criteria and procedures described herein.
- 25.6.1.2 In developing solutions as required by Section 25.6.1.2.6, the ISO will, as it develops its own generic solutions, also utilize the following procedures.
- 25.6.1.2.1 The ISO will first select as generic solutions proposed Class Year Developer Projects sufficient to meet Applicable Reliability Requirements on a year by year basis. If a proposed Class Year Developer project is larger than necessary, the ISO shall select that portion or segment of the project that is sufficient to meet but not exceed Applicable Reliability Requirements. If the proposed Developer project is not capable of being segmented or if the Developer

project cannot meet Applicable Reliability Requirements on a year by year basis, the ISO shall not select it.

25.6.1.2.2 If the generation and transmission facilities included in the Existing System Representation, together with any proposed Developer Projects that qualify as solutions pursuant to Section 25.6.1.2.1, above, are not sufficient to meet Applicable Reliability Requirements, the ISO shall complete the development of its own generic solutions, taking into account any generic solutions proposed pursuant to Section 25.6.1.2.3, below, for inclusion in the ATBA.

25.6.1.2.3 Market Participants may also propose generic solutions for inclusion in the ATBA. The Market Participant proposing such solutions shall provide the ISO with all data necessary for the ISO to determine the feasibility of such proposed generic solutions.

25.6.1.2.4 The ISO shall develop and consider alternative sets of proposed generic solutions that fairly represent the range of feasible solutions to Applicable Reliability Requirements.

25.6.1.2.5 The ISO shall determine the feasibility of additional generic solutions developed pursuant to Sections 25.6.1.2.2, 25.6.1.2.3 and 25.6.1.2.3, according to the following criteria:

25.6.1.2.5.1 The ISO shall select only solutions that are based on proven technologies that have actually been licensed and financed, are under construction or have already been built in similar locations.

25.6.1.2.5.2 The ISO shall select as additional generic solutions only facilities that can reasonably be placed in service in time to meet Applicable Reliability Requirements on a year by year basis. In making this determination, the ISO shall consider the size and type of facility, access to fuel, access to transmission facilities, transmission upgrade requirements, construction time, and Good Utility Practice.

25.6.1.2.6 The ISO will submit its proposed generic solutions and the alternatives that it considered to Market Participants and to an independent expert for review and will make the results of the expert's review available to Market Participants. The independent expert shall review the feasibility of the proposed generic solutions developed pursuant to Sections 25.6.1.2.2, 25.6.1.2.3 and 25.6.1.2.3, and of generic solutions based on the segmentation of any Class Year developer Projects under Section 25.6.1.2.1, according to the criteria set forth in Section 25.6.1.2.5.

25.6.1.2.6.1 If the independent expert concludes that one or more generic is not feasible, the ISO shall eliminate that solution from further review.

25.6.1.2.6.2 If the ISO does not adopt the expert's recommendations, it will state in its report to the Operating Committee its reasons for not adopting those recommendations.

25.6.1.2.7 Subject to Section 25.6.1.2.7, below, in the event that more than one generic solution or set of solutions satisfies the feasibility requirement of Section 25.6.1.2.7, the ISO shall compare the System Upgrade Facilities that would be necessary to interconnect each such generic solution and shall adopt the solution

that is most consistent with Good Utility Practice. For these purposes, in comparing alternative solutions, a generic solution that satisfies sub-load pocket deficiencies shall normally be selected first.

25.6.1.2.7.1 The ISO shall be responsible for determining whether any generic solution or proposed Developer Project meets Applicable Reliability Requirements.

25.6.1.3 With the exception of those upgrades that were previously allocated to, and accepted by Developer Projects as a part of the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment in the Final Decision Round of previous Class Years, Developers are not responsible for the cost of any System Upgrade Facilities that are identified in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment, or any System Upgrade Facilities that resolve in whole or in part a deficiency in the system identified in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment.

25.6.1.4 Developers are responsible for 100% of the cost of the System Upgrade Facilities, not already identified in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment that are needed as a result of their Projects, and required for their Projects to reliably interconnect to the transmission system in a manner that meets the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard. The System Upgrade Facilities necessary to accommodate Developer Projects will be determined by the Interconnection Facilities Studies and the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment. The criteria and procedures that will be followed to conduct the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment are discussed below.

25.6.1.4.1 If a Connecting Transmission Owner or Developer elects to construct System Upgrade Facilities that are larger or more extensive than the minimum

facilities required to reliably interconnect the proposed project, and are reasonably related to the interconnection of the proposed project, then the Connecting Transmission Owner or Developer is responsible for the cost of those System Upgrade Facilities in excess of the minimum System Upgrade Facilities required by the Developer Projects. If there is Headroom associated with these larger System Upgrade Facilities and a Developer of any subsequent project interconnects and uses the Headroom within ten years of its creation, such subsequent Developer shall pay the Connecting Transmission Owner or the Developer for this Headroom in accordance with these rules, including Section 25.8.7, below.

25.6.1.5 The System Upgrade Facilities cost for which a Developer is responsible will be determined on a “net” basis; that is, the Developer’s System Upgrade Facilities cost will be determined net of the benefits, or System Upgrade Facility cost reductions, that result from the construction and operation of its project and the related upgrades. The net cost responsibility of a Developer will not be less than zero. Also, the cost responsibility of the Connecting Transmission Owner for System Upgrade Facilities will be no greater than it would have been without the Developer’s project. Specifically, the Connecting Transmission Owner shall not be required to pay (in total) more than 100% of the cost of installing a specific piece of equipment.

25.6.1.5.1 The purpose of this approach is to allocate to the Developer the responsibility for the cost of the net impact of its project on the needs of the transmission system for System Upgrade Facilities. Thus, a Developer is

responsible for the cost of the System Upgrade Facilities that are required by, or caused by, its project. A Developer is not responsible for the cost of System Upgrade Facilities that would be required anyway, without the construction of its project. If a Developer's project reduces the cost of System Upgrade Facilities that would be required anyway, that beneficial cost reducing impact will be recognized.

25.6.1.5.2 The net System Upgrade Facilities cost and cost reduction benefits of a Developer's project are determined by ISO staff comparing and netting the results of an Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment with the corresponding Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment in accordance with these rules.

25.6.1.5.3 The net System Upgrade Facilities cost and cost reduction benefits of a Developer's project are comprised of those costs and cost reduction benefits caused by (1) the construction of System Upgrade Facilities not contained in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment, and (2) eliminating or reducing the need for the construction of System Upgrade Facilities contained in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment, due to the construction of System Upgrade Facilities associated with the proposed project.

25.6.1.5.4 The Developer's net cost responsibility will be determined using constant dollars. That is, when netting the cost of System Upgrade Facilities required for its project, as identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, with those identified in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment, the cost of System Upgrade Facilities in the out-years of the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment and the out-years of the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment

will be discounted to a current year value for netting. The cost of out-year System Upgrade Facilities will be discounted to a current value using the weighted average cost of capital of the Connecting Transmission Owner.

25.6.2 Cost Allocation Among Developers (ATRA)

The Developers' share of the cost of System Upgrade Facilities is allocated among Developers based upon the ISO Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment. The Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment will be conducted by ISO staff to ensure New York State Transmission System compliance with Applicable Reliability Requirements. The ISO staff will conduct the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, as described in these rules, in cooperation with Market Participants. No Market Participant will have decisional control over any determinative aspect of the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment. The ISO and its staff will have decisional control over the entire Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment. If, at any time, the ISO staff decides that it needs specific expert services from entities such as Market Participants, consultants or engineering firms for it to conduct the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, then the ISO will enter into appropriate contracts with such entities for such input. As it conducts each Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, the ISO staff will provide regularly scheduled status reports and working drafts, with supporting data, to the Operating Committee to ensure that all affected Market Participants have an opportunity to contribute whatever information and input they believe might be helpful to the process. Each completed Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment will be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee. Each Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment is reviewable by the ISO Board of Directors in accordance with the provisions of the Commission-approved ISO Agreement.

25.6.2.1 The Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment for each Class Year will identify the System Upgrade Facilities required for all Class Year Projects, with cost estimates for the System Upgrade Facilities. The System Upgrade Facilities identified through the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment will only be those System Upgrade Facilities that are not already included in an Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment.

25.6.2.2 For each Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, the ISO will utilize the Existing System Representation used for the corresponding Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment.

25.6.2.3 Each Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment will update the results of Interconnection System Reliability Impact Studies that have previously been performed for certain proposed Projects.

25.6.2.3.1 Subject to the additional requirements in Sections 25.6.2.3.2 - 25.6.2.3.4, below, a Large Facility is eligible to have its project included in a given Class Year Study (*i.e.*, become a Class Year Project), if on or before the Class Year Start Date (i) the Operating Committee has approved (1) an Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study for the project performed pursuant to Attachment X of the ISO OATT or (2) a System Impact Study for the project performed pursuant to Attachment P to the ISO OATT, and (ii) the regulatory milestone has been satisfied in accordance with Sections 25.6.2.3.1.1, 25.6.2.3.1.2, or 25.6.2.3.1.3; provided, however, in lieu of satisfying a regulatory milestone by the Class Year Start Date, the Large Facility can, on or before the date by which a Developer is required to return a completed Class Year Interconnection Facilities

Study Agreement pursuant to Section 30.8.1 of Attachment X to the OATT,
either:

(1) demonstrate that the Developer has obtained for the Project (a) a New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (“NYSERDA”) Renewable Portfolio Standard agreement, (b) a NYSERDA Renewable Energy Certificate agreement (c) a NYSERDA Market Acceleration Incentive agreement, or (d) a power purchase agreement for the full output of the Large Facility; or

(2) submit a two-part deposit consisting of \$100,000, and \$3,000/MW for the requested ERIS of the Large Facility, or the requested ERIS of one or more Generators in a multi-unit Large Facility, for which the Project has not (1) obtained a NYSERDA or power purchase agreements specified above; or (2) satisfied a regulatory milestone set forth in Section 25.6.2.3.1 (*e.g.*, for a Co-located Storage Resource for which the Developer has only satisfied the regulatory milestone for the Energy Storage Resource but not the Intermittent Power Resource, the Developer may submit \$100,000 and \$3,000/MW for the requested ERIS of the Intermittent Power Resource).

The \$100,000 portion of the deposit submitted pursuant to subsection (ii)(2) of this Section 25.6.2.3.1 will be fully refundable if, within twelve months after the Class Year Start Date or the Operating Committee’s approval of the Class Year Study, whichever occurs first, the Developer satisfies an applicable regulatory milestone and provides the ISO with adequate documentation that the Large Facility has satisfied an applicable regulatory milestone. The \$3,000/MW deposit will be fully refundable upon the earlier of (a) the Large Facility’s

satisfaction of an applicable regulatory milestone; (b) the Large Facility's withdrawal from the Class Year Study, to the extent permitted by this Attachment S and by Attachment X to the ISO OATT; (c) the Large Facility's rejection of its Project Cost Allocation for System Upgrade Facilities in a Class Year Study; (d) the Large Facility's withdrawal from the ISO's interconnection queue; or (e) the Large Facility's acceptance of its Project Cost Allocation and posting of Security for System Upgrade Facilities in a Class Year Study. Upon a Large Facility's withdrawal from the ISO's interconnection queue, the \$3,000/MW deposit will be fully refundable with interest actually earned. For Class Year 2019, the \$3,000/MW deposit will be fully refundable for Projects that satisfy (ii)(1) of this Section 25.6.2.3.1. on or before March 1, 2020. The requirements set forth in this Section 25.6.2.3.1 do not apply to Projects that elect to enter a Class Year Study solely for the purpose of requesting CRIS.

25.6.2.3.1.1 The Developer must obtain or achieve at least one of the regulatory determinations or actions for the Large Facility, including all Generators for a multi-unit Large Facility, described in this Section 25.6.2.3.1.1. To satisfy the regulatory milestone, an applicable regulatory body (*e.g.*, local, state, or federal) must determine that the permitting application submitted to site and construct the Large Facility is complete, as described below:

25.6.2.3.1.1.1 In connection with the Large Facility's air or water permit application, either (i) a notice of determination of completeness mailed to the applicant by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation ("DEC") pursuant to 6 NYCRR § 621.6(c), as may be amended from time to time,

or public notice of a complete application in the Environmental Notice Bulletin, or (ii) in the absence of such notices, a demonstration that the permit application is deemed to be complete pursuant to 6 NYCRR § 621.6(h), as may be amended from time to time.

25.6.2.3.1.1.2 A negative declaration issued for the Large Facility pursuant to the New York State Environmental Quality Review Act (“SEQRA”) by (i) the lead agency if the review is conducted in a coordinated manner or (ii) one of the involved agencies if the review is conducted in an uncoordinated manner pursuant to the implementing regulations for SEQRA in [the](#) New York Codes, Rules and Regulations (“NYCRR”) at 6 [NYCRR Part 617.6](#)(b)(4), as amended from time to time.

25.6.2.3.1.1.3 Under SEQRA, either (i) a determination by the lead agency, documented in minutes or other official records, that the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Large Facility is adequate for public review, (ii) a notice of completion of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the project issued by the lead agency pursuant to SEQRA, or (iii) public notice of completion in the Environmental Notice Bulletin.

25.6.2.3.1.1.4 A determination pursuant to Article VII that the Article VII application filed for the Class Year Transmission Project or for a transmission portion of the Large Facility is in compliance with Public Service Law §122.

25.6.2.3.1.1.5 A Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Large Facility filed with the U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (“NEPA”) and its implementing regulations.

25.6.2.3.1.1.6 A final Finding of No Significant Impact for the project issued by the lead agency pursuant to NEPA and its implementing regulations.

25.6.2.3.1.1.7 For a Large Generator that is larger than 25 MW, a determination pursuant to Article 10 of the Public Service Law that the Article 10 application filed for the Large Generator is in compliance with Public Service Law § 164.

25.6.2.3.1.1.8 For a Large Generator, a determination pursuant to Section 94-C(5)(b) of the Executive Law that an application filed for a major renewable energy facility is deemed complete.

25.6.2.3.1.1.9 For a Large Generator that is an offshore wind facility on the outer continental shelf, a construction and operations plan deemed sufficient by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management for which the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has issued a Notice of Intent to prepare a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Large Facility in accordance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (“NEPA”) and its implementing regulations.

25.6.2.3.1.1.10 For a Large Facility with Attachment Facilities, System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades that require an Article VII application, a determination pursuant to Article VII that the Article VII application is in compliance with Public Service Law §122.

25.6.2.3.1.2 A Large Facility located outside New York State will satisfy the regulatory milestone by achieving Section 25.6.2.3.1.1.5 or 25.6.2.3.1.1.6, above,

or by satisfying a milestone comparable to that specified in Section 25.6.2.3.1.1.1 through 25.6.2.3.1.1.4, above, under applicable permitting laws.

25.6.2.3.1.3 In the event that none of the permitting processes referred to in Section 25.6.2.3.1.1 and 25.6.2.3.1.2 apply to the Large Facility, the Large Facility will be considered to have satisfied the regulatory milestone and will qualify for Class Year entry as of the date the Operating Committee approved the Large Facility's Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study.

25.6.2.3.1.4 After a Large Facility's Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study is approved by the Operating Committee and until the ISO confirms that the Large Facility has satisfied the regulatory milestone, the Developer must inform the ISO upon request, whether or not the Large Facility has satisfied the regulatory milestone described above. A project Developer must inform the ISO within ten (10) Business Days of the ISO's request for such information.

25.6.2.3.2 A project must satisfy the applicable regulatory milestone in Section 25.6.2.3.1.1, above, within six (6) months after the date the ISO tenders to the project Developer the Standard Large Generator Interconnection Agreement for the project pursuant to Section 30.11.1 of Attachment X to the ISO OATT.

25.6.2.3.3 If a project fails to satisfy the regulatory milestone within the time period set forth in Section 25.6.2.3.2 of this Attachment S, the Interconnection Request of the project will be deemed to be withdrawn in accordance with Section 30.3.6 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures contained in Attachment X.

25.6.2.3.4 Once a project has an Operating Committee-approved SRIS or the ISO has determined the project is required to enter a Class Year Study pursuant to

Attachment Z, then the project may enter up to two, but no more than two, of the next three consecutive Class Year Studies. The first Class Year with a Class Year Start Date after the date the Operating Committee approves a project's Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study will count as the first of the three consecutive Class Year Studies. For purposes of this Section 25.6.2.3.4, a Class Year that a project enters and from which it later withdraws for ERIS evaluation pursuant to Section 25.7.7.1 or 25.6.2.3.3 of this Attachment S or Section 30.8.1.2 of Attachment X, counts as one of the two Class Years a project may enter.

25.6.2.3.4.1 Except as provided in Section 25.6.2.3.4.3, the project must accept its System Upgrade Facilities cost allocation and post required security for Energy Resource Interconnection Service from a Class Year ATRA that is no later than the first to occur of either (i) the second Class Year ATRA the project enters, or (ii) the third consecutive Class Year that starts after the project satisfies the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the Class Year ATRA. If the project fails to accept its System Upgrade Facilities cost allocation and post security by this deadline, the Interconnection Request of the project will be deemed to be withdrawn in accordance with Section 30.3.6 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures contained in Attachment X.

25.6.2.3.4.2 Except as provided in Section 25.6.2.3.4.3, below, if a project has not accepted its System Upgrade Facilities cost allocation and posted required security for Energy Resource Interconnection Service from either the first or second Class Year that starts after the project satisfies the eligibility criteria for

inclusion in the Class Year ATRA and has not entered both the first and second such Class Year ATRA, then the project must enter the third Class Year ATRA (by satisfying the Class Year entry requirements set forth in Section 25.5.9 of this Attachment S and Section 30.8.1 of Attachment X). If the developer fails to do so within the timeframes specified in Attachments X or Z, as applicable, the Interconnection Request of the project will be deemed to be withdrawn in accordance with Section 30.3.6 of the Large Facilities Interconnection Procedures contained in Attachment X.

25.6.2.3.4.3 A project that was a member of a completed Class Year but did not accept its System Upgrade Facilities cost allocation and post any required security as of January 17, 2010 will be able to enter any one of the three consecutive Class Year ATRAs starting after that date. If the project enters one of these Class Year ATRAs and fails to accept its System Upgrade Facilities cost allocation and post required security, the Interconnection Request of the project will be deemed to be withdrawn in accordance with Section 30.3.6 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures. If the project has not entered either the first or second such Class Year, then the project must enter the third Class Year ATRA (by satisfying the Class Year entry requirements set forth in Section 25.5.9 of this Attachment S and Section 30.8.1 of Attachment X). If the Developer fails to do so within the timeframes specified in Attachments X or Z, as applicable, the Interconnection Request of the project will be deemed to be withdrawn in accordance with Section 30.3.6 of the Large Facilities Interconnection Procedures.

- 25.6.2.4 The Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment will update Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study results in accordance with the Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study procedures in Section 30.8 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X to the ISO OATT.
- 25.6.2.5 For Projects included in each Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, the Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study updated results will specify the impact of each project in the Class Year on the reliability of the transmission system, that is, the pro rata contribution of each project in the Class Year to each individual System Upgrade Facilities identified in the updates.
- 25.6.2.5.1 In the case of a new System Upgrade Facility that has a functional capacity not readily measured in amperes or other discrete electrical units, such as a System Upgrade Facility dedicated to system protection, the pro rata impact of each project in the Class Year on the reliability of the transmission system will be based upon the number of Projects in the Class Year contributing to the need for the new System Upgrade Facility. The pro rata impact of each project in the Class Year needing such a new System Upgrade Facility will be equal. Accordingly, the pro rata contribution of each of the Projects to the need for the new System Upgrade Facility will be equal to $(1/a)$, where “a” is the total number of Projects in the Class Year needing the new System Upgrade Facility.
- 25.6.2.5.2 In the case of a new System Upgrade Facility that has a capacity readily measured in amperes or other discrete electrical units, the impact of each project in the Class Year will be stated in terms of its pro rata contribution to the total electrical impact on each individual System Upgrade Facility in the Class Year of

all Projects that have at least a *de minimus* impact, as described in Section 25.6.2.6.1 of these rules. The contribution to electrical impact will be measured in various ways depending on the nature of the transmission problem primarily causing the need for the individual System Upgrade Facility.

