



0000132325

475
39

From: Jerry D. Smith
To: DGI Interested Parties
Date: 12/7/99 10:14am
Subject: DGI Siting, Certification & Permitting Committee Minutes

RECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

1999 DEC -8 P 2: 24

DEC 08 1999

(Reply by E-Mail if you desire to be removed from this distribution list)

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

DOCKETED BY	88
-------------	----

As a party interested in the ACC's investigation of Distributed Generation and Interconnections you will find the following attached items concerning the DGI Workgroup's Siting, Certification & Permitting Committee:

1. Approved committee meeting minutes for October 19, October 25, November 4 and November 16.
2. October 25 meeting materials available in electronic format (APS1, APS2).
3. November 4 meeting materials in electronic format (APS3).

These items will be filed in ACC Docket Control per:

Docket No. E-00000A-99-0431

General investigation of Distributed Generation and Interconnections for potential retail electric competition rules consideration.

CC: LLK

Distributed Generation & Interconnection Workgroup

Siting, Certification and Permitting Committee
Approved Meeting Minutes – October 19, 1999

The following individuals were present

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E mail</u>
James P Barry	Tucson Elec/IBEW 1116	520-745-3490	jbarry@tucsonelectric.com
Jana Brandt	SRP	602-236-5028	jkbrandt@srpnet.com
Ann Cobb	TRICO	520-744-2944	acobb@trico.org
Greg Czaplewski	Cummins Southwest	602-257-5981	gczaplew@notesbridge.cummins.com
Art Fregoso	Tucson Electric	520-884-3624	afregoso@tucsonelectric.com
Bryan Gernet	Arizona Public Service	602-371-6959	h37614@apsc.com
Larry Holly	SW Gas	602-395-4082	larry.holly@swgas.com
Barbara Keene	ACC	602-542-0853	bkeene@cc.state.az.us
Sharon Madden	APS	602-250-2027	smadden@apsc.com
Bill Murphy	City of Phoenix	602-262-7897	bmurphy@ci.phoenix.az.us
Brian O'Donnell	DEAA	602-395-4058	brian.odonnell@swgas.com
Matt Puffer	Engine World	818-353-3617	mannfred@earthlink.net
Jerry Smith	ACC	602-542-7271	jsmith@cc.state.az.us
Tony Turturro	ICG	602-532-9606	icg.inc@ix.netcom.com
Chris Weathers	APS	602-371-6563	cweather@apsc.com
Ray Williamson	ACC	602-542-0828	rwilliamson@cc.state.az.us

The October 7th meeting minutes were approved.

Jerry Smith indicated that at the last meeting it was indicated that the ACC would keep a copy of distributed generation (DG) mapping and keep other DG information at the ACC. Jerry indicated that no decision regarding the ACCs role has been reached at this time.

Jerry Smith gave a presentation and handout on the Direct Access Service Request (DASR) process. The following was agreed upon:

1. The DASR process is not needed if the distributed generation (DG) customer is not selling electricity on the wires company's distribution or transmission systems.
2. The DASR process will be required if the customer is exporting electricity on the wires company's system.
3. The DASR process will be required if the DG customer is not selling electricity on the wires company system, but is using a Energy Service Provider (ESP) other than the wires company for back-up, supplemental or maintenance power.

3 COMMISSIONERS
LEGAL / HEARING
DIRECTOR
OLEA

Smith Williamson

Matt Puffer/Larry Holly gave a presentation and handout on the process & jurisdiction for certification of distributed generation equipment and system packages. The following was generally agreed upon:

1. Certification of equipment should be optional.
2. Various parties could certify DG including consulting engineers, UL, DPCA, etc.

Matt Puffer/Larry Holly will present a listing of agencies that would need to be involved in certification at the next meeting. These may include cities, counties, UDC for interconnection requirements, State of Arizona, Federal government, fuel suppliers, etc.

The following items were also discussed:

1. Sharon Madden would like to suggest the following change to item 8 of the October 7, 1999 minutes.

“8. At the time an application is submitted, the wires company will include within the Interconnect Agreement package, a reference sheet, listing additional agencies (e.g., county, state, municipalities, U.S. EPA, etc.) that may have additional requirements that the applicant must meet (e.g., air quality, noise, fuel requirements, safety, siting and permitting). This information may also be obtained through various entities such as the gas company, city, etc. The ACC will keep the list updated and available for the public. The ACC web site may be used for that purpose.

There was no opposition to Sharon's suggestion.

