

150 FERC ¶ 61,049
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20426

January 28, 2015

In Reply Refer To:
California Independent System
Operator Corporation
Docket No. ER13-2484-001

Alston & Bird LLP
The Atlantic Building
950 F Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004

Attention: Mr. Bradley R. Miliauskas

Reference: Compliance Filing

Dear Mr. Miliauskas:

1. On December 20, 2013, the California Independent System Operator Corporation (CAISO) filed revised tariff records related to the administration of CAISO's generator interconnection queue to comply with a Commission order dated November 26, 2013.¹ In the compliance filing, CAISO also requested clarification of one of the Commission's directives in the November 26 Order. In this order, the Commission accepts CAISO's tariff revisions, effective December 3, 2013, and grants CAISO's request for clarification.

2. In the November 26 Order, the Commission conditionally accepted for filing, subject to a further compliance filing, CAISO's proposed tariff revisions, effective December 3, 2013. The purpose of the revisions was to improve the administration of the CAISO tariff provisions pertaining to the generator interconnection queue and to address miscellaneous non-substantive tariff issues. In filed comments to the proceeding, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) claimed that CAISO had previously agreed to

¹ *Cal. Indep. Sys. Operator Corp.*, 145 FERC ¶ 61,172 (2013) (November 26 Order).

remove revised tariff language which indicated that CAISO could, “at its option” involve the participating transmission owner in the verification and review process for new interconnection or service/facility modification assessments (the “at its option” clause).² In response, CAISO confirmed that the “at its option” clause was included as an oversight and would be removed from its tariff records in a compliance filing.³

3. In addition, in accepting CAISO’s proposed modifications regarding the process for tender of a draft interconnection agreement in the November 26 Order, the Commission noted that CAISO appeared not to have included all of the relevant tariff records in the September 30, 2013 filing. Specifically, revisions to tariff appendices U and Y,⁴ as referenced by CAISO in its description of which interconnection procedures would be revised, were not provided.⁵ The Commission, therefore, directed CAISO to include those revised appendices in a compliance filing.⁶

4. In the instant compliance filing, CAISO has removed the “at its option” clause from the revised tariff provisions as required by the November 26 Order. In addition, CAISO is requesting clarification that, within its revisions for tendering a draft interconnection agreement, it is not necessary to revise appendices U and Y as directed by the Commission in the November 26 Order because CAISO’s references in the September 30, 2013 filing to those appendices were unintentional. CAISO states that it explicitly reflected the tender changes only in its proposed tariff records in appendix DD⁷

² The tariff sections are: section 25.1.2, section 1.3.4.1. of appendix S, article 3.4.5 of appendix T, section 4.4.3 of appendix U, section 6.9.2.2 of appendix Y, section 6.7.2.2 of appendix DD, and article 3.4.5 of appendix FF. PG&E October 21, 2013 Comments, at 2.

³ See CAISO October 29, 2013 Answer at 2.

⁴ Appendices U and Y to the CAISO tariff are the Standard Large Generator Interconnection Procedures and the Generator Interconnection Procedures, respectively.

⁵ Based on its description of revisions, CAISO did not include revised tariff sheets for section 11.1.1 of appendices U and Y concerning the tender by CAISO of interconnection agreements and under each of those appendices.

⁶ November 26 Order, 145 FERC ¶ 61,172 at P 20.

⁷ Appendix DD to the CAISO tariff sets forth the Generator Interconnection and Deliverability Allocation Procedures (GIDAP), which superseded the interconnection procedures set forth in appendices U and Y.

because all interconnection customers that were studied under procedures set forth in appendices U and Y have long since been tendered interconnection agreements, thus obviating the need to include tender timing revisions in those appendices.⁸

5. Notice of CAISO's compliance filing was published in the *Federal Register*, 79 Fed. Reg. 125 (2014), with interventions and protests due on or before January 10, 2014. None were filed.

6. Because the proposed revisions to section 11.1.1 of appendices U and Y are no longer applicable, we find that it is unnecessary for CAISO, on compliance, to file tariff sheets revising those appendices, as directed in the November 26 Order.

7. Given the above clarification, we find that CAISO's filing complies with the directives in the November 26 Order. Accordingly, we accept CAISO's compliance filing, effective December 3, 2013.

By direction of the Commission.

Nathaniel J. Davis, Sr.,
Deputy Secretary.

⁸ CAISO Filing at 2-3 (referencing CAISO September 13, 2013 Filing at n.36 and n.40).