

Total # Projects in Queue Rule 21 = 13

Total # Projects added to Queue in most recent quarter Rule 21 = 0

Pre-Application Reports Reporting:

a- Total since Rule 21 Revision in September 2012 (9/13/12-3/31/16)	Total for First Quarter 2016 (1/1/16 – 3/31/16)

	9/13/12 –3/31/16	1/1/16 – 3/31/16
Number requested:	36	2
Number issued:	36	5
Number currently in progress:	0	0
Number withdrawn:	0	0

Rule 21 Fast Track Reporting¹:

Rule 21 Fast Track applications received since 9/13/12 –3/31/16	Rule 21 Fast Track applications for First Quarter 2016 - 1/1/16 – 3/31/16

Initial Review^{1,2}

- Number of Fast Track Applications received for **all** types of generating facilities:
 - **9/13/12 –3/31/16: 9**
 - **1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 0**

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

- **9/13/12 –3/31/16: 9**
- **1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 0**

¹ Projects referenced are for exporting for resale facilities only and do not include NEM or non-export facilities.

² Applications included are those applications deemed complete

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 –3/31/16: 0
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 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 –3/31/16: 9
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 0

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

- 9/13/12 –3/31/16: 5
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 0

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

N/A this quarter

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:

N/A this quarter

Supplemental Review

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

- 9/13/12 –3/31/16: 8
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 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 –3/31/16: 1
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 0

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

- 9/13/12 –3/31/16: 2
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 0

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

- 9/13/12 –3/31/16: 0
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 0

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

- 9/13/12 –3/31/16: 0
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 0

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

N/A this quarter

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.

N/A this quarter

q. Number of Fast Track projects that signed GIAs:

- 9/13/12 –3/31/16: 6
- 1/1/16 – 3/31/16: 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.

Q1, 2016 - 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.

	Q1 2016
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, 2015.²

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

² Please note, the IOUs will be filing an Advice Letter on June 23, 2014, in compliance with D.14-05-033, that outlines the NEM cost categories currently being tracked and will be reported.

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):
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 3 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|
- b. Number of cases / incidents which involved emails the Ombudsman has received from September 2012 to date:
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 3 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|
- 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)
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 3 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|
- d. Number of disputes initiated in writing by a Party that invokes Rule 21, Section K.2 Dispute Resolution Procedures (DRP).
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 0 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|
- e. Number of disputes resolved within 45 calendar days of the original notice.
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 0 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|
- f. Number of disputes where an additional 45 days was sought for resolution (second part of original question e).
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 0 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|
- g. Number of disputes mediated by a member of the CPUC’s ALJ Division:
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 0 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|
- h. Number of disputes mediated by an outside third-party mediator:
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 0 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|
- i. Number of disputes in which a Formal Complaint has been filed at the CPUC and served on the IOU:
- | | | |
|---|---------|---|
| 0 Incidents From Rule 21 Reform through 1Q 2016 | 1Q 2016 | 0 |
|---|---------|---|