

142 FERC ¶ 61,082
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Before Commissioners: Jon Wellinghoff, Chairman;
Philip D. Moeller, John R. Norris,
Cheryl A. LaFleur, and Tony T. Clark.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Docket No. ER13-494-000

ORDER ON TARIFF AMENDMENT

(Issued February 1, 2013)

1. On December 3, 2012, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) filed proposed revisions to its Generator Interconnection Procedures (GIP), its Small Generator Interconnection Agreement (SGIA) and related provisions of its Wholesale Distribution Tariff (WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA, respectively).¹ PG&E proposes these revisions to align PG&E's WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA with changes recently approved by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to PG&E's Electric Rule 21 tariff, and to make other administrative corrections and clarifications to PG&E's WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA. This order accepts PG&E's proposed tariff revisions, effective December 4, 2012, as requested.

I. Background

2. On April 29, 2011, the Commission conditionally accepted PG&E's proposal to implement a new GIP structure, which followed the California Independent System Operator Corporation's (CAISO) earlier proposal to combine the large and small generator interconnection procedures and implement a new cluster study process.² The Commission sought to improve the efficiency of the PG&E and CAISO interconnection procedures by creating a framework through which PG&E and CAISO can simultaneously, and in a more coordinated manner, evaluate impacts to their respective systems.³

¹ PG&E, FERC Electric Tariff, Volume No. 4.

² See *Pacific Gas and Electric Co.*, 135 FERC ¶ 61,094, *order on reh'g*, 137 FERC ¶ 61,024 (2011).

³ *Id.* P 28.

3. On September 13, 2012, the CPUC approved the Rule 21 Tariff Settlement Agreement (Rule 21 Settlement) in Rulemaking 11-09-011.⁴ The revised Rule 21 establishes PG&E's, as well as other California investor-owned utilities' (IOU), rules and regulations pertaining to CPUC-jurisdictional generator interconnections, such as Net-Energy Metered customers and Qualifying Facilities.

4. PG&E explains that the Rule 21 Settlement fulfilled the CPUC's goals to address policy and technical issues essential to timely, predictable and transparent interconnection rules, and to avoid issues like duplicative queues and study processes for CPUC and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (Commission)-jurisdictional projects. PG&E states that the Rule 21 Settlement was supported by a large and varied group of stakeholders.

5. Revised Rule 21 provides interconnection, operating and metering requirements for generating facilities to be connected to a distribution utility's system over which the CPUC has jurisdiction. It generally applies to net energy metering generating facilities and generating facilities that do not export to the grid or sell any exports sent to the grid. All other interconnections are made pursuant to either CAISO's interconnection procedures or the distribution utility's wholesale access distribution tariff.⁵

6. Section II.F of the Rule 21 Settlement provides:

Coordination with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission: Following Commission approval of this Settlement Agreement, the IOUs shall seek Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") approval of any necessary changes to their respective FERC-approved wholesale distribution access tariffs to accommodate Revised Rule 21 Tariff applicants that are studied in the transmission cluster study process and choose a Commission jurisdictional interconnection agreement. The Settling Parties shall support

⁴ See CPUC Decision (D.) 12-09-018, *Decision Adopting Settlement Agreement Revising Distribution Level Interconnection Rules and Regulations – Electric Tariff Rule 21 and Granting Motions to Adopt the Utilities' Rule 21 Transition Plans* (D.12-09-018), issued September 20, 2012 in Order Instituting Rulemaking (R.) 11-09-011, *Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Improve Distribution Level Interconnection Rules and Regulations for Certain Classes of Electric Generators and Electric Storage Resources* (R.11-09-011), filed September 22, 2011. D.12-09-018 (with all attachments) available at <http://docs.cpuc.ca.gov/PublishedDocs/Published/G000/M028/K168/28168335.PDF>.

⁵ *Id.*

or not file any pleadings or administrative challenges objecting to the IOUs' FERC filings.

To comply with this directive, PG&E proposes several changes to its GIP in order to conform its GIP to revised Rule 21. PG&E explains that these proposed changes will provide interconnection customers with a more consistent set of timelines and costs between PG&E's WDT-GIP and the revised Rule 21 process. PG&E states these changes will also allow interconnection customers to make an easier transition between the revised Rule 21 processes and the WDT-GIP, if such a transition is necessary.

