California Independent System Operator Corporation

July 29, 2014

The Honorable Kimberly D. Bose
Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

Re: California Independent System Operator Corporation
Docket Nos. ER08-1317-003 and ER11-1830-000
Interconnection Queue Quarterly Progress Reports, Q1 & Q2 2014, and Request to File Q1 Report Out of Time

Dear Secretary Bose:

The California Independent System Operator Corporation ("CAISO") hereby submits its interconnection queue quarterly progress reports for the first and second quarters of 2014 pursuant to the following orders of the Commission:

- *Order Conditionally Approving Tariff Amendment*, 124 FERC ¶ 61,292, at P 200 (2008); and

- *Order Conditionally Accepting Tariff Revisions*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,223, at PP 97, 117 (2010).

The CAISO intended and was prepared to file the report for the first quarter of 2014 by April 30, 2014. However, due to an administrative oversight the CAISO did not file the first-quarter report until now. The CAISO requests leave to file the first-quarter report out of time and apologizes for any inconvenience this may have caused.

Please contact the undersigned with any questions about this submittal.

Respectfully submitted,

By: */s/ Sidney Davies*
Roger E. Collanton
General Counsel
Sidney Davies
Assistant General Counsel
California Independent System
Operator Corporation
250 Outcropping Way
Folsom, CA 95630
Tel: (916) 608-7144
Fax: (916) 608-7222
sdavies@caiso.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

California Independent System Operator Corporation	Docket Nos. ER08-1317-003 ER11-1830-000

CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION INTERCONNECTION QUEUE QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT Q1 2014

Quarterly Reporting Period:
January 1 to March 31, 2014

Deborah A. Le Vine
Director, Infrastructure Contracts & Management
California Independent System Operator Corporation

Date: April 30, 2014

I. INTRODUCTION AND DISCUSSION OF THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS GIVING RISE TO THIS REPORT

This report describes the ISO's progress over the period January 1, 2014 to March 31, 2014 in processing generator interconnection requests under the ISO's interconnection process.

The two primary sets of procedures under which the ISO is processing interconnection requests today are: (a) ISO Tariff Appendix Y, called the "Generator Interconnection Procedures ("GIP"); and (b) ISO Tariff Appendix DD, the "Generator Interconnection and Deliverability Allocation Procedures ("GIDAP").[1] The GIP applies to the transition cluster through cluster four, and the GIDAP applies to cluster five and subsequent cluster studies.

The GIP and GIDAP combined govern all interconnection requests in the clusters to which they apply, regardless of whether the proposed facility is a large generating facility or a small generating facility. Under either the GIP or the GIDAP, an interconnection request is processed under one of three tracks:

(1) The cluster study process track, which serves as the primary processing method and the default interconnection process;
(2) The independent study process track, under which certain projects can be studied independently if they are determined to be electrically independent from other projects in the cluster study (and demonstrate the ability to complete non-ISO development milestones (like licensing) sooner than typical development timeframes); and
(3) The fast track process track, which is available for projects of up to 5 MW, when it can be determined, through a limited evaluation methodology, that the project can be interconnected with no upgrades or with *de minimis* upgrades.

[1] The GIP and GIDAP can be accessed on the ISO website at http://www.caiso.com/rules/Pages/Regulatory/Default.aspx.

As explained in later sections of this report, the ISO is also processing some previous interconnection requests under prior "serial" interconnection tariff processes.

Background Regarding the Quarterly Reporting Requirements

The reporting requirements giving rise to this report originate with the Commission's orders approving the ISO's 2008 GIPR Amendment and the later 2010 GIP Amendment. In 2008, the ISO revised its Large Generator Interconnection Procedures ("LGIP") to change from a serial approach to a cluster approach. The ISO called this tariff amendment "Generator Interconnection Process Reform (GIPR)." The ISO refers to this revised LGIP as the "Cluster LGIP." The Commission's September 2008 Order accepting the GIPR Amendment included a requirement to file quarterly status reports on the ISO's progress in processing interconnection requests under the cluster approach.[2] The Commission intended the quarterly reports to serve as a tool to evaluate how well the ISO's cluster process is working.

In the December 2010 Order accepting the GIP (which the ISO now calls GIP Phase 1, after the ISO undertook another process called GIP Phase 2 in 2011), the Commission directed the ISO to include additional information within the quarterly status reports concerning the independent study process ("ISP") and fast track process. For the ISP, the Commission directed the ISO to include information about the number of projects requesting interconnection through the ISP, the outcome of those requests, the complete length of time for recently completed ISP interconnection studies (from initial application through final approval), and the reason for any rejections of projects requesting ISP treatment.[3]

[2] *California Independent System Operator Corp.*, 124 FERC ¶ 61,292, at P 200 (2008) ("September 2008 Order"). The September 2008 Order also required the ISO to file two comprehensive status reports, one pertaining to the transition cluster and one pertaining to the first cluster. The ISO filed its first comprehensive report on the transition cluster on January 31, 2011.

[3] *California Independent System Operator Corp.*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,223, at PP 1, 97, 117 (2010) ("December 2010 Order").

With respect to the fast track process, the Commission directed the ISO to include in its reports the size and type of generator interconnection requested under the fast track process, the proposed location of the generator, the number of requests that did not pass the screens, and which screens the generator developer failed.[4]

This report is the ISO's twenty-first quarterly report.