25.6.2.5.2.1 Contribution to short circuit current for interrupting duty beyond the rating of equipment.

25.6.2.5.2.2 Contribution to MW loading on the critical element for thermal overloads under the test conditions that cause the need for a System Upgrade Facility. MW contribution will be calculated by multiplying the associated distribution factor by the declared maximum MW of the project. The distribution factor is calculated by pro rata displacement of New York System load by the added generation.

25.6.2.5.2.3 Contribution to voltage drop on the most critical bus for voltage problems. A critical bus will be defined as representative for voltage conditions during a specific contingency. The pro rata impact of each project is measured as the ratio of the voltage drop at the critical bus caused by the project when none of the other Projects are represented, to the voltage drop at the critical bus when all of the Projects in the Class Year are represented.

25.6.2.5.2.4 Contribution to transient stability problems as measured by the fault current calculated for the most critical stability test that is causing the need for the System Upgrade Facility.

25.6.2.6 For each individual electrical impact standard listed in subsections 6.(a)(1) through 6.(a)(4) below, a Developer will not be responsible for the cost associated with a corresponding System Upgrade Facility if its project's contribution is less

than the *de minimus* impacts defined below. The costs of Projects that would otherwise have been allocated to certain Developer's Projects but for the sub-*de minimus* impact exemption, shall be allocated 100 percent to the other Developers in the Class Year according to their pro rata contribution.

25.6.2.6.1 *De minimus* impact is defined in terms of any one of the factors listed below in this subsection. Examples of computations used to determine *de minimus* impact are shown in ISO Procedures.

25.6.2.6.1.1 **Short Circuit Contribution:** Equal to or greater than 100 amperes of the existing rating of the equipment that needs to be replaced.

25.6.2.6.1.2 **Thermal Loadings:** Equal to or greater than 10 MW on the most limiting monitored element under the most critical contingency that is causing the need for transmission improvements.

25.6.2.6.1.3 **Voltage Effects:** Equal to or greater than 2% of the voltage drop occurring with all Class Year Projects at the most critical bus.

25.6.2.6.1.4 **Stability Effects:** Equal to or greater than 100 amperes of the fault current for the most critical stability test that is causing the need for the System Upgrade Facility.

25.6.2.7 The pro rata contribution of each project in the Class Year to each of the System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment.

25.6.2.7.1 First, in accordance with Section 25.6.1.5 of these rules, the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment is compared and netted with the total cost of System Upgrade

Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment. If the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment does not exceed the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment, then there is no cost to be allocated among Class Year Developers.

25.6.2.7.2 If the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment does exceed the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment by some amount, then this amount (“Overage Cost”) is a cost to be allocated among Class Year Developers. Appendix One to this Attachment S sets out an example of an allocation of Overage Cost among Class Year Developers.

25.6.2.7.3 The Overage Cost represents a percentage of the total cost of System Upgrade Facilities identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment (“Overage Cost Percentage”).

25.6.2.7.4 Each System Upgrade Facility identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment has a cost specified for it in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment.

25.6.2.7.5 The pro rata contribution of each project in the Class Year to a System Upgrade Facility identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment represents a percentage contribution to the need for that System Upgrade Facility (“Contribution Percentage”).

25.6.2.7.6 An individual Developer’s pro rata responsibility for the cost of each System Upgrade Facility identified in the Annual Transmission Reliability

Assessment is the product of (a) the Overage Cost Percentage; (b) the Developer's Contribution Percentage for the particular System Upgrade Facility; and (c) the cost of the particular System Upgrade Facility as specified in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment.

25.6.2.7.7 If the least cost solution identified is to install one System Upgrade Facility (*e.g.*, a series reactor) rather than replacing a number of System Upgrade Facilities (*e.g.*, breakers), the ISO staff will determine each Developer's Contribution Percentage by calculating what each Developer's pro rata contribution would have been on the System Upgrade Facilities not replaced (*e.g.*, breakers) and applying that percentage to the System Upgrade Facility that is installed (*e.g.*, series reactor).

25.7 Deliverability Studies and Cost Allocation Methodology for CRIS

25.7.1 Class Year Deliverability Study and Non-Class Year Expedited Deliverability Study

A Developer requesting CRIS for a Project larger than 2 MW may elect to enter either a Class Year Study or an Expedited Deliverability Study; provided however, a Developer may not be evaluated in both studies simultaneously (i.e., a Developer with CRIS being evaluated in a Class Year Study may not enter an Expedited Deliverability Study for evaluation of the same CRIS request until the Class Year Study has completed. A Developer with CRIS being evaluated in an Expedited Deliverability Study may not enter a Class Year Study for evaluation of the same CRIS request until the Expedited Deliverability Study has completed). A Class Year Study deliverability evaluation first evaluates whether a Project satisfies the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard at its full amount of requested CRIS. If a Project is not deliverable for its full amount of requested CRIS, the Class Year Study proceeds to identify and cost allocate System Deliverability Upgrades required to make the Project fully deliverable for the full amount of requested CRIS. An Expedited Deliverability Study only evaluates whether a Project satisfies the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard at its full amount of requested CRIS; it does not identify or cost allocate System Deliverability Upgrades. A Developer evaluated in an Expedited Deliverability Study and deemed undeliverable at its full amount of requested CRIS may (1) enter the next Open Class Year Study to obtain a Project Cost Allocation for required System Deliverability Upgrades; or (2) enter into a subsequent Expedited Deliverability Study or Class Year Study with the same or different CRIS request.

25.7.1.1 Cost Allocation Among Developers in a Class Year

Each Project in a Class Year Deliverability Study (“Class Year CRIS Project”) will share in the then currently available deliverability capability of the New York State Transmission System, and will also share in the cost of any System Deliverability Upgrades required for its Project to qualify for CRIS at the requested level. The total cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades required for all the Projects in the Class Year will be allocated among the Projects in the Class Year based on the pro rata impact of each Class Year CRIS Project on the deliverability of the New York State Transmission System, that is, the pro rata contribution of each Project in the Class Year Deliverability Study to the total cost of each of the System Deliverability Upgrades identified in the Class Year Deliverability Study. In addition to this allocation of cost responsibility for System Deliverability Upgrades among the Projects in a Class Year, the cost of certain Highway System Deliverability Upgrades will be shared with Load Serving Entities and subsequent Developers, as described below in Section 25.7.12 of these rules.

25.7.1.2 Expedited Deliverability Study

The Expedited Deliverability Study shall be performed concurrently for all Projects that meet the entry requirements set forth in Section 25.5.9.2.1 of this Attachment S as a combined Expedited Deliverability Study.

25.7.2 Categories of transmission facilities

For purposes of applying the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard, transmission facilities comprising the New York State Transmission System will be categorized as either Byways or Highways or Other Interfaces.

25.7.2.1 Byways

The Developer of a Class Year CRIS Project will pay its pro rata share of one hundred percent (100%) of the cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades to any Byway needed to make the Class Year CRIS Project deliverable in accordance with these rules. The System Deliverability Upgrades on the Byway or Byways will be identified by the ISO, with input from the Connecting Transmission Owner and from the Affected Transmission Owner(s), in the Class Year Deliverability Study.

The Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing a System Deliverability Upgrade on a Byway shall request Incremental TCCs with respect to the System Deliverability Upgrade in accordance with the requirements of Section 19.2.4 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT. A Developer paying to upgrade a Byway will receive the right to accept any Incremental TCCs awarded by the ISO in proportion to its contribution to the total cost of the System Deliverability Upgrade. The ISO shall round any non-whole MW quantities to a whole number of Incremental TCCs in a manner that ensures that the sum of all individual allocations to eligible entities is equal to the total number of Incremental TCCs awarded to the System Deliverability Upgrade; provided, however, that a Developer will not be entitled to receive any Incremental TCCs if the whole number value determined by the ISO for the Developer's proportionate share is zero. If a Developer elects to accept its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs resulting from the System Deliverability Upgrade, the Developer shall be the Primary Holder of such Incremental TCCs. If a Developer declines an award of its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs resulting from the System Deliverability Upgrade, or subsequently terminates the Incremental TCCs it elected to receive in accordance with Section 19.2.4.9 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT, the declined or terminated Incremental TCCs will be deemed reserved to the extent necessary to facilitate the potential for transfers to subsequent

Developers that pay for the use of Headroom pursuant to this Attachment S on a System Deliverability Upgrade that has been awarded Incremental TCCs. Incremental TCCs that are declined or terminated by a Developer and not otherwise deemed reserved will be deemed permanently terminated. Incremental TCCs related to a System Deliverability Upgrade that were previously deemed reserved as a result of prior declination or termination will be deemed permanently terminated when the Headroom on the System Deliverability Upgrade ceases to exist or is otherwise reduced to zero in accordance with Section 25.8.7.4 of this Attachment S.

A Developer paying to upgrade a Byway will be eligible to receive Headroom payments in accordance with these rules. A subsequent Developer paying for use of Headroom on a System Deliverability Upgrade on a Byway will be entitled to receive Incremental TCCs, to the extent Incremental TCCs have been awarded by the ISO for the System Deliverability Upgrade, in proportion to its contribution to the total cost of the System Deliverability Upgrade, as determined based on its required Headroom payments. The ISO shall round any non-whole MW quantities to a whole number of Incremental TCCs in a manner that ensures that the sum of all individual allocations to eligible entities is equal to the total number of Incremental TCCs awarded to the System Deliverability Upgrade; provided, however, that a subsequent Developer will not be entitled to receive any Incremental TCCs if the whole number value determined by the ISO for the subsequent Developer's proportionate share is zero. If a Developer that initially paid for a System Deliverability Upgrade on a Byway elected to receive its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade and continues to hold such Incremental TCCs, any Incremental TCCs that a subsequent Developer is eligible to receive will be made available by reducing the Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade held by the Developer that initially paid for the System Deliverability Upgrade in

proportion to the Headroom payments received by such Developer from the subsequent Developer making such Headroom payments. If a Developer that initially paid for a System Deliverability Upgrade on a Byway declined to receive its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade or subsequently terminated the Incremental TCCs it elected to receive, any Incremental TCCs that a subsequent Developer is eligible to receive will be made available from the Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade that were previously deemed reserved as a result of prior declination or termination in proportion to the Headroom payments received by the Developer that initially paid for the System Deliverability Upgrade from the subsequent Developer making such Headroom payments. If a subsequent Developer elects to accept its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs, the subsequent Developer shall be the Primary Holder of such Incremental TCCs; provided, however, that Incremental TCCs that were previously deemed reserved and are transferred to a subsequent Developer will become effective on the first day of the Capability Period that commences following the next Centralized TCC Auction conducted after the subsequent Developer makes the necessary Headroom payment and elects to receive its proportionate share of Incremental TCCs. If a subsequent Developer declines an award of its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs resulting from its Headroom payments, or subsequently terminates the Incremental TCCs it elected to receive in accordance with Section 19.2.4.9 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT, the declined or terminated Incremental TCCs will be deemed permanently terminated.

Any Incremental TCCs resulting from a System Deliverability Upgrade on a Byway, regardless of the Primary Holder thereof, may not be sold or transferred through a Centralized TCC Auction, Reconfiguration Auction or the Secondary Market.

25.7.2.2 Highways

The Developer of a Class Year CRIS Project will pay an allocated share of the cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades to any Highway needed to make the Class Year Project deliverable in accordance with these rules. The System Deliverability Upgrades on the Highway or Highways, and the Developer's allocated share of the cost of those System Deliverability Upgrades, will be identified by the ISO, with input from the Connecting Transmission Owner and from the Affected Transmission Owner(s), in the Class Year Deliverability Study.

The Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade shall request Incremental TCCs with respect to the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade in accordance with the requirements of Section 19.2.4 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT. A Developer paying for Highway System Deliverability Upgrades will receive the right to accept any Incremental TCCs awarded by the ISO, in proportion to its contribution to the total cost of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade. The ISO shall round any non-whole MW quantities to a whole number of Incremental TCCs in a manner that ensures that the sum of all individual allocations to eligible entities is equal to the total number of Incremental TCCs awarded to the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade; provided, however, that a Developer will not be entitled to receive any Incremental TCCs if the whole number value determined by the ISO for the subsequent Developer's proportionate share is zero. If a Developer elects to accept its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs resulting from the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, the Developer shall be the Primary Holder of such Incremental TCCs. If a Developer declines an award of its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs resulting from the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, or subsequently terminates the Incremental TCCs it elected to receive in accordance with Section 19.2.4.9 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT, the declined or terminated Incremental TCCs will be deemed

reserved to the extent necessary to facilitate the potential for transfers to subsequent Developers that pay for the use of Headroom pursuant to this Attachment S on a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade that has been awarded Incremental TCCs. Incremental TCCs that are declined or terminated by a Developer and not otherwise deemed reserved will be deemed permanently terminated. Incremental TCCs related to a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade that were previously deemed reserved as a result of prior declination or termination will be deemed permanently terminated when the Headroom on the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade ceases to exist or is otherwise reduced to zero in accordance with Section 25.8.7.4 of this Attachment S.

The Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade shall also be awarded, and be the Primary Holder of, any Incremental TCCs related to the portion of a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade funded by Load Serving Entities pursuant to Section 25.7.12 of this Attachment S, in proportion to the contribution of the Load Serving Entities to the total cost of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade. The ISO shall round any non-whole MW quantities to a whole number of Incremental TCCs in a manner that ensures that the sum of all individual allocations to eligible entities is equal to the total number of Incremental TCCs awarded to the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade; provided, however, that no Incremental TCCs will be awarded to the Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade for the portion of a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade funded by Load Serving Entities if the whole number value determined by the ISO for the Load Serving Entities' proportionate share is zero.

A Developer paying for a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade will be eligible to receive Headroom payments in accordance with these rules to the extent that it pays for System Deliverability Upgrade capacity in excess of that required to provide the requested level of CRIS and Load Serving Entities have not funded a portion of the costs of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade pursuant to Section 25.7.12 of this Attachment S. If Load Serving Entities have funded a portion of a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade pursuant to Section 25.7.12 of this Attachment S, the Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade will be eligible to receive any and all Headroom payments related to the System Deliverability Upgrade in accordance with these rules on behalf, and for the benefit, of the Load Serving Entities that funded a portion of the System Deliverability Upgrade.

A subsequent Developer paying for use of Headroom on System Deliverability Upgrades will be entitled to receive Incremental TCCs, to the extent Incremental TCCs have been awarded by the ISO for the System Deliverability Upgrade, in proportion to its contribution to the total cost of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, as determined based on its required Headroom payments. The ISO shall round any non-whole MW quantities to a whole number of Incremental TCCs in a manner that ensures that the sum of all individual allocations to eligible entities is equal to the total number of Incremental TCCs awarded to the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade; provided, however, that a subsequent Developer will not be entitled to receive any Incremental TCCs if the whole number value determined by the ISO for the Developer's proportionate share is zero. If: (i) a Developer that initially paid for a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade paid for capacity in excess of that required to provide its requested level of CRIS; (ii) Load Serving Entities have not funded a portion of the costs of the

Highway System Deliverability Upgrade pursuant to Section 25.7.12 of this Attachment S; and (iii) the Developer elected to receive its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade and continues to hold such Incremental TCCs, any Incremental TCCs that a subsequent Developer is eligible to receive will be made available by reducing the Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade held by the Developer that initially funded the System Deliverability Upgrade in proportion to the Headroom payments received by such Developer from the subsequent Developer making such Headroom payments. If: (i) a Developer that initially paid for a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade paid for capacity in excess of that required to provide its requested level of CRIS; (ii) Load Serving Entities have not funded a portion of the costs of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade pursuant to Section 25.7.12 of this Attachment S; and (iii) the Developer declined to receive its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade or subsequently terminated the Incremental TCCs it elected to receive, any Incremental TCCs that a subsequent Developer is eligible to receive will be made available from the Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade that were previously deemed reserved as a result of prior declination or termination in proportion to the Headroom payments received by the Developer that initially paid for the System Deliverability Upgrade from the subsequent Developer making such Headroom payments. If Load Serving Entities have funded a portion of a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade pursuant to Section 25.7.12 of this Attachment S, any Incremental TCCs that a subsequent Developer is eligible to receive will be made available by reducing the Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade held by the Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing the System Deliverability Upgrade. If a subsequent Developer elects to accept its proportionate share of any Incremental

TCCs, the subsequent Developer shall be the Primary Holder of such Incremental TCCs; provided, however, that Incremental TCCs that were previously deemed reserved and are transferred to a subsequent Developer will become effective on the first day of the Capability Period that commences following the next Centralized TCC Auction conducted after the subsequent Developer makes the necessary Headroom payment and elects to receive its proportionate share of Incremental TCCs. If a subsequent Developer declines an award of its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs resulting from its Headroom payments, or subsequently terminates the Incremental TCCs it elected to receive in accordance with Section 19.2.4.9 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT, the declined or terminated Incremental TCCs will be deemed permanently terminated.

Any Incremental TCCs resulting from a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, regardless of the Primary Holder thereof, may not be sold or transferred through a Centralized TCC Auction, Reconfiguration Auction or the Secondary Market.

25.7.2.3 Other Interfaces

If the Class Year CRIS Project degrades the transfer capability of any one of the Other Interfaces below the transfer capability identified in the current ATBA, then the Developer will pay its pro rata share of one hundred percent (100%) of the cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades needed to restore the transfer capability of the Other Interfaces degraded by its proposed Project to what the transfer capability of those Other Interfaces would have been without its Project, as that transfer capability was measured in the current ATBA. Where two or more Projects would cause degradation of an Other Interface's transfer capability, the cost of the necessary System Deliverability Upgrades to restore the original transfer capability of the

interface shall be shared on a pro rata basis, based on the MW of degradation that each Project would cause.

25.7.3 Capacity Regions

The deliverability test will be applied within each of the four (4) Capacity Regions: (1) Rest of State (i.e., Load Zones A through F); (2) Lower Hudson Valley (i.e., Load Zones G, H and I); (3) New York City (i.e., Load Zone J); and (4) Long Island (i.e., Load Zone K). To be declared deliverable a generator or Class Year Transmission Project must only be deliverable, at its requested CRIS MW, throughout the Capacity Region in which the Project is interconnected or is interconnecting, or, if requesting External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights, throughout the Rest of State Capacity Region. For example, starting with Class Year 2012, a proposed generator or Class Year Transmission Project interconnecting in the Rest of State Capacity Region (i.e., Load Zones A-F) will be required to demonstrate deliverability throughout the Rest of State Capacity Region (i.e., Load Zones A-F), but will not be required to demonstrate deliverability to or within any of the following Capacity Regions: Lower Hudson Valley (i.e., Load Zones G, H and I); New York City (i.e., Load Zone J); or Long Island (i.e., Load Zone K).