II. PG&E's Tariff Filing

A. Rule 21 Tariff-Related Changes

7. PG&E states that several of the proposed changes have been made to the WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA in order to more closely align the WDT-GIP and the WDT-SGIA to the revised Rule 21 Tariff.

8. The first set of proposed changes will allow an interconnection customer that is eligible to interconnect under state jurisdiction to opt for a Rule 21 Generator Interconnection Agreement (GIA). Consistent with the Rule 21 Settlement, PG&E has added language to two sections of the WDT-GIP to permit a CPUC-jurisdictional interconnection customer, which has been studied under the WDT-GIP Cluster Study Process, to sign a Rule 21 GIA instead of a WDT GIA.⁶

9. The next proposed changes address certain details required in an interconnection request. PG&E proposes that an interconnection customer must submit a complete and valid interconnection request via the distribution provider's on-line application and that queue position should be determined by the date the distribution provider receives a complete and valid request from an interconnection customer. PG&E further outlines how the request would be acknowledged and how to address deficiencies. PG&E contends this new language tracks Section E (Interconnection Request Submission Process) of revised Rule 21. PG&E explains that including this language in the WDT-GIP will bring consistency, especially with respect to the Queue Validation process, to the revised Rule 21 request submission processes and the WDT-GIP.⁷ Section 1.6 (Queue Position) is eliminated consistent with this change.

⁶ WDT-GIP sections 1.1.6 and 5.8.1 (Tender).

⁷ *Id.* section 1.3 (Interconnection Request).

10. The next two proposed changes address the Fast Track Process that is available for certain smaller generating facilities.⁸ PG&E proposes a fifteen day period for Initial Review with the cost to be paid by the interconnection customer. PG&E states that these proposed changes were made using language from the revised Rule 21 in order to align the WDT-GIP Fast Track processes and timelines more closely with those contained in the revised Rule 21.⁹ Similarly, PG&E explains that the proposed changes to sections 2.4 and 2.5 respecting the timing, cost responsibility and duties associated with Supplemental Review and an Optional Supplemental Review Results Meeting have been made for the same reasons.¹⁰

11. The next series of proposed changes address financial security in the Independent Study Process and the Cluster Study Process.¹¹ PG&E proposes the removal of certain types of financial instruments as acceptable security. PG&E explains that with the proposed revisions, the instruments used to demonstrate financial security under the WDT-GIP Independent Study Process and Cluster Study Process are now the same as those allowed under the revised Rule 21.¹² To provide consistency with revised Rule 21, PG&E states the Interconnection Study deposit under the Independent Study Process has been lowered for generators 5 MW or less.¹³

12. Next, PG&E explains that it is proposing a new paragraph that allows the withdrawal of a proposed interconnection modification if it is found to be “material” per the terms of the tariff. PG&E states that the addition is consistent with revised Rule 21, addressing the roles of the interconnection customer and PG&E if a customer modification is determined to be material during the Independent Study Process.¹⁴ Also,

⁸ The Fast Track Process, under which interconnection customers that pass certain screens are able to avoid detailed study prior to interconnection, is available for generating facilities (connecting to the distribution system) no larger than 5 MW (up to 3 MW for a 21 kV interconnection, and up to 2 MW on a 12 kV interconnection).

⁹ *Id.* sections 2.2 (Initial Review) and 2.3 (Initial Review Results Meeting).

¹⁰ *Id.* sections 2.4 (Supplemental Review) and 2.5 (Optional Supplemental Review Results Meeting).

¹¹ The Independent Study Process allows for expedited processing of those requests that are electrically independent of other requests in the interconnection queue. Under the Cluster Study Process, a group of interconnection requests are studied jointly to determine their effects on the transmission system.

¹² *Id.* sections 3.11.1 and 4.23.1 (Types of Interconnection Financial Security).

¹³ *Id.* section 3.2.1 (Initiating an Interconnection Request).