The ISO Continues to Refine Its Generation Interconnection Process

As the Commission is aware, since 2008, the ISO has worked with stakeholders to continue to refine its interconnection process. The ISO has commenced a new stakeholder initiative called Interconnection Process Enhancements. The initiative has spawned a number of separate paths for the topics the initiative addresses. The stakeholder process for topic 1 (annual downsizing policy) and topic 2 (disconnection of completed phase(s) of projects due to failure to complete a subsequent project phase) has been substantially completed and new tariff language will be filed with the Commission in Q2 2014. The ISO posted draft final proposals for topic 4 (improve independent study process) and topic 5 (improve fast track process) on March 25, 2014.and held a stakeholder call on April 2, 2014 to discuss the proposals. The ISO Governing Board will be considering these revisions to the ISO tariff at its May 28 – 29, 2014 meeting. Lastly a revised straw proposal for topic 13 (clarity regarding timing of transmission cost reimbursement) was posted on March 25, 2014 and discussed on the April 2, 2014 stakeholder call. [5]

These efforts are part of a continual commitment by the ISO to refine and improve the process and to respond to the dramatic increase in interconnection requests in response to California's renewable portfolio standards ("RPS") policy, which

[4] *Id.* at P 117.

[5] Stakeholder materials related to the Interconnection Process Enhancements initiative are available on the ISO website at http://www.caiso.com/informed/Pages/StakeholderProcesses/InterconnectionProcessEnhancements.aspx.

mandates that Load Serving Entities satisfy their load requirements from 33% renewable energy sources by 2020.[6]

The Component Parts of the ISO's Interconnection Queue[7]

The ISO's interconnection queue consists of the following queue components:

- ***Two legacy serial groupings***[8]

o Component 1: certain projects that predated the serial study group. These requests were grouped together because, at the time the ISO made its 2008 waiver request which was a foundational step to establishing the Cluster LGIP, the associated interconnection studies for these projects had already been completed.[9]

The governing tariff provisions for each project under this component depend on the date that the interconnection customer submitted its interconnection request. If that date was before July 1, 2005, the governing provisions are those set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix W, *Interconnection Procedures in Effect Prior to July 1, 2005*, also known as the "Amendment 39 Procedures." If the submittal date was on or after July 1, 2005, then the applicable provisions are those set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix U, *Standard Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (LGIP)*.

o Component 2: projects known as "the serial study group." These projects still needed interconnection studies to be completed at the time the ISO

[6] SBX1-2 enacted by the California Legislature and signed by Governor Brown in April 2011 codified California's 33% RPS. Prior to this time, the 33% standard was a function of Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order S-21-09 signed in September 2009, which required the California Air Resources Board to adopt a 33% renewable energy requirement by 2020 to implement California's greenhouse gas law (AB 32).

[7] The Commission's orders relating to queue reporting require the ISO to report on the cluster component of the ISO interconnection queue and the ISP and Fast Track processes. Nevertheless, the ISO has made a practice of including the legacy interconnection requests as well as requests in the SGIP serial study and transition cluster groups in its reporting, so that each report would cover the entire ISO generator interconnection queue.

[8] In the listing below, Component 1 generally consists of that group of interconnection requests that are older in time than the interconnection requests under Component 2. However, this is not exactly so, as the groupings were also based on common characteristics (*e.g.*, studies that were already completed) that make collective treatment of the individual requests within the group more logical. This means that some interconnection requests that were older in time are part of Component 2 rather than Component 1.

[9] *See, e.g.*, Q1 2009 Report at p. 1for discussion of the ISO's 2008 waiver petition.

categorized interconnection requests and filed its 2008 request for tariff waiver that preceded the 2008 GIPR Amendment.

For all requests in this grouping, the applicable process is set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix U, *Standard Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (LGIP)*, which contains the procedures which immediately preceded the implementation of the Cluster LGIP.

- ***ISO Clusters governed by the GIP***

For the grouping of the cluster interconnection requests up through and including cluster four, the applicable interconnection procedures are set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix Y, *Generator Interconnection Procedures (GIP) for the Interconnection Requests*.

- Component 3: projects in the Cluster LGIP transition cluster. This component consists of certain requests received prior to June 2, 2008 that were transitioned to the Cluster LGIP.

- Component 4: the first cluster. This component consists of the first group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (June 2, 2008 to July 31, 2009).

- Component 5: the second cluster. This component consists of the second group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (October 1, 2009 to January 31, 2010).

- Component 6: the third cluster. This component consists of the third group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (March 1, 2010 to July 31, 2010).

- Component 7: the fourth cluster. This component consists of the fourth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (March 1-31, 2011).[10]

- ***ISO Clusters Governed by the GIDAP***

[10] Under the Cluster LGIP, the fourth cluster window opened on October 1, 2010 and was set to close on January 31, 2011. However, while the window period was opened, the GIP became effective. Under the GIP, a further fourth cluster window was opened during the month of March (March 1-31, 2011). All earlier fourth cluster applications received during 2010 are being processed together with the cluster track applications received during the March 2011 window period.

Clusters after cluster four are governed by ISO's GIDAP procedures, as set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix DD.

