Straw Proposal
Coordination of Inclusion Rules for Interconnection Queues

Current Inclusion Rules for Queue Coordination

SIR process (5 MW or less)
- Project would be considered firm (i.e., modeled in base case for future projects) for the purpose of queue coordination when the project has an executed IA and made at least its 25% payment for upgrades (if required)

Utility process (non-SIR) (larger than 5 MW)
- Project would be considered firm for the purpose of queue coordination when the project has an executed IA and has made payment for all upgrades

NYISO process
- Non-Class Year project would be considered “firm” for the purpose of queue coordination when the project has executed a Facility Study Agreement.
- Class Year project would be considered “firm” for the purpose of queue coordination when the project accepts Class-Year cost allocation and post Security.

There is no ability to allocate costs for developers that fund upgrades in one interconnection process to any developer in any other interconnection process.

There is a need to ensure that there are clear and defined rules to address what happens when projects from other queues drop out and either upgrades that were required no longer are or additional upgrades are now required.
- For the SIR Process, each relied on upgrade (whether defined in the SIR, Utility or NYISO Process) and its costs should be included in the CESIR as potentially required upgrades if other projects do not progress.
- For the Utility Process, each relied on upgrade (whether defined in the SIR, Utility or NYISO Process) and its costs should be included in the Interconnection Report as potentially required upgrades if other projects do not progress. (i.e., they list contingent facilities and various cost scenarios)
- For the NYISO Process, each relied on upgrade (whether defined in the SIR or Utility Process) and its costs should be included in the SIS / SRIS and Part 1 Class Year Study or Facility Study as potentially required upgrades if other projects do not progress.