2. Bryan Gernet indicated that he missed the last meeting but would like to indicate that from APS's prospective the application process for DG is more like an iterative process rather than the committee's agreed upon timeline discussed at the October 7, 1999 meeting.

The next meeting of the Workgroup is Monday, October 25th at 10:00 am - 12 noon at the ACC.

The next meeting of the committee will be Monday, October 25th at 1:00 PM – 3:00 PM at the ACC. Items to be presented will be the Fuel Preference Policy by the State of Arizona Department of Commerce Energy Office, discussion of delivery of Hydrogen as a product of fuel cell applications, APS appeals policy (Sharon Madden), listing of agencies involved in certification (Matt Puffer/Larry Holly) and Bryan Gernet's concerns on the application process for DG

Distributed Generation & Interconnection Workgroup

Siting, Certification and Permitting Committee
Approved Meeting Minutes – October 25, 1999

The following individuals were present

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E mail</u>
James P Barry	Tucson Elec/IBEW 1116	520-745-3490	jbarry@tucsonelectric.com
Jana Brandt	SRP	602-236-5028	jkbrandt@srpnet.com
Greg Czaplewski	Cummins Southwest	602-257-5981	gczaplew@notesbridge.cummins.com
Randy Despain	City of Phoenix	602-261-8504	rdespain@ci.phoenix.az.us
Art Fregoso	Tucson Electric	520-884-3624	afregoso@tucsonelectric.com
Larry Holly	SW Gas	602-395-4082	larry.holly@swgas.com
Barbara Keene	ACC	602-542-0853	bkeene@cc.state.az.us
Sharon Madden	APS	602-250-2027	smadden@apsc.com
Brian O'Donnell	DEAA	602-395-4058	brian.odonnell@swgas.com
Matt Puffer	Engine World	818-353-3617	mannfred@earthlink.net
Chuck Skidmore	City of Scottsdale	480-312-7606	cskidmore@ci.scottsdale.az.us
Ray Williamson	ACC	602-542-0828	rwilliamson@cc.state.az.us

The October 19th meeting minutes were approved.

The group decided that the issue “Delivery of H2 as By Product of Fuel Cell Application” is not an item that needs to be addressed by the ACC DGI Workgroup.

Sharon Madden of APS gave a presentation on the APS appeals procedure that APS would use to dispute APS requirements on a cogeneration or distributed generation project. First there is no written procedure for appeal. APS does not have an arbitration or 3rd party review process. The applicant would have to file a complaint with the ACC if they didn't agree with the stipulated requirements. APS believes this should not change.

Matt Puffer/Larry Holly continued their presentation on certification. The following was generally agreed upon:

1. Certification of equipment should be optional.
2. There should probably be a flow chart given to applicants who desire certification outlining the potential agencies that would need to approve a product to have it certified.
3. Installations should not be certified. Brian O'Donnell was the only dissenting member. Randy Despain felt that the building permit process makes each installation unique.

Sharon Madden passed out two papers she would like to discuss at the next meeting. They present APS' position regarding the DG application process.

At the next meeting, Sharon Madden will present information on the topic "Can a location match be achieved for mutual benefit of Customer and UDC ?"

The next meeting of the Workgroup is Thursday, November 4th at 10:00 am - 12 noon at the ACC.

**Arizona Public Service Company
White Paper Regarding Issues Set Forth by Siting, Certification and Permitting Committee
Submitted as an Attachment to the Meeting Minutes of October 25, 1999**

APS is submitting a proposed process that outlines a realistic approach to the Application Process for Distribution Generation projects within the State of Arizona. It attempts to emphasize desired utility-customer interaction and a team-work approach throughout the interconnection and design process that would facilitate a timely and successful interconnection project, as opposed to a few simplistic "time-stamp" type requirements at the end of the design process.

