January 8, 2016

From: Amy D’Alessandro, Esq.

To: Chairperson Curran, Commissioners Roberti and DeSimone

Re: Docket 4483- National Grid’s DG Interconnection Tariff Revisions

CC: 4483 Service List

**I. Background**

National Grid’s DG Interconnection Tariff (Tariff) Revisions, filed January 15, 2015, arise out of a petition filed by WED and ACP Land on January 15, 2014.[[1]](#footnote-1) The petition raised concerns about an interconnection tax and interconnection costs assessed by National Grid and the timeliness of National Grid’s interconnection studies. The parties participated in mediation in April of 2014 pursuant to the Tariff’s dispute resolution provision.[[2]](#footnote-2) The mediation resulted in certain agreements of the parties. One of those agreements was for the Company to meet with interested parties to discuss possible revisions to the Tariff. This agreement, along with the other agreements reached in mediation, was memorialized in an Interim Order of the Commission issued November 12, 2014. The Interim Order directed National Grid to convene a working group to discuss possible revisions to the Tariff, and to propose revisions to the Tariff, based on feedback from the working group.[[3]](#footnote-3) Pursuant to the Interim Order, National Grid filed tariff revisions on January 15, 2015. A procedural schedule was established and a hearing was held on October 14, 2015.[[4]](#footnote-4)

**II. National Grid’s Proposed DG Interconnection Tariff Revisions**

The Tariff revisions are fairly comprehensive and intended to address not only issues raised in the January 15 petition and ensuing mediation, but also various updates and clarifications that were necessary since the last revision in 2011.[[5]](#footnote-5) While the complexity of the Tariff is a concern raised in this docket, the Company indicated from the outset that it had planned to update the Tariff, independently of this docket, for compliance with ISO-NE rule changes.[[6]](#footnote-6) Accordingly, the Tariff revisions generally fall into 4 categories:

1. Clarification edits intended to simplify or improve the interconnection process. They may be triggered by the Petition filed in this docket, working group feedback or the Company’s past experiences and lessons learned.
2. Edits which incorporate agreements reached by the parties during mediation.
3. Edits which incorporate provisions of the RE Growth Act.
4. Housekeeping edits, such as grammar, syntax, typographical and redundancy edits.[[7]](#footnote-7)

This memorandum will review the major revisions proposed by the Company in each of these categories, as well as revisions proposed by the Petitioner.[[8]](#footnote-8)

1. **Clarification edits.**
2. **System improvements**.[[9]](#footnote-9) The Company is proposing revisions to clarify that interconnecting customers are not responsible for system improvements. System improvements are defined as economically justified upgrades determined by the Company in the Facility interconnection design phase for capital investments associated with improving the capacity or reliability of the EPS.[[10]](#footnote-10)
3. **System modifications benefitting subsequent interconnecting customers.[[11]](#footnote-11)** The Company is proposing for interconnecting customers to be entitled to a refund of system modification costs which benefit subsequent interconnecting customers for a period of up to 5 years from the effective date of the previous interconnecting customer’s ISA.

* **Petitioner:** Petitioner proposes alternative language that would expand the time period for reimbursements from 5 to 10 years beyond the previous customer’s payment of modification costs, and the amount of the reimbursement would be determined by the Commission.[[12]](#footnote-12)Petitioner would also like the Tariff to reflect that a developer has the right to appeal to the Commission to reduce system upgrade costs if they can be shown to benefit other customers.
* **Division:** The Division supports the Company’s revisions related to system improvements and system modifications. The only reason that system modifications occur is but for the generator. The generator should be solely responsible for all incremental system modification costs. If a future customer benefits, or if work is performed to specifically serve other customers, then costs should be appropriately allocated as proposed by the Company.[[13]](#footnote-13)

1. **Timelines refer to the delivery of an executable ISA.[[14]](#footnote-14)** The Company is proposing to clarify that timelines established in the Tariff refer to the time it takes for the Company to deliver an executable ISA. This is not a new requirement but clarification of an existing practice.[[15]](#footnote-15) This requirement conforms to industry standards. It is consistent with MA interconnection standards, FERC small generator rules, and IREC model rules.[[16]](#footnote-16)