¹⁴ *Id.* section 3.5.8 (Modifications Between the Interconnection System Impact Study and Interconnection Facilities Study).

two new sections to the Independent Study Process are added to provide the interconnection customer with the option of requesting an Interconnection Facilities Study results meeting and to establish when PG&E will provide the customer with a draft GIA.¹⁵

13. Further, PG&E states that it is proposing clarifying language, consistent with revised Rule 21, regarding extending the Commercial Operation Date under the Independent Study Process under certain circumstances.¹⁶ Regarding financial postings, PG&E explains that it has proposed revisions to each section regarding the time period for notice that the customer's posting has been made. The time allowed for initial postings under the Independent Study Process has been increased from thirty to sixty days. PG&E states these changes are also consistent with revised Rule 21.¹⁷

14. PG&E next explains that it proposes to add revised Rule 21 language regarding partial recovery of financial security under the Independent Study Process in cases where the customer withdraws its interconnection request.¹⁸ Further, PG&E explains that it has proposed adding a citation to its online application process. In addition, PG&E argues that consistent with revised Rule 21, a nonrefundable, \$800 Interconnection Request fee has been added.¹⁹

15. The next proposed changes address the timelines and financial security requirements related to interconnection requests. PG&E proposes that its timeline and processes regarding the receipt of an interconnection request be extended from three to ten days in order to be consistent with revised Rule 21.²⁰ Moreover, PG&E states that revised Rule 21 revisions are proposed in each section regarding the time period for notice that the customer's posting under the cluster study process has been made.²¹

¹⁵ *Id.* sections 3.6.6 and 3.6.7 (Interconnection Facilities Study).

¹⁶ *Id.* section 3.8 (Extensions of Commercial Operation Date).

¹⁷ *Id.* sections 3.11.2, 3.11.3 and 3.11.4 (Initial, Second and Third Postings of Financial Security).

¹⁸ *Id.* section 3.11.6 (General Effect of Withdrawal of Interconnection Request or Termination of the GIA on Interconnection Financial Security).

¹⁹ *Id.* section 4.2 (Materials to be Submitted at the Time of the Interconnection Request).

²⁰ *Id.* section 4.5.1 (Acknowledgement of Interconnection Request).

²¹ *Id.* sections 4.23.2, 4.23.3 and 4.23.4 (Initial, Second and Third Postings of Financial Security).

16. PG&E is also proposing changes to the GIP Attachments. PG&E states that new revised Rule 21-related terms should be added to the Glossary.²² PG&E also states that consistent with revised Rule 21, sections 1.8.2 and 1.8.3, which cover payments to the interconnection customer for reactive power, should be deleted. In addition, PG&E states that Section 6.3 (Financial Security Arrangements) surety bonds should be removed as an acceptable form of financial security as provided in revised Rule 21.²³

B. Administrative and Miscellaneous Changes

17. Next, PG&E explains that the several proposed changes should be made to the WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA in order to add clarity to the procedures under the WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA.

18. PG&E proposes adding a Table of Contents to better demonstrate how the WDT-GIP is organized.²⁴ Further, PG&E proposes to reorganize section 1.1.1 for clarity. Similarly, PG&E proposes language covering the Tender (section 2.6.1), Negotiation (section 2.6.2) and Execution & Filing (section 2.6.3) of the GIA, consistent with the language contained in section 5.8 (Generator Interconnection Agreement).²⁵

19. Under the Independent Study Process, PG&E proposes removal of the Generating Facility certification language to clarify there is no requirement to initially apply under Fast Track Process.²⁶ PG&E next proposes revisions to clarify the processes and roles of PG&E and CAISO in determining electrical independence under the Independent Study Process and to add clarity to the terms used.²⁷

20. Next, PG&E proposes removal of the requirement that it provide a good faith estimate of the costs of the Interconnection System Impact Study under the Independent Study Process, because previously the Commission accepted the use of study deposits in Docket No. ER11-3004-000.²⁸ PG&E also proposes that the requirement that an Independent Study Process Results Meeting, if requested, occur within 20 business days

²² GIP, Attachment 1 (Glossary of Terms).

²³ WDT, Attachment F (Small Generator Interconnection Agreement).

²⁴ WDT-GIP Table of Contents.

²⁵ WDT-GIP section 2.6 (Execution of the Generator Interconnection Agreement).

²⁶ *Id.* section 3.1 (Applicability).

²⁷ *Id.* section 3.1.1 (Independent Study Process Screen).