Application Process

a. The Customer initially contacts the utility for the interconnection information and briefly outlines/discusses his proposed project. The utility then forwards the appropriate information to the Customer and provides the Customer with a contact name and number should he decide to proceed with the project.

b. If the Customer decides to proceed, then he is encouraged to work closely with the utility contact at the conceptual stage of the design to ensure that the interconnect requirements are met, the project proceeds smoothly and in a timely fashion, and to ensure that there are no surprises at the end. The utility either meets with, or works closely with the Customer during the initial stages, and explains the interconnect process and applicable requirements with the Customer as it will apply to his specific project. The utility informs the Customer if any utility or other studies may need to be performed or if any special requirements apply.

c. The Customer proceeds with the design and prepares the utility-required information - application form, electrical diagrams, protective relaying and settings, site and equipment layout plans, etc. It is strongly suggested that these be submitted to the utility as they are developed, so that the utility can make any comments or recommendations as early on in the design process as possible. On larger projects the utility may often participate in the design team meetings. On smaller projects, the design and review can normally be expediently accomplished. Depending on the size, scope and complexity of the project, as well as any special situations or requirements, timeframes may be worked out between the Customer and the utility so the project proceeds smoothly. The utility will generally also begin preparing applicable interconnection documents and site inspection/testing checksheets at this time.

(This is normally a very iterative and desired process, often involving a close working relationship between the utility and the Customer and/or his designers or consultants. It generally includes forwarding marked-up prints or written/verbal comments back and forth, or actually meeting as required. It may also involve performing and sharing any study results with the Customer, and could involve initiating work on the utility system to accommodate the Customer's generation. The utility may also need to forward distribution system characteristics to the Customer for fault current calculations and coordination studies).

d. Upon completion of the design, the Customer submits the final design information package (as specified in the Application Form of the Interconnect Requirements manual) to the utility for final review and approval. Upon completion of a satisfactory final review, the utility responds in writing to the Customer that all utility interconnection requirements have been satisfied, and again outlines the final steps that still need to be taken prior to bringing the generating facility on line. The utility prepares and forwards final interconnection/electric service agreements to the Customer.

e. Following construction/installation of the generating facility, the Customer notifies the utility (the utilities request at least 5 days notice) as to when the utility can perform the site inspection, and

when the relay calibrations/functional tests, as applicable, are to be performed so that the utility may witness and/or review them.

f. Upon the satisfactory completion of the site inspection and protective testing, the utility notifies the Customer in writing that the generation facility may be operated in parallel with the utility grid per the agreed terms and conditions.

Filename: apsl.doc
Directory: C:\temp
Template: H:\MSOFFICE\TEMPLATE\NORMAL.DOT
Title: Arizona Public Service Company
Subject:
Author: z61960
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 10/22/99 15:54
Change Number: 7
Last Saved On: 10/25/99 09:16
Last Saved By: z61960
Total Editing Time: 34 Minutes
Last Printed On: 12/07/99 10:19
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 2
Number of Words: 632 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 3,607 (approx.)

Distributed Generation & Interconnection Workgroup

Siting, Certification and Permitting Committee

APS Comments to Meeting Minutes of October 7, 1999
Submitted October 25, 1999 as attachment to Meeting Minutes

1. A sufficiency review needs to be performed by the wires company. The wires company can turn this around in 10 working days. This review will tell the applicant if information is missing from the application.

Concern:

This does not reflect the discussion surrounding the sufficiency review, what it needs to include, or at what point in the application process the "sufficiency review" is performed. Interaction with the UDC is crucial prior to this point, as opposed to the customer waiting until the project is designed and equipment ordered to avoid any delays, especially if any studies or special requirements apply.

2. The wires company will review an application within 30 calendar days. The sufficiency review will be a part of the 30 calendar days.

Concern:

This does not include the discussion clarifying that the customer **must** have all prerequisite information and details in place to allow the UDC to meet a thirty day review requirement.

3. Resubmittals to obtain comments can be performed by the wires company in 5 working days.

Concern:

My understanding is that the **Customer** would have 5 days to resubmit their application after returned by the UDC in order to continue with the 30 day commitment on behalf of the UDC. Why would the UDC only have 5 days after resubmittal, when total allowed time is 30 days?

APS submits that the proposed process as outlined in Steps 1 through 3 is presented in a very simplistic and unrealistic approach. APS is therefore submitting a White Paper describing the desired process and steps required to facilitate a timely and successful interconnection project, in lieu of these three items above. (Attached as separate document)

4. Currently, there will be no additional cost to the applicant for submitting an application. If wheeling onto the distribution system is proposed, there will be a cost for the engineering study required by the wires company.

This statement is not valid as it only pertains to APS, not all UDC's. Also, the comment that "there **will** be no additional cost to the customer, is misguided. Currently, APS has not charged customers that interconnected with the grid for expenses incurred, other than when hardware has been required to be installed on the utility system. APS however, retains the right to charge customers for all expenses incurred in interconnecting any future projects, including any required engineering studies. Such studies may be required (eg. fault and coordination studies) irrespective of whether or not the customer actually wheels power onto the distribution system.