* **Petitioner:** Petitioner wants to have strict deadlines imposed for the entire interconnection process.[[17]](#footnote-17) Specifically, Petitioner wants to require that all interconnection work must be performed within 270 days of the impact study, or no more than 360 days from the interconnection application.[[18]](#footnote-18) Petitioner originally proposed a 180-day deadline for the entire interconnection process.[[19]](#footnote-19) No extensions of time would be allowed for the provision of additional information, and the Company would be liable for damages resulting from delays, including legal fees, to be paid by the Company’s shareholders. As an alternative to the penalty provision, Petitioner asks that the Commission conduct a regular review of the Company’s performance on interconnection deadlines and assess appropriate penalties for exceeding levels established by the MA DPU.[[20]](#footnote-20)
* **Division:** The Division supports the Company’s revisions clarifying that the Tariff’s interconnection timelines apply to the delivery of an executable ISA. Mr. Booth opposes the Petitioner’s proposal for a strict deadline for the entire interconnection process calling it unreasonable and overly burdensome. He objects to the Petitioner’s proposed Tariff language, including specifically the shareholder liability provision, which he criticized for being unreasonable and unnecessary in light of the Tariff’s existing dispute resolution process, and creating an unjustified benefit to the generator.[[21]](#footnote-21)

1. **Pre-Application Report.[[22]](#footnote-22)** The Company is proposing to allow interconnecting customers an upfront view of the system capacity in the proposed interconnection site before actually applying for interconnection and incurring impact study costs. The Company views this as a valuable resource to assist the interconnecting customer in determining on an informal basis whether to move forward with the interconnection process. The Pre-Application Report was discussed at the hearing in the context of how it compares with a public website that would enable interconnecting customers to view various DG installations in the proposed site. The Company views the Pre-Application Report as the preferred method of informing the customer of existing DG installations, noting the challenges inherent in designing a public website that would accurately depict a dynamic, ever-changing distribution system.[[23]](#footnote-23) Given that California has experienced significant customer complaints with its public website, the Company would like to wait and see how California addresses this issue before attempting to establish a similar website in RI.[[24]](#footnote-24) At the hearing, the Company admitted that security and customer confidentiality of information were also potential concerns inherent with any such website.[[25]](#footnote-25)

* **Petitioner:** Petitioner initially appears to support the Pre-Application report, claiming it will provide sufficient information at the time of application to enable the Company to adhere to Tariff timelines.[[26]](#footnote-26) However, he later describes the Pre-Application report as “more paperwork” which fails to meet the requirement of an accepted projects conference, if in fact is was intended to meet this requirement.[[27]](#footnote-27)
* **Division:** The Division supports this revision because it allows the customer to obtain critical decision-making information prior to investing time and money in a project.[[28]](#footnote-28)

1. **Expanding the Simplified Process.[[29]](#footnote-29)** The Company is expanding the range of projects eligible for the simplified interconnection process. The simplified process currently applies to projects with power ratings of 10 kW or less. This would be revised to cover projects of 15 kW or less.[[30]](#footnote-30) The simplified interconnection process is typically the quickest and least expensive of the three tracks (Simplified, Expedited and Standard).[[31]](#footnote-31) The Company views this revision as one of the most significant changes to the Tariff.

* **Petitioner:** Petitioner did not object to this particular revision.
* **Division:** The Division supports this revision.

1. **Exception for projects over 3 MW or that require substation upgrades.[[32]](#footnote-32)** There is currently an exception to the interconnection timelines for projects larger than 3 MW. The exception simply states that these projects may be subject to special interconnection requirements.[[33]](#footnote-33) The Company is now proposing to elaborate on that exception to state that facilities larger than 3 MW, or that require substation upgrades, may be subject to mutually agreed upon timelines rather than the timelines otherwise prescribed in the Tariff.