25.7.4 Participation in Capacity Markets

A Developer, in order to be eligible to become an Installed Capacity Supplier or receive Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights or External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights, must obtain CRIS pursuant to the procedures set forth in this Attachment S. A Developer must enter a Class Year Deliverability Study or Expedited Deliverability Study in order to obtain CRIS, unless otherwise provided for in this Attachment S. The MW amount of CRIS requested by a Developer, stated in MW of Installed Capacity (“ICAP”), cannot exceed the MW levels specified in Sections 25.8.1 of this Attachment S. All requests for CRIS must be in tenths of a MW. The

ISO will perform the Class Year Deliverability Study and Expedited Deliverability Study in accordance with these rules and with input of Market Participants, to determine the deliverability of the Projects requesting CRIS in each study. The Expedited Deliverability Study will only determine the extent to which the Project is deliverable at the full amount of requested CRIS. The Class Year Deliverability Study will determine deliverability at the full amount of requested CRIS and, if not deliverable, will identify and allocate the cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades needed to make deliverable each Class Year CRIS Project. In order to be eligible to become an Installed Capacity Supplier or receive Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights or External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights, a Developer must be found fully deliverable at the requested CRIS level in an Expedited Deliverability Study or, in a Class Year Study, either (1) accept its deliverable MW in a Class Year Study or Expedited Deliverability Study; or (2) fund or commit to fund, in accordance with these rules, the System Deliverability Upgrades needed for its Project to be deliverable at the requested level of CRIS.

25.7.5 The Pre-Existing System

Where the Existing System Representation demonstrates deliverability issues, a Developer electing CRIS need only address the incremental deliverability of its CRIS request, not the deliverability of the pre-existing system depicted in the Existing System Representation. Likewise, Transmission Owners will not be responsible for curing any pre-existing issues related to the deliverability of generators.

25.7.6 CRIS Values

Through a Class Year Study, a Developer may elect no CRIS, partial CRIS, or full CRIS for its Project by satisfying the applicable sections of this Attachment S. Through an Expedited

Deliverability Study, a Developer may elect CRIS or partial CRIS to the extent its requested CRIS is deliverable pursuant to the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard.

Each Project qualifying for CRIS will have two CRIS values per Project: one for the Summer Capability Period and one for the Winter Capability Period. For Projects comprised of multiple Generators, the Project's CRIS, subject to the maximum permissible requested CRIS pursuant to Section 25.8.1 of this Attachment S, shall be allocated among the multiple Generators, and shall be allocated among the multiple Generators, as requested by Developer (to the extent permissible under Section 25.8.1 of this Attachment S). The Project's CRIS and allocation of CRIS among its units, as applicable, will be specified by ISO in the Class Year Deliverability Study report approved by the ISO Operating Committee.

The Project's CRIS value for the Summer Capability Period will be set using the deliverability test methodology and procedures described below. Through the Winter Capability Period 2017/2018, the Project's CRIS value for the Winter Capability Period will be set at a value that will maintain the same proportion of CRIS to ERIS as the Project has for the Summer Capability Period. For Winter Capability Periods beyond 2017/2018, the Project's CRIS value for the Winter Capability Period will be determined by the applicable process below:

25.7.6.1 Winter CRIS will be calculated as follows:

Winter CRIS MW = (Summer CRIS MW x Maximum Net Output at 10 degrees Fahrenheit)/Maximum Net Output at 90 degrees Fahrenheit

Where:

Maximum Net Output at 10 degrees Fahrenheit = the Project's maximum net output at 10 degrees Fahrenheit determined pursuant to the Project's ISO-approved temperature curve; and

Maximum Net Output at 90 degrees Fahrenheit = the Project's maximum net output at 90 degrees Fahrenheit determined pursuant to the Project's ISO-approved temperature curve.

25.7.6.1.1 For facilities with Summer CRIS as of December 16, 2017, the following additional provision applies: For such facilities for which there is an ISO-accepted temperature curve used for determining the Project's DMNC, Winter CRIS will be calculated using such temperature curve, provided the capability represented by the curve does not exceed the Project's ERIS. For facilities for which there is not an ISO-accepted temperature curve used for determining the Project's DMNC, Winter CRIS will be set equal to the Project's Summer CRIS unless the Project provides a temperature curve to the ISO by December 16, 2017, that the ISO subsequently determines is acceptable.

25.7.6.1.2 For facilities first obtaining Summer CRIS on or after December 16, 2017, the Winter CRIS will be determined using the most recent temperature curve provided to and accepted by the ISO, either during the interconnection process or at the time the Summer CRIS is first obtained.

25.7.6.2 Upon an increase to a Project's Summer CRIS pursuant to a permissible increase in Summer CRIS under Section 25.9.4 of this Attachment S, Attachment X, Section 30.3.2.6 or Attachment Z, Section 32.4.11.1 (increases in CRIS not requiring a Class Year Study) or pursuant to an increase in Summer CRIS evaluated in a Class Year Study for which a Developer accepts its Project Cost Allocation for System Deliverability Upgrades and posts Security therefore (if applicable) or accepts its Deliverable MWs, the Winter CRIS will be determined using the formula set forth in Section 25.7.6 (i), wherein the Summer CRIS MW will be the increased Summer CRIS MW.

25.7.7 Deliverability Study Procedures

25.7.7.1 Class Year Deliverability Study Procedures

The ISO staff will conduct the Class Year Deliverability Study, as described in these rules, in cooperation with Market Participants. No Market Participant will have decisional control over any determinative aspect of the Class Year Deliverability Study. The ISO and its staff will have decisional control over the entire Class Year Deliverability Study. If, at any time, the ISO staff decides that it needs specific expert services from entities such as Market Participants, consultants or engineering firms for it to conduct the Class Year Deliverability Study, then the ISO will enter into appropriate contracts with such entities for such input. The ISO shall utilize existing studies to the extent practicable when it performs the study, including but not limited to SRIS deliverability analyses performed pursuant to Section 30.7.3.2 and 30.7.4.2 of Attachment X to the OATT. As it conducts each Class Year Deliverability Study, the ISO staff will provide regularly scheduled status reports and working drafts, with supporting data, to the Operating Committee or an Operating Committee subcommittee to ensure that all affected Market Participants have an opportunity to contribute whatever information and input they believe might be helpful to the process. Each completed Class Year Deliverability Study will be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee, when the Operating Committee approves the ATRA for the same Class Year. Each Class Year Deliverability Study is reviewable by the ISO Board of Directors in accordance with the provisions of the Commission-approved ISO Agreement.

Starting with Class Year 2019, if the ISO determines that an Additional SDU Study is required pursuant to Section 25.5.10 of this Attachment S, ISO will notify all Class Year Projects that such Additional SDU Study will be conducted, such notice to be provided as soon as

practicable after the ISO receives notice from Developers in response to the Notice of SDU Requiring Additional Study.

25.7.7.2 Expedited Deliverability Study Procedures

The ISO staff will conduct the Expedited Deliverability Study, as described in these rules in cooperation with Market Participants. No Market Participant will have decisional control over any determinative aspect of the Expedited Deliverability Study. The ISO and its staff will have decisional control over the entire Expedited Deliverability Study. If, at any time, the ISO staff decides that it needs specific expert services from entities such as Market Participants, consultants or engineering firms for it to conduct the Expedited Deliverability Study, then the ISO will enter into appropriate contracts with such entities for such input. The ISO shall utilize existing studies to the extent practicable when it performs the study, including but not limited to SRIS deliverability analyses performed pursuant to Section 30.7.3.2 and 30.7.4.2 of Attachment X to the OATT. As it conducts each Expedited Deliverability Study, the ISO staff will provide regularly scheduled status reports and working drafts, with supporting data, to the Operating Committee or an Operating Committee subcommittee to ensure that all affected Market Participants have an opportunity to contribute whatever information and input they believe might be helpful to the process. Each completed Expedited Deliverability Study will be reviewed and approved by the Operating Committee. Each Expedited Deliverability Study is reviewable by the ISO Board of Directors in accordance with the provisions of the Commission-approved ISO Agreement.

25.7.8 Deliverability Test Methodology for Highways and Byways

25.7.8.1 Definition of NYCA Deliverability

The NYCA transmission system shall be able to deliver the aggregate of NYCA capacity resources to the aggregate of the NYCA load under summer peak load conditions. This is accomplished, in the Class Year Study, through ensuring the deliverability of each Class Year CRIS Project, in the Capacity Region where the Project interconnects. This is accomplished, in the Expedited Deliverability Study, through ensuring the deliverability of each Class Year CRIS Request, in the Capacity Region where the Project interconnects.

25.7.8.2 NYCA Deliverability Testing Methodology

25.7.8.2.1 Class Year Study

25.7.8.2.1.1 The current Class Year ATBA, developed in accordance with ISO Procedures, will serve as the starting point for the deliverability baseline for testing under summer peak system conditions, subject to ISO Procedures and the following:

All Class Year CRIS Projects will be evaluated on an aggregate Class Year basis. Deliverability will be determined through a shift from generation to generation within the Capacity Regions in New York State. Each Capacity Region will be tested on an individual basis.

25.7.8.2.1.2 Each entity requesting External CRIS Rights will request a certain number of MW to be evaluated for deliverability pursuant to Section 25.7.11 of this Attachment S. The MW of an entity requesting External CRIS Rights will not be derated for the deliverability analysis.

25.7.8.2.1.3 Each Developer requesting CRIS will request that a certain number of MW be evaluated for deliverability, such MW not to exceed the maximum levels set forth in Section 25.8.1 of this Attachment S. The MW requested by a Developer will represent Installed Capacity, and will be derated for the deliverability analysis. The MW requested by a Resource with an Energy Duration Limitation will represent Installed Capacity based on the Developer-selected duration (i.e., its expected maximum injection capability in MW hours for the Developer-selected duration) and will also be derated for the deliverability analysis. At the conclusion of the analysis, the ISO will reconvert only the deliverable MW and report them in terms of MW of Installed Capacity using the same derating factor utilized at the beginning of the deliverability analysis.

A derated generator capacity incorporating availability is used. This derated generator capacity is based on the unforced capacity or “UCAP” or Net UCAP, as applicable, of each resource and can be referred to as the UCAP Deration Factor (“UCDF”). The UCDF used is the average from historic ICAP to UCAP translations on a Capacity Region basis, as determined in accordance with ISO Procedures. For Class Years prior to and including Class Year 2017, this is the average EFORD, which will be used for all non intermittent ICAP providers. The UCDF for intermittent resources will be calculated based on their resource type in accordance with ISO Procedures. For Class Years commencing after the completion of Class Year 2017, the UCDF used is the average EFORD, which will be used for all ICAP providers that are not Intermittent Power Resources

(resources that are not Intermittent Power Resources include Energy Storage Resources). The UCDF for Intermittent Power Resources will be calculated based on their resource type in accordance with ISO Procedures.

Resources with an Energy Duration Limitations evaluated for CRIS will be derated to reflect the Developers' selected duration. Facilities comprised of Generators of different technologies will be derated using a blended UCDF that combines the UCDF of the individual Generators within the Project; provided however, that if the Project includes load reduction, the load reduction would not impact the UCDF of the Project.

The UCDF factor for proposed Projects will be applied to the requested CRIS level. For facilities modeled in the ATBA, the UCDF will be applied to their CRIS level.

Existing CRIS that will be modeled in the Class Year Study shall include: existing CRIS for facilities not being evaluated in the Class Year Study regardless of outage state, unless that CRIS will expire prior to the scheduled completion of the applicable Class Year study or the CRIS is associated with a Retired facility that cannot transfer such rights prior to CRIS expiration. For purposes of this Section 25.7.8.2.1.3, "existing CRIS" is CRIS that has been obtained through Attachment S and that has not expired. For Projects that have undergone a prior Class Year Study deliverability evaluation, "existing CRIS" is CRIS obtained upon completion of a Class Year Study through which the Developer accepted its deliverable MW or accepted its Project Cost Allocation and posted Security for System Deliverability Upgrades, as applicable. For Projects that undergo an

Expedited Deliverability Study deliverability evaluation, “existing CRIS” is considered to be CRIS that is obtained upon completion of an Expedited Deliverability Study through which the Developer was deemed to have accepted its deliverable MW in an Expedited Deliverability Study completed prior to the Class Year Study Start Date.

- 25.7.8.2.1.4 Load uncertainties will be addressed in accordance with ISO Procedures by taking the impact of Load Forecast Uncertainty (“LFU”) from the most recent base case IRM and applying it to load.
- 25.7.8.2.1.5 Deliverability base case conditioning steps will be consistent with those used for the Reliability Planning Process and Area Transmission Review transfer limit calculation methodology.
- 25.7.8.2.1.6 In deliverability testing, Emergency transfer criteria and contingency testing will be in conformance with NYSRC rules and correspond to that used in the Reliability Planning Process studies.
- 25.7.8.2.1.7 The NYISO will monitor all transmission facilities that are part of the New York State Transmission System.
- 25.7.8.2.1.8 When either the voltage or stability transfer limit of an interface calculated in the ATBA is more binding than the calculated thermal transfer limit, then the lower of the ATBA voltage or stability transfer limit will be included in the deliverability testing as a proxy limit.
- 25.7.8.2.1.9 External system imports will be adjusted as necessary to eliminate or minimize overloads, other than the following external system imports: (i) the grandfathered import contract rights listed in Attachment E to the Installed

Capacity Manual, (ii) the operating protocols set forth in Schedule C of Attachment CC to the OATT, (iii) the appropriate rules for reflecting PJM service to RECo load, (iv) beginning with Class Year 2008 and in subsequent Class Years, the Existing Transmission Capacity for Native Load listed for the New York State Electric & Gas Corporation in Table 3 of Attachment L to the OATT, (v) in Class Year 2008 and 2009, 1090 MW of imports made over the Quebec (via Chateauguay) interface, and (vi) beginning with Class Year 2010 and in subsequent Class Years, any External CRIS Rights awarded pursuant to Section 25.7.11 of this Attachment S, either as a result of the conversion of grandfathered rights over the Quebec (via Chateauguay) Interface or as a result of a Class Year Deliverability Study, until, as of the Class Year Start Date, the time available to renew the External CRIS Rights has expired, as described in Section 25.9.3.2.2 of this Attachment S.

25.7.8.2.1.10 Flows associated with generators physically located in the NYCA but selling capacity out of the market will be modeled as such in the deliverability base cases.

25.7.8.2.1.11 Resources and demand are brought into balance in the baseline. If resources are greater than demand in the Capacity Region, existing generators within the Capacity Region are prorated down. If resources are lower than demand in the Capacity Region, additional external resources are included in the model.

25.7.8.2.1.12 PARs within the applicable Capacity Region will be adjusted as necessary, in either direction and within their angle capability, to eliminate or minimize

overloads without creating new ones. PARs controlling external ties and ties between the Capacity Regions will be modeled, within their angle capability, to hold the individual tie flows to their respective deliverability baseline schedules, which shall be set recognizing firm commitments and operating protocol set forth in Schedule C of Attachment CC to the OATT.

25.7.8.2.1.13 Deliverability testing will proceed as follows - The generation/load mix is split into two groups of generation and load, one upstream and one downstream for each zone or sub-zone tested within the Capacity Region. All elements that are part of the New York State Transmission System within the Capacity Region will be monitored. If there is excess generation upstream (that is, more upstream generation than is necessary to serve the upstream load plus LFU) then the generation excess, taking into account generator derate factors described in Section 25.7.8.2.2 above, is assumed to displace downstream generation. If the dispatch of the upstream excess generation causes an overload, this overload is flagged as a potential deliverability problem and will be used to determine the amount of capacity that is assigned CRIS status and the overload mitigation.

25.7.8.2.1.14 For Highway interfaces, the generators or Class Year Transmission Projects in a Class Year, whether or not they are otherwise deliverable, will not be considered deliverable if their aggregate impact degrades the transfer capability of the interface more than the lesser of 25 MW or 2 percent of the transfer capability identified in the ATBA and results in an increase to the NYCA LOLE determined for the ATBA of .01 or more. The Class Year CRIS Projects causing the degradation will be responsible, on a pro rata basis, for restoring transfer

capability only to the extent their aggregate degradation of transfer capability, compared to that in the ATBA, would not occur but for the Class Year CRIS Projects.

25.7.8.2.2 Expedited Deliverability Study

25.7.8.2.2.1 The current Class Year ATRA, developed in accordance with ISO Procedures, will serve as the starting point for the deliverability baseline for testing under summer peak system conditions, subject to ISO Procedures and the following: All Expedited Deliverability Study Projects will be evaluated on an aggregate Expedited Deliverability Study basis. Deliverability will be determined through a shift from generation to generation within the Capacity Regions in New York State. Each Capacity Region will be tested on an individual basis.

25.7.8.2.2.2 Each Developer requesting CRIS will request that a certain number of MW be evaluated for deliverability, such MW not to exceed the maximum levels set forth in Section 25.8.1 of this Attachment S. The MW requested by a Developer will represent Installed Capacity, and will be derated for the deliverability analysis. The MW requested by a Resource with an Energy Duration Limitation will represent Installed Capacity based on the Developer-selected duration (i.e., its expected maximum injection capability in MW hours for the Developer-selected duration) and will also be derated for the deliverability analysis. At the conclusion of the analysis, the ISO will reconvert only the deliverable MW and report them in terms of MW of Installed Capacity using the same derating factor utilized at the beginning of the deliverability analysis.

A derated generator capacity incorporating availability is used. This derated generator capacity is based on the unforced capacity or “UCAP” or Net UCAP, as applicable, of each resource and can be referred to as the UCAP Deration Factor (“UCDF”). The UCDF used is the average from historic ICAP to UCAP translations on a Capacity Region basis, as determined in accordance with ISO Procedures. The UCDF used is the average EFORD, which will be used for all ICAP providers that are not Intermittent Power Resources (resources that are not Intermittent Power Resources include Energy Storage Resources). The UCDF for Intermittent Power Resources will be calculated based on their resource type in accordance with ISO Procedures. Resources with Energy Duration Limitations evaluated for CRIS will be derated to reflect the Developers’ selected duration. Facilities comprised of Generators of different technologies will be derated using a blended UCDF that combines the UCDF of the individual Generators within the Project; provided however, that if the Project includes load reduction, the load reduction would not impact the UCDF of the Project.

The UCDF factor for proposed Projects will be applied to the requested CRIS level. For facilities modeled in the ATRA, the UCDF will be applied to their CRIS level.

25.7.8.2.2.3 CRIS that will be modeled in the Expedited Deliverability Study shall include: (1) existing CRIS, including CRIS obtained in a previous Expedited Deliverability Study, for facilities not being evaluated in the instant Expedited Deliverability Study, regardless of outage state, unless that CRIS will expire prior to the scheduled completion of the applicable Expedited Deliverability Study or

the CRIS is associated with a Retired facility that cannot transfer such rights prior to CRIS expiration; and (2) CRIS requested by Projects in the Class Year Study(ies) pending during the Expedited Deliverability Study. For purposes of this section 25.7.8.2.2.3, “existing CRIS” is CRIS that has not expired and CRIS that has been obtained by Projects through Attachment S. For Projects that undergo a Class Year Study deliverability evaluation, “existing CRIS,” is CRIS obtained, upon completion of a Class Year Study through which the Developer accepted deliverable MW or accepted its Project Cost Allocation and posted Security for System Deliverability Upgrades, as applicable. For Projects that undergo an Expedited Deliverability Study deliverability evaluation, “existing CRIS,” is CRIS obtained, upon completion of an Expedited Deliverability Study through which the Developer was deemed to have accepted its deliverable MW.

25.7.8.2.2.4 Load uncertainties will be addressed in accordance with ISO Procedures by taking the impact of Load Forecast Uncertainty (“LFU”) from the most recent base case IRM and applying it to load.

25.7.8.2.2.5 Deliverability base case conditioning steps will be consistent with those used for the Comprehensive Reliability Planning Process and Area Transmission Review transfer limit calculation methodology.

25.7.8.2.2.6 In deliverability testing, Emergency transfer criteria and contingency testing will be in conformance with NYSRC rules and correspond to that used in the NYISO Comprehensive Reliability Planning Process studies.

25.7.8.2.2.7 The ISO will monitor all transmission facilities that are part of the New York State Transmission System.

25.7.8.2.2.8 When either the voltage or stability transfer limit of an interface calculated in the ATRA is more binding than the calculated thermal transfer limit, then the lower of the ATRA voltage or stability transfer limit will be included in the deliverability testing as a proxy limit.