5. The Wires Company will interface with the ACC to keep the ACC informed of all distributed generation projects. The means to accomplish this needs to be worked out by the ACC.

Concern:

Discussion on this was that the ACC already had reporting requirements in place, and if they felt a need to modify this procedure, they would initiate. Reporting requirements should not be included in the Interconnection Standards Process unless it becomes a requirement for the installer or operator to provide any information to ACC.

6. The ACC will handle the mapping functions for DG projects installed within their service territory. The ACC will be given a copy of the map for access by the public.

Concern:

This should be a not be required function of the ACC as APS out of necessity for system load and safety of field personnel, maps the location of each DG unit interconnected with the APS distribution system today. This will continue to be an internal function of APS for business purposes and system/feeder configurations and maps not released as a public document.

7. At the time an application is submitted, the wires company will give the applicant a reference sheet, listing additional agencies (e.g., county, state, municipalities, U.S. EPA, etc.) that may have additional requirements that the applicant must meet (e.g., air quality, noise, fuel requirements, safety, siting and permitting). The ACC will keep the list updated and available for the public. The ACC web site may be used for that purpose.

Concern:

In further discussion with others within APS, this is not a viable procedure. Once a document is included within a "package", there is an assumed liability to APS, especially if new requirements or contacts were not updated.

APS would be in favor of including language in the State Standards for Interconnection Process (if it does get established) that would direct the customer to go to the ACC website or the Arizona Distributed Generation Society, to get a listing of permits and contacts they may need to get.

Distributed Generation & Interconnection Workgroup

Siting, Certification and Permitting Committee
Approved Meeting Minutes – November 4, 1999

The following individuals were present

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E mail</u>
James P Barry	Tucson Elec/IBEW 1116	520-745-3490	jbarry@tucsonelectric.com
Jana Brandt	SRP	602-236-5028	jkbrandt@srpnet.com
Greg Czaplewski	Cummins Southwest	602-257-5981	gczaplew@notesbridge.cummins.com
Bryan Gernet	Arizona Public Service	602-371-6959	h37614@apsc.com
Larry Holly	SW Gas	602-395-4082	larry.holly@swgas.com
Barbara Keene	ACC	602-542-0853	bkeene@cc.state.az.us
Sharon Madden	APS	602-250-2027	smadden@apsc.com
Brian O'Donnell	DEAA	602-395-4058	brian.odonnell@swgas.com
Amanda Ormond	Dept of Commerce Energy	602-280-1401	amandao@ep.state.az.us
Chuck Skidmore	City of Scottsdale	480-312-7606	cskidmore@ci.scottsdale.az.us
Tony Turturro	ICG	602-532-9606	icg.inc@ix.netcom.com
Chris Weathers	APS	602-371-6563	cweather@apsc.com
Ray Williamson	ACC	602-542-0828	rwilliamson@cc.state.az.us

The October 25th meeting minutes were approved.

Amanda Ormond, Director, Arizona Department of Commerce Energy Office gave a presentation on the topic “ Is a fuel preference policy needed (gas, solar, wind, H2, etc.) ? “ Amanda discussed the initial legislative resolution of 1977 and the State Energy Policy recommendations of 1990. In general the policy indicates that energy must be efficient, affordable and environmentally sound. Renewable energy is “desireable” but not mandated. Sharon Madden indicated that renewables were now being discussed in deregulation meetings at the ACC. The group didn’t see how we could implement any preference policy for distributed generation applications.

Sharon Madden presented a paper on the topic “Can a location match be achieved for mutual benefit of Customer and UDC. The paper discussed such items as:

1. Need for case by case evaluation
2. Capital budget deferment for the UCD
3. Sites available on the feeder to locate DG
4. Can the UDC schedule/control the DG ?
5. Counting on DG reliability
6. Loss of UDC revenue
7. Cost/benefit

Sharon also discussed the potential to have the UDC offer RFPs for a specific site, as well as technology and economic issues.

There was no objection to any of the information presented by Sharon. However, the group did feel that we should recommend that DG be considered in the ACC Distribution Planning Process.

Ray Williamson pointed out that it may be necessary for the ACC to also take a closer look at transmission because of the many proposed inter ties into the distribution system proposed by ESPs.