* **Petitioner:** Petitioner claims this revision allows the Company unfettered discretion to delay projects.[[34]](#footnote-34)
* **Division:** The Division supports this revision. It is common industry practice to require special requirements for larger projects because they have greater system impacts. The 3 MW limit is not only reasonable but necessary and practical.[[35]](#footnote-35)

1. **Timelines may be impacted if ISO-NE’s Operating Procedure 14 is required.[[36]](#footnote-36)**

* **Petitioner:** Petitioner claims the language is inaccurate and will serve to delay Petitioner’s projects. Petitioner proposes separate language regarding ISO-NE’s jurisdiction provision to be inserted into Section 3.4(3) (c) and Exhibit C.[[37]](#footnote-37)
* **Division:** The Division supports this revision. Quoting directly from ISO-NE’s Operating Procedure No. 14, which refers to facilities of 5 MW or greater, in aggregate or individually, Mr. Booth reasons that OP-14 could apply to certain generators seeking interconnection and finds this revision entirely appropriate.[[38]](#footnote-38)

1. **Impact study cost estimates are valid for 60 days.[[39]](#footnote-39)**

* **Petitioner:** Petitioner objects to this revision claiming that it adds instability to the interconnection process which will hamper project financing.[[40]](#footnote-40)
* **Division:** The Division supports this revision.

1. **Customers required to select an enrollment program (i.e. net metering, RE Growth Program) when applying for interconnection.[[41]](#footnote-41)** This information merely ensures that the Company obtains all necessary documentation for determining compliance with the interconnection Tariff and ultimately issuing the Authority to Interconnect in a timely manner.[[42]](#footnote-42)

* **Petitioner:** The Petitioner claims this information is irrelevant to the interconnection process and restricts the developers’ flexibility.[[43]](#footnote-43)
* **Division:** The Division supports this revision.

1. **Mediation edits.**
2. **Itemization of impact study costs.[[44]](#footnote-44)** The customer no longer must request an itemization of impact study costs. The Company will provide an itemization of study costs in every case where the customer’s previous payments exceed the customer’s cost responsibility, or in the case of an ISRDG Agreement, whenever the actual costs exceed the statutory fee and the Company seeks to collect actual costs.[[45]](#footnote-45)
3. **Final accounting of interconnection costs no longer by request, and timeline begins after the closing of work orders.[[46]](#footnote-46)** The customer no longer must request a final accounting of interconnection costs but will receive one within 90 days of the date when all work and services have been performed and work orders are complete. The Company will issue refunds within 45 days of the final accounting.[[47]](#footnote-47)

* **Petitioner:** Petitioner claims the Company may use this provision to avoid reimbursing interconnection costs.[[48]](#footnote-48)
* **Division:** The Division supports this revision.

**c. Dispute resolution provision.[[49]](#footnote-49)** The Company is proposing revisions to clarify the responsibilities of the parties requesting mediation and slightly expand the timeframe allowed to begin mediation (from 14 to 17 days).[[50]](#footnote-50) You may recall that the parties agreed to submit to an arbitration conducted by commission staff in Docket 4547. If the Commission foresees arbitrations like this in the future, then the following language should be added to Section 9.0. The parties have agreed to this language.

“Notwithstanding any provision contained in this section, the parties may agree to have formal arbitrations conducted by Commission staff.”

The Company’s proposed Tariff revisions do not include the above language; therefore, if the Commission is in favor of including this language, it should make a specific ruling to that effect.

1. **RE Growth edits.** The Petitioner did not object to the following revisions which are supported by the Division.
2. **Meters.[[51]](#footnote-51)** Where parallel metering is required for the generation output, the Company is proposing that all meters on the site have remote access.[[52]](#footnote-52)
3. **RE Growth Eligibility Requirements.[[53]](#footnote-53)** The Company is proposing to add the RE Growth eligibility requirements to the Simplified Process Interconnection Application.