²⁸ *Id.* sections 3.3.2 (Processing of interconnection Request), 3.3.3 (Scoping Meeting) and 3.5.2 (Interconnection System Impact Study).

after the Interconnection System Impact Study report is issued be removed. Further, PG&E proposes language which allows the parties to choose a mutually agreeable date to hold the meeting.²⁹

21. PG&E proposes changing the time period for it to provide the customer with an accounting of liquidated financial security to be consistent with section 3.11.6.5.³⁰ The next proposed clarification specifies that if a Results Meeting is held, PG&E will provide the interconnection customer with a draft GIA within thirty days after the Results Meeting.³¹

22. PG&E next proposes revising the language of section 4.24.3 to make this section consistent with section 5.8.3. In addition, PG&E proposes the removal of the ten-day time requirement for PG&E's filing of an executed GIA in both sections. Typically, explains PG&E, executed GIAs are reported to the Commission on a quarterly basis.³² PG&E has also proposes clarification of when PG&E will tender a GIA to the interconnection customer.³³ Finally, PG&E proposes several revisions to enhance the clarity of the Application and to its Appendices.³⁴

C. Proposed Effective Date

23. PG&E requests that the Commission grant a waiver of the 60-day notice requirements set forth in section 35.3 of Commission's rules and regulations, 18 C.F.R § 35.3 (2012), to allow an effective date of December 4, 2012. PG&E states that the proposed effective date for the WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA revisions will permit PG&E to use the new procedures to assign interconnection customers queue positions. This will

²⁹ *Id.* section 3.5.6 (Interconnection System Impact Study).

³⁰ *Id.* section 4.23.6.5 (Notification to Interconnection Customer and Accounting by Distribution Provider).

³¹ *Id.* section 4.24.1 (Tender of Draft GIA).

³² *Id.* section 4.24.3 and 5.8.3 (Execution and Filing).

³³ *Id.* section 5.8.1 (Tender).

³⁴ GIP, Attachment 2 (Generator Interconnection Request Online Application); Attachment 6 (Generator Interconnection Study Process Agreement); Attachment 7 (Interconnection System Impact Study Agreement) (revisions for clarity have been made to the Agreement and section 12.0 has been revised to state that any study costs that exceed (or are less than) the study deposit must be paid (or refunded) with interest consistent with FERC policy); Attachment 8 (Interconnection Facilities Study Agreement); and WDT Attachment F (Small Generator Interconnection Agreement).

eliminate interconnection customer confusion as it enables PG&E to assign queue positions for both revised Rule 21 Tariff and WDT interconnections on the same basis.

III. Notice of Filing and Responsive Pleadings

24. Notice of PG&E's filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 77 Fed. Reg. 73,643 (2012), with interventions, comments, and protests due on or before December 24, 2012.

25. Motions to intervene were filed the City of Santa Clara, California and the M-S-R Public Power Agency and the Modesto Irrigation District. Notice of intervention and comments were filed by the CPUC. On January 4, 2013, PG&E filed a motion to answer and answer to the CPUC's comments.

IV. Discussion

A. Procedural Matters

26. Pursuant to Rule 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.214 (2012), the timely, unopposed notice and motions to intervene serve to make the entities that filed them parties to this proceeding. Rule 213(a)(2) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, 18 C.F.R. § 385.213(a)(2) (2012), prohibits an answer to a protest and/or answer unless otherwise ordered by the decisional authority. We will accept PG&E's answer because it has provided information that assisted us in our decision-making process.

B. CPUC's Comments and PG&E's Answer

1. CPUC's Comments

27. The CPUC supports the proposed revisions to PG&E's WDT and associated documents. The CPUC states that PG&E's proposed method of accommodating eligible interconnection customers that elect CPUC-jurisdictional or FERC-approved interconnection agreements following a transmission cluster study is reasonable. Further, the CPUC states that PG&E's harmonization of additional WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA procedural provisions with revised Rule 21 closes gaps and ensures fair treatment.

28. The CPUC nevertheless recommends additional changes to coordinate PG&E's WDT-GIP with revised Rule 21. Specifically, the CPUC recommends that PG&E incorporate the revised Rule 21 minimum load-based penetration threshold to PG&E's WDT-GIP.

