

**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>
--	--

	9/13/12 – 3/31/14	1/1/14 – 3/31/14
Number requested:	12	5
Number issued:	12	5
Number currently in progress:	0	0
Number withdrawn:	0	0

**Rule 21 Fast Track Reporting<sup>1</sup>:**

<b>Rule 21 Fast Track applications received since 9/13/2012 -3/31/14</b>	<b>Rule 21 Fast Track applications for Fourth Quarter 2013 (1/1/14-3/31/14)</b>
--	---

**Initial Review**

- a. Number of Fast Track Applications received for **all** types of generating facilities:
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 8
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 3
  
- b. Number of Fast Track applications received for exporting generating facilities only (excluding Net Energy Metering and non-export):
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 8
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 3

---

<sup>1</sup> Projects referenced are for exporting facilities only and do not include NEM or non-export facilities.

- 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:
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 0
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 0
- d. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities currently being evaluated in Initial Review: 0
- e. Number of Fast Track applications for exporting generating facilities that failed Initial Review:
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 8
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 3

**For the 9/13/2012 to 3/31/2014 period:** From the 8 Fast Track requests received since 9/13/2012, none have passed the Initial Review Screens, all have failed the Initial Review Screens, and no projects withdrew prior to completing the application.

**For the 1/1/2014 to 3/31/2014 period:** Only 3 Rule 21 Fast Track requests were received during this period. All three received their initial study results. Two of them have decided to skip the Supplemental Review and proceed to the Detailed Interconnection Study, and one has not indicated whether it will proceed.

- f. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities for which a Results Meeting following Initial Review has taken place:
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 5
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 1
- 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:
  - Screen I: The project size can be reduced or the project location can be changed to not export at the point of common coupling (PCC).
  - Screen J: The project size must be reduced to 11 kVA or less.
  - Screen M: Select a location that has sufficient line section load to meet the less than 15% of line section peak load criteria or relocate project to a feeder with adequate capacity.

**Supplemental Review**

- i. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities that have requested Supplemental Review after failing Initial Review.
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 5
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 0
  
- j. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities currently being evaluated in Supplemental Review: 0
  
- k. Number of Fast Track Applications that have successfully passed Supplemental Review, where success is defined as passing all screens:
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 1
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 0
  
- l. Number of Fast Track applications that successfully passed Supplemental Review and received a GIA:
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 1
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 0
  
- m. Number of Fast Track Applications that withdrew before supplemental review began:
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 0
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 0
  
- n. Number of Fast Track projects withdrew after supplemental review began:
  - 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 0
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 0
  
- o. please indicate the two most frequently failed Supplemental review screens:
  1. Screen N
  2. Screen O
  
- 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.

- Screen N: Choose a location for the project where the existing distribution conductors are large and likely to be serving a large aggregate load.
- Screen O: Projects are more likely to pass this screen if they use a smart inverter with dynamic reactive power support of at least +/- .8 power factor.

- q. Number of Fast Track projects that signed GIAs:
- 9/13/12 to 3/31/14: 5
  - 1/1/14 to 3/31/14: 0

### 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 through Q1 2014	1Q 2014

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

<b>1 Incident</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through Q1 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 through Q1 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>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through Q1 2014	1Q 2014

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

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through Q1 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 through Q1 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 through Q1 2014	1Q 2014

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

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through Q1 2014	1Q 2014

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

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through Q1 2014	1Q 2014