25.7.8.2.2.9 External system imports will be adjusted as necessary to eliminate or minimize overloads, other than the following external system imports: (i) the grandfathered import contract rights listed in Attachment E to the Installed Capacity Manual, (ii) the operating protocols set forth in Schedule C of Attachment CC to the OATT, (iii) the appropriate rules for reflecting PJM service to RECo load, (iv) the Existing Transmission Capacity for Native Load listed for the New York State Electric & Gas Corporation in Table 3 of Attachment L to the OATT, (v) any External CRIS Rights awarded pursuant to Section 25.7.11 of this Attachment S, either as a result of the conversion of grandfathered rights over the Quebec (via Chateauguay) Interface or as a result of a Class Year Deliverability Study, until, as of the Expedited Deliverability Study start date, the time available to renew the External CRIS Rights has expired, as described in Section 25.9.3.2.2 of this Attachment S.

25.7.8.2.2.10 Flows associated with generators physically located in the NYCA but selling capacity out of the market will be modeled as such in the deliverability base cases.

25.7.8.2.2.11 Resources and demand are brought into balance in the baseline. If resources are greater than demand in the Capacity Region, existing generators within the Capacity Region are prorated down. If resources are lower than

demand in the Capacity Region, additional external resources are included in the model.

25.7.8.2.2.12 PARs within the applicable Capacity Region will be adjusted as necessary, in either direction and within their angle capability, to eliminate or minimize overloads without creating new ones. PARs controlling external ties and ties between the Capacity Regions will be modeled, within their angle capability, to hold the individual tie flows to their respective deliverability baseline schedules, which shall be set recognizing firm commitments and operating protocol set forth in Schedule C of Attachment CC to the OATT.

25.7.8.2.2.13 Deliverability testing will proceed as follows - The generation/load mix is split into two groups of generation and load, one upstream and one downstream for each zone or sub-zone tested within the Capacity Region. All elements that are part of the New York State Transmission System within the Capacity Region will be monitored. If there is excess generation upstream (that is, more upstream generation than is necessary to serve the upstream load plus LFU) then the generation excess, taking into account generator derate factors described in Section 25.7.8.2.2 above, is assumed to displace downstream generation. If the dispatch of the upstream excess generation causes an overload, this overload is flagged as a potential deliverability problem and will be used to determine the amount of partial CRIS, if any, for the applicable Projects in the Expedited Deliverability Study.

25.7.8.2.2.14 For Highway interfaces, the Projects in an Expedited Deliverability Study, whether or not they are otherwise deliverable, will not be considered deliverable

if their aggregate impact degrades the transfer capability of the interface more than the lesser of 25 MW or 2 percent of the transfer capability identified in the ATRA. To the extent possible, the ISO will determine partial CRIS, if any, for any applicable Project in the Expedited Deliverability Study.

25.7.9 Deliverability Test Methodology for Other Interfaces

25.7.9.1 Class Year Deliverability Test Methodology for Other Interfaces

The generators or Class Year Transmission Projects in a Class Year, whether or not they are otherwise deliverable across Highways and Byways, will not be considered deliverable if their aggregate impact degrades the transfer capability of any Other Interface more than the lesser of 25 MW or 2 percent of the transfer capability of the Other Interface identified in the ATBA. Each Developer will be responsible for its pro rata Class Year share of one hundred percent (100%) of the cost of System Deliverability Upgrades needed to restore transfer capability on the Other Interfaces impacted by the Class Year CRIS Projects but only to the extent that the degradation of transfer capability on the Other Interfaces, compared to that measured in the current Class Year ATBA, would not occur but for the aggregate impact of the Class Year Projects. Where two or more Projects contribute to the degradation of the transfer capability of an Other Interface, each Project Developer shall pay for a share of the required System Deliverability Upgrades based on its contribution to the degradation of the transfer capability. To the extent possible, the ISO will determine partial CRIS, if any, for any applicable Project in the Class Year Study.

25.7.9.2 Expedited Deliverability Study Test Methodology for Other Interfaces

The Projects in an Expedited Deliverability Study, whether or not they are otherwise deliverable across Highways and Byways, will not be considered deliverable if their aggregate

impact degrades the transfer capability of any Other Interface more than the lesser of 25 MW or 2 percent of the transfer capability of the Other Interface identified in the ATBA. To the extent possible, the ISO will determine partial CRIS, if any, for any applicable Project in the Expedited Deliverability Study.

25.7.10 Deliverability of External Installed Capacity

External Installed Capacity not associated with Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights, External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights or External CRIS Rights will be subject to the deliverability test in Section 25.7.8 and 25.7.9 of this Attachment S, but not as a part of the Class Year Deliverability Study. As described in detail in Section 5.12.2 of the Services Tariff, the deliverability of External Installed Capacity not associated with Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights, External-to ROS Deliverability Rights or External CRIS Rights will be evaluated separately as a part of the annual process under the Services Tariff that sets import rights for the upcoming Capability Year, to determine the amount of External Installed Capacity that can be imported to the New York Control Area.

25.7.11 CRIS Rights For External Installed Capacity

An entity, by following the procedures and satisfying the requirements described in this Section 25.7.11, may obtain External CRIS Rights. While the External CRIS Rights are in effect, External Installed Capacity associated with External CRIS Rights is not subject to (1) the deliverability determination described above in Section 25.7.10 of this Attachment S, (2) the annual deliverability determination applied in the import limit setting process described in Section 5.12.2.2 of the Services Tariff, or (3) to the allocation of import rights described in ISO Procedures.

25.7.11.1 Required Commitment of External Installed Capacity

An entity requesting External CRIS Rights for a specified number of MW of External Installed Capacity must commit to supply that number of MW of External Installed Capacity for a period of at least five (5) years (“Award Period”). The entity’s commitment to supply the specified number of MW for the Award Period may be based upon either an executed bilateral contract to supply (“Contract Commitment”), or based upon another kind of long-term commitment (“Non-Contract Commitment”), both as described herein.

25.7.11.1.1 Contract Commitment

An entity making a Contract Commitment of External Installed Capacity must have one or more executed bilateral contract(s) to supply a specified number of MW of External Installed Capacity (“Contract CRIS MW”) to a Load Serving Entity or Installed Capacity Supplier for an Award Period of at least five (5) years. The entity must have ownership or contract control of External Installed Capacity to fulfill its bilateral supply contract throughout the Award Period, and that otherwise satisfies ISO requirements.

25.7.11.1.1.1 The bilateral supply contract(s) individually or in the aggregate, must be for all months of the Summer Capability Periods over the term of the bilateral supply contract(s), but need not include any of the months of the Winter Capability Periods over that term. The entity seeking External CRIS Rights must specify which, if any, months of the Winter Capability Period it will supply External Installed Capacity under the bilateral supply contract(s) (“Specified Winter Months”).

25.7.11.1.1.2 The bilateral supply contract(s) must be for the same number of MW for all months of the Summer Capability Periods (“Summer Contract CRIS MW”)

and the same number of MW for all Specified Winter Months (“Winter Contract CRIS MW”). The Winter Contract CRIS MW level must be less than or equal to the Summer Contract CRIS MW level.

25.7.11.1.1.3 An entity holding External CRIS Rights under a Contract Commitment must certify the bilateral supply contract for every month of the Summer Capability Periods and all Specified Winter Months for the applicable Contract CRIS MW. The Summer Contract CRIS MW must be certified for every month of the Summer Capability Period, and the Winter Contract CRIS MW must be certified for every Specified Winter Month (if any).

25.7.11.1.2 Non-Contract Commitment

An entity holding External CRIS Rights under a Non-Contract Commitment must offer the committed number of MW of External Installed Capacity for every month of the commitment, as described below, in the ISO Installed Capacity auctions for an Award Period of at least five (5) years. The entity must have ownership or contract control of External Installed Capacity to fulfill its Non-Contract Commitment throughout the Award Period.

25.7.11.1.2.1 The Non-Contract Commitment must be made for all months of the Summer Capability Periods over the term of the Award Period, but need not include any months in the Winter Capability Periods. The entity must identify the Specified Winter Months, if any, of the Winter Capability Periods for which it will make the commitment.

25.7.11.1.2.2 The commitment must be for the same number of MW for each month of the Summer Capability Period (“Summer Non-Contract CRIS MW”), and the same number of MW for all Specified Winter Months (“Winter Non-Contract

CRIS MW”). The Winter Non-Contract CRIS MW level must be less than or equal to the Summer Contract CRIS MW level.

25.7.11.1.2.3 An entity holding External CRIS Rights under a Non-Contract Commitment must offer the committed capacity (a) in at least one of the following NYCA auctions: the Capability Period Auction, the Monthly Auction or the ICAP Spot Market Auction, or (b) through a certified and scheduled Bilateral Transaction (as such terms not defined in this Attachment S are defined in the Services Tariff). The Summer Non-Contract CRIS MW must be offered for every month of the Summer Capability Period, and the Winter Non-Contract CRIS MW must be offered for every Specified Winter Month (if any).

25.7.11.1.2.4 Notwithstanding other capacity mitigation measures that may apply, the offers to sell Installed Capacity into an auction submitted pursuant to this Non-Contract Commitment will be subject to an offer cap for each month of the Summer Capability Periods and each Specified Winter Month. This offer cap will be determined in accordance with the provisions contained in Section 5.12.2.4 of the Services Tariff.

25.7.11.1.3 Failure to Meet Commitment

If an entity fails to certify or offer the full number of Contract CRIS MW or Non-Contract CRIS MW in accordance with the terms stated above, in Sections 25.7.11.1.1 and 25.7.11.1.2, the entity shall pay the ISO an amount equal to 1.5 times the Installed Capacity Spot Auction Market Clearing Price for the month in which either the capacity under Non-Contract Commitment was not offered or the Contract Commitment to supply ICAP was not certified

(“Supply Failure”), times the number of MW committed under the Non-Contract or Contract Commitment but not offered.

25.7.11.1.3.1 Within a given Award Period and each subsequent renewal of an Award Period pursuant to Section 25.9.3.2.2 herein, for the first three instances of a Supply Failure, no additional actions will be taken. Upon the fourth instance within the Award Period or the fourth instance within a subsequent renewal period of a Supply Failure, the associated External CRIS Rights will be terminated in their entirety with no ability to renew. Entities that had External CRIS Rights terminated may reapply for External CRIS in accordance with Section 25.7.11.1.4.2 below. Nothing in this Section 25.7.11.1.3 shall be construed to limit or diminish any provision in the Market Power Mitigation Measures or the Market Monitoring Plan.

25.7.11.1.4 Obtaining External CRIS Rights

An entity making a Contract Commitment or Non-Contract Commitment of External Installed Capacity may obtain External CRIS Rights for a specified number of MW of External Installed Capacity in one of two different ways, either (i) by converting MW of grandfathered deliverability rights over the External Interface with Quebec (via Chateauguay), or (ii) by having its specified MW of External Installed Capacity evaluated in a Class Year Deliverability Study, both as described herein.

25.7.11.1.4.1 One-Time Conversion of Grandfathered Rights. An entity can request to convert a specified number of MW pursuant to the conversion process established in Section 5.12.2.3 of the Services Tariff.

25.7.11.1.4.2 Class Year Deliverability Study. An entity may seek to obtain External CRIS Rights for its External Installed Capacity by requesting that its External Installed Capacity be evaluated for deliverability in the Open Class Year. To make such a request an entity must provide to the ISO a completed External CRIS Rights Request stating whether it is making a Contract Commitment or Non-Contract Commitment, the number of MW of External Installed Capacity to be evaluated, and the specific External Interface(s). The first Class Year Deliverability Study to evaluate requests for External CRIS Rights will be that for Class Year 2010. After the ISO receives a completed External CRIS Rights Request, an entity making a Contract Commitment or Non-Contract Commitment that satisfies the requirements of Section 25.7.11.1 of this Attachment S will be eligible to proceed, as follows:

25.7.11.1.4.2.1 The entity is made a Class Year Project when the ISO receives the entity's executed Class Year Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement for External Installed Capacity and all required data and the full deposit.

25.7.11.1.4.2.2 The entity's MW of External Installed Capacity covered by its bilateral contract(s) or, in the case of a Non-Contract Commitment the number of MW committed by the entity, are evaluated for deliverability within the Rest of State Capacity Region. The entity's External Installed Capacity is not subject to the NYISO Minimum Interconnection Standard. The ISO will determine whether the requests for External CRIS Rights within a given Class Year exceed the import limit, established pursuant to ISO procedures, for the applicable External Interface that is in effect on the Class Year Start Date when combined, to the

extent not already reflected in the import limit, with the following: (1) awarded External CRIS Rights at the same External Interface, (2) Grandfathered External Installed Capacity Agreements listed in Attachment E of the ISO Installed Capacity Manual at the same External Interface, and (3) the Existing Transmission Capacity for Native Load listed for New York State Electric & Gas Corporation in Table 3 of Attachment L to the ISO OATT (applies to the PJM interface only) (“Combined Total MW”). In addition to the other requirements stated herein, External CRIS Rights will only be awarded to the extent that the Combined Total MW does not exceed the import limit, as described above.

25.7.11.1.4.2.3 The Class Year Deliverability Study report will include an SDU Project Cost Allocation and a Deliverable MW number for the entity’s External Installed Capacity.

25.7.11.1.4.2.4 The entity will have the same decision alternatives as other Class Year Projects participating in the Deliverability Study only. That is, the entity may either (a) accept its SDU Project Cost Allocation, (b) decline its SDU Project Cost Allocation and accept its Deliverability MW figure, or (c) decline both its SDU Project Cost Allocation and its Deliverable MW. If the entity does decline both its SDU Project Cost Allocation and its Deliverable MW, the entity’s External Installed Capacity will be removed from the Class Year Deliverability Study. Once removed from the then current Class Year Deliverability Study, the entity can request for its External Installed Capacity to be evaluated again for deliverability in a subsequent Class Year Deliverability Study that is open at the time of its request.

25.7.11.1.4.2.5 If the entity accepts its SDU Project Cost Allocation, it must fund, or commit to fund the SDU upgrades, like any other Class Year Project.

25.7.11.1.4.2.6 If the entity accepts its SDU Project Cost Allocation and funds or commits to fund the SDU upgrades as required by this Attachment S, the entity must also execute and fulfill agreement(s) with the ISO and the Connecting Transmission Owner and any Affected Transmission Owner to cover the engineering, procurement and construction of the SDUs.

25.7.11.1.4.2.7 By the end of the Initial Decisional Period (i.e., 30 days from Operating Committee approval of the Class Year Deliverability Study), an entity making a Contract Commitment and accepting either its SDU Project Cost Allocation or Deliverable MW quantity, must provide specific contract and resource information to the ISO. Unless entities are supplying External Installed Capacity as Control Area System Resources, requests for External Installed Capacity shall be resource-specific. Entities are permitted to substitute resources located in the same External Control Area. Such substitutions shall be subject to review and approval by ISO consistent with ISO Procedures and deadlines specified therein.

25.7.11.1.4.2.8 If the entity satisfies the requirements described in this Section 25.7.11.1.4, the entity will obtain External CRIS Rights for the number of MW determined to be deliverable, made deliverable through an SDU (with an accepted SDU Project Cost Allocation), or deemed deliverable through a commitment to pay for an SDU.

25.7.12 Cost Allocation for Highway System Deliverability Upgrades

25.7.12.1 If the portion of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrades (measured in MW) required to make one or more CRIS Projects in a Class Year deliverable is ninety percent (90%) or more of the total size (measured in MW) of the System Deliverability Upgrades, each Developer(s) of a Class Year CRIS Project(s) will be responsible for its pro rata Class Year share of one hundred percent (100%) of the cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades.

25.7.12.2 If the portion of the System Deliverability Upgrades required to make one or more CRIS Projects in a Class Year deliverable is less than 90% of the total size (measured in MW) of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, the Developer(s) will be required to pay or commit to pay for a percentage share of the total cost of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrades equal to the estimated percentage megawatt usage by the Class Year CRIS Project of the total megawatts provided by the System Deliverability Upgrades. Other generators or Class Year Transmission Projects in the current Class Year Deliverability Study may share in the cost of these System Deliverability Upgrades, on the same basis. Projects in the current Class Year Deliverability Study will not be allocated all of the cost of these System Deliverability Upgrades. The rest of the cost of these System Deliverability Upgrades will be allocated to Load Serving Entities and subsequent Developers, as described in this Section 25.7.12. The Developer may either (1) make a cash payment of its proportionate share of the upgrade, which will be held by the Connecting Transmission Owner and Affected Transmission Owner(s) in interest-bearing account(s); or (2) post Security (as defined in this Attachment S) meeting the commercially reasonable requirements of the

Connecting Transmission Owner and Affected Transmission Owner(s) for the Developer's proportionate share of the cost of the upgrade. The amount(s) of cash or Security that a Developer must provide to its Connecting Transmission Owner and any Affected Transmission Owners will be included in the Class Year Deliverability Study report. If the Developer chooses to provide Security, its allocated cost will be increased by an annual construction-focused inflation index. The Developer will update its Security on an annual basis to reflect this increase. Except for this adjustment for inflation, the cost allocated to the Developers will not be increased if the estimated cost of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade increases. However, the costs allocated to subsequent Developers will be based on a current cost estimate of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade project.

25.7.12.3 If requesting CRIS, the generator or Class Year Transmission Project will be considered deliverable, and eligible to become a qualified Installed Capacity Supplier or to receive Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights or External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights, as applicable and subject to eligibility requirements in the ISO Procedures, when the Project associated with the CRIS request is in service, provided the Developer has paid its share of the total cost of System Deliverability Upgrades necessary to support the requested CRIS level, or made a satisfactory commitment to do so. Highway System Deliverability Upgrades-- where the System Deliverability Upgrades are below the 90% threshold discussed in Section 25.7.12.2 above--will be constructed and funded either (i) according to

Sections 25.7.12.3.1 and 25.7.12.3.2 below, or (ii) according to Section 25.7.12.3.3 below.

25.7.12.3.1 When a threshold of 60% of the most current cost estimate of the System Deliverability Upgrade has been paid or posted as Security by Developers, the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade will be built by the Transmission Owner that owns the facility to be upgraded. If the facility to be constructed will be entirely new, construction should be completed by the Transmission Owner that owns or controls the necessary site or right of way. If no Transmission Owner(s) has such control, construction should be completed by the Transmission Owner in whose Transmission District the facility would be constructed. If the upgrade crosses multiple Transmission Districts, each Transmission Owner will be responsible for the portion of the upgrade in its Transmission District; and

25.7.12.3.2 The actual cost of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade project above that paid for by Developers will be funded by Load Serving Entities, using the rate mechanism contained in Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT. Load Serving Entity funding responsibility for the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade will be allocated among Load Serving Entities based on their proportionate share of the ICAP requirement in the statewide capacity market, adjusted to subtract their locational capacity requirements. Provided, however, Load Serving Entities will not be responsible for actual costs in excess of their share of the final Class Year estimated cost of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade if the excess results from causes, as described in Section 25.8.6.4 of this Attachment S, within the

control of a Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade; or

25.7.12.3.3 If the NYISO triggers a transmission project under the Reliability Planning Process, selects a transmission project under the Short-Term Reliability Process, selects a transmission upgrade under the Public Policy Transmission Planning Process, or results in a Regulated Economic Transmission Project being approved under the Economic Planning Process (collectively “CSPP transmission upgrade”) and the CSPP transmission upgrade requires construction of a transmission facility that provides the same or greater transfer limit capability as the Highway facility identified as a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade to be constructed earlier than would be the case pursuant to Section 25.7.12.3.1, the CSPP transmission upgrade will be constructed as determined in the CSPP or the Short-Term Reliability Process, as applicable. Funds collected from Developers (pursuant to Section 25.7.12.2, above) will be used to cover a portion of the regulated solution costs to the extent that the funds collected from Developers were collected for System Deliverability Upgrades that are actually constructed by the regulated solution. To the extent this is true, these funds originally collected (or posted as Security) for System Deliverability Upgrades will be used as an offset to the total CSPP transmission upgrade cost, with the remainder of the upgrade cost to be allocated per the requirements of the CSPP, as set forth in Section 31.5 of Attachment Y to the ISO OATT, or the Short-Term Reliability Process, as set forth in Section 38.22 of Attachment FF to the ISO OATT.