- Component 8: the fifth cluster. This component consists of the fifth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (March 1-31, 2012).

- Component 9: the sixth cluster. This component consists of the sixth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (April 1-30, 2013).

- ***Customers Governed by GIP Tracks Other than the Cluster Track***

- Component 10: Independent Study Process (ISP). ISP interconnection requests can be submitted at any time. This component tracks ISP projects received from the inception of the ISP on December 19, 2010 through the end of the reporting period. It is important to note that the ISP is available to projects of any MW size. Accordingly, this component will be composed of both large and small generators. The independent study for these projects is done as energy-only. If an ISP project desires to have full-capacity deliverability status, then the deliverability study is done in the next deliverability study that the ISO performs as part of a cluster process in the Phase II interconnection study process.

- Components 11 and 12: SGIP Serial Study projects and SGIP Transition Cluster projects. On December 19, 2010, the effective date for revised GIP Appendix Y, there were 128 active projects in the queue for the Small Generator Interconnection Process (SGIP). The ISO sent a notice to all SGIP interconnection customers whose projects were eligible to remain in the SGIP serial process, to inform them that they had an option to move their projects into the new SGIP transition cluster and be studied as energy-only in the combined Phase II interconnection studies that the ISO is conducting for LGIP Cluster 1 and Cluster 2.[11]

- Component 13: Fast Track Process (Fast Track). The Fast Track is available to projects up to 5 MW in size. Fast Track interconnection requests can be submitted at any time. This component tracks Fast Track projects received from the time the Fast Track process was revised on December 19, 2010 through the end of the reporting period. Currently the ISO does not have any Fast Track projects in its interconnection queue.

[11] See Appendix 8 to Appendix Y.

II. COMPOSITION OF CLUSTER INTERCONNECTION REQUESTS BY TECHNOLOGY

Component 1: The Pre-Serial Group

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the pre-serial group is as follows:

Table 1
Pre-Serial Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		WTR	G	NG	B	W
Wind Turbine	1					1
Combined Cycle	1			1		
Total	**2**	**0**	**0**	**1**	**0**	**1**

WTR=Water; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; B=Biomass; W=Wind

Component 2: The Serial Group

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the serial group is as follows:

Table 2
Serial Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		WTR	G	NG	B	S	W
Steam Turbine	3				1	2	
Wind Turbine	12						12
Natural Gas	7			7			
Photovoltaic	4					4	
Pumped Storage	1	1					
Total	**27**	**1**	**0**	**7**	**1**	**6**	**12**

WTR=Water; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; B=Biomass; S=Solar; W=Wind

Component 3: The Transition Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the transition cluster is as follows:

Table 3
Transition Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		B	G	NG	S	W
Steam Turbine	5	1			4	
Photovoltaic	11				11	
Wind Turbine	4					4
Combined Cycle	3			3		
Total	**23**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**15**	**4**

B=Biomass; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind

Component 4: The First Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the first cluster is as follows:

Table 4
First Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		WTR	NU	NG	S	W
Steam Turbine	0		0			
Photovoltaic	6				6	
Total	**6**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**

WTR=Water; NU=Nuclear; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind

Component 5: The Second Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the second cluster is as follows:

Table 5
Second Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		G	NG	S	W	WTR
Steam Turbine	1	1				
Photovoltaic	13			13		
Wind Turbine	1				1	
Combined Cycle	0		0			
Combustion Turbine	1		1			
Reciprocating Engine	1		1			
Total	**17**	**1**	**2**	**13**	**1**	**0**

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water

Component 6: The Third Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the third cluster is as follows:

Table 6
Third Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		G	NG	S	W	B
Steam Turbine	1					1
Photovoltaic	6			6		
Combustion Turbine/PV	0			0	0	
Total	**7**	**0**	**0**	**6**	**0**	**1**

B=Biomass; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind

Component 7: The Fourth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the fourth cluster is as follows:

Table 7
Fourth Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	Li
Photovoltaic	35			35			
Wind Turbine	1				1		
Combined Cycle	1		1				
Combustion Turbine	1		1				
Hydraulic Turbine	1					1	
Total	**39**	**0**	**2**	**35**	**1**	**1**	**0**

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; Li=Lithium-ion Battery

Component 8: The Fifth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the fifth cluster is as follows:

Table 8
Fifth Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		G	NG	*S*	*W*	
Steam Turbine	1	1				
Photovoltaic	9			*9*		
Wind Turbine	1				*1*	
Combined Cycle	2		2			
Combustion Turbine	1		1			
Total	**14**	**1**	**3**	**9**	**1**	

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel

Component 9: The Sixth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the sixth cluster is as follows:

Table 9
Sixth Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Steam Turbine	1	0		1			
Photovoltaic	19			19			
Wind Turbine	0				0		
Combined Cycle	6		6				
Combustion Turbine	4		4				
Hydraulic Turbine	2					2	
Other (CHP)	1		1				
Total	**33**	**0**	**11**	**20**	**0**	**2**	**0**

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel

Component 10: Independent Study Process

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the independent study process is as follows:

Table 10
ISP Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Wind Turbine	1				1		
Total	**1**				**1**		

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel

Component 11: The Small Generators (Serial)

The breakdown by technology of small generator interconnection customers is as follows:

Table 11
Small Serial Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		B	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Photovoltaic	18			18			
Wind Turbine	1				1		
Reciprocating Engine	2	1	1				
Total	**21**	**1**	**1**	**18**	**1**		

B=Biomass; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel

Component 12: The Small Generators (Transition Cluster)

The breakdown by technology of small generator interconnection customers in the transition cluster is as follows:

Table 12
Small Transition Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		G	NG	S	W	WTR	FW
Photovoltaic	19			19			
Total	**19**			**19**			

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind; WTR=Water; CHP = Combined Heat & Power; FW=Flywheel

III. QUARTERLY PROGRESS IN PROCESSING THE QUEUE

Component 1: Pre-Serial Projects

Table 13 Component 1 Projects – Amendment 39	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	1	1
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	1	1
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	1
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Of the two remaining pre-serial projects in the queue, the project designated as without a GIA is in active negotiations and is expected to execute a GIA in the near future.

Component 2: The Serial Study Group

Table 14 Component 2 Projects - The Serial Study Group	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	23	21
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	4	7
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	1	2
Projects completed during the quarter	0	3

In Q1 2014one serial project withdrew and two serial projects executed a GIA. Currently there are 27 active serial study projects which have not achieved commercial operation, and four of those projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs.

Component 3: The Transition Cluster

Table 15 Component 3 Projects - The Transition Cluster	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	16	17
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	7	8
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	1	2
Projects completed during the quarter	1	0

InQ1 2014, one transition cluster project withdrew and one transition cluster project achieved commercial operation. . Currently there are 23 active transition cluster projects which have not achieved commercial operation and seven of those projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs.

Component 4: The First Cluster

Table 16 Component 4 Projects - The First Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q1 2014	Q3 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	3	3
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	3	5
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	1	0
Projects completed during the quarter	1	0

In Q4 2013, one cluster 1 project achieved commercial operation and one cluster 1 project withdrew, leaving six active projects in this cluster (three of which have not completed negotiations).

Component 5: The Second Cluster

Table 17 Component 5 Projects - The Second Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	10	10
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	7	8
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	1	1
Projects completed during the quarter	0	2

In Q1 2014, one project withdrew. Seven projects remain to complete the negotiation process, making a total of 17 active projects in this cluster.

Component 6: The Third Cluster

Table 18 Component 6 Projects - The Third Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	4	2
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	3	5
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	1

In Q1 2014, two projects executed a GIA. Three projects remain to complete the negotiation process, making a total of 7 active projects in this cluster.

Component 7: The Fourth Cluster

Table 19 Component 7 Projects - The Fourth Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	14	6
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	25	33
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter		5
Projects completed during the quarter		0

In Q1 2014 eight projects executed a GIA and 25 projects remain to complete the negotiation process, making a total 39 active projects in this cluster.

Component 8: The Fifth Cluster

Table 20 Component 8 Projects - The Fifth Cluster under GIDAP	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	0	0
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	7	15
Number of projects which have elected to park as a result of the transmission plan deliverability allocation process	7	
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	1	1
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

In Q1 2014 one project was withdrawn from Cluster 5. Cluster 5 projects received their transmission plan deliverability allocation during Q1 2014 and in response to that allocation, seven projects elected to park their projects for 12 months and will not be required to post the second installment of their interconnection financial security or negotiate GIAs until after the 2015 transmission plan deliverability allocation process has been completed. Seven projects remain to complete the negotiation process, making a

total 14 active projects in this cluster. GIA negotiations are expected to commence in Q2 2014 after the transmission plan deliverability allocation process is completed.

Component 9: The Sixth Cluster

Table 21 Component 9 Projects - The Sixth Cluster under GIDAP	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	0	0
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	33	48
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	15	0
Projects completed during the quarter		0

A total of 15 Cluster 6 projects withdrew in Q1 2014, making a total 33 active projects in this cluster.

Component 10: Independent Study Process

Table 22 Component 10: Requests Within the Independent Study Process under GIP	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Active Projects as of beginning of Quarter	1	1
Interconnection Requests received	0	0
Number of Interconnection Requests that withdrew during the Quarter	0	0

There were no changes to the ISP projects during Q1 2014.

Component 11: SGIP Serial Study Projects

Table 23 Component 11 Projects - SGIP Serial Projects	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	20	22
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	1	3
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	3	6
Projects completed during the quarter	1	0

In Q1 2014, three projects withdrew, two projects executed GIAs, and one project achieved commercial operation, making a total of 21 active SGIP serial projects in the ISO's queue.

Component 12: SGIP Transition Cluster Projects

Table 24 Component 12 Projects - The SGIP Transition Cluster	Q1 2014	Q4 2013
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	10	10
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	9	9
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	8
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

There were no changes to the active SGIP Transition Cluster projects during Q1 of 2014.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

California Independent System Operator Corporation	Docket Nos. ER08-1317-003 ER11-1830-000

CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR CORPORATION INTERCONNECTION QUEUE QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT Q2 2014

Quarterly Reporting Period:
April 1 to June 30, 2014

Deborah A. Le Vine
Director, Infrastructure Contracts & Management
California Independent System Operator Corporation

Date: July 29, 2014

I. INTRODUCTION AND DISCUSSION OF THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS GIVING RISE TO THIS REPORT

This report describes the ISO's progress over the period April 1, 2014 to June 30, 2014 in processing generator interconnection requests under the ISO's interconnection process.

