

Part I:

Reporting updates shown below do not include projects processed under Section D(13) of the Rule 21 Tariff.

Section Pre-Application Reports Reporting:

a- Total since Rule 21 Revision in September 2012 (9/13/12 – 3/31/14) 96	b- Total for First Quarter 2014 (1/1/14 - 3/31/14): 16
---	---

- i. Number requested: 96
- ii. Number issued: 94
- iii. Number currently in process: 0
- iv. Number withdrawn (if any): 2

Rule 21 Fast Track Reporting:

Rule 21 Fast Track applications received since 9/13/2012 – 3/31/14	Rule 21 Fast Track applications for First Quarter 2014 (1/1/14 – 3/31/14)
---	--

Initial Review

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

176¹	20²
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14	1Q 2014

¹ Total includes Rule 21 applications that indicate a customer is seeking a Non-Export, Inadvertent Export or Multiple Tariff agreements as part of this total. In SCE’s previous compliance updated dated January 31, 2014, 154 Fast Track Applications were shown for the timeframe of September 13, 2012 – December 31, 2013. Two additional projects dating prior to January 1, 2014 were reclassified during this current reporting period as Fast Track projects and are now accounted for within this total.

² Total includes Rule 21 applications that indicate a customer is seeking a Non-Export, Inadvertent Export or Multiple Tariff agreements as part of this total.

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

92	6
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14	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:

15³	0
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14	1Q 2014

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

1⁴
1Q 2014

- 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:

42	1
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14	1Q 2014

For the 9/13/2012 to 3/31/2014 period: From the 92 Fast Track requests received since 9/13/2012, 15 passed the Initial Review Screens, 4 were not eligible for Fast Track (greater than 3MW), 27 projects withdrew prior to completing the Initial Review, 42 failed the Initial Review Screens, 1 is pending for the Initial Review, and 3 active projects were in the process of completing their application thus the Initial Review has not been started as of the day of this report.

For the 1/1/2014 to 3/31/2014 period: Only 6 Fast Track requests were received during Q1-2014, 0 passed the Initial Review Screens, 1 failed the Initial Review Screens, 2 projects withdrew prior to completing the application, and 3 active projects were in the process of completing their application thus the Initial Review has not been started as of the day of this report.

³ In SCE’s previous compliance updated dated January 31, 2014, 17 projects were shown for the timeframe of September 13, 2012 – December 31, 2013. During this current reporting period, one project was withdrawn due to lack of site exclusivity, along with removal of another project due to impacts of prior queued projects for a revised total of 15.

⁴ Final confirmation is being made with business unit to confirm 1Q activity. An update will be provided if any changes are required based on final confirmation with business unit.

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

31 **1**
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

- g. Please indicate the top three most frequently failed Initial Review screens in descending order.
1. Screen M (Aggregate generation 15% larger than line section peak load)
 2. Screen N (Penetration Test)
 3. Screen F (Short Circuit Current Contribution)
- 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. Use SCE's Interconnection maps and locate projects in green zones and in accordance with the available capacity as identified in the green zone;
 2. Submit a Pre-Application Report Request for the proposed generator project;
 3. Interconnect via non-export with certified technology.

Supplemental Review

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

14 **2**
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

1
1Q 2014

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

11⁵ **1**
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

- l. Number of Fast Track applications that successfully passed Supplemental Review and received a GIA⁶:

⁵ In SCE's previous compliance updated dated January 31, 2014, 9 projects were shown for the timeframe of September 13, 2012 – December 31, 2013. One additional project dating within the reporting period has now also been placed within this total.

11 **1**
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

All 11 projects that have passed Supplemental Review were tendered a draft Generator Interconnection Agreement. Of those 11 projects, 5 projects are within the Interconnection Agreement negotiation phase.

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

23⁷ **2**
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

1⁸ **0**
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **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 3/31/14

1. Screen M (Aggregate generation 15% larger than line section peak load);
2. Screen N (Penetration Test).

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.

Please refer to answer provided for Part (h).

q. Number of Fast Track projects that signed GIAs:

10 **2**
From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

⁶ For purposes of this compliance response and going forward, SCE assumes that “receiving a GIA” should be interpreted as SCE tendering an interconnection agreement to the customer for their review.

⁷ Total reflects projects eligible for Fast Track that failed Initial Review and did not request a further Supplemental Review. Three projects have been removed from the reporting timeframe of September 13, 2012 – March 31, 2014 as such projects were deemed not Fast Track eligible.

⁸ Response represents a Fast Track eligible project that failed Initial Review, requested Supplemental Review and withdrew after failing the Supplemental Review.

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):

0 **0**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

59 **0**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **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)

8 **2**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

14 **2**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

10 **1**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

3 **0**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

0 **0**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

0 **0**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**

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

2 **1**
 From Rule 21 Reform to 3/31/14 **1Q 2014**