29. The CPUC states that under revised Rule 21, aggregate generating capacity on a distribution line segment is permitted to reach 100 percent of that line segment's

minimum load.³⁵ The CPUC states that it has advocated for this penetration threshold in the context of other FERC proceedings.³⁶ The CPUC states that this new penetration threshold is implemented in revised Rule 21 as part of the Supplemental Review. Where a generating facility's output in aggregate with other generating capacity on the line segment exceeds the standard 15 percent of peak load threshold, the interconnection customer may pay an additional fee for Supplemental Review. Then, the utility determines whether the minimum load level on that line segment can accommodate the aggregate generating capacity, and whether other safety and reliability tests are met.³⁷ If the tests are met, Fast Track is complete and the customer may proceed to interconnection.³⁸

30. The CPUC states that it is aware that the Commission is considering opening a rulemaking to investigate modifications to the Small Generator Interconnection Procedure, including the 15 percent of peak load penetration threshold.³⁹ In the interim, argues the CPUC, introduction of the 100 percent of minimum load-based penetration threshold to PG&E's WDT-GIP would allow a more complete implementation in California of this important new interconnection standard. The CPUC states that it anticipates that this new 100 percent of minimum load-based threshold, plus the additional voltage, power quality, safety, and reliability queries set out in Supplemental Review in revised Rule 21, will provide a path to interconnection for a significant number of interconnection requests, allowing greater opportunity to interconnect to the distribution system in California without detailed study.

2. PG&E's Answer

31. PG&E does not support the CPUC's suggestion that the tariff be modified to incorporate a 100 percent of minimum load-based penetration threshold review into the Supplemental Review portion of the Fast Track process. PG&E states such a modification is not necessary since PG&E's Fast Track process already has the flexibility to incorporate the 100 percent of minimum load-based penetration threshold review into the Supplemental Review (subject to the availability of minimum load information and

³⁵ Rule 21, section G.2.a (Screen N, Penetration Test).

³⁶ See CPUC, Motion to Intervene and File Comments Out of Time, Docket No. RM12-10-000 at 4 (filed Apr. 9, 2012).

³⁷ Rule 21, section G.2.b (Screen O, Power Quality and Voltage Tests), and section G.2.c (Screen P, Safety and Reliability Tests).

³⁸ *Id.* section G.2.c.

³⁹ See Supplemental Notice of Technical Conference, Docket No. AD12-17-000, (July 2, 2012), Agenda, Panel 1 ("Whether the 15% Screen in Section 2.2.1.2 of the pro forma SGIP should be revised").

other supplemental review screens). That is, if a project fails the 15 percent peak load screen, it is not automatically rejected, but will be reviewed under the 100 percent of minimum load-based penetration threshold screen in the supplemental review if that data is available for that particular circuit or line section. Furthermore, PG&E states that in June 2011, it updated its Distribution Interconnection Handbook to describe how projects would be treated with respect to the 15 percent peak load screen.

32. PG&E also cites to this technical update which describes the treatment generally as follows:

Peak load is monitored and recorded by PG&E for all distribution circuits. The minimum load hasn't traditionally been monitored, yet has been made available in recent years on a few installations via remote metering. Minimum load on radial circuits is typically 30% of the peak load. The data sampling period should be at least one year and represent typical system loading conditions.

Islanding becomes a power quality and protection concern when the maximum aggregate generation on a radial distribution circuit approaches 50% of the minimum load. Therefore, planning engineers use a 15% of peak load screen (50% of 30%) to quickly identify if the interconnection request poses a potential islanding and power quality concern. If the interconnection request and aggregated generation exceed 15% of peak load, PG&E can re-evaluate this screen using minimum load if available as opposed to peak load. Failing this screen a second time would indicate that further study is necessary and special protection requirements may result to allow the interconnection.⁴⁰

Therefore, PG&E requests that the Commission accept its tariff filing without modification.

C. Commission Determination

33. PG&E explains that the revisions to its WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA incorporate changes recently approved by the CPUC in PG&E's revised Rule 21 and makes

⁴⁰ PG&E Updates to Distribution Interconnection Handbook – PV Solar 2 – 20 MW, Utility Bulletin TD-2306B-001, Rev. 0 (June 10, 2011) *available at* [http://www.pge.com/includes/docs/pdfs/shared/customerservice/nonpgeutility/electrictransmission/handbook/updates_to_distribution_interconnection_handbook\(dih\)-pv_solar2-20_mw.pdf](http://www.pge.com/includes/docs/pdfs/shared/customerservice/nonpgeutility/electrictransmission/handbook/updates_to_distribution_interconnection_handbook(dih)-pv_solar2-20_mw.pdf).