The two primary sets of procedures under which the ISO is processing interconnection requests today are: (a) ISO Tariff Appendix Y, called the "Generator Interconnection Procedures ("GIP")[1]; and (b) ISO Tariff Appendix DD, the "Generator Interconnection and Deliverability Allocation Procedures ("GIDAP"). The GIP applies to the transition cluster through cluster four, and the GIDAP applies to cluster five and subsequent cluster studies.

The GIP and GIDAP combined govern all interconnection requests in the clusters to which they apply, regardless of whether the proposed facility is a large generating facility or a small generating facility. Under either the GIP or the GIDAP, an interconnection request is processed under one of three tracks:

(1) The cluster study process track, which serves as the primary processing method and the default interconnection process;
(2) The independent study process track, under which certain projects can be studied independently if they are determined to be electrically independent from other projects in the cluster study (and demonstrate the ability to complete non-ISO development milestones (like licensing) sooner than typical development timeframes); and

[1] The ISO OATT, ISO Tariff Appendix Y can be accessed on the ISO's website at http://www.caiso.com/Documents/AppendixY_GIP-InterconnectionRequests_Dec3_2013.pdf, and ISO Tariff Appendix DD can be accessed on the ISO's website at http://www.caiso.com/Documents/AppendixDD_GeneratorInterconnection-DeliverabiltyAllocationProcess_Dec3_2013.pdf.

(3) The fast track process track, which is available for projects of up to 5 MW, when it can be determined, through a limited evaluation methodology, that the project can be interconnected with no upgrades or with *de minimis* upgrades.

As explained in later sections of this report, the ISO is also processing some previous interconnection requests under prior "serial" interconnection tariff processes.

Background Regarding the Quarterly Reporting Requirements

The reporting requirements giving rise to this report originate with the Commission's orders approving the ISO's 2008 GIPR Amendment and the later 2010 GIP Amendment. In 2008, the ISO revised its Large Generator Interconnection Procedures ("LGIP") to change from a serial approach to a cluster approach. The ISO called this tariff amendment "Generator Interconnection Process Reform (GIPR)." The ISO refers to this revised LGIP as the "Cluster LGIP." The Commission's September 2008 Order accepting the GIPR Amendment included a requirement to file quarterly status reports on the ISO's progress in processing interconnection requests under the cluster approach.[2] The Commission intended the quarterly reports to serve as a tool to evaluate how well the ISO's cluster process is working.

In the December 2010 Order accepting the GIP (which the ISO now calls GIP Phase 1, after the ISO undertook another process called GIP Phase 2 in 2011), the Commission directed the ISO to include additional information within the quarterly status reports concerning the independent study process ("ISP") and fast track process. For the ISP, the Commission directed the ISO to include information about the number of projects requesting interconnection through the ISP, the outcome of those requests, the complete length of time for recently completed ISP interconnection studies (from initial

[2] *California Independent System Operator Corp.*, 124 FERC ¶ 61,292, at P 200 (2008) ("September 2008 Order"). The September 2008 Order also required the ISO to file two comprehensive status reports, one pertaining to the transition cluster and one pertaining to the first cluster. The ISO filed its first comprehensive report on the transition cluster on January 31, 2011.

application through final approval), and the reason for any rejections of projects requesting ISP treatment.[3]

With respect to the fast track process, the Commission directed the ISO to include in its reports the size and type of generator interconnection requested under the fast track process, the proposed location of the generator, the number of requests that did not pass the screens, and which screens the generator developer failed.[4]

This report is the ISO's twenty-second quarterly report.

The ISO Continues to Refine Its Generation Interconnection Process

As the Commission is aware, since 2008, the ISO has worked with stakeholders to continue to refine its interconnection process. The ISO has commenced a new stakeholder initiative called Interconnection Process Enhancements ("IPE"). The initiative has spawned into a number of separate paths. Tariff language for the future downsizing policy and disconnection of completed phase(s) of projects due to failure to complete a subsequent project phase was filed with the Commission on May 29, 2014. Also, on May 29, the ISO Board of Governors approved the proposal to modify the independent study and fast track interconnection processes, as developed during IPE topic (4) (regarding improvements to the independent study process) and IPE topic (5) (regarding improvements to the Fast Track). The ISO anticipates filing the tariff amendment to implement these changes in Q3 2014. The ISO posted a Draft Final Proposal on IPE topic (13) (regarding clarity on timing of transmission cost reimbursement) and IPE topic (14) (regarding redistribution of forfeited funds) on May 28, 2014, and discussed those topics on a June 4, 2014 stakeholder call. These two topics

[3] *California Independent System Operator Corp.*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,223, at PP 1, 97, 117 (2010) ("December 2010 Order").

[4] *Id.* at P 117.

are before the ISO Governing Board at its July 15-16, 2014 meeting.[5]

These efforts are part of a continual commitment by the ISO to refine and improve the process and to respond to the dramatic increase in interconnection requests in response to California's renewable portfolio standards ("RPS") policy, which mandates that Load Serving Entities satisfy their load requirements from 33% renewable energy sources by 2020.[6]

The Component Parts of the ISO's Interconnection Queue[7]

The ISO's interconnection queue consists of the following queue components:

- ***Two legacy serial groupings***[8]

  - Component 1: certain projects that predated the serial study group. These requests were grouped together because, at the time the ISO made its 2008 waiver request which was a foundational step to establishing the Cluster LGIP, the associated interconnection studies for these projects had already been completed.[9]

[5] Stakeholder materials related to the Interconnection Process Enhancements initiative are available on the ISO website at http://www.caiso.com/informed/Pages/StakeholderProcesses/InterconnectionProcessEnhancements.aspx.

[6] SBX1-2 enacted by the California Legislature and signed by Governor Brown in April 2011 codified California's 33% RPS. Prior to this time, the 33% standard was a function of Governor Schwarzenegger's Executive Order S-21-09 signed in September 2009, which required the California Air Resources Board to adopt a 33% renewable energy requirement by 2020 to implement California's greenhouse gas law (AB 32).

[7] The Commission's orders relating to queue reporting require the ISO to report on the cluster component of the ISO interconnection queue and the ISP and Fast Track processes. Nevertheless, the ISO has made a practice of including the legacy interconnection requests as well as requests in the SGIP serial study and transition cluster groups in its reporting, so that each report would cover the entire ISO generator interconnection queue.

[8] In the listing below, Component 1 generally consists of that group of interconnection requests that are older in time than the interconnection requests under Component 2. However, this is not exactly so, as the groupings were also based on common characteristics (*e.g.*, studies that were already completed) that make collective treatment of the individual requests within the group more logical. This means that some interconnection requests that were older in time are part of Component 2 rather than Component 1.

[9] *See, e.g.*, Q1 2009 Report at p. 1for discussion of the ISO's 2008 waiver petition.

The governing tariff provisions for each project under this component depend on the date that the interconnection customer submitted its interconnection request. If that date was before July 1, 2005, the governing provisions are those set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix W, *Interconnection Procedures in Effect Prior to July 1, 2005*, also known as the "Amendment 39 Procedures." If the submittal date was on or after July 1, 2005, then the applicable provisions are those set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix U, *Standard Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (LGIP)*.

- Component 2: projects known as "the serial study group." These projects still needed interconnection studies to be completed at the time the ISO categorized interconnection requests and filed its 2008 request for tariff waiver that preceded the 2008 GIPR Amendment.

  For all requests in this grouping, the applicable process is set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix U, *Standard Large Generator Interconnection Procedures (LGIP)*, which contains the procedures which immediately preceded the implementation of the Cluster LGIP.

  - ***ISO Clusters governed by the GIP***

  For the grouping of the cluster interconnection requests up through and including cluster four, the applicable interconnection procedures are set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix Y, *Generator Interconnection Procedures (GIP) for the Interconnection Requests*.

- Component 3: projects in the Cluster LGIP transition cluster. This component consists of certain requests received prior to June 2, 2008 that were transitioned to the Cluster LGIP.

- Component 4: the first cluster. This component consists of the first group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (June 2, 2008 to July 31, 2009).

- Component 5: the second cluster. This component consists of the second group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (October 1, 2009 to January 31, 2010).

- Component 6: the third cluster. This component consists of the third group of interconnection requests received during an open request window (March 1, 2010 to July 31, 2010).

- Component 7: the fourth cluster. This component consists of the fourth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (March 1-31, 2011).[10]

  - ***ISO Clusters Governed by the GIDAP***

  Clusters after cluster four are governed by ISO's GIDAP procedures, as set forth in ISO Tariff Appendix DD.

- Component 8: the fifth cluster. This component consists of the fifth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (March 1-31, 2012).

- Component 9: the sixth cluster. This component consists of the sixth group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (April 1-30, 2013).

- Component 10 – the seventh cluster. This component consists of the seventh group of interconnection requests received during the open request window (April 1-30, 2014).

  - ***Customers Governed by GIP Tracks Other than the Cluster Track***

- Component 11: Independent Study Process (ISP). ISP interconnection requests can be submitted at any time. This component tracks ISP projects received from the inception of the ISP on December 19, 2010 through the end of the reporting period. It is important to note that the ISP is available to projects of any MW size. Accordingly, this component will be composed of both large and small generators. The independent study for these projects is done as energy-only. If an ISP project desires to have full-capacity deliverability status, then the deliverability study is done in the next deliverability study that the ISO performs as part of a cluster process in the Phase II interconnection study process.

- Components 12 and 13: SGIP Serial Study projects and SGIP Transition Cluster projects. On December 19, 2010, the effective date for revised GIP Appendix Y, there were 128 active projects in the queue for the Small

[10] Under the Cluster LGIP, the fourth cluster window opened on October 1, 2010 and was set to close on January 31, 2011. However, while the window period was opened, the GIP became effective. Under the GIP, a further fourth cluster window was opened during the month of March (March 1-31, 2011). All earlier fourth cluster applications received during 2010 are being processed together with the cluster track applications received during the March 2011 window period.

Generator Interconnection Process (SGIP). The ISO sent a notice to all SGIP interconnection customers whose projects were eligible to remain in the SGIP serial process, to inform them that they had an option to move their projects into the new SGIP transition cluster and be studied as energy-only in the combined Phase II interconnection studies that the ISO is conducting for LGIP Cluster 1 and Cluster 2.[11]

- Component 14: Fast Track Process (Fast Track). The Fast Track is available to projects up to 5 MW in size. Fast Track interconnection requests can be submitted at any time. This component tracks Fast Track projects received from the time the Fast Track process was revised on December 19, 2010 through the end of the reporting period. Currently the ISO does not have any Fast Track projects in its interconnection queue.

II. COMPOSITION OF CLUSTER INTERCONNECTION REQUESTS BY TECHNOLOGY

Component 1: The Pre-Serial Group

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the pre-serial group is as follows:

Table 1
Pre-Serial Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology	
		NG	W
Wind Turbine	1		1
Combined Cycle	1	1	
Total	**2**	**1**	**1**

NG=Natural Gas; W=Wind

[11] See Appendix 8 to Appendix Y.

Component 2: The Serial Group

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the serial group is as follows:

Table 2
Serial Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology					
		WTR	G	NG	B	S	W
Steam Turbine	3				1	2	
Wind Turbine	12						12
Natural Gas	7			7			
Photovoltaic	4					4	
Pumped Storage	1	1					
Total	**27**	**1**	**0**	**7**	**1**	**6**	**12**

WTR=Water; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; B=Biomass; S=Solar; W=Wind

Component 3: The Transition Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the transition cluster is as follows:

Table 3
Transition Cluster Interconnection Customers
Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology				
		B	G	NG	S	W
Steam Turbine	5	1			4	
Photovoltaic	9				9	
Wind Turbine	4					4
Combined Cycle	3			3		
Total	**21**	**1**	**0**	**3**	**13**	**4**

B=Biomass; G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind

Component 4: The First Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the first cluster is as follows:

Table 4
First Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Technology
	S
Photovoltaic	6
Total	**6**

S=Solar

Component 5: The Second Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the second cluster is as follows:

Table 5
Second Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology			
		G	NG	S	W
Steam Turbine	1	1			
Photovoltaic	13			13	
Wind Turbine	1				1
Combustion Turbine	1		1		
Reciprocating Engine	1		1		
Total	**17**	**1**	**2**	**13**	**1**

G=Geothermal; NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind

Component 6: The Third Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the third cluster is as follows:

Table 6
Third Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology	
		S	B
Steam Turbine	1		1
Photovoltaic	6	6	
Total	**7**	**6**	**1**

S=Solar; B=Biomass

Component 7: The Fourth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the fourth cluster is as follows:

Table 7
Fourth Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology			
		NG	S	W	WTR
Photovoltaic	34		34		
Wind Turbine	1			1	
Combined Cycle	1	1			
Combustion Turbine	1	1			
Hydraulic Turbine	1				1
Total	**38**	**2**	**34**	**1**	**1**

NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W= Wind; WTR=Water

Component 8: The Fifth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the fifth cluster is as follows:

Table 8
Fifth Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology			
			NG	S	W
Steam Turbine	.5		.5		
Photovoltaic	8.5			8.5	
Solar Thermal	1			1	
Wind Turbine	1				1
Combined Cycle	2		2		
Combustion Turbine	1		1		
Total	**14**	**0**	**3.5**	**9.5**	**1**

NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; W=Wind

Component 9: The Sixth Cluster

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the sixth cluster is as follows:

Table 9
Sixth Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology		
		NG	S	WTR
Photovoltaic	17		17	
Combined Cycle	4	4		
Combustion Turbine	2	2		
Hydraulic Turbine	1			1
Total	**24**	**6**	**17**	**1**

NG=Natural Gas; S=Solar; WTR=Water

Component 10: The Seventh Cluster

Table 10
Seventh Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology							
		NG	S	WTR	B	BAT	Other	S/BAT	W
Steam Turbine	2				1		1		
Photovoltaic	30		30						
Wind Turbine	3								3
Combined Cycle	2.5	2.5							
Combustion Turbine	6	6							
Hydraulic Turbine	1			1					
Storage	32.5	1				30.5	1		
Photovoltaic and Storage	1	0.5						0.5	
Combustion Turbine and Storage	1	1							
Total	**79**	**11**	**30**	**1**	**1**	**30.5**	**2**	**0.5**	**3**

B=Biofuel, BAT=Battery, NG=Natural Gas, S=Solar, W=Wind, WTR=Water

Component 11: Independent Study Process

The breakdown by technology of interconnection customers in the independent study process is as follows:

Table 11
ISP Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	W	G
Wind Turbine	1	1	
Steam Turbine	1		1
Total	**2**	**1**	**1**

G=Geothermal, W=Wind

Component 12: The Small Generators (Serial)

The breakdown by technology of small generator interconnection customers is as follows:

Table 12
Small Serial Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology			
		NG	S	B	W
Photovoltaic	16		16		
Wind Turbine	0				0
Reciprocating Engine	1	1		0	
Total	**17**	**1**	**16**	**0**	**0**

B=Biofuel NG=Natural Gas, S=Solar, W=Wind

Component 13: The Small Generators (Transition Cluster)

The breakdown by technology of small generator interconnection customers in the transition cluster is as follows:

Table 13
Small Transition Cluster Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Technology
	S
Photovoltaic	19
Total	**19**

S=Solar

Component 14: The Fast Track Generators (Fast Track)

The breakdown by technology of fast track interconnection customers is as follows:

Table 14
Fast track Interconnection Customers Categorized by Prime Mover Technology

Prime Mover	Number	Technology	
		B	S
Photovoltaic	1		1
Steam Turbine	1	1	
Storage	1		1
Total	**3**	**1**	**2**

B=Biomass; S=Solar

III. QUARTERLY PROGRESS IN PROCESSING THE QUEUE

Component 1: Pre-Serial Projects

Table 15 Component 1 Projects – Amendment 39	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	1	1
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	1	1
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Of the two remaining pre-serial projects in the queue, the project designated as without a GIA is in active negotiations and is expected to execute a GIA in the near future.

C**omponent 2: The Serial Study Group**

Table 16 Component 2 Projects - The Serial Study Group	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	23	23
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	4	4
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Currently there are 27 active serial study projects which have not achieved commercial operation, and four of those projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs.

Component 3: The Transition Cluster

Table 17 Component 3 Projects - The Transition Cluster	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	14	15
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	7	7
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	1
Projects completed during the quarter	1	1

InQ2 2014, one transition cluster project achieved commercial operation. Currently there are 21 active transition cluster projects which have not achieved commercial operation, and seven of those projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs.

Component 4: The First Cluster

Table 18 Component 4 Projects - The First Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	3	3
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	3	3
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	1
Projects completed during the quarter	0	1

Currently there are six active projects in the first cluster which have not achieved commercial operation, and three of those projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs.

Component 5: The Second Cluster

Table 19 Component 5 Projects - The Second Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	10	10
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	7	7
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	1
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Currently there are 17 active projects in the second cluster which have not achieved commercial operation, and seven projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs..

Component 6: The Third Cluster

Table 20 Component 6 Projects - The Third Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	4	4
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	3	3
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

Currently there are seven active projects in the third cluster which have not achieved commercial operation, and three projects still need to complete the negotiation of their GIAs.

Component 7: The Fourth Cluster

Table 21 Component 7 Projects - The Fourth Cluster under GIPR LGIP	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	14	14
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	24	25
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	1	0

In Q2 2014, one project executed a GIA and 24 projects remain to complete the negotiation process, making a total 39 active projects in this cluster.

Component 8: The Fifth Cluster

Table 22 Component 8 Projects - The Fifth Cluster under GIDAP	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	0	0
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	7	7
Number of projects which have elected to parked as a result of the Transmission Planning Deliverability process	7	7
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	1
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

During Q1 2014, seven projects elected to park after receiving their Transmission Plan Deliverability allocation results. These projects will be parked for 12 months and will not be required to post the second installment of their financial security or negotiate GIAs until after the 2015 Transmission Plan Deliverability process has been completed. Seven projects remain to complete the negotiation process, making a total 14 active projects in this cluster. GIA negotiations commenced in Q2 2014.

Component 9: The Sixth Cluster

Table 23 Component 9 Projects - The Sixth Cluster under GIDAP	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	0	0
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	24	33
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	9	15
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

A total of 9 Cluster 6 projects withdrew in Q2 2014, making a total of 24 active projects in this cluster.

Component 10: The Seventh Cluster

Table 24 Component 10 Projects - The Seventh Cluster under GIDAP	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	0	NA
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	79	NA
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	NA
Projects completed during the quarter	0	NA

A total of 79 Cluster 6 projects are active in this cluster.

Component 11: Independent Study Process

Table 25 Component 11: Requests Within the Independent Study Process under GIP	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Active Projects as of beginning of Quarter	1	1
Interconnection Requests received	0	0
Number of Interconnection Requests that withdrew during the Quarter	0	0

There were no changes to the ISP projects during Q2 2014.

Component 12: SGIP Serial Study Projects

Table 26 Component 12 Projects - SGIP Serial Projects	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	17	20
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	0	1
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	3	3
Projects completed during the quarter	1	1

In Q2 2014, three projects withdrew, one project executed a GIA, and one project achieved commercial operation, making a total of 17 active SGIP serial projects in the ISO's queue.

Component 13: SGIP Transition Cluster Projects

Table 27 Component 13 Projects - The SGIP Transition Cluster	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Number of active projects which have completed the GIA negotiation process	11	10
Number of active projects which have not completed the GIA negotiation process	8	9
Number of projects withdrawn this quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

In Q2 2014, one project executed a GIA and 8 projects remain to complete the negotiation process, making a total 19 active projects in this cluster.

Component 14: Fast Track Projects

Table 28 Component 14 Projects - The SGIP Transition Cluster	Q2 2014	Q1 2014
Active Projects as of beginning of Quarter	2	1
Interconnection Requests received	1	1
Number of Interconnection Requests that withdrew during the Quarter	0	0
Projects completed during the quarter	0	0

In Q2 2014, the ISO received one Interconnection Request for a Fast Track project, making a total 3 active projects in the Fast Track process.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served the foregoing document upon all of the parties listed on the official service lists for the above-referenced proceedings, in accordance with the requirements of Rule 2010 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 C.F.R. § 385.2010).

Dated at Washington, DC this 29th day of July, 2014.

/s/ Bradley R. Miliauskas
Bradley R. Miliauskas