To the extent funds collected from Developers for System Deliverability Upgrades are insufficient to cover the entire cost of the CSPP transmission upgrades, the Developers' contribution to the System Deliverability Upgrades allocated to the CSPP transmission upgrades will not exceed the Developers' respective Project Cost Allocations for the System Deliverability Upgrade. To the extent funds collected from Developers for System Deliverability Upgrades exceed the cost of the CSPP transmission upgrades, the funds collected for the System Deliverability Upgrades will be allocated to the CSPP transmission upgrade pro rata with the Developers' contribution to the System Deliverability Upgrades, and excess funds or Security for System Deliverability Upgrades above the cost of the CSPP transmission upgrade will be returned to the Developers.

25.7.12.4 If a Developer has accepted its Project Cost Allocation, before construction of an identified System Deliverability Upgrade for a Highway is commenced, if a Developer elects to be retested for deliverability it may request to be placed in the then Open Class Year. The Developer's cost responsibility for System Deliverability Upgrades shall not increase as a result of such retesting. It may decrease or be eliminated. If the Developer's Project is found to be deliverable without the System Deliverability Upgrades previously identified, the Developer's Security posting will be terminated, or the Developer's cash payment will be returned with the interest earned.

25.7.12.5 When the Highway System Deliverability Upgrades are placed in to Commercial Operation and any resulting Incremental TCCs related to the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade become effective in accordance with

Section 19.2.4 of Attachment M of the ISO OATT, a Developer electing to receive its proportionate share of such Incremental TCCs, as further described in Section 25.7.2.2 of this Attachment S, will receive its proportionate share of such Incremental TCCs.

25.7.12.5.1 Load Serving Entities required by this Section 25.7.12 to fund a portion of the costs of a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade will receive the corresponding financial value of any Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade held by the Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, as further described in Section 25.7.2.2 of this Attachment S. The corresponding financial value of any such Incremental TCCs will be accounted for in determining the applicable Highway Facilities Charge in accordance with Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT. The eligibility of the Load Serving Entities to the financial value of any Incremental TCCs related to the System Deliverability Upgrade held by the Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade shall commence as of the date such Incremental TCCs become effective in accordance with Section 19.2.4 of Attachment M to the OATT and continue until the earlier of: (i) the expiration of any such Incremental TCCs; or (ii) the termination of the obligation of the Load Serving Entities to fund a portion of the costs of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade.

25.7.12.6 As new generators and Class Year Transmission Projects come on line and use the Headroom on System Deliverability Upgrades created by a prior Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, the Developers of those new facilities will

reimburse the prior Developers or will compensate the Load Serving Entities who funded the System Deliverability Upgrades for use of the Headroom created by the prior Developers and Load Saving Entities in accordance with Sections 25.8.7 and 25.8.8 of these rules.

25.7.12.6.1 In accordance with Section 25.7.2.2 of this Attachment S, as subsequent Developers make Headroom payments to prior Developers and if a subsequent Developer elects to receive its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs related to the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, such Incremental TCCs will be transferred to the subsequent Developers; provided, however, that Incremental TCCs that were previously deemed reserved and are transferred to a subsequent Developer will become effective on the first day of the Capability Period that commences following the next Centralized TCC Auction conducted after the subsequent Developer makes the necessary Headroom payment and elects to receive its proportionate share of Incremental TCCs.

25.7.12.6.2 In accordance with Section 25.7.2.2 of this Attachment S, as subsequent Developers compensate Load Serving Entities for use of their Headroom by providing any such Headroom payments to the Transmission Owner(s) responsible for constructing a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade and if a subsequent Developer elects to receive its proportionate share of any Incremental TCCs related to the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade, such Incremental TCCs will be transferred to the subsequent Developer.

25.7.12.7 The Transmission Owner responsible for constructing a System Deliverability Upgrade or a Developer contributing toward the cost of a System

Deliverability Upgrade can elect to construct upgrades that are larger and/or more expensive than the System Deliverability Upgrades identified to support the requested level of CRIS for the Class Year CRIS Project in the Class Year Deliverability Study, provided that those upgrades are reasonably related to the Class Year Project. The party electing to construct the larger upgrade will pay for the incremental cost of the upgrade; i.e., the difference in cost between the cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades as determined by these rules, and the cost of the larger and/or more expensive upgrade.

25.7.12.13 Engineering, Procurement and Construction Agreement for System Deliverability Upgrades

If a System Deliverability Upgrade on the Connecting Transmission Owner's system is cost allocated to a Developer and such Developer accepts its SDU Project Cost Allocation and fund or commits to fund the System Deliverability Upgrade, the Interconnection Agreement among the Developer, Connecting Transmission Owner and ISO will provide for the engineering, procurement and construction of such System Deliverability Upgrade.

If a System Deliverability Upgrade on an Affected System is cost allocated to a Developer and such Developer accepts its SDU Project Cost Allocation and fund or commits to fund the System Deliverability Upgrade, the Developer and Affected System Operator will cooperate with the ISO in development of an Engineering, Procurement and Construction Agreement to provide for the engineering, procurement and construction of the System Deliverability Upgrades on the Affected System.

If a System Deliverability Upgrade is cost allocated to a Developer or multiple Developers and multiple Developers accept their SDU Project Cost Allocation and fund or commit to fund such System Deliverability Upgrades as required by Attachment S, the

Developers, Connecting Transmission Owner(s), and Affected Transmission Owner(s) will cooperate with the ISO in development of an Engineering, Procurement and Construction Agreement to provide for the engineering, procurement and construction of the System Deliverability Upgrades on the Affected System.

The Engineering, Procurement and Construction Agreement shall be consistent with the NYISO's Commission-approved Standard Large Generator Interconnection Agreement located in Appendix 2 to Attachment X of the OATT, modified to address only the engineering, procurement and construction of the System Deliverability Upgrades. The Parties to such agreement will use Reasonable Efforts to complete and execute the agreement, or submit the agreement unexecuted to the Commission, within six (6) months of the ISO's tender of the agreement.

25.8 Project Cost Allocation Decisions

25.8.1 Maximum Requested CRIS and Project Cost Allocation Figures

Starting with the Class Year subsequent to Class Year 2012, each Developer entering a Class Year Study or Expedited Deliverability Study whose Project is not yet In-Service will specify an Interconnection Service evaluation election and provide an updated In-Service Date and Commercial Operation Date (subject to the limitations set forth in Sections 30.3.3.1 and 30.4.4.5 of Attachment X) when it completes a Class Year Study Agreement or Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement. For Large Facilities and Small Generating Facilities that are required to enter a Class Year Study pursuant to Section 32.3.5.3.2 of Attachment Z to the ISO OATT, in the Class Year Study Agreement, must elect to be evaluated for ERIS. Any Project entering a Class Year Study may request CRIS. If the Developer elects to be evaluated for CRIS, the maximum requested MW level of CRIS is as follows:

- (i) if the Class Year Project is a BTM:NG Resource, it can elect to be evaluated for ERIS alone, or both ERIS and some MW level of CRIS, not to exceed its Net ICAP;
- (ii) if the Class Year Project is a Resource with Energy Duration Limitations, the requested MW level of CRIS cannot exceed the minimum of the following: (a) its expected maximum injection capability in MW for the Developer-selected duration; (b) the nameplate capacity of the Project (i.e., injection capability of the Project expressed in MW); or (c) the sum of the Project's requested and existing ERIS, as applicable;
- (iii) if the Class Year Project is a request for External-to-ROS Deliverability Rights, it can request a MW level of CRIS, not to exceed the increase in transfer capability

created by its associated Class Year Transmission Project, as demonstrated in the Project's System Reliability Impact Study.

- (iv) if the Class Year Project is a facility comprised of multiple units of the same or different technology type, the requested MW level of CRIS must be requested at the facility level (i.e., corresponding to the Project as described in the Interconnection Request or revised Interconnection Request, as applicable), subject to the limitations below. The MW level of CRIS for a Project comprised of multiple Generators (e.g., Co-located Storage Resource or single technology facility with multiple units, each proposed to be assigned a single PTID) will be determined at the facility (i.e., Project) level and shall be allocated among the multiple Generators, as requested by Developer (to the extent permissible under Section 25.8.1 of this Attachment S). The Project's CRIS and allocation of CRIS among its units, as applicable, will be specified by ISO in the Class Year Deliverability Study report approved by the ISO Operating Committee. The MW level of CRIS requested by the Developer cannot exceed the minimum of the following: (a) the expected maximum injection capability in MW for the Project as described in the Interconnection Request, as revised if applicable, including all co-located Generators sharing the same injection limit (e.g., entire Distributed Energy Resource, entire Co-located Storage Resource or entire multi-unit single technology resource); provided however, if the Project includes a Resource with Energy Duration Limitation, its expected maximum injection capability in MW is limited by the Developer-selected duration); (b) the nameplate capacity of the Project (i.e., collective injection capability of all units within the proposed Project

expressed in MW); or (c) the sum of facility's requested and existing ERIS, as applicable; and

- (v) If the above subsections do not apply to the Class Year Project, the requested MW level of CRIS cannot exceed the nameplate capacity of the Project.

If the Class Year Project is existing and/or already interconnected taking ERIS, the Class Year Project will be evaluated for a MW level of CRIS specified by the Developer, not to exceed the permissible levels of CRIS that may be requested pursuant to this Section 25.8.1. For existing facilities proposing a modification to add a Generator of the same or different technology co-located at the same Point of Interconnection for which the Developer requests CRIS, the collective CRIS of the resources within what will be the modified facility (*e.g.*, the resulting Co-located Storage Resource or Distributed Energy Resource) cannot exceed the injection limit of the co-located units. For a Project that requests CRIS for part of a multi-unit facility, after combining with another existing or proposed co-located facility, the requested MW level of CRIS for cannot exceed the permissible levels of CRIS that may have been requested pursuant to this Section 25.8.1 for the entire co-located facility.

Based on the Class Year Project's Interconnection Service evaluation elections, on the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment update of Interconnection System Reliability Impact Study results, and on the results of the Class Year Deliverability Study, ISO staff shall, in accordance with these rules, provide the Developer of each Project included in the then-current Class Year with a dollar figure for its share of the cost of the System Upgrade Facilities required for reliable interconnection of the Project to the New York State Transmission System ("SUF Project Cost Allocation"). The ISO shall also provide each Class Year Developer requesting CRIS with (i) a dollar figure for its share of the cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades

required for the megawatt level of CRIS requested for the Class Year Project (“SDU Project Cost Allocation”), and (ii) the number of megawatts of Installed Capacity, if any, that are deliverable from the Class Year Project with no new System Deliverability Upgrades (“Deliverable MW”). The ISO shall also provide a dollar figure for the total cost of the System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades required for interconnection of the Class Year Project, as well as a description of the required System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades, their expected in-service date, and a plan for their installation that is sufficient to verify these dollar figures. The ISO shall also provide a dollar figure for the total cost of all System Upgrade Facilities required by Projects in the Class Year and a dollar figure for the total cost of the System Deliverability Upgrades necessary to support the level of CRIS requested by each Class Year Developer. Each Class Year Developer will be given the Project Cost Allocation(s) and, Deliverable MW, if any associated with its Interconnection Service evaluation election, as soon as practicable prior to the submittal of the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment and Class Year Deliverability Study to the Operating Committee.

25.8.2 Decision Periods for Class Year Study and Additional Deliverability Study

Within 30 calendar days following (1) approval of the final Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment and Class Year Deliverability Study by the Operating Committee (collectively the “Class Year Study Reports”); or (2) approval of the final SDU Study report by the Operating Committee when such approval is prior to completion of the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment study cases for the following Class Year Study, (each such 30 calendar day period to be referred to as the “Initial Decision Period” for the respective study), or within 7 calendar days following the ISO’s issuance of a revised Class Year Study report or a revised Additional SDU Study report, as applicable, and accompanying Revised Project Cost Allocation

and revised Deliverable MW report, as defined in and pursuant to Section 25.8.3 (a “Subsequent Decision Period”), if applicable, each Developer shall provide notice to the ISO, in writing and via electronic mail, stating whether it shall accept (an “Acceptance Notice”) or not accept (a “Non-Acceptance Notice”) the Project Cost Allocation(s) and Deliverable MW, if any, reported to it by the ISO for its Class Year Project. A Developer for a Class Year Project that is a multi-unit facility may not submit separate notices for separate portions of the Class Year Project (*e.g.* a Class Year Project that is a Co-located Storage Resource may not submit an Acceptance Notice for one of its resources and a Non-Acceptance Notice for the co-located resource). Failure to notify the ISO by the prescribed deadline as to whether a Developer accepts or rejects its Project Cost Allocation and Deliverable MW, if any, will be deemed a Non-Acceptance Notice. Each Developer may respond with either an Acceptance Notice or a Non-Acceptance Notice to each Project Cost Allocation and Deliverable MW reported to it by the ISO. Starting with Class Year 2012, an Acceptance Notice for Projects not yet In-Service must also include a confirmed In-Service Date and Commercial Operation Date, subject to the limitations set forth in Section 30.4.4.5 of Attachment X. A Developer in its first Class Year Study that requests to be evaluated for CRIS may accept both its SDU Project Cost Allocation and its SUF Project Cost Allocation. Alternatively, that Developer, if it accepts its SUF Project Cost Allocation, may provide a Non-Acceptance Notice for its SDU Project Cost Allocation and at the same time accept, or not accept its Deliverable MW. Or, as another alternative, that same Developer may elect to interconnect taking ERIS by providing an Acceptance Notice only for its SUF Project Cost Allocation. A Developer that accepts an SUF and/or SDU Project Cost Allocation will not be provided with the option to accept a Revised Project Cost Allocation following a Subsequent

Decision Period unless the Revised Project Cost Allocation provides for (1) an increase in the SUF or the SDU Project Cost Allocation; or (2) a decrease in the Developer's Deliverable MW.

A Developer in an Additional SDU Study that has not completed when the Initial Decision Period for the Class Year Study has commenced may, in the Initial Decision Period or Subsequent Decision Period for the Class Year in which the Additional SDU Study was triggered, (1) accept its SUF Project Cost Allocation and proceed with its Additional SDU Study; (2) reject its SUF Project Cost Allocation and be withdrawn from both the Class Year Study and the Additional SDU Study; or (3) wait until the Initial Decision Period that commences pursuant to this Section 25.8.2 upon completion of the Additional SDU Study to provide an Acceptance Notice or Non-Acceptance Notice for its SUF Project Cost Allocation and SDU Project Cost Allocation; provided however, that pursuant to this Section 25.8.2, no Initial Decision Period will be triggered by an Additional SDU Study that is ongoing at the time the ISO completes the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment study cases for the subsequent Class Year Study. The SUF Project Cost Allocation and any deliverable MW identified in the Class Year Study for a Developer in an Additional SDU Study that elects not to accept its SUF Project Cost Allocation with its Class Year, but that elects to wait until the Initial Decision Period that commences pursuant to this Section 25.8.2 upon completion of the Additional SDU Study, will be revised in light of the final Class Year project cost allocation decisions (i.e., the SUF Cost Allocation and deliverable MW, if any, may change between the Initial Decision Period for the Class Year and the Initial Decision Period for the Additional SDU Study).

As soon as practicable following the end of the Initial Decision Period and any Subsequent Decision Period, as applicable, but not later than two (2) business days following the end of such decision period, the ISO shall report to the Operating Committee, all of the

acceptance Notices and Non-Acceptance Notices that were received during that decision period. Starting with Class Year 2012, consistent with Section 30.4.4.5 of Attachment X, for any Project that fails to provide a confirmed In-Service Date and Commercial Operation Date in its Acceptance Notice or that provides a proposed In-Service Date or Commercial Operation Date with its Acceptance Notice that is beyond the time period permissible by Section 30.4.4.5 of Attachment X, the ISO's Interconnection queue will reflect the latest possible permissible date, even if that requires the ISO to reject and modify the proposed In-Service Date or Commercial Operation Date provided in the Class Project's Acceptance Notice. Subsequent modifications to a Project's In-Service Date or Commercial Operation Date are governed by Section 30.4.4.5.2 of Attachment X.

25.8.2.1 If, following the Initial Decision Period or any Subsequent Decision Period, each and every Developer that remains eligible at that time provides Acceptance Notice(s), each Developer must signify its willingness to pay the Connecting Transmission Owner and Affected Transmission Owner(s) for its share of the required System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades that it accepted by (i) satisfying Headroom payment/security posting obligations, if any, as specified in Section 25.8.7.6 and (ii) paying cash or posting Security (as hereinafter defined) in accordance with these rules, for the full amount of its respective Project Cost Allocation within 5 business days after the end of the Initial Decision Period or Subsequent Decision Period, as applicable. "Security" means a bond, irrevocable letter of credit, parent company guarantee or other form of security from an entity with an investment grade rating, executed for the benefit of the Connecting Transmission Owner and Affected Transmission

Owner(s), meeting the requirements of these cost allocation rules, and meeting the respective commercially reasonable requirements of the Connecting Transmission Owner and Affected Transmission Owner(s). Security shall be posted to cover the period ending on the date on which full payment is made to the Connecting Transmission Owner for the System Upgrade Facilities, and the date(s) on which full payment is made to the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner(s) for the System Deliverability Upgrades; provided, however, that Security may be posted with a term as short as one year, so long as such Security is replaced no later than 15 business days before its stated expiration. In the event Security is not replaced as required in the preceding sentence, the Connecting Transmission Owner, or an Affected Transmission Owner in the case of Security for System Deliverability Upgrades, shall be entitled to draw upon the Security and convert it to cash, which cash shall be held by the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner for the account of the Developer. The round in which no remaining eligible Developers issue a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default shall be the final round for that Class Year or Additional SDU Study (the “Final Decision Round”).

25.8.2.2 At the end of the Initial Decision Period or any Subsequent Decision Period, if one or more of the Developers in the Class Year provides Non-Acceptance Notice (such event a “Non-Acceptance Event”), then every Developer in the Class Year shall be relieved of its obligation to pay cash or post Security in connection with that version of its Project Cost Allocation for both System

Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades. In addition, following the Initial Decision Period or any Subsequent Decision Period, if all Developers in the Class Year provide Acceptance Notice under the Class Year Deliverability Study, the ATRA or both, but one or more of the Developers fails to pay cash or post the Security required hereunder (such event a “Security Posting Default”), then the beneficiaries of the payments and Security posted by the Developers that did pay or post Security (e.g., the Connecting Transmission Owners and Affected Transmission Owners) shall surrender the cash and posted Security to the respective Developers immediately. The Connecting Transmission Owners or Affected Transmission Owner(s) shall not make any draws or encumbrances on any cash or posted Security unless and until cash has been paid and Security has been posted by all Developers that issued Acceptance Notices in the Final Decision Round.

