

MEMORANDUM

To: Participants of Docket No. 5077 Technical Session
From: Cindy Wilson-Frias
Date: February 10, 2021
Re: Advance notice of topics for the Technical Session (not necessarily all-inclusive)

NECEC –

- NECEC has filed comments supporting the proposed amendments to the tariff. Please be prepared to expand on its experience in Massachusetts to the extent the proposals applicable to the RI tariff have been implemented in Massachusetts.
 - In particular, please describe NECEC’s role in and experience with the Technical Standards Review Committee in Massachusetts.
 - The expanded pre-application report was something that seemed important to developers in the Massachusetts technical sessions in MA DPU Docket 19-55. Has the expanded pre-application report been incorporated into the MA Standards for Connecting Distributed Generation and if so, what has been the feedback of member developers?
 - To the extent any of the other language in the proposed RI tariff reflects amendments incorporated into the MA tariff, please identify those sections and provide feedback as to the efficacy.
- Please be prepared to explain in detail what NECEC’s understanding of the ombudsperson’s role would be in Rhode Island, how NECEC would propose funding for it, what types of disputes are appropriate for an ombudsperson to consider and what types are not.
- Please review National Grid’s responses to PUC 1-1 and PUC 1-2. Does NECEC disagree with any of the characterizations National Grid has made for each clarifying amendment of the proposed changes. In other words, does NECEC believe a “clarifying” amendment actually represents a substantive change from the developer’s point of view? If so, please explain.

National Grid –

- Referencing Section 3.2 of Sheet 14, please explain where the fee for Pre-Application Reports appears in the redline of the proposed tariff on Table 2 – Fee Schedules. How will it be calculated?
- Referencing the new language on Sheet 23 related to the timing of payments, will this affect queue management? If so, how? Is this language consistent with Massachusetts? If so, what has the Company’s experience been with project viability within the queue compared to Rhode Island?
- Where is the calculation of the pre-impact study fee that is referenced in new Exhibit F included in Table 2 – Fee Schedules? How is it calculated?
- Any response to Sol Power comments?

- Will the Company still offer a Conditional ISA to customers in the form accepted by the Commission in Docket No. 4956?
- Please be prepared to further discuss the ombudsperson role and discuss further (expand on PUC 1-3.f) what types of disputes are appropriate for an ombudsperson to consider and what types are not. What does “oversee the interconnection process under the tariff” mean?
- Please provide examples of the following (even if it’s made up). Each response should include the fact set applicable to that scenario, the criteria used to determine which provision applies, any necessary calculations and totals together with the relevant timing of the assessment of costs to the interconnecting customer and credits to the interconnecting customer (and from whom credits are sourced – one customer/socialized to entire customer base, etc.), if applicable:
 - A project that is covered entirely by Section 5.3, paragraphs 1 and 2 (sentence 1) (pure system modification for one customer)
 - A project that is covered by Section 5.3, paragraphs 2,3 and 4 (subsequent renewable energy or commercial customer relies on the modification paid for by the first project) – be sure to provide the information for both the first customer and the subsequent customer.
 - A project that is covered by Section 5.4, paragraph 1 (combination system modification and system improvement)
 - A project that is covered by Section 5.4, paragraphs 2 and 3 (“accelerated modification”)
 - A project that is covered by Section 5.4, paragraph 4 (“may provide an obvious future benefit to the Company EPS”)
 - Which paragraph applies to a group study where multiple developers/projects are studied and assessed costs as part of a group? Please provide an example similar to the prior examples. What happens if a project that is part of a group study does not progress?

Division –

- Did the Division discuss any of its concerns with National Grid prior to filing its position?
- Does Mr. Booth have any comments after having reviewed National Grid’s reply comments?
- Mr. Booth has objected to the use of Commission staff in dispute resolutions. This is not a new provision. Why is the Division now objecting?