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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:30 – 1:40</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Kristina Osborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40 – 2:30</td>
<td>Extended parking</td>
<td>Jason Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 2:55</td>
<td>Interconnection request window and validation timeframe</td>
<td>Jason Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:55 – 3:00</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>Kristina Osborne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Extended Parking
The ISO proposed to extend the parking option period for one additional year when the following criterion is met:

**Criterion 1:**
A project will only be allowed to park for a second year when there is TP Deliverability still available in the project’s area.

**Criterion 2:**
If a project has a network upgrade assigned to it, which is needed by later clustered projects, parking for a second year will not be allowed.

**Tendering of an Interconnection Agreement**
To mitigate risk to a PTO, a project must come out of parking status to be tendered a GIA, including the first year and second year of parking.
Stakeholder Comments were evenly mixed. CAISO made no changes to proposal

- **Supportive**
  - Provides more time for developers to obtain a purchase agreement.
  - Provides benefits to LSEs RPS procurement process.

- **Opposed**
  - Allows projects to linger in queue unnecessarily.
  - Concern that this change would unnecessarily impact to ratepayers.
  - Concerns about the affidavit process and balance-sheet financing option inflating deliverability allocations.
Assessment of Parking Criteria

- Currently 30, Cluster 8 projects parked
  - 5 Projects (17%) did not meet criterion 1 or 2
  - 3 Projects (10%) impact NUs within the same cluster group

- Thus, 22 of the 30 projects (73%) would have opportunity to park for a second year
  - This analysis does not include Cluster 10, Phase I study results.

- Final determination of C8 project’s opportunity to park for a second year will be based on the results of the allocation study in March 2018.
Clarification to ISO Proposal

The ISO proposed to extend the parking option period for one additional year when the following criterion is met:

**Criterion 2:**
- If a project has a network upgrade assigned to it, which is needed by a later clustered project, parking for a second year will not be allowed.
- If a project has network upgrades assigned to it, which is needed by other projects within its cluster, then parking is only allowed if all projects sharing those network upgrade opt to park.

The ISO maintains that this proposal strikes the right balance between developer interests, risks to PTOs, and impacts to other projects.
Interconnection Request Window & Validation Timelines
The ISO proposed to shorten the cluster application window and increase the validation period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Timeline</th>
<th>Proposed Timeline</th>
<th>Tariff Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR/Application Window Opens</strong></td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR/Application Window Closes</strong></td>
<td>April 30</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR Validation</strong></td>
<td>Within 20 BDs after close of app. window</td>
<td>No later than May 31</td>
<td>3.5.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro-forma Study Agreement to Interconnection Customer</strong></td>
<td>Within 30 CDs after close of app. window</td>
<td>No later than May 31</td>
<td>6.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scoping Meeting held</strong></td>
<td>Within 60 CDs after close of app. window</td>
<td>No later than June 30</td>
<td>6.1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BD = Business Days. CD = Calendar Days. Deadlines falling on non-BDs move to next BD.
Stakeholder comments & proposal unchanged

• All stakeholders are supportive of the shortened window proposal, have no concerns, or did not comment.

• One party suggested the three major IOU’s create uniformity by adopting this for their wholesale distribution access tariffs.

• ISO proposal is unchanged in the draft final straw proposal.
Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post Draft Final Proposal</td>
<td>October 9, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder call</td>
<td>October 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder comments due</td>
<td>October 23, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Written stakeholder comments on the draft final proposal are due by COB October 23 to InitiativeComments@caiso.com.