**III. Petitioner**

In addition to the foregoing, Petitioner raised the following concerns about the proposed Tariff revisions.[[54]](#footnote-54)

1. **Simplify the Tariff.[[55]](#footnote-55)** The Petitioner has three requests in this category. The Petitioner first asks the Commission to simplify the Tariff according to model rules such as those developed by IREC or NARUC.[[56]](#footnote-56) Next, the Petitioner argues that impact study timelines should not be delayed when the Company requests additional information. The Company should be required to obtain all necessary information at the beginning of the process so that deadlines can be met and enforced. Finally, Petitioner objects to revisions clarifying that timelines apply to the delivery of an ISA and recommends a strict deadline for the entire interconnection process [[57]](#footnote-57)

* **National Grid:** The Tariff revisions achieve the purpose outlined in the Commission’s Interim Order issued November12, 2014 which was not to simplify the Tariff.[[58]](#footnote-58) Regardless, Petitioner has proposed no specific language to simplify the Tariff.[[59]](#footnote-59) The Tariff is already based on IREC and FERC Small Generator Interconnection Procedures.[[60]](#footnote-60) The DG workshop members expressed reluctance toward providing all information upfront, at the beginning of the application process.[[61]](#footnote-61) The Tariff’s interconnection timelines have always applied to the delivery of an executable ISA. [[62]](#footnote-62) This qualification is standard in the industry.[[63]](#footnote-63)
* **Division:** The Division supports all of the Company’s proposed Tariff revisions, recognizing that they include clarifications, updates to legislative amendments and revisions, such as the Pre-Application Report, which benefit the customer.[[64]](#footnote-64) The Division offered a few recommendations but only in the event the Company were to pursue further revisions to the Tariff.[[65]](#footnote-65)

1. **System upgrade costs should be budged and integrated into the Electric ISR Plan.[[66]](#footnote-66)** The Petitioner offers this proposal as a solution to the current framework which he believes unfairly burdens developers with the cost of system upgrades. Petitioner argues that ratepayers will be “more than compensated by rate reductions resulting from the resulting diversification of our electricity supply as needed to relieve constraints during our limited periods of peak consumption.“[[67]](#footnote-67)

* **National Grid:** Petitioner would like all customers to subsidize the renewable energy industry’s interconnection. This is contrary to basic cost causation principles and Rhode Island law. For other customers to be charged for the costs of interconnecting distributed generation, it must be clear that other customers also directly benefitted from the system modifications.[[68]](#footnote-68)
* **Division:** The Division strongly disagrees with the Petitioner’s request to include system modification costs in the annual ISR budget and planning process. Funding interconnection costs through ISR is counter to industry norms and the RE Growth Act, unreasonably shifts system modification costs from the generator/cost-causer to the ratepayer, masks the true cost of renewable generation, and encourages the development of noneconomic projects.[[69]](#footnote-69) Mr. Booth also disagreed with the Petitioner’s premise supporting this proposal, stating that renewable generation is neither firm nor dispatchable, is not a reliable solution to relieve grid constraints during system peaks and does not forego system investments otherwise necessary for local reliability.[[70]](#footnote-70) The Division did, however, support the idea of the Company comparing system upgrades to current area construction work plans to identify any opportunities to consolidate work and thereby reduce the interconnecting customer’s costs. Mr. Roughan addressed this comment both in discovery and at the hearing, testifying that the Company already performs this type of analysis in order to reduce costs to the interconnecting customer wherever possible.[[71]](#footnote-71)

1. **Tariff does not provide for an accepted projects conference.[[72]](#footnote-72)**

* **National Grid:** The Company acknowledges that it agreed to conduct an accepted projects conferences and represents that it is now conducting, and will continue to conduct, these conferences in the future.[[73]](#footnote-73) It also agreed to notify the customer of the accepted projects conference in writing upon transmittal of the executed DG contract to the customer.[[74]](#footnote-74) The Company also refers to the accepted projects conference on the RE Growth Program website.[[75]](#footnote-75)
* **Division:** The Division did not respond to certain issues raised by the Petitioner, including this one, electing to confine its analysis to major matters pertaining to the DG interconnection Tariff, rather than specific dealings between the Company, Petitioner and the parties.[[76]](#footnote-76)

1. **The application process should produce sufficient information to enable National Grid to determine whether the safe harbor provision applies to the project.[[77]](#footnote-77)** Petitioner did not propose specific language to include in the Tariff or specify how the application process should be changed to support this recommendation.

