

Total # Projects in Queue Rule 21 = 11  
 Total # Projects added to Queue in last quarter Rule 21 = 1

**Pre-Application Reports Reporting:**

<b>a- Total since Rule 21 Revision in September 2012 (9/13/12-9/30/14)</b>	<b>b- Total for First Quarter 2014 (7/1/14-9/30/14):</b>
--	--

	<b>9/13/12 – 9/30/14</b>	<b>7/1/14 - 9/30/14</b>
<b>Number requested:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Number issued:</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Number currently in progress:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Number withdrawn:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

<b>Rule 21 Fast Track applications received since 9/13/2012 - 9/30/14</b>	<b>Rule 21 Fast Track applications for Fourth Quarter 2013 (7/1/14 - 9/30/14)</b>
---	---

**Initial Review<sup>2</sup>**

- a. Number of Fast Track Applications received for **all** types of generating facilities:
- 9/13/12 to 9/30/14: 13
  - 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 4

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

<sup>2</sup> Applications included are those applications deemed complete

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

- 9/13/12 to 9/30/14: 13
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 4

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 9/30/14: 0
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 0

d. Number of Fast Track Applications for exporting generating facilities currently being evaluated in Initial Review: 2

e. Number of Fast Track applications for exporting generating facilities that failed Initial Review:

- 9/13/12 to 9/30/14: 11
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 2

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 9/30/14: 5
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 0

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 9/30/14: 6
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 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 9/30/14: 1
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 0

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

- 9/13/12 to 9/30/14: 1
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 0

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

- 9/13/12 to 9/30/14: 0
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 0

n. Number of Fast Track projects withdrew after supplemental review began and did not receive a review:

- 9/13/12 to 9/30/14: 0
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 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 9/30/14: 5
- 7/1/14 to 9/30/14: 0

### **Distribution Group Study Detailed Study Process**

A distribution group study is appropriate in certain situations, such as when multiple projects apply to interconnect within close proximity. A group study allows the projects to be studied together in order to equitably allocate distribution upgrade costs.

Q3, 2014 - There are “0” number of active groups. “0” is the number of groups that contain more than one interconnection request.

\*\*\*The project will continue to be included in this count until project reaches COD.

### **Compliance with Rule 21 Timelines for Exporting Projects**

The utility is considered in compliance with the timeline if the customer is notified of the delay prior to the expiration of the timeline. The numbers below reflect instances in which the timeline was not met and the customer was not notified. In other instances the utility either met the timeline or conveyed the delay to the customer therefore both parties’ expectations are set.

This report is a snapshot of the quarter indicated below. The number below should reflect a 0 value at most times.

	Q3 2014
Initial Review Timeline Missed	0
Supplemental Review Timeline Missed	0
System Impact Study Timeline Missed	0
Tendering of Interconnection Agreement Timeline Missed	0
Screen Q and R Timeline Missed	0
Facilities Study Timeline Missed	0
DGSP Phase I Timeline Missed	0
DGSP Phase II Timeline Missed	0

### **Accounting of Exemptions from Rule 21 Interconnection Fees, Including the Value of Those Exemptions**

In accordance with the Public Utilities Code Section 2827 and D.02-03-057, NEM customer generators are exempt from interconnection application fees, supplemental review fees, costs for distribution upgrades and standby charges. The accounting of NEM interconnection exemptions, starting in November

2013, will be reported to the Commission and the service list of the R.12-11-005 proceeding pursuant to the Commission’s Resolution E-4610 and Decision (D.) 14-05-033 on September 19, 2014 and will be updated on June 30, 2015.

The report can be found at: <http://regarchive.sdge.com/tm2/pdf/2650-E.pdf>

### Ombudsman Role and Dispute Resolution Reporting:

- a. Number of cases / incidents which involved 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>2 Incidents</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through 3Q 2014	3Q 2014

- b. Number of cases / incidents which involved emails the Ombudsman has received from September 2012 to date:

<b>2 Incidents</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through 3Q 2014	3Q 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>2</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through 3Q 2014	3Q 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 3Q 2014	3Q 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 3Q 2014	3Q 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 3Q 2014	3Q 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 3Q 2014	3Q 2014

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

<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
From Rule 21 Reform through 3Q 2014	3Q 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 3Q 2014	3Q 2014