

Table A-3: 2012 IRM Data Scrub

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>	<u>Change Req'd</u>	<u>Effect on IRM¹</u>
NYISO findings				
1	The transfer limits from Ontario into zone A should show 1600 MW of import into NY and 1200 MW of export.	Final database and Assumptions Matrix (AM) have been corrected.	Yes	No
2	The LFU for PJM's RECO load had not been updated	Final database has been updated to include the latest LFU information.	Yes	No
3	Need identified to break the new unit called Bayonne into 8 units, per their reporting determination.	Final database has been updated to include this information.	Yes	No ²
4	Stony Creek start date had not been updated.	December start state changed to Aug per AM	Yes	No
5	Dynamic rating tied to a retired unit (Far Rockaway ST4)	Dynamic rating re-worked.	Yes	No ²
6	Duplication of Wading River Unit in transition rate table	Software takes the latest entry of data. This entry was correct.	No	No
TO Findings				
7	Interface ratings for LI to Con Ed should have changed with Far Rockaway retirement	A nomagram has been developed to represent the interface changes without the retired units.	Yes	No
8	EOP table SCR values fall short of the AM(attachment F) listed values	A revised EOP table has been issued to correct for the several MW shortfall.	Yes	No
9	In the "INF-DATA-00" table, the full interface name "AREA_K - NORWICH" should be "AREA_K - NORWALK" for the NYCA to ISONE interface "LI_NE".	Correct name in MIF	No	No
10	There is an extra letter "x" at the end of the data line of "@MAY2011** 'AMRFF2' "	This was introduced in the masking process. Preliminary base case mif is correct.	No	No
11	There are some differences of the unit maximum capacities found between the NYISO database and the NYISO Gold Book 2011.	Assumption matrix assumes the lesser of DMNC vs. CRIS MW values for the model.	No	No
12	Wind shape totals exceed the 1648 MW listed	There was a mismatch in the mif and the wind shapes sent to TOs. The mif was updated and is now correct	No	No
GE Findings				
13	Solar cap of 38.5 MW shows a July reading of 30.8 MW	Peak occurs in August at 38.5 MW. Database is correct as is.	No	No
14	Stony Creek Wind Farm has incorrect In-Service date	Corrected date.	Yes	No
15	The assumption matrix called for 50 MW of scheduled maintenance during	The NYISO models specific units for the maintenance. An exact MW	No	No

1 Changes lower than 0.001days/year LOLE are not considered material and not reported here.

2 Although the change in NYCA was less than a 0.001 days/year reduction, the LOLE was reduced in NYC by 0.002 days/year.

<u>Item</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>	<u>Change Req'd</u>	<u>Effect on IRM¹</u>
	the summer period. The actual scheduled maintenance modeled during the peak week was 63.5 MW.	match is not expected.		
16	The assumption matrix says that all contracts are being modeled as equivalent contracts, but the transfer limits between New York and PJM show 1,080 MW of contracts being modeled as adjustments to the transfer limits	The 1080 MW of derates on the PJM to NY ties represent the grandfathered contracts (37 MW) and the 1043 MW of electric transmission capacity reserved for native load (ETCNL).	No	No
17	Under “Reserve Sharing between Areas” in the assumption matrix, the comment should probably state that the NPCC Control Areas will share reserves equally “among themselves”. There are reserve sharing arrangements in the data, but they are such that PJM is always last.	It was changed in the description for this year’s sharing and is now changed for the description to last year’s sharing.	No	No
18	The MIF data shows that the ties from HQ to VT and HQ to CMA are being zeroed for the initial non-firm and EOP calculations. This may have been done intentionally to prevent HQ from providing assistance to New England until New York was also ready to accept outside assistance.	GE confirms that this modeling assumption performs as intended.	No	No
19	The UPNY/SENY interface group shown in the diagram does not appear to include Marcy South, while the MIF data includes it.	Diagram is incorrect and will be revised.	No	No
20 GE	The New England Imports appear to be defined as exports in the MIF, although it should not matter since the limits are the same for both directions	Imports to them, exports to us. OK as long as signage is correct.	No	No
21	We were not able to check the PJ_GPJ_J interface group in the MIF since it does not appear on the diagram	The description of this grouping appears on the lower left corner of attachment E-1.	No	No
22	The ratings on the A to ONT interface in the MIF are reversed from those shown on the diagram	Diagram is incorrect. Update diagram.	No	No
23	The tie from HUDV to NE has a rating of 600 MW in the MIF compared to 800 MW on the diagram	Limit value corrected	Yes	No
24	The tie from PJM-C to PJM-SW has a rating of 810 MW in the MIF compared to 850 MW in the diagram	Rating corrected	Yes	No

25	The assumption matrix mentioned a total of 2,192 MW of SCR for July, while the MIF had 1,862 MW based on the coincident peak loads for the zone	Attachment F of the assumptions matrix shows that the 2192 MW is an ICAP value while the 1862 MW is the UCAP modeled.	No	No
26	The assumption matrix showed 95 MW of EDRP being modeled for July and August, while the MIF had 88.6 MW in July and 89.2 MW in August	A revised EOP table has been issued to correct for the several MW shortfall.	Yes	No
27 GE	EFORD analysis	The original analysis made adjustments to 19 units where the EFORDs were unrealistic. These adjustments are described in the IRM Study Report Appendix A	No	No