* **National Grid:** The safe harbor exemption does not apply to projects covered by the Tariff and, therefore, should not be referenced in the Tariff.[[78]](#footnote-78)
* **Division:** No recommendation. See paragraph III (3) above and footnote 76.

1. **A preliminary consultation should be required prior to the impact study which confirms the best approach to interconnection.[[79]](#footnote-79)**

* **National Grid:** The best approach to interconnection is not known until the proposal is analyzed; however, the pre-application report is performed prior to the impact study at no cost to the customer and should assist the developer in assessing to some degree the level of upgrades necessary to interconnect the project.[[80]](#footnote-80)
* **Division:** No recommendation.See paragraph III (3) above and footnote 76.

1. **The Company should designate a project manager to facilitate the interconnection of complex projects.[[81]](#footnote-81)**

* **National Grid:** The Company has staff working exclusively on generation projects and can acquire the assistance of additional employees, as needed, to review larger projects.[[82]](#footnote-82)
* **Division:** No recommendation. See paragraph III (3) above and footnote 76.

1. **Appoint a neutral ombudsman to audit past interconnection applications and monitor future interconnections.[[83]](#footnote-83)** This request was precipitated by a data response in which National Grid confirmed a 50% interconnection rate for all projects except simple solar, meaning that since 2011, only half of the projects that applied for interconnection (excluding simple solar) actually interconnected.[[84]](#footnote-84)

* **National Grid:** A neutral ombudsman is not necessary. A 50% interconnection rate is not unusual for larger projects which may decide not to follow through due to financing or any number of reasons.[[85]](#footnote-85) National Grid’s simplified interconnection process in Rhode Island is the fastest in the nation, taking only 2-3 days.[[86]](#footnote-86)
* **Division:** A 50% interconnection rate is not unusual for many reasons, including financial viability, siting and permitting issues, and in fact, utilities have interconnection rates that are lower than 50%.[[87]](#footnote-87)

**IV. Conclusion**

The findings and recommendations of the Division support approval of the Tariff revisions filed by National Grid on January 15, 2015. The Division retained expert consultant, Gregory L. Booth, PE, to review the filings in this docket. Mr. Booth is uniquely qualified for review of this docket, with more than 50 years of experience in the utility industry, including work supporting both the utility and the generator’s perspective.[[88]](#footnote-88) He provides consulting services in the annual ISR Plan and participated in the original implementation of this Tariff in 2008.[[89]](#footnote-89) Mr. Booth recommends that the Commission approve National Grid’s proposed Tariff revisions and disagreed ardently with each of Petitioner’s arguments. The specific bases for his disagreement have been previously summarized in this memorandum. In short, Mr. Booth found nothing in the Company’s filing that is unreasonable or outside the norm within the industry across the United States.[[90]](#footnote-90) Mr. Booth summarized his findings by saying that “interconnection processes and agreements must balance the desire to encourage more DG, particularly renewables, with the need for electric utility grid integrity. Between these two interests, grid integrity is the prevailing interest since no one benefits from a reduction in reliable power delivery or safety.”[[91]](#footnote-91) The interconnection process is inherently complex, involving multiple steps depending on the generator size, operating characteristics and location of the project, and interconnection requests must be considered on a one-by-one basis.[[92]](#footnote-92) System impacts would not occur but for the existence of the interconnected generator, and it is standard industry practice for the generator to be responsible for study costs, facilities to physically interconnect and meter the generator, and for system improvements necessary to mitigate any identified system impact.[[93]](#footnote-93) Finally, if cost causes a project not to be built, then it is not the most economical solution for the delivery of a generation product to customers.[[94]](#footnote-94)

