

TO: Mark Karl & Chris Hamlen, ISO-NE
FROM: Alternative Tie Benefit Proposal Proponents
RE: Information Request
DATE: November 5, 2010
CC: Eric Runge, NEPOOL Counsel

In connection with the discussion at the November 2, 2010 Reliability Committee (RC) meeting, and in particular with ISO-NE's offer to be helpful to stakeholders and states working to develop further details of the Alternative Proposal supported by the RC in a straw vote, please provide responses to the following requests.

If you view this request as unduly burdensome, please let us know promptly so that we can discuss.

We appreciate your response as soon as possible in light of the RC schedule on this issue. After you review this request, please let us know the date by which you can provide the analysis.

Please perform the following probabilistic runs of ICR:

1. As is conditions for external areas, no reserve requirement for ties, reserve requirement of 200 MW for ICR, no transmission constraints modeled, resources adjusted to meet 1 day in 10 years LOLE.
2. The same as case 1 except model transmission constraints as envisioned in Sections III.12.9.2.2 and III.12.9.2.3 of the draft Market Rules, with resources adjusted to meet 1 day in 10 years LOLE.
3. The same as case 2 but with a requirement of 700 MW of reserves to be provided through ties to external areas. Do not adjust resources, but rather report the resulting LOLE.
4. Adjust resources for case 3 to meet 1 day in 10 years LOLE.
5. The same as case 4 but with a requirement for an additional 500 MW of reserves in the calculation of ICR. Do not adjust resources, but rather report the resulting LOLE.
6. Adjust resources for case 5 to meet 1 day in 10 years LOLE.

Referring to Mr. Brandien's presentation to the Reliability Committee on August 25, his slide 6 indicated constraints at the NY Central East location of 875 MW and 600 MW for the 95th and 86th percentiles of his data set. What would those amounts have been at the 50th percentile and 98th percentile?