25.8.2.3 Following the Initial Decision Period, or any Subsequent Decision Period, if a Non-Acceptance Event or a Security Posting Default shall have occurred with respect to the ATRA, the Developer that provided the Non-Acceptance Notice or committed the Security Posting Default with respect to its SUF Project Cost Allocation will be removed by the ISO from the then current Class Year Study. If a Developer provides an Acceptance Notice and posts the required Security for its SUF Project Cost Allocation, or has done so in a prior Class Year, but provides a Non-Acceptance Notice with respect to its SDU Project Cost Allocation, it may provide an Acceptance Notice for its Deliverable MW and interconnect taking CRIS at that level. If the Developer either (i) provides a Non-Acceptance Notice

with respect to both its SDU Project Cost Allocation and its Deliverable MW, or (ii) commits a Security Posting Default with respect to its SDU Project Cost Allocation, then that Developer shall be removed from the Class Year Deliverability Study or Additional SDU Study, as applicable, but, if in the Class Year Study, it may continue to participate in the ATRA and interconnect taking ERIS if it provides an Acceptance Notice and posts the required Security for its SUF Project Cost Allocation. The Developer electing to interconnect taking ERIS may later request, any number of times, to enter a Class Year Study or Expedited Deliverability Study and be evaluated for CRIS, subject to the Class Year Study and Expedited Deliverability Study entry requirements set forth in Section 25.5.9 of this Attachment S. The Developer will not be re-evaluated for ERIS. Once evaluated for CRIS in a later Class Year or Expedited Deliverability Study, the Developer may elect to accept either its SDU Project Cost Allocation or its Deliverable MW, or the Developer may provide a Non-Acceptance Notice for both its SDU Project Cost Allocation and its Deliverable MW and continue its interconnection taking ERIS. If the Developer does provide a Non-Acceptance Notice for both its SDU Project Cost Allocation and Deliverable MW and continues taking ERIS, the Developer may later request to enter a Class Year Study or Expedited Deliverability Study, subject to the Class Year Study and Expedited Deliverability Study entry requirements set forth in Section 25.5.9 of this Attachment S, and be evaluated again for CRIS. If, however, a Developer provides a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default for its SUF Project Cost Allocation, that Class Year Project shall be removed from both

the ATRA and, if applicable, the Class Year Deliverability Study, and that Developer's Interconnection Request will be processed further in accordance with Section 25.6.2.3 above.

25.8.2.4 Whenever Projects are removed from an Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, Class Year Deliverability Study, Additional SDU Study, or Expedited Deliverability Study, ISO staff will notify the remaining Developers still included in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, Class Year Deliverability Study, Additional SDU Study, or Expedited Deliverability Study, as applicable.

25.8.3 Revised Study Results

Immediately following receipt of Non-Acceptance Notices for any SDU Project Cost Allocations or SUF Project Cost Allocations or Deliverable MW, or upon the occurrence of a Security Posting Default, the ISO shall update the Class Year Study results or Additional SDU study results for those remaining Developers that continue to be included in the then-current Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, Class Year Deliverability Study, or Additional SDU Study, as applicable, to reflect the impact of Non-Acceptance Notices and any Security posting Default. The updated Class Year Study or Additional SDU Study, as applicable, shall include updated SUF Project Cost Allocations and updated SDU Project Cost Allocations (each a "Revised Project Cost Allocation") together with a revised Deliverable MW report. The updated Class Year Study shall be issued as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 14 calendar days following the occurrence of the Non-Acceptance Event or the Security Posting Default that necessitated development of the Revised Project Cost Allocations and revised Deliverable MW report. The ISO shall also provide the additional dollar figures relating to total cost for

Developers in the Class Year Study or Additional SDU Study, as applicable, and the related information, described in Section 25.8.1, above. Following the issuance of the revised Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, Class Year Deliverability Study, or Additional SDU Study, as applicable, and the issuance of Revised Project Cost Allocations and the revised Deliverable MW, each remaining Developer shall provide notice to the ISO within 7 calendar days whether it will accept its respective Revised Project Cost Allocation and revised Deliverable MW.

25.8.4 Completion of Class Year Decision Process

The process set forth in Sections 25.8.2 through 25.8.3 shall be repeated until none of the remaining eligible Developers in the Class Year Study or Additional SDU Study, as applicable, provides a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default.

25.8.5 Forfeiture of Security

With the exception of the requirement that cash and Security shall be surrendered back to the issuing Developer in connection with another Developer's Security Posting Default, once a Developer has accepted the Project Cost Allocation(s) or Revised Project Cost Allocation(s) appropriate for its Interconnection Service election, as the case may be, and paid cash and posted Security or posted Security for that amount, such cash payment and Security shall be irrevocable and shall be subject to forfeiture as provided herein in the event that the Developer that paid cash and posted Security or posted the Security subsequently terminates or abandons development of its Project. Any cash and Security previously posted on a terminated Project will be subject to forfeiture to the extent necessary to defray the cost of the System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades required for the Projects included in the Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment, Class Year Deliverability Study, or Additional SDU Study, as

applicable, but only as described below. Security for System Upgrade Facilities constructed by the Developer (i.e., for which the Developer elects the option to build), shall be reduced after discrete portions of the System Upgrade Facilities have been completed, such reductions to be based on cost estimates from the Class Year Study, subject to review by the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner with which Security is posted, and subject to transfer of ownership to the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner, as applicable of all subject property, free and clear of any liens, as well as transfer of title and any transferable equipment warranties reasonably acceptable to the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner with which Security is posted. For System Upgrade Facilities constructed by the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner, Security shall be reduced after discrete portions of the System Upgrade Facilities have been completed by the Transmission Owner and paid for by the Developer, on a dollar-for-dollar basis for payments made to the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner pursuant to an E&P Agreement or Interconnection Agreement, subject to the Connecting Transmission Owner's or Affected Transmission Owner's review and approval.

25.8.6 Developer's Future Cost Responsibility

Once a Developer has accepted a Project Cost Allocation or Revised Project Cost Allocation, as the case may be, in the Final Decision Round and paid cash and posted Security or posted Security for that amount, then the accepted figure caps the Developer's maximum potential responsibility for the cost of System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades required for its Project, except as discussed below.

25.8.6.1 If the portion of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrades required to make the Developer's generator or Class Year Transmission Project deliverable is

less than 90% of the total size of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade identified for the Developer's Project, and the Developer elects to commit to pay for its proportionate share of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade by posting Security instead of paying cash, then the Developer's allocated cost of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade will be increased during the period of construction deferral by application of a construction inflation adjustment, as discussed in Section 25.7.12.2 of these rules. When deferred construction of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade commences, the Developer will be responsible for actual costs in excess of the secured amount only when the excess results from changes to the operating characteristics of the Developer's Project. If the portion of the System Deliverability Upgrades for a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade required to make one or more generators or Class Year Transmission Projects in a Class Year deliverable is ninety percent (90%) or more of the total size (measured in MW) of the System Deliverability Upgrades, construction is not deferred, and those Developers will be responsible for actual costs in excess of the secured amount in accordance with the rules in Sections 25.8.6.2-25.8.6.4 of this Attachment S.

25.8.6.2 If the actual cost of the Developer's share of required System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades is less than the agreed-to and secured amount, the Developer is responsible only for the actual cost figure.

25.8.6.3 If the actual cost of the Developer's share of required System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades would be greater than the agreed-to and secured amount because other Projects have been expanded, accelerated,

otherwise modified or terminated, including Transmission Projects evaluated pursuant to Attachment P to the OATT and their required upgrades, as identified pursuant to Attachment P to the OATT, then the Developer is responsible only for the agreed-to and secured amount for its Project. The additional cost is covered by the Developers of the modified Projects, in accordance with these cost allocation rules, or by the drawing on the cash that has been paid and the Security that has been posted for terminated Projects, depending on the factors that caused the additional cost. Forfeitable cash and Security will be drawn on only as needed for this purpose, and only to the extent that the terminated Project associated with that Security has caused additional cost.

25.8.6.4 If the actual cost of the Developer's share of required System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades is greater than the agreed-to and secured amount because of circumstances that are not within the control of the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner(s) (such as, for example: (i) changes to the design or operating characteristics of the Project that impact the scope or cost of related System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades; (ii) any costs that were not within the scope of the Class Year Study or Additional SDU Study, as applicable, that subsequently become known as part of the final construction design, including costs related to detailed design studies such as electro-magnetic transient analyses and subsynchronous resonance analyses; or (iii) cost escalation of materials or labor, or changes in the commercial availability of physical components required for construction), the cost cap shall be adjusted by any such amount and the Developer or the Load

Serving Entity will pay the additional costs to the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner(s) as such costs are incurred by each of them. However, to the extent that some or all of the excess cost is due to factors within the control of the Connecting Transmission Owner or the Affected Transmission Owner(s) (such as, for example, additional construction man-hours due to Connecting Transmission Owner or the Affected Transmission Owner(s) management, or correcting equipment scope deficiencies due to Connecting Transmission Owner or the Affected Transmission Owner(s) oversights), then that portion of the excess cost will be borne by the Connecting Transmission Owner or the Affected Transmission Owner(s). Disputes between the Developer and the Connecting Transmission Owner concerning costs in excess of the agreed-to and secured amount will be resolved by the parties in accordance with the terms and conditions of their interconnection agreement. Disputes between the Developer and an Affected Transmission Owner will be resolved in accordance with Section 30.13.5 of the LFIP, or Section 32.4.2 of Attachment Z, as applicable.

25.8.7 Headroom Accounting

If, pursuant to these rules, a Developer, Connecting Transmission Owner, Affected Transmission Owner or Load Serving Entity (each an “Entity”) pays for any System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades, or for any Attachment Facilities or Distribution Upgrades that are later determined to be System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades, that create “Headroom”, and pays for the Headroom that is created, then that Entity will be paid the depreciated cost of that Headroom by the Developer of any subsequent Project that interconnects and uses the Headroom within the applicable period of time following the

creation of the Headroom, as specified in Section 25.8.7.4.3 herein. The ISO will depreciate Headroom cost in accordance with Section 25.8.7.3 herein.

25.8.7.1 Developers of terminated Projects who have paid for Headroom with forfeited cash or Security instruments, as well as Developers of completed Projects who have paid for Headroom, will be repaid in accordance with these rules.

25.8.7.2 The Developer of the subsequent Project shall pay the prior Entity as soon as the cost responsibilities of the subsequent Developer are determined in accordance with these rules. In the case of Headroom created by Load Serving Entity funding Highway System Deliverability Upgrades pursuant to Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT, the Developer of the subsequent Project shall pay the Connecting Transmission Owner, and any Affected Transmission Owner(s), that are receiving or will receive Load Serving Entity funding for the Highway System Deliverability Upgrades pursuant to Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT. Upon receipt of the Developer Headroom payment, the Connecting Transmission Owner and any Affected Transmission Owner(s), will make the rate adjustment(s) called for by Section 6.12.4.1.3 of Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT.

25.8.7.3 The ISO will determine the depreciated cost of the System Upgrade Facilities and/or System Deliverability Upgrades associated with the Entity - created Headroom using one of the following two methods:

25.8.7.3.1 In all cases except the case of Highway System Deliverability Upgrades funded by Load Serving Entities pursuant to Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT, the ISO will use the FERC-approved depreciation schedule applied to comparable

facilities by the Connecting Transmission Owner or the applicable Affected Transmission Owner. The ISO will depreciate the Headroom cost annually, starting with the year when the Headroom account is first established.

25.8.7.3.2 In the case of Highway System Deliverability Upgrades funded by Load Serving Entities pursuant to Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT, the ISO will use the FERC-approved depreciation schedule applied to the particular Highway System Deliverability Upgrades by the Connecting Transmission Owner or the applicable Affected Transmission Owner pursuant to Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT. The ISO will depreciate the Headroom cost annually, starting with the year the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade is placed in service. If a Class Year Deliverability Study or Additional SDU Study determines that a Developer in such study uses Headroom on such a Highway System Deliverability Upgrade before the Highway System Deliverability Upgrade has been placed in service, the ISO will calculate the Headroom use payment obligation of the Developer using the undepreciated cost of the Headroom.

25.8.7.4 Entity-created Headroom will be measured by the ISO in accordance with these rules. The use that a subsequent Project makes of Entity -created Headroom will also be measured by the ISO in accordance with these rules.

25.8.7.4.1 In the case of Headroom on System Upgrade Facilities that have an excess functional capacity not readily measured in amperes or other discrete electrical units, the use that each subsequent Project makes of the Entity-created Headroom will be measured solely by using the total number of Projects in the current and prior Class Years needing or using the System Upgrade Facility.

25.8.7.4.1.1 The use that each Project in a subsequent Class Year makes of Headroom on such a System Upgrade Facility will be measured as an amount equal to $(1/b)$, where “b” is the total number of Projects in all prior and current Class Years using the System Upgrade Facility.

25.8.7.4.1.2 Each Developer in a subsequent Class Year that uses Headroom on such a System Upgrade Facility will make a Headroom payment to all prior Developers that have previously made payments for that System Upgrade Facility, both the prior Developers that have previously made Headroom payments and the Developers in the first Class Year that paid for the original installation of the System Upgrade Facility. The amount of the Headroom payment to each prior Developer that each Developer in a subsequent Class Year must make for its use of Headroom on such a System Upgrade Facility will be an amount equal to $c/(b) \times (d)$, where “c” is the depreciated cost of the System Upgrade Facility at the time of the subsequent Class Year Study, “b” is the total number of Projects in all prior and current Class Years using the System Upgrade Facility, and “d” is the total number of Projects in all the prior Class Years that have previously made payments for the System Upgrade Facility, both Headroom payments and payments for original installation.

25.8.7.4.2 In the case of System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades that have an excess capacity readily measured in amperes or other discrete electrical units, the use the subsequent Project makes of the Entity-created Headroom will be measured in terms of the electrical impact of the

subsequent Project, as that electrical impact is determined by the ISO in accordance with these rules.

25.8.7.4.3 The ISO will publish accounts showing the Headroom for each Developer and other Entities, and will update those accounts to reflect the impact of subsequent Projects. With the exception of Headroom on Highway System Deliverability Upgrades funded by Load Serving Entities pursuant to Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT, the ISO will close the Headroom account of an Entity when the electrical values in the account are reduced to zero or when ten years have passed since the establishment of the account, whichever occurs first.

25.8.7.4.3.1 In the case of Headroom on Highway System Deliverability Upgrades funded by Load Serving Entities pursuant to Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT, the ISO will close the Headroom account of the Load Serving Entity when the MW value in the account is reduced to zero, or at the end of the useful financial life of the Highway System Deliverability Upgrades, whichever occurs first.

25.8.7.4.4 If a subsequent Developer uses up all the Headroom of an earlier Entity, and also triggers the need for a new System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade, then the subsequent Developer will pay the Connecting Transmission Owner or Affected Transmission Owner for the new System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade, but will not pay the earlier Entity for the Headroom used up or the account extinguished. However, the earlier Entity will get a new Headroom account and a pro rata share of the Headroom in the new System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade purchased by the subsequent Developer. The economic value of this pro rata

share will be equal to the economic value of the earlier Entity's Headroom account that was extinguished by the subsequent Developer.

25.8.7.5 For Class Years 2001 and 2002, the ISO shall account for Headroom as provided by the Non-Financial Settlement. Developers in Class Year 2002 shall reimburse Class Year 2001 Developers in accordance with the terms of the Non-Financial Settlement.

25.8.7.6 The Developer of the subsequent Project shall pay the prior Entity within the five (5) business day period specified in Section 25.8.2.1 of this Attachment S. Headroom obligations related to a System Upgrade Facility that has been fully constructed must be satisfied by cash payment. Starting with Class Year 2012, all remaining Headroom obligations may be satisfied by a form of "Headroom Security" – a bond, irrevocable letter of credit, parent company guarantee or other form of security from an entity with an investment grade rating, executed for the benefit of the prior Entity, meeting the requirements of these cost allocation rules, and meeting the respective commercially reasonable requirements of the prior Entity. Headroom Security shall be posted to cover the period ending on the date on which full payment is made to the prior Entity for the Headroom obligation; provided, however, that Headroom Security may be posted with a term as short as one year, so long as such Headroom Security is replaced no later than fifteen (15) business days before its stated expiration. In the event Headroom Security is not replaced as required in the preceding sentence, the prior Entity shall be entitled to draw upon the Headroom Security and convert it to cash, which cash shall be held by the prior Entity for the account of the Developer.

25.8.8 Headroom Account Adjustments in the ATBA

In addition to the adjustments made by the ISO in Headroom accounts to reflect the impact of subsequent Projects, the ISO will make other adjustments to Headroom accounts when preparing for each Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment. The ISO will make these adjustments to reflect the impact of changes in the Existing System Representation modeled for the Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment that result from the installation, expansion or retirement of generation and transmission facilities for load growth and changes in load patterns. Such changes in the Existing System Representation can also result from changes in these rules or the criteria, methods or, software used to apply these rules.

25.8.8.1 No compensation will be paid as a result of these changes to the Existing System Representation. However, the ISO will adjust the ratios of dollars to electrical values in each Entity's account to maintain the economic value of the Entity's account that existed before the changes were made in the Existing System Representation.

25.8.8.2 The ISO will make no adjustments to Headroom accounts for the impact of subsequent generic solutions, except in those cases where the generic solution is a Class Year Project and the adjustment is made to reflect the impact of the Class Year Project.

25.8.9 Rate Base Facilities

With the exception of Developer use of Headroom created by Load Serving Entity funding of Highway System Deliverability Upgrades pursuant to Schedule 12 of the ISO OATT, Developers are not charged for their use of any rate base facilities, except to the degree

applicable as customers taking service in accordance with the rates, if any, that apply to those facilities.

25.9 Going Forward

25.9.1 ERIS Election and future Evaluation for CRIS

Whenever a Developer elects to interconnect taking ERIS only, that Developer may, at any later date, ask the ISO to evaluate the Developer's Large Facility or Small Generating Facility for CRIS by including the Developer's Large Facility or Small Generating Facility in (1) the next Open Class Year and the Deliverability Study to be conducted for that Class Year; or (2) the next open Expedited Deliverability Study.

25.9.2 No Developer Responsibility for Future Upgrades

Once a Developer has posted Security for its share of the System Upgrade Facilities required for its project, and paid cash or posted Security for its share of the System Deliverability Upgrades required for its project, then, except as provided in Section 25.8.6 of these rules, that Developer has no further responsibility for the cost of additional Attachment Facilities, Distribution Upgrades System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades that may be required in the future.

25.9.2.1 The Project interconnection agreement executed between a Developer and its Connecting Transmission Owner will reflect the Developer's responsibility for the cost of new Attachment Facilities, Distribution Upgrades and System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades, as that responsibility has been determined in accordance with these rules.

25.9.2.2 The cost of those additional Attachment Facilities, Distribution Upgrades, System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades needed for future interconnection projects will be shared between future Developers and

Transmission Owners, and allocated among future Developers, in accordance with the rules.

25.9.3 CRIS Rights

25.9.3.1 Retaining CRIS Status

Facilities qualifying for CRIS will retain their CRIS Status at the capacity level found deliverable pursuant to this Attachment S, as allocated among the facilities' individual units, as applicable, regardless of subsequent changes to the transmission system or the transfer of facility ownership, provided the facility has not withdrawn from the ISO interconnection queue, remains capable of operating at the capacity level studied, and is not CRIS-inactive for more than three (3) continuous years.

25.9.3.1.1 For the purpose of the rules in this Section 25.9.3, and in Sections 25.9.4 and 25.9.5 of Attachment S, once a facility has synchronized and has CRIS, becomes CRIS-inactive on the last day of the month for which it fails to (i) offer capacity into ISO capacity auctions, and/or (ii) certify capacity as an Installed Capacity Supplier through a Bilateral Transaction(s) or Export of capacity to an External Control Area, except as provided in Sections 25.9.3.1.1.1 and 25.9.3.1.1.2 below.

25.9.3.1.1.1 A facility that has synchronized before February 29, 2020 and was not CRIS-inactive under the previously-effective rules due to its activity as a load modifier, will be considered CRIS-inactive no earlier than February 29, 2020, based on its activity on and after that date.

25.9.3.1.1.2 A facility that has synchronized before February 29, 2020 but never offered capacity into ISO capacity auctions or certified capacity through a bilateral prior

to February 29, 2020 will be considered CRIS-inactive no earlier than February 29, 2020, based on its activity on and after that date.