administrative corrections and clarifications to PG&E's WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA. As discussed below, we accept PG&E's revised tariff provisions as consistent with or superior to the provisions in Order No. 2003 and Order No. 2006.⁴¹ We find that PG&E's proposal will be beneficial to all customers seeking interconnection as it will foster consistency, avoid duplicative queues and study processes for Commission and CPUC-jurisdictional projects and enable a more efficient and transparent interconnection process going forward because it "will improve efficiency by creating a framework through which PG&E and CAISO can simultaneously, and in a more coordinated manner, evaluate impacts to their respective systems."⁴²

34. The Commission finds that PG&E's proposed changes to the WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA will provide interconnection customers with more consistency with respect to timelines and cost estimates, transparency, and flexibility. The flexibility to select between a Commission-jurisdictional and a CPUC-jurisdictional interconnection agreement will promote efficiency and effective coordination of the interconnection processes.

35. PG&E asserts that revised Rule 21 fulfills the CPUC's goal of ensuring a timely, non-discriminatory, cost-effective, and transparent interconnection process in California. Many of the proposed changes to PG&E's WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA incorporate language from revised Rule 21. Because, a request to interconnect to PG&E's distribution system may invoke treatment under revised Rule 21 or the Commission-approved WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA, depending on individual circumstances, harmonizing the terms and conditions between the CPUC-jurisdictional and Commission-jurisdictional tariffs will be of significant benefit. We find that PG&E's proposed revisions incorporate appropriate measures to allow for evaluation of transmission system impacts while also incorporating appropriate interconnection study processes to allow for evaluation of system impacts at the distribution level. We find that PG&E's proposal is beneficial in that it offers a standardized approach that avoids duplicative processes for studying generators that seek interconnection to PG&E's distribution system, which may impact CAISO's transmission system.

36. The Commission further finds that PG&E's proposed administrative and miscellaneous changes adding clarity to the WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA are appropriate. The addition of a table of contents and the proposed changes to language, terms used,

⁴¹ *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp.*, 133 FERC ¶ 61,223, at P 78 (2010) (stating "[a]ny utility proposing to utilize an approach that mirrors the GIP will have to justify its consistency with Order No. 2003 and Order No. 2006 and Commission precedent under the relevant standard, and it will not enjoy an independent entity variation accommodation.").

⁴² *Pacific Gas and Electric Co.*, 135 FERC ¶ 61,094 at P 28.

timelines, cost estimates, and roles of PG&E and CAISO are acceptable. Therefore, we will accept those changes as just and reasonable.

37. The CPUC generally supports the proposed revisions to PG&E's WDT-GIP and WDT-SGIA. However, the CPUC recommends that the Commission require PG&E to modify its tariff to incorporate Rule 21's 100 percent minimum load-based penetration threshold into the Supplemental Review portion of the Fast Track Process. We find that the modification recommended by CPUC is outside the scope of this proceeding, but note that this issue is under review as part of the proposals in the Small Generator Interconnection Agreements and Procedures Notice of Proposed Rulemaking.⁴³

38. PG&E requests that the Commission grant a waiver of the 60-day notice requirements set forth in section 35.3 of Commission's rules and regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 35.3 (2012), to allow the revisions to become effective on December 4, 2012. Consistent with *Central Hudson*, we find good cause exists to grant the requested waiver.⁴⁴ Accordingly, waiver of the Commission's prior notice requirements is granted and PG&E's revised tariff sheets are accepted, effective December 4, 2012, as requested.

The Commission orders:

PG&E's revised tariff sheets are hereby accepted as discussed in the body of this order, effective December 4, 2012, as requested.

By the Commission.

(S E A L)

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.

⁴³ *Small Generator Interconnection Agreements and Procedures*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 142 FERC ¶ 61,049 (January 17, 2013).

⁴⁴ *Central Hudson Gas and Electric Company, et al.*, 60 FERC ¶ 61,106, *reh'g denied*, 61 FERC ¶ 61,089 (1992); *Prior Notice and Filing Requirements Under Part II of the Federal Power Act*, 64 FERC ¶ 61,139, *clarified*, 65 FERC ¶ 61,081 (1993) (*Central Hudson*).