

**Part I:**

**Pre-Application Reports Reporting:**

<b>a- Total since Rule 21 Revision in September 2012 (9/13/12-3/31/14)</b>	<b>b- Total for First Quarter 2014 (1/1/14-3/31/14):</b>
--	--

- i. Number requested: 95 / 16
- ii. Number issued: 93 / 16
- iii. Number currently in process: 0
- iv. Number withdrawn (if any): 2

**Rule 21 Fast Track Reporting:**

<b>Rule 21 Fast Track applications received since 9/21/2012 -3/31/14</b>	<b>Rule 21 Fast Track applications for First Quarter 2014 (1/1/14-3/31/14)</b>
--	--

**Initial Review**

- a. Number of Fast Track Applications received for **all** types of generating facilities:

<b>Non-Queued: 44,015</b>	<b>8,730</b>
<b>Queued: 199</b>	<b>43</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

Queued projects represent non-NEM Interconnection Requests that would be placed on the PG&E Public Queue upon being deemed complete and receipt of a queue position.

- b. Number of Fast Track applications received for exporting generating facilities only (excluding Net Energy Metering and non-export):

<b>109</b>	<b>29</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- c. Number of Fast Track applications for exporting generating facilities that successfully passed Initial Review, where success is defined by passing all Initial Review screens:

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- d. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities currently being evaluated in Initial Review.

**1**

- e. Number of Fast Track applications for exporting generating facilities that failed Initial Review:
  - i. If the total set out in B does not equal the totals set out in C + E, please explain why:

**88**

From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014

**11**

1Q 2014

There was 1 project which was a reapplication and requested to go straight to Supplemental Review and did not go through the Initial Review Process.

There were 17 projects that applied but withdrew prior to completing the application process and as such were not given queue number or Initial Review Results.

Additionally, 3 projects are going through the Application Review process for Fast Track and have not yet been assigned queue numbers to begin the study process.

- f. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities for which a Results Meeting following Initial Review has taken place:

**34**

From Rule 21 Reform to EOY 2013

**5**

1Q 2014

- g. Please indicate the top three most frequently failed Initial Review screens in descending order.

1. Screen I
2. Screen J
3. Screen M

- h. If possible, please write three recommendations describing how an interconnection customer might apply for Fast Track in a way that would avoid failing the top three most frequently failed screens:

1. Screen I (Will power be exported across the PCC?): If it can be assured that the Generating Facility will not export power, Distribution Provider's Distribution or Transmission System does not need to be studied for load-carrying capability or Generating Facility power flow effects on Distribution Provider voltage regulators. It is important to note that the customer can choose to apply as Non-Export. However, it is not needed because we can proceed and complete the IR even if this screen fails.

2. Screen J (Is the Generating Facility  $\leq$  11kVA?): The Generating Facility will have a minimal impact on fault current levels and any potential line over-voltages from loss of Distribution Provider’s Distribution System neutral grounding if it is  $\leq$  11kVA. However, no action is needed because we can proceed and complete the IR even if this screen fails.
3. Screen M (15% line section peak load check): Is the aggregate Generating Facility capacity on the Line Section less than 15% of Line Section peak load for all line sections bounded by automatic sectionalizing devices?
  - a. Utilize Pre-Application to determine the location of the project avoiding clustering the queue.
  - b. Reduce the generation size
  - c. Pick another location
  - d. Proceed to Supplemental Review because this project may still pass the Fast Track process.

**Supplemental Review**

- i. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities that have requested Supplemental Review after failing Initial Review.

<b>78</b>	<b>9</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

An additional customer skipped Initial Review and went straight to Supplemental Review upon being deemed complete and being assigned a queue position since it was a resubmittal. This would bring the total number of requested Supplemental Reviews to 79.

- j. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities currently being evaluated in Supplemental Review.

**2**

- k. Number of Fast Track Applications that have successfully passed Supplemental Review, where success is defined as passing all screens:

<b>39</b>	<b>12</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- l. Number of Fast Track applications that successfully passed Supplemental Review and received a GIA:

<b>34</b>	<b>20</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- m. Number of Fast Track Applications that withdrew before supplemental review began:

<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

n. Number of Fast Track projects withdrew after supplemental review began:

<b>18</b>	<b>2</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

o. Please indicate the two most frequently failed Supplemental review screens:

Answer provided applies to both quarter review and from Rule 21 reform to EOY 2013

1. Screen N
2. Screen P

p. If possible, please indicate 2 recommendations describing how a developer might request a fast track interconnection that would avoid failing the two most frequently failed supplemental review screens.

1. Use Pre-Application Process to determine load levels
2. Connect as close to the substation as possible
3. Design site so point of interconnection is on main line and not on tap line extensions if possible.
4. Apply under 1MW

q. Number of Fast Track projects that signed GIAs:

<b>16</b>	<b>11</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

These numbers reflect the number of Fast Track projects where the customer has signed the GIA.

Additionally, 6 projects have transitioned from CPUC to FERC jurisdiction and have converted from Rule 21 to Wholesale Distribution.

**Ombudsman Role and Dispute Resolution Reporting:**

- a. Number of phone calls that the Ombudsman has received from September 2012 to date (calls related to Rule 21 issues that were within the Ombudsman’s responsibilities or function):

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- b. Number of emails the Ombudsman has received from September 2012 to date:

<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- c. Number of cases that the Ombudsman took an active role in handling: (“active role” means the Ombudsman sought out information from another source to provide that information to an interconnection customer or other third party)

<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- d. Number of disputes initiated in writing by a Party that invokes Rule 21, Section K.2 Dispute Resolution Procedures (DRP).

<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- e. Number of disputes resolved within 45 calendar days of the original notice.

<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- f. Number of disputes where an additional 45 days was sought for resolution (second part of original question e).

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- g. Number of disputes mediated by a member of the CPUC’s ALJ Division:

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- h. Number of disputes mediated by an outside third-party mediator:

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014	1Q 2014

- i. Number of disputes in which a Formal Complaint has been filed at the CPUC and served on the IOU:

**0**  
From Rule 21 Reform to 1Q 2014

**0**  
1Q 2014