25.9.3.1.2 In the case of a CRIS-inactive facility, the facility's CRIS status at the capacity level eligible for CRIS terminates three years after the facility becomes CRIS-inactive, except as provided in Sections 5.18.2.3.2, 5.18.3.3.2, and 5.18.5 of the Services Tariff, unless the CRIS-inactive facility takes one of the following actions before the end of the three-year period: (1) returns to service and participation in ISO capacity auctions or bilateral transactions; (2) transfers capacity deliverability rights to another facility as permitted by Sections 25.9.4 and 25.9.5 of this Attachment S

25.9.3.2 Term of External CRIS Rights

25.9.3.2.1 The initial term of External CRIS Rights, whether based on a Contract or Non-Contract Commitment, will be for an Award Period of no less than five (5) years.

25.9.3.2.2 An entity holding External CRIS Rights may renew those rights for one or more subsequent terms, as described below:

25.9.3.2.2.1 An entity holding External CRIS Rights based on a Contract Commitment may renew its External CRIS Rights, provided that the ISO receives from the entity a request to renew on or before the date specified in Section 25.9.3.2.2.3 indicating that the entity has renewed its bilateral contract to supply External Installed Capacity for an additional term of no less than five (5) years. If the entity does so, then that entity's External CRIS Rights will be renewed for the

same additional term, without any further evaluation of the deliverability of the External Installed Capacity covered by the renewed bilateral contract.

25.9.3.2.2.2 An entity holding External CRIS Rights based on a Non-Contract Commitment may renew its External CRIS Rights, provided that the ISO receives from the entity a request to renew on or before the date specified in Section 25.9.3.2.2.3. Any Non-Contract Commitment renewal must be for an additional term of no less than five (5) years. If the entity does so, then that entity's External CRIS Rights will be renewed for the same additional term, without any further evaluation of the deliverability of the External Installed Capacity associated with the Non-Contract Commitment.

25.9.3.2.2.3 Requests for renewal of External CRIS Rights must be received by the ISO on or before a date defined by the earlier of: (i) six months prior to the expiration date of the Contract or Non-Contract Commitment, or (ii) one month prior to the Study Start Date of the ATRA that is prior to the start of the last Summer Capability Period within the current Award Period or renewal of an Award Period.

25.9.3.2.3 External CRIS Rights will terminate at the end of the effective Award Period or renewal of an Award Period if those rights have not been renewed for an additional term, pursuant to the process described above.

25.9.3.3 CRIS for Facilities Pre-Dating Class Year 2007

For Large Facilities and Small Generating Facilities pre-dating Class Year 2007, *i.e.*, facilities interconnected or completely studied for interconnection before the projects in Class Year 2007, the facility shall qualify for CRIS service so long as (i) it is not retired (*e.g.*,

identified as retired in a NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report prior to October 5, 2008, (ii) its interconnection agreement is not terminated, and (iii) the facility begins commercial operations within three years of the commercial operation date or comparable commencement date specified in its initial interconnection agreement filing. A generator or merchant transmission facility pre-dating Class Year 2007 without an interconnection agreement on October 5, 2008, or one with an initial interconnection agreement filing that does not specify a commercial operation date or any comparable commencement date, shall qualify for CRIS so long as it is not retired (*e.g.*, identified as retired in a NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report) prior to October 5, 2008 and it begins commercial operations within three years of its in-service date specified in the 2008 NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report. For generators pre-dating Class Year 2007, the CRIS capacity level will be set at the maximum DMNC level achieved during the five most recent Summer Capability Periods prior to October 5, 2008, even if that DMNC value exceeds nameplate MW.

For a generator pre-dating Class Year 2007 and not having DMNC levels recorded for five Summer Capability Periods prior to October 5, 2008, its CRIS capacity level will be set, and reset if necessary, at the maximum DMNC level achieved during successive Summer Capability Periods until it has DMNC levels recorded for five Summer Capability Periods. Prior to the establishment of the generator's first DMNC value for a Summer Capability Period, the generator's CRIS level will be set at nameplate MW. The CRIS capacity level for intermittent resources pre-dating Class Year 2007 will be set at nameplate MW, and the CRIS capacity level for controllable lines pre-dating Class Year 2007 will be set at the MW of Unforced Capacity Deliverability Rights awarded to them. Existing generators that are eligible for CRIS under this Section 25.9.3.3.3 that wish to obtain CRIS pursuant to this provision must request CRIS within

60 days of May 19, 2016; CRIS cannot be obtained under this Section 25.9.3.3.3 if not requested by such date.

25.9.3.4 CRIS for Facilities Not Subject to ISO Interconnection Procedures

Starting May 19, 2016, all facilities that wish to become eligible to participate as Installed Capacity Suppliers pursuant to the requirements of Section 5.12 of the ISO Services Tariff, must have CRIS, even if the facility is not or was not, when interconnected, subject to the ISO's interconnection procedures set forth in Attachments X or Z to the OATT.

Facilities not subject to the ISO's interconnection procedures set forth in Attachments X and Z to the OATT may obtain CRIS rights by (i) entering a Class Year Deliverability Study and satisfying the NYISO Deliverability Interconnection Standard or (ii) satisfying the requirements set forth in Section 25.9.3.4.1. For a facility subject to this Section 25.9.3.4 that has obtained CRIS on or before February 29, 2020, its CRIS will terminate four (4) years after February 29, 2020 if the Developer has failed to provide notice to the ISO that the facility has synchronized. For a facility subject to this Section 25.9.3.4 that obtains CRIS after February 29, 2020, its CRIS will terminate four (4) years after the facility obtains CRIS, if the Developer fails to provide notice to the ISO that the facility has synchronized.

25.9.3.4.1 A facility not subject to the ISO's interconnection procedures set forth in Attachments X and Z to the OATT may obtain CRIS without being evaluated in a Class Year Deliverability Study if it meets the following requirements (i) if the facility has not commenced Commercial Operation, it must have completed all required interconnection studies and have an effective interconnection agreement by May 19, 2016, (ii) if the facility has commenced Commercial Operation by May 19, 2016, it must have an effective interconnection agreement and must not

have been out-of-service for more than three (3) consecutive years; (iii) it is not or was not, when first interconnected, subject to the ISO's interconnection procedures set forth in Attachments X and Z to the OATT, and (iv) the facility owner must request CRIS within 60 days of May 19, 2016. The CRIS level for a facility that qualifies for CRIS under this Section 25.9.3.4.1 will be set in accordance with Section 25.9.3.4.1.1 and 25.9.3.4.1.2.

25.9.3.4.1.1 BTM:NG Resource

A BTM:NG Resource's initial CRIS level will be set at its Net-ICAP level. The CRIS level will be set, and reset if necessary, at the maximum Net-ICAP level achieved during successive Summer Capability Periods until the facility has Net-ICAP levels recorded for five Summer Capability Periods. The five-year CRIS set and reset period begins with the first Summer Capability Period, following receipt of an initial CRIS value, for which the BTM:NG Resource's Net-ICAP calculation incorporates a demonstrated Average Coincident Host Load. The final CRIS level will be the highest Net-ICAP recorded for the Summer Capability Period during the five-year set and reset period, excluding the initial CRIS level.

The five-year CRIS set and reset period will terminate early, before five Net-ICAP values have been recorded if any of the following conditions occurs: (i) the BTM:NG Resource ceases to qualify as a BTM:NG Resource pursuant to Section 5.12.1 of the Services Tariff; (ii) the BTM:NG Resource elects to participate as another type of Installed Capacity Supplier, other than as a BTM:NG Resource; or (iii) the BTM:NG Resource's Net ICAP is equal to or less than zero for a Capability Period. Upon an early termination of the five-year CRIS set and reset period, the final CRIS value will be determined based on the available data from the CRIS set and reset

period up to the point of early termination – *i.e.*, the highest Net-ICAP value recorded during the CRIS set and reset period prior to the point of early termination.

25.9.3.4.1.2. Facilities Other than BTM:NG Resources

Prior to the establishment of the generator's first DMNC value for a Summer Capability Period, the generator's CRIS level will be set at nameplate MW. The CRIS level will be set, and reset if necessary, at the maximum DMNC level achieved during successive Summer Capability Periods until the facility has DMNC levels recorded for five Summer Capability Periods.

25.9.3.5 CRIS for BTM:NG Resources Evaluated in a Class Year Deliverability Study

If meter data is available for both the Load and the generator, the initial CRIS that can be requested is limited to the demonstrated Net-ICAP. If meter data is not available for either the Load or the generator of the BTM:NG Resource, the initial CRIS that can be requested is limited to the Net-ICAP calculation set forth in Section 5.12.1 of the ISO Services Tariff. The initial CRIS level will set at the CRIS MW level evaluated in the Class Year Deliverability Study and either found to be deliverable or for which the Developer accepted its Project Cost Allocation and posted Security for any required System Deliverability Upgrades.

The CRIS level will be set, and reset if necessary, at the maximum DMNC level achieved during successive Summer Capability Periods, not to exceed the initial CRIS level, until the facility has DMNC levels recorded for five Summer Capability Periods – *i.e.*, the initial CRIS level will act as a cap through the set and reset period and for the final CRIS level. The final CRIS level will be the highest Net-ICAP recorded for the Summer Capability Period during the five-year set and reset period, excluding the initial CRIS level.

The five-year CRIS set and reset period will terminate early, before five Net-ICAP values have been recorded if any of the following conditions occurs: (i) the BTM:NG Resource ceases to qualify as a BTM:NG Resource pursuant to Section 5.12.1 of the Services Tariff; (ii) the BTM:NG Resource elects to participate as another type of Installed Capacity Supplier, other than as a BTM:NG Resource; or (iii) the BTM:NG Resource's Net ICAP is equal to or less than zero for a Capability Period. Upon an early termination of the five-year CRIS set and reset period, the final CRIS value will be determined based on the available data from the CRIS set and reset period up to the point of early termination – *i.e.*, the highest Net ICAP value recorded during the CRIS set and reset period prior to the point of early termination.

25.9.4 Transfer of Deliverability Rights - Same Location

If a facility deactivates an existing facility within the NYCA and commissions a new one at the same electrical location, the CRIS status of the deactivated facility and its deliverable capacity level may be transferred to that same electrical location, provided that the new facility becomes operational within three years from the deactivation of the original facility; provided however, a facility comprised of multiple Generators may only transfer CRIS under this Section 25.9.4 if all of the individual Generators within the facility deactivate. The new facility will only acquire the assigned capacity deliverability rights once the new facility becomes operational. Capacity rights will be stated in MW of Installed Capacity. In the case of transfers between the same or different resource types, those MW of Installed Capacity will be adjusted by the derate factor applicable to the existing facility (based on the asset-class derate factors used in the most recent Class Year Deliverability Study) before the transfer and, following the transfer, will be readjusted to MW of Installed Capacity in accordance with the derate factor applicable to the

new facility (based on the asset-class derate factors used in the most recent Class Year Deliverability Study).

25.9.5 Transfer of Deliverability Rights - Different Locations

Rights may also be transferred on a bilateral basis between an existing facility within the NYCA and a new facility at a different location within the NYCA to the extent that the new facility is found to be deliverable after the existing facility assumes ERIS status or deactivates. The new facility may contract with an existing facility (with assigned capacity rights) to transfer some or all of the existing facility's assigned capacity rights. The new facility will be allowed to acquire these rights if it meets the deliverability test executed in the following manner:

25.9.5.1 Prior to the Class Year Deliverability Study, the new and existing facilities involved in the transfer transaction must tell the ISO the MW level of capacity rights proposed to be transferred. Capacity rights will be stated in MW of Installed Capacity. In the case of transfers between different resource types, those MW of Installed Capacity will be adjusted by the derate factor applicable to the existing facility before the transfer and, following the transfer, will be readjusted to MW of Installed Capacity in accordance with the derate factor applicable to the new project. All derate factors will be based on the asset-class derate factors in the current Class Year Deliverability Study.

25.9.5.1.1 The ISO will evaluate the deliverability of the Class Year projects together, with no transfers, to determine the extent to which new facilities in the Class Year that are parties to proposed transactions are deliverable without the proposed transfers.

25.9.5.1.2 The ISO will then reduce the output of all established facilities that are parties to proposed transactions to see if the new facility counterparties benefit, *i.e.*, their undeliverable capacity is made deliverable, from the proposed transfers; provided, however, the established facilities will be reduced only to the extent that their reduction does not adversely impact the deliverability of Class Year projects that are not parties to the proposed transactions.

25.9.5.1.3 If the deliverability test conducted by the ISO shows that the new Class Year projects that are parties to the proposed transactions are fully or partially deliverable with these reductions of the established facility counterparties, then the new projects will be given five business days to notify the ISO as to whether their particular transaction is final or not. If any proposed transactions are not finalized, then Sections 25.9.5.1.1 and 25.9.5.1.2 will be repeated until all proposed transactions have been terminated or finalized.

25.9.5.2 For each finalized transaction, the existing facility that is a party to the transaction will be modeled in Class Year Study at its reduced output level (current level less CRIS finally transferred adjusted by the applicable derate factors). The Deliverability of Class Year Projects not parties to finalized transactions may benefit, but will not be adversely affected, by those transactions.

25.9.5.3 The existing facility will be restricted in future capacity sales up to levels consistent with the CRIS rights that were transferred to the new project counterparty.

25.9.5.4 The new project will only acquire the assigned capacity rights once the new project becomes operational at the levels necessary to utilize those rights.

25.9.6 Transfer of External CRIS Rights

A holder of External CRIS Rights may transfer some or all of the Contract or Non-Contract CRIS MW that it holds to another entity, provided that the following requirements are met:

25.9.6.1 The entity to receive the External CRIS Rights must, prior to the transfer, make either (i) a Contract Commitment of External Installed Capacity satisfying the requirements of Section 25.7.11.1.1 of this Attachment S, or (ii) a Non-Contract Commitment of External Installed Capacity satisfying the requirements of Section 25.7.11.1.2 of this Attachment S; and

25.9.6.2 The External Installed Capacity of the entity to receive the External CRIS Rights must use the same External Interface(s) used by the External Installed Capacity of the entity currently holding the External CRIS Rights; and

25.9.6.3 The transfer must be for the remaining duration of the Award Period or renewal of an Award Period currently effective for the External CRIS Rights to be transferred; and

25.9.6.4 If the holder of External CRIS Rights transfers some, but not all of its CRIS MW, the number of CRIS MW transferred must be such that, following the transfer, both the holder and the entity receiving External CRIS Rights satisfy the applicable requirements of Section 25.7.11.1.1 and 25.7.11.1.2 of this Attachment S; and

25.9.6.5 The transfer must take place on or before the earlier of:

25.9.6.5.1 Six months prior to the expiration date of the Contract or Non-Contract Commitment of the entity currently holding the External CRIS Rights to be transferred; or

25.9.6.5.2 One month prior to the Study Start Date of the ATRA that is prior to the start of the last Summer Capability Period within the current Award Period or renewal of an Award Period.

25.10 Miscellaneous Provisions

25.10.1 Non-financial Settlement of 2004

Notwithstanding any foregoing provisions to the contrary, the following provisions apply to the resumption of the cost allocation process after the approval by FERC of the Non-Financial Settlement.

25.10.1.1 Upon the study start date specified in the Non-Financial Settlement (“Study Start Date”), the ISO shall resume the cost allocation process set forth herein.

25.10.1.2 Except as provided below, the initial cost allocation shall determine the System Upgrade Facilities required for the reliable interconnection of all Developer projects that have met the milestones identified in Section 25.6.2.3.1 of this Attachment S on or before the Study Start Date. The ISO shall prepare an ATRA with respect to these Developer projects as a single class (the “Catch Up Class Year”). The Catch Up Class Year shall not include (1) Class Year 2001 Developer projects that have accepted their Project Cost Allocation prior to the Study Start Date, or (2) Class Year 2002 Developer Projects that have accepted their Project Cost Allocation pursuant to the terms of the Non-Financial Settlement.

25.10.1.3 The ISO shall use the 2004 Load and Capacity Data Report for the Catch Up Class Year cost allocation studies, unless the Study Start Date is later than January 1, 2005 in which event the ISO shall use the 2005 Load and Capacity Data Report. The Catch Up Class Year cost allocation studies shall identify system needs for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2005. In the event the

Study Start Date is later than January 1, 2005 the Catch Up Class Year cost allocation studies shall identify system needs for the five-year period beginning January 1, 2006. The ISO shall present the results of the Catch Up Class Year cost allocation studies to the Operating Committee for approval as provided in Section 25.10.4 of this Attachment S.

25.10.1.4 The ISO shall represent the NYPA Poletti project in the ATBA and ATRA for the Catch Up Class Year as connected to the Astoria West Substation.

25.10.1.5 Once all Developers in the Catch Up Class Year have either (i) accepted their Project Cost Allocation, or (ii) dropped out of the class, the ISO shall resume annual cost allocations with respect to individual Class Years in accordance with the time frames set out in these rules.

25.10.1.6 All Developer projects in the Catch Up Class Year who do not accept their Project Cost Allocation shall be included in the ATRA in the next Class Year cost allocation process.

25.10.1.7 The ISO shall finalize the results of the Class Year 2002 cost allocation (including headroom issues) in accordance with the provisions of the Non-Financial Settlement.

25.10.2 Combined Study of Class Years 2009 and 2010

Notwithstanding any foregoing provisions to the contrary, the following special provisions apply to the Interconnection Facilities Studies for Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010. These provisions provide that Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will be performed on a combined basis. However, cost allocation for these two Class Years will be calculated separately, as described herein. All provisions of this Attachment S that are not inconsistent with

the special provisions of this Section 25.10.2 shall apply as they normally do to projects in Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.1 A single ATBA under the Minimum Interconnection Standard for the Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will be developed using the 2010 NYISO Load and Capacity Data Report and will be the same ATBA as would otherwise be developed for the 2010 Class Year Study absent the combination of Class Year 2010 with Class Year 2009. This ATBA will be the starting point for a single deliverability baseline used under the Deliverability Interconnection Standard for Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010. For purposes of this Section 25.10.2, “ATBA-Deliverability” refers to the deliverability baseline developed for Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 pursuant to this Section, and “ATRA-Deliverability” refers to the ATBA-Deliverability with the relevant Class Year projects added, as described below.

25.10.2.2 There will be two ATRAs and two ATRAs-Deliverability in the combined Class Year study: an ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2009, as well as an ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.2.1 The ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2009 will be the ATBA and ATBA-Deliverability, respectively, developed pursuant to Section 25.10.2.1 above, plus the projects that qualified for Class Year 2009 on or before March 1, 2009 and entered Class Year 2009.

25.10.2.2.2 The ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2010 will be the ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability for Class Year 2009, plus the projects that qualified for Class Year 2010 on or before March 1, 2010 and entered Class Year

2010.

25.10.2.3 Cost Allocation for the Two Class Years

25.10.2.3.1 The cost allocation for Class Year 2009 System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades will be calculated based on the incremental impact of the Class Year 2009 projects (i.e., the 2009 ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability) over the ATBA and ATBA-Deliverability, respectively, developed pursuant to Section 25.10.2.1 above.

25.10.2.3.2 The cost allocation for Class Year 2010 System Upgrade Facilities and System Deliverability Upgrades will be calculated based on the incremental impact of the Class Year 2010 projects (i.e., the 2010 ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability) over the Class Year 2009 ATRA and ATRA-Deliverability, respectively, as described fully below.

25.10.2.3.3 If Class Year 2010 projects use Headroom on System Upgrade Facilities or System Deliverability Upgrades identified for Class Year 2009 projects, the Class Year Study for Class Year 2010 will identify the Headroom use payments that must be made by Class Year 2010 projects to Class Year 2009 projects.