1. On October 29, 2015, the Company updated the proposed revisions to incorporate additional edits raised in discovery. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. See R.I.P.U.C. No. 2078, Section 9.2, for Dispute Resolution Provision. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Memorandum and Summary of Interim Orders, Paragraph 4 (11/12/14). The original filing date was December 1, 2014 but was continued to January 15, 2015, per request of National Grid. The issue of the appropriateness of the interconnection tax was decided at an open meeting held on December 11, 2014. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The hearing was originally scheduled for June 22. The Commission continued the hearing to July 23 due to an internal schedule conflict. The Commission continued the hearing again to October 14 after receiving a voluminous pile of new exhibits from Seth Handy on the day before the scheduled hearing date. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The DG Interconnection Tariff (R.I.P.U.C. No. 2078) was first approved in 2008 and amended once on November 30, 2011. Order No. 206210 (Docket. 4276). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See Letter of National Grid to Commission at 3 (08/06/14) and Memorandum from Attorney D’Alessandro to the Parties at 4, Paragraph 5 (08/14/14). The August 14 Memorandum is based on feedback from the parties addressing the appropriate language to use that would accurately reflect the agreements of the parties. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For brevity, specific housekeeping edits are intentionally omitted from this memo. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Most of the revisions covered in this memorandum were either opposed by the Petitioner or raised for some reason in discovery and/or at the hearing. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Section 1.2 Definitions, Sheet 7; Section 5.2 Interconnection Equipment Costs, Sheet 36. All Tariff citations refer to the Red-lined version filed January 15, unless otherwise specified. See also COMM 9-9. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. When asked to explain this revision, Mr. Roughan said, “[I]f the Company is already looking to do certain work in the area that coincides with a developer’s intent to interconnect and we can gain efficiencies through doing both projects at once, we will do so, but we will not charge the interconnecting customer for those system improvements.” Transcript at 210. See also Transcript at 34-35. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Section 5.3 System Modification Costs, Sheet 36. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Supplemental Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 2. See Attached for Tariff language proposed by Petitioner. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Report of Gregory L. Booth, PE at 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Section 3.0, Process Overview, Sheet 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. The Tariff language itself reflects that this is not new language. See also Transcript at 31-32. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Testimony of Timothy Roughan. Transcript at 211-212. The Tariff already specifies that interconnection timelines refer to the delivery of an executable ISA. See Table 1- Time Frames, Explanatory Note 3, Sheet 26. This revision is meant to highlight or clarify that point. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. See Attached for Tariff language proposed by Petitioner. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Supplemental Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 2-3 (dated 09/14/15, Filed 10/14/15). [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 9-10. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Id. at 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Id. at 8-9. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Section 3.2, Pre-Application Reports, Sheet 13. This was updated in the October 29 filing to clarify that the customer is not required to proceed with the interconnection application after it receives the pre-application report. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Transcript at 217-219. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Id. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Id. at 227-228. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 7, line 21 to page 8, line 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Id. at 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Report of Gregory L. Booth at 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Section 3.1, Simplified Process, Sheet 11. The simplified process is currently for projects with power ratings of 7.5 kW or less. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Screening criteria for radial interconnections is also increasing from a maximum limit of 7.5% to 15% of circuit annual peak load. Id. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. The Tariff establishes a 20-day approval period for the simplified process. No ISA is required for the simplified process which typically takes only 1-3 business days for interconnection approval. Table 1- Time Frames. (10/29/15); COMM 7-10 and COMM 8-1. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. Section 2.0, Basic Understanding, Sheet 9. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. Id. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 10. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. Report of Gregory L. Booth at 9-10. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Section 3.4, Standard Process, subparagraph (3) (c), Sheet 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. Id. at 16. See Attached for Tariff language proposed by Petitioner. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Report of Gregory L. Booth, PE at 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Section 1.2, Definition of Impact Study, Sheet 4. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Exhibit A Simplified Process Interconnection and Service Agreement, Sheet 52; Exhibit C Expedited/Standard Process Interconnection Application, Sheet 60. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. Joint Rebuttal of Timothy R. Roughan and John C. Kennedy at 21; COMM 7-10, footnote 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. Exhibit F Impact Study or ISRDG Agreement, Paragraph 7, Sheet 71; Exhibit G Detailed Study Agreement, Paragraph 7, Sheet 74. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. COMM 6-28 and COMM 7-1. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. Exhibit H ISA, Section 5.2, Sheet 77. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. The Company updated the final accounting provisions on October 29, 2015 to clarify that 1) the customer is entitled to a final accounting of impact study costs regardless whether there is an ISA and 2) the final accounting provision does not apply to ISRDG agreements since they cover statutory study fees which may be reconciled at any time if the costs exceed the statutory fee and the Company seeks to collect actual costs. COMM 7-1. The first clarification was a response to a Commission data request, which was precipitated by Mark DePasquale’s Pre-Filed Testimony at 12, lines 17 -22. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 17. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. Section 9.2, Mediation/Non-binding Arbitration, Sheet 43; Table 3-Dispute Resolution Timeframes, Sheet 48. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. Table 3-Dispute Resolution Timeframes, Sheet 48. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. Section 8.1, Metering, Related Equipment and Billing Options, Sheet 42. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. COMM 9-6. The expansion of the simplified process (Supra. at paragraph II (1) (e), page 4) could also be viewed as a RE Growth edit since the Company has year-round open enrollment for the small solar class, and most of the new RE Growth projects are small solar projects which are eligible for the simplified interconnection process. [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. Exhibit A Simplified Process Interconnection Application, Sheets 50-51. [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. This memorandum reviews the major tariff revisions proposed by National Grid, the Petitioner’s objections to those Tariff revisions, as well as any Tariff revisions proposed by the Petitioner. Petitioner’s Pre-Filed Testimony contains allegations which are intentionally omitted from this review. These include developers’ alleged fear of retribution from National Grid and National Grid’s alleged retaliatory assessment of interconnection costs. Similarly, Petitioner’s “contextual information and argument not suited for cross examination” are also omitted. For review of Petitioner’s “contextual information and argument,” please see Petitioner’s Memorandum of Law filed October 28, 2015, and reply memoranda of National Grid (11/13/15) and the Division (11/12/15). [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Attached is a list of all Tariff provisions proposed by Petitioner. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. IREC is the Interstate Renewable Energy Council. [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 7-8. [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. Transcript at 203-204. [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. Joint Rebuttal Testimony of Timothy R. Roughan and John C. Kennedy at 5. National Grid Reply Memorandum at 6 (11/13/15). Transcript at 67-68. [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. National Grid Reply Memorandum at 6 (11/13/15); Transcript at 28, 38. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Transcript at 47. [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Id. at 31-32. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Id. at 211. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Report of Gregory L. Booth, PE at 5. [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. If the Company should pursue further Tariff revisions in the future, the Division recommended allowing generators to follow similar paths regardless of renewable status. In the event the Company should pursue broad sweeping changes to the Tariff, the Division recommended the Company use FERC’s Small Generator Interconnection Procedures as a model. Finally, the Division suggested the Company create a publically available queue of distributed generation projects over 15 kW which would allow generators to view the status of interconnection requests. Id. at 6-7. Mr. Roughan responded to these recommendations at the hearing. He testified that the interconnection Tariff in Massachusetts was recently approved, and at the present time, the Company does not intend to make any further revisions based on the latest revisions approved in Massachusetts. Transcript at 213, 215-216. He clarified that Rhode Island’s interconnection Tariff is already based on the FERC’s SGI Procedures. Id. at 38. Finally, he testified that the Company is waiting to see how California addresses issues surrounding its interconnection website before it commits to launching a similar website in Rhode Island. Id. at 217-219. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. Pre-Filed Testimony of Mark DePasquale at 11-12. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. Id. at 12. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. Joint Rebuttal of Timothy R. Roughan and John C. Kennedy at 12-13. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
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