Sharon Madden reviewed the application process previously reviewed by the group. Bryan Gernet indicated that APS prefers an interactive and iterative approach with the customer working with the UDC commencing at the beginning of the project, as opposed to a "time stamp" approach. The remainder of the group felt that a reasonable time line was necessary and fair. Greg Czaplewski indicated that time lines ensure that project can be completed in a reasonable time. Bryan suggested that he and Tony Turturro take another look at this issue.

Sharon Madden wanted to clarify two previous items. First, the October 7, 1999 minutes indicated that currently there is no additional cost for an application. Sharon indicated that this may only be true for APS ; not other utilities. Second, in the October 19th minutes APS had indicated that they would provide a reference sheet listing agencies (e.g., Maricopa County) that may have additional requirements for DG. The APS legal Department feels that this is not possible because of liability concerns. APS is willing to reference the Distributed Energy Association of Arizona, a non-profit organization which could provide the check list to DG applicants.

Jim Barry asked that the heading "qualified contractors" be added to the check list for applications.

Brian O'Donnell and Chris Weathers will try to have an outline for our Committee's final report prepared for the next meeting.

The next meeting of the committee will be Tuesday, November 16th at 10:00 am – 12:00 noon at the ACC. Items to be presented are a 5 to 10 minute presentation on the application process for DG presented by Bryan and Tony and an outline for submitting our committee's report.

ACC DGI WORKSHOP
ORGANIZATIONAL PROPOSAL

Location and Types of Distributed Generation Connections:

Prepared for The Siting, Certification and Permitting Subcommittee

November 4, 1999

Can a location match be achieved for mutual benefit of Customer and UDC?

- Under the former paradigm of a vertically integrated utility, UDC's had the sole responsibility to provide reliable, cost efficient and basically "guaranteed" electric service to any customer that desired such service in a CC&N service territory. In order to accommodate such requirements, UDC's planned for future load growth, whether by population or technology related, to make this guarantee of power available as needed. In order that the UDC is also sufficiently compensated for such guarantees, the Arizona Corporation Commission allows a fixed rate of return for providing these services.
- With the onset of "electric competition" UDC's continue to remain a regulated entity and allowed a fixed rate of return on its investment to guarantee a reliable, safe, and efficient means of providing power for anyone wishing to use its distribution system. Therefore, it is in the best interest of the UDC, and it's customers, to keep its facilities fully utilized.
- Under this new paradigm, providing safe, reliable power is entering into an era of development and possible opportunities for both UDC's and Distributive Generation manufacturers. As a result of this changing environment, the ACC has requested that we, as a group, look at the benefits of a mutual location match for DG to assist the UDC's and customers.
- Using the current planning decisions for the UDC's, DG has not been a major consideration for system relief. This is mainly due to the fact that most DG units are cost prohibitive as compared to upgrading current systems or installing new distribution lines and equipment. In the future, however, the possibility for utilizing DG resources may prove to be an amicable solution. In order to make this determination, here are some items of consideration that must be determined prior to that choice.
 1. Each possible opportunity must be evaluated on a case by case basis. (Site specific)
 2. What capital budget deferment would the UCD be making.
 3. Are there sites available on the feeder to locate DG.
 4. Can the UDC schedule/control the operation of these DG units.
 5. Can the UDC count on the unit's reliability. (Both day to day operation, as well as long term)
 6. Will the UDC lose any revenue entitled to be recovered by distribution customers when the DG unit is online.
 7. Can the cost benefit be obtained without the requirement of any type of subsidy to the DG supplier.

This should really be the prevailing determination as to mutual benefits:

- As technology advances, the type and efficiency of DG's should increase, with the price to provide DG decreasing. This would then dictate what market will prevail to determine the mutual benefits to customers and the UDC.
- If an opportunity should arise, the UDC could offer to accept RFP's for a specific site, requesting all interested DG suppliers to bid. The UDC would detail the requirements of the system upgrade, with a cost they must incur to provide services themselves. If a DG supplier is able to offer their services for a better price, and supply a cost backup for deliveries, there is no reason for a UDC to not be willing to contract for such services.
- As this is still a new arena with multiple players, technology today has been unproven to advocate any benefits, one way or another. As we progress in the future, a new awareness of possible choices must be included when planning on reliability or availability of the distribution system, as well as cost recovery to ensure the UDC is not held accountable to promote DG just for the sake of DG. It must stand on its own merit, without subsidy to make it happen. If this can happen, the *mutual benefits* will be seen by all involved, whether it is the manufactures, suppliers, UDC's or customers.

Filename: aps3.doc
Directory: C:\temp