25.10.2.3.4 In the event that a System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade identified for Class Year 2009 is replaced in the Class Year Study for Class Year 2010 by a more capable System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade required for projects in Class Year 2010, the cost allocation for Class Year 2009 will be based on the System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade identified for Class Year 2009, and the cost allocation to Class Year 2010 will be based on the more capable replacement

System Upgrade Facility or System Deliverability Upgrade.

25.10.2.4 Operating Committee Approval, Project Cost Allocation Decision Process and Class Year Settlement.

25.10.2.4.1 The initial Project Cost Allocation contained in the ATRA and Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2009 will be based upon all projects in Class Year 2009. The initial Project Cost Allocation contained in the ATRA and Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2010 will be based upon all projects in Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010, except as described below in Section 25.10.2.4.4.3.

25.10.2.4.2 The ISO will undertake to complete the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2009 and the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2010 in parallel so that both study reports are ready to be presented at the same Operating Committee meeting. However, if at any time, the ISO determines that the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2009 is ready for presentation to the Operating Committee (following applicable working group and subcommittee review), the ISO will present that study report to the Operating Committee regardless of the status of the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2010. The Operating Committee will separately vote to approve the study report for Class Year 2009 and the study report for Class Year 2010, even if both study reports are presented at the same Operating Committee meeting.

25.10.2.4.3 If the Class Year Study Reports for Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 are both approved at the same Operating Committee meeting, the Project Cost Allocation decision process will commence at that time and be conducted in

parallel for the projects in both Class Years, as described in Section 25.10.2.4.5 below.

25.10.2.4.4 If the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2009 is approved at an Operating Committee meeting where either (1) the study report for Class Year 2010 is not presented for approval, or (2) the study report for Class Year 2010 is presented for approval but not approved, the following process will be followed:

25.10.2.4.4.1 The Project Cost Allocation decision process for Class Year 2009 will not commence until the following Operating Committee meeting (“Second Operating Committee Meeting”), held not more than forty-five (45) days after the Operating Committee meeting where the study report for Class Year 2009 was approved.

25.10.2.4.4.2 If the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2010 is approved at the Second Operating Committee Meeting, the Project Cost Allocation decision process for the projects in both Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will commence at that time and be conducted in parallel for the projects in both Class Years as described in Section 25.10.2.4.5 below.

25.10.2.4.4.3 If the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2010 is not approved at the Second Operating Committee Meeting, the Project Cost Allocation decision process for the projects in Class Year 2009 will commence immediately upon the Second Operating Committee Meeting and will follow the existing Project Cost Allocation decision process described in Sections 25.8.1-25.8.4 of Attachment S, with initial Acceptance Notices and/or Non-Acceptance Notices due 30 days after the Second Operating Committee Meeting. When the Project Cost Allocation decision process for the projects in Class Year 2009 is completed, and the Class

Year Study Report for Class Year 2010 has been revised to reflect the final settlement of Class Year 2009 and is otherwise complete, the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2010 will be presented to the Operating Committee meeting for approval. Upon Operating Committee approval of the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2010, the Project Cost Allocation decision process for the projects in Class Year 2010 will begin.

25.10.2.4.4.4 Only in the event that the Class Year Study Report for Class Year 2010 is not approved at the Second Operating Committee Meeting, as described immediately above in Section 25.10.2.4.4.3, a Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2009 providing a Non-Acceptance Notice for its System Upgrade Facility Project Cost Allocation may, by the due date for providing such notice, elect to enter Class Year 2010, and its project will be placed in Class Year 2010, provided that (a) the project is otherwise eligible under the Class Year re-entry rules, (b) it submits to the ISO an executed Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement, together with the required deposit and data, within ten (10) days of its receipt of the Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement, and (c) cures any deficiency in its submittal within five (5) Business Days after receiving notice from the ISO about such deficiency. A project in Class Year 2009 committing a Security Posting Default may not enter Class Year 2010. Other than as described in this Section 25.10.2.4.4.4, projects in Class Year 2009 may not enter Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.4.5 If both Class Year Study Reports are approved by the Operating Committee, either at the same meeting or by the Second Operating Committee

Meeting, as described above in Sections 25.10.2.4.2-25.10.2.4.4, the Developers and Interconnection Customers in both Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will have thirty (30) days from the date of Operating Committee approval of the Interconnection Facilities Study Report for Class Year 2010 to provide an Acceptance Notice(s) or Non-Acceptance Notice(s) in accordance with Sections 25.8.1-25.8.4 of Attachment S. If any Developer or Interconnection Customer in either Class Year 2009 or Class Year 2010 provides a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default, the ISO will prepare a revised Class Year Study Report by the following process:

25.10.2.4.5.1 If any Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2009 provides a Non-Acceptance Notice(s) and/or commits a Security Posting Default, the ISO will notify all Developers and Interconnection Customers in both Class Years as required by Section 25.8.2 of Attachment S, and will prepare (1) a revised ATRA and/or Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2009 to reflect impact of the Non-Acceptance Notice(s) and/or Security Posting Default(s) from Class Year 2009 projects, and (2) a revised ATRA and/or Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2010 to reflect the impact of the Non-Acceptance Notice(s) and/or Security Posting Default(s) from Class Year 2009 project and Class Year 2010 projects. The ISO will prepare and publish the required ATRAs and/or Class Year Deliverability Study(ies) for both Class Years within four (4) weeks of its receipt of the last Non-Acceptance Notice or its receipt of notice of the last Security Posting Default, whichever is later.

25.10.2.4.5.2 If any Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2010

provides a Non-Acceptance Notice(s) and/or commits a Security Posting Default, but no Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2009 does so, the ISO will notify all Developers and Interconnection Customers in both Class Years as required by Section 25.8.2 of Attachment S, and will prepare and publish a revised ATRA and/or Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2010 within two (2) weeks of its receipt of the last Non-Acceptance Notice or its receipt of notice of the last Security Posting Default, whichever is later. The ISO will not revise the ATRA or the Class Year Deliverability Study for Class Year 2009 as a result of a Non-Acceptance Notice from or a Security Posting Default by a Developer or Interconnection Customer in Class Year 2010.

25.10.2.4.5.3 The process described in the foregoing Sections 25.10.2.4.5.1 and/or 25.10.2.4.5.2 will be repeated until either (1) none of the remaining eligible Class Year Developers or Interconnection Customers provides a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default, or (2) all Developers or Interconnection Customers have dropped out of their respective Class Years.

25.10.2.5 Except for projects in Class Year 2009 that elect to enter Class Year 2010 pursuant to the procedures described above in Section 25.10.2.4.4.4, Class Year 2009 and Class Year 2010 will be considered as a single Class Year for purposes of calculating the number of Class Years a project may enter pursuant to Section 25.8.2.3 of Attachment S. A project that was in Class Year 2009 but elects to enter Class Year 2010 under section 25.10.2.4.4.4 that subsequently provides a Non-Acceptance Notice or commits a Security Posting Default related to its System Upgrade Facilities for Class Year 2010 will be deemed to have withdrawn

its Interconnection Request in accordance with Section 30.3.6 of the Large Facility Interconnection Procedures in Attachment X to the OATT, or in accordance with Attachment Z to the OATT, as applicable.

25.10.3 ISO Data Requirements

Developers and Transmission Owners shall provide the ISO with all data necessary to make the determinations contemplated by these rules.

25.10.4 Rights Under the Federal Power Act

Nothing in these rules restricts the rights of any person under the OATT, or the right of any person to file a complaint with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under the relevant provisions of the Federal Power Act.

25.10.5 Transmission Service Customer Rights

Nothing in these rules precludes any transmission service customer from receiving transmission service charge credits to the extent the customer is entitled to such credits under FERC policy and precedent.

25.11 Appendices

APPENDIX 1 TO ATTACHMENT S– Allocation of Overage Cost

An Example of the Allocation of Overage Cost Among Class Year Developers, in

Accordance with Section 25.6.2 of Attachment S:

- There are five Developer projects in Class Year 20XX.
- The Annual Transmission Reliability Assessment (“ATRA”) determines that 10 System Upgrade Facilities (“SUFs”) are needed to reliably interconnect the Class Year 20XX projects, at a total cost of \$30 million.
- The Annual Transmission Baseline Assessment (“ATBA”) determines that 7 SUFs would be needed to meet reliability standards without the Class Year 20XX projects, at a total cost of \$20 million. (Note: The ATBA may have included some generic “projects” identical to or similar to some of the Class Year 20XX projects, but not necessarily. Also, some of the SUFs identified by the ATBA may be the same as those identified in the ATRA, but not necessarily.)
 - (1) The total cost of ATRA SUFs allocated to the Transmission Owners (“TOs”) is equal to the total cost of the ATBA SUFs (\$20 million).
 - (2) The total cost of ATRA SUFs allocated to the Developers, the Overage Cost, is the net of the total cost of the ATRA vs. ATBA SUFs (\$30 million - \$20 million = \$10 million).
 - (3) The ratio of the Overage Cost to the total cost of ATRA SUFs, the Overage Cost Percentage, is used to compute the Developers’ cost allocations for each ATRA SUF. In this example, the Overage Cost Percentage, the ratio, = \$10 million/\$30 million = 1/3 (The Developers pay 1/3 the cost of each ATRA SUF). Assume the cost of one of the ATRA SUFs (SUF#1) is \$3 million. The Developers’ share of the cost of that SUF = 1/3 x \$3 million = \$1 million.
 - (4) The Developers’ share of the cost of each ATRA SUF is allocated among all the Developers that have at least a *de minimus* impact causing the need for that SUF. In this example, the ATRA determines that 3 of the 5 Class Year 200X projects have at least a *de minimus* impact causing the need for SUF#1.

- (5) The Developers' cost of an ATRA SUF is allocated to each Developer that has at least a *de minimus* impact in accordance with the Contribution Percentage, or ratio of that Developer's measured impact, its electrical contribution, to the sum of the measured impact of all the Developers that have at least a *de minimus* impact.

In this example, the measured impacts of the three projects are 200, 300, and 500 amps, respectively. Thus the pro rata shares of the projects' cost of SUF#1 are \$200K, \$300K, and \$500K, respectively.

APPENDIX 2 TO ATTACHMENT S – Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this ____ day of _____, 20__ by and among _____, a _____ organized and existing under the laws of the State of _____ (“Developer”), the New York Independent System Operator, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York (“NYISO”), and _____ a _____ organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York (“Connecting Transmission Owner”). Developer, NYISO and Connecting Transmission Owner each may be referred to as a “Party,” or collectively as the “Parties.”

RECITALS

WHEREAS, Developer is proposing to develop or owns an existing or facility requesting Capacity Resource Interconnection Service (“CRIS”); and

WHEREAS, the NYISO has confirmed that the Developer has satisfied the eligibility requirements for entering an Expedited Deliverability Study; and

WHEREAS, Developer has elected to enter an Expedited Deliverability Study in order to obtain or increase CRIS pursuant to Attachments S, X and Z to the NYISO’s Open Access Transmission Tariff (“OATT”), as applicable.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of and subject to the mutual covenants contained herein the Parties agreed as follows:

- 1.0 When used in this Agreement, with initial capitalization, the terms specified shall have the meanings indicated in Section 30.1 of Attachment X to the NYISO’s OATT or Section 25.1.2 of Attachment S to the NYISO’s OATT.
- 2.0 Developer elects to be evaluated for CRIS and NYISO shall cause to be performed an Expedited Deliverability Study consistent with Attachments S and X to the ISO OATT. The terms of the above-referenced OATT Attachments, as applicable, are hereby incorporated by reference herein.
- 3.0 The scope of the Expedited Deliverability Study shall be subject to the assumptions set forth in Attachment A and the data provided in Attachment B to this Agreement.
- 4.0 The Expedited Deliverability Study report (i) shall identify whether the facility is fully deliverable at its requested level of CRIS; and (ii) if not fully deliverable, shall determine the facility’s deliverable MW.
- 5.0 The Developer shall provide a deposit of \$30,000 for the performance of the Expedited Deliverability Study. The time for completion of the Expedited Deliverability Study is specified in Attachment A.

NYISO shall invoice Developer on a monthly basis for the expenses incurred by

NYISO and the Connecting Transmission Owner on the Expedited Deliverability Study each month, as computed on a time and materials basis in accordance with the rates attached hereto. Developer shall pay invoiced amounts to NYISO within thirty (30) Calendar Days of receipt of invoice. NYISO shall continue to hold the amounts on deposit until settlement of the final invoice.

6.0 Miscellaneous.

- 6.1 Accuracy of Information. Except as Developer or Connecting Transmission Owner may otherwise specify in writing when they provide information to NYISO under this Agreement, Developer and Connecting Transmission Owner each represent and warrant that the information it provides to NYISO shall be accurate and complete as of the date the information is provided. Developer and Connecting Transmission Owner shall each promptly provide NYISO with any additional information needed to update information previously provided.
- 6.2 Disclaimer of Warranty. In preparing the Expedited Deliverability Study, the Party preparing such study and any subcontractor consultants employed by it shall have to rely on information provided by the other Parties, and possibly by third parties, and may not have control over the accuracy of such information. Accordingly, neither the Party preparing the Expedited Deliverability Study nor any subcontractor consultant employed by that Party makes any warranties, express or implied, whether arising by operation of law, course of performance or dealing, custom, usage in the trade or profession, or otherwise, including without limitation implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose, with regard to the accuracy, content, or conclusions of the Expedited Deliverability Study. Developer acknowledges that it has not relied on any representations or warranties not specifically set forth herein and that no such representations or warranties have formed the basis of its bargain hereunder.
- 6.3 Limitation of Liability. In no event shall any Party or its subcontractor consultants be liable for indirect, special, incidental, punitive, or consequential damages of any kind including loss of profits, arising under or in connection with this Agreement or the Expedited Deliverability Study or any reliance on the Expedited Deliverability Study by any Party or third parties, even if one or more of the Parties or its subcontractor consultants have been advised of the possibility of such damages. Nor shall any Party or its subcontractor consultants be liable for any delay in delivery or for the non-performance or delay in performance of its obligations under this Agreement.
- 6.4 Third-Party Beneficiaries. Without limitation of Sections 6.2 and 6.3 of this Agreement, Developer and Connecting Transmission Owner further agree that subcontractor consultants employed by NYISO to conduct or

review, or to assist in the conducting or reviewing, an Expedited Deliverability Study shall be deemed third party beneficiaries of these Sections 6.2 and 6.3.

- 6.5 Term and Termination. This Agreement shall be effective from the date hereof and unless earlier terminated in accordance with this Section 6.5, shall continue in effect until the Expedited Deliverability Study is completed and approved by the NYISO Operating Committee. Developer or NYISO may terminate this Agreement upon the withdrawal of the Developer's project from the NYISO interconnection queue.
- 6.6 Governing Law. This Agreement shall be governed by and construed in accordance with the laws of the State of New York, without regard to any choice of laws provisions.
- 6.7 Severability. In the event that any part of this Agreement is deemed as a matter of law to be unenforceable or null and void, such unenforceable or void part shall be deemed severable from this Agreement and the Agreement shall continue in full force and effect as if each part was not contained herein.
- 6.8 Counterparts. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, and each counterpart shall have the same force and effect as the original instrument.
- 6.9 Amendment. No amendment, modification or waiver of any term hereof shall be effective unless set forth in writing signed by the Parties hereto.
- 6.10 Survival. All warranties, limitations of liability and confidentiality provisions provided herein shall survive the expiration or termination hereof.
- 6.11 Independent Contractor. NYISO shall at all times be deemed to be an independent contractor and none of its employees or the employees of its subcontractors shall be considered to be employees of Developer or Connecting Transmission Owner as a result of this Agreement.
- 6.12 No Implied Waivers. The failure of a Party to insist upon or enforce strict performance of any of the provisions of this Agreement shall not be construed as a waiver or relinquishment to any extent of such party's right to insist or rely on any such provision, rights and remedies in that or any other instances; rather, the same shall be and remain in full force and effect.
- 6.13 Successors and Assigns. This Agreement, and each and every term and condition hereof, shall be binding upon and inure to the benefit of the Parties hereto and their respective successors and assigns.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Parties have caused this Agreement to be duly executed

by their duly authorized officers or agents on the day and year first above written.

New York Independent System Operator, Inc.

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

[Insert name of Connecting Transmission Owner]

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

[Insert name of Developer]

By: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

Attachment A To Appendix 2 - Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement

SCHEDULE FOR CONDUCTING THE EXPEDITED DELIVERABILITY STUDY

The NYISO and Connecting Transmission Owner shall use Reasonable Efforts to complete the study and issue an Expedited Deliverability Study report to the Developer within the four months after of receipt of an executed copy of this Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement:

- Study work (other than data provision and study review) that may be requested of the Transmission Owner by the NYISO is currently not specified, but will be specified in a Study Work Agreement to be developed between the NYISO and Transmission Owner.
- Pursuant to Article 5.0 of this Agreement, the rates for the study work are attached as Exhibit 1.

Attachment B To Appendix 2 - Expedited Deliverability Study Agreement

DATA FORM TO BE PROVIDED BY DEVELOPER

WITH THE EXPEDITED DELIVERABILITY STUDY AGREEMENT

1. Provide location plan and simplified one-line diagram of the plant and station facilities. For staged projects, please indicate future generation, transmission circuits, etc.
2. Specify the MW level of Capacity Resource Interconnection Service (“CRIS”) requested; provided however, that CRIS requests are subject to the limits specified in Section 25.8.1 of Attachment S to the ISO OATT.

Evaluation election (MW of requested CRIS): _____

If the Project will consist of multiple units, specify the requested allocation of the above MW level of requested CRIS: _3. Proposed Schedule:

Begin Construction	Date: _____
In-Service	Date: _____
Initial Synchronization	Date: _____
Generation Testing	Date: _____
Commercial Operation	Date: _____

4. Additional Information Required as Part of this Data Form:

All facilities, including BTM:NG Resources, and Class Year Transmission Projects, must also complete Section A, below.

A. Additional Information:

Nameplate MW: _____

Nameplate MVA: _____

Auxiliary Load: _____

For temperature sensitive units, provide MW vs. temp curves and indicate maximum summer and winter net capability below:

- Maximum summer net (net MW = gross MW minus auxiliary loads total MW) which can be achieved at 90 degrees F: _____

- Maximum winter net (net MW = gross MW minus auxiliary loads total MW) which can be achieved at 10 degrees F : _____

1. One set of metering is required for each generation connection to the new ring bus or existing Connecting Transmission Owner station. Number of generation connections: _____

2. On the one-line indicate the generation capacity attached at each metering location. (Maximum load on CT/PT)

3. On the one-line indicate the location of auxiliary power. (Minimum load on CT/PT)
Amps

4. Will an alternate source of auxiliary power be available during CT/PT maintenance?
_____ Yes _____ No

5. Will a transfer bus on the generation side of the metering require that each meter set be designed for the total plant generation? _____ Yes _____ No

(If yes, indicate on one-line diagram).

6. What type of control system or PLC will be located at the Developer's facility?

7. What protocol does the control system or PLC use?

8. Please provide a 7.5-minute quadrangle of the site. Sketch the plant, station, transmission line, and property line.

9. Physical dimensions of the proposed interconnection station:

10. Bus length from generation to interconnection station:

11. Line length from interconnection station to Connecting Transmission Owner's transmission line.

12. Tower number observed in the field. (Painted on tower leg):

13. Number of third-party easements required for transmission lines, if known:

14. Describe any injection-limiting equipment if the facility is requesting ERIS below its full output:

15. In addition to the above information, as applicable, for BTM:NG Resources, please also provide the following information:

Interconnection Customer or Customer-Site Load: _____ kW (if none, so state)

Existing load? Yes ___ No ___

If existing load with metered load data, provide coincident Summer peak load: _____

If new load or existing load without metered load data, provide estimated coincident Summer peak load: _____

Is the *new or existing load* in the Transmission Owner's service area?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Local provider: _____