Stakeholder Comments Template

Subject: Modifications to the Small Generator Interconnection Procedures Issues Paper and Meeting

Submitted by	Company	Date Submitted
Bob de Korne' dekorne@encous.com 909-289-5427	ENCO Utility Services	April 22, 2010

This template was created to help stakeholders submit written comments on topics related to the April 1, 2010 Modifications to the Small Generator Interconnection Procedures Issue Paper and April 12, 2010 Small Generator Interconnection Procedures Stakeholder Meeting. Please submit comments and thoughts (in MS Word) to dkirrene@caiso.com no later than the close of business on April 27, 2010.

The ISO is interested in knowing the importance and urgency of the issues identified through this stakeholder process. The issues identified below are further described in the Issues Paper. Please rate the importance of each issue as high, medium or low by checking the check box. In addition, please identify the urgency for getting each of the identified issues resolved. Check the urgent check box for issues that should be resolved in a FERC filing this year. Check the not urgent check box if the issue could be resolved beyond year-end. The information provided will assist the ISO in determining the scope of this stakeholder effort.

Study Process Issues				
	Importance	Urgency		
2.1.1 Time required for the	⊠ high medium low	□ urgent □ not urgent		
SGIP study process				
2.1.2 SGIP serial study	☐ high⊠ medium☐ low	urgent 🔀 not urgent		
process coordination with				
the studies under the large				
generation interconnection				
procedures (LGIP)				
2.1.3 Avoiding delays	⊠ high medium low	⊠urgent ☐ not urgent		
caused by the increasing				
volume of SGIP projects				
2.1.4 Detail and necessity	☐ high☐ medium⊠ low	☐urgent ☐ not urgent		
of the feasibility study		_		

2.1.5 Interconnect	ction	high	medium	low	urgent	
request data requ	uirements	_			_	_
2.1.6 Should the	SGIP	$oxed{oxed}$ high $oxed{oxed}$	medium	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
accommodate re	-studies?	_			_	_
2.1.7 Availability	of the	oxtimes high $oxtimes$	medium_	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
current base case	e data for	_			_	
use by project de	evelopers					
2.1.8 Delays and		$oxed{oxed}$ high $oxed{oxed}$	medium	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
uncertainty in stu	dy results	_			_	_
caused by project	ts that					
withdraw						
Comments:						
Solution Ideas:						
Deliverabili	ity Issues	Related 1	to Interco	nnecti	ng Small (Generation
2.2.1 Should SG	IP have an	⊠ high	medium	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
option for deliver	ability?	_ 0 _			_ 0	_
2.2.2 Should then		high	medium	low	urgent	not urgent
opportunity to ha	ve "partial	_ 0 _		•		_
deliverability"?	·					
2.2.3 Should then	e be a	\boxtimes high \square	medium	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
later opportunity	to change	_ 5 _			_	_
deliverability stat	us after					
generator is com	mercially					
operational?	-					
2.2.4 How would	a change	⊠ high	medium	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
in policy affect ex	risting	_			_	
generation and/o	r existing					
projects in the qu						
Comments:	Deliverabili	ty is the mo	ost importar	nt issue i	in the questi	onnaire
					_	
Solution Ideas:						ster for delivery
	after facility	/ analysis a	nd develop	appropi	riate study co	ost.
	Issu	es relatir	ng to Cos	t Certa	inty	
2.3.1 Developers	desire	$oxed{oxed}$ high $oxed{oxed}$	medium	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
cost certainty						
2.3.2 How to min	imize the	$oxed{oxed}$ high $oxed{oxed}$	medium	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
impacts caused b	• • •					
that drop out of the	•					
2.3.3 Accuracy of the per		$oxed{oxed}$ high $oxed{oxed}$	medium	low	⊠urgent	not urgent
unit construction cost						

estimates				
2.3.4 Effects of a	dding cost	⊠ high medium low	⊠urgent	not urgent
certainty measure				
overall SGIP time	eline			
Comments:				
Solution Ideas:				
	Issue	es related to Eligibility C	riteria	
2.4.1 LGIP project	cts broken	☐ high⊠ medium☐ low	urgent	
up into multiple S				<u> </u>
projects				
2.4.2 Real vs. Sp	eculative	│ high │ medium │ low	⊠urgent	not urgent
projects				
2.4.3 Generation	MW size	☐ high☐ medium☒ low	urgent	not urgent
2.4.4 MW Increas	ses to	high medium low	urgent	not urgent
existing projects				<u></u>
2.4.5 Site Contro	I	high medium low	urgent	not urgent
Comments:		e projects unfairly impact inves		
	•	or time delays.		, ,
		·		
Solution Ideas:	Current Sit	e Control Policy appears to de	eal with the iss	sue pretty
	effectively.			
	lssues rel	ated to application and	study fees	
2.5.1 Appropriate amount	eness of	⊠ high⊡ medium⊡ low	urgent	□ not urgent
Comments:	Fees shou	ld be cost-based. Not based u	non artificial i	ncentives
Solution Ideas:	1 663 31100	id be cost-based. Not based d	pori artificiai ii	iliceritives.
Colution lucas.				
Sma	II Genera	tor Interconnection Agre	eement Iss	ues
2.6.1 Pace of SG	ilA	│	⊠urgent	not urgent
completion				
2.6.2 Detail of the	SGIA	│	urgent	
Comments:				
	Level of de	etail appears to be adequate.		
Solution Ideas:				
	Miso	cellaneous SGIP tariff is	sues	
micochanicodo con tarm issues				
2.7.1 Detail of the tariff	e SGIP	☐ high☐ medium☐ low	urgent	not urgent

CAISO

Comments Template for April 1 2010 SGIP Modification Issue Paper

2.7.2 Clarity of S	GIP tariff	$oxed{oxed}$ high $oxed{oxed}$	medium Iow	⊠urgent	not urgent
definitions					
Comments:					
Solution Ideas:					
	Additiona	l Issues t	hat should be o	onsidered	
Please include ada issues here.	litional	high	medium low	urgent	not urgent
_	litional	high	medium low	urgent	not urgent

Do you have any additional comments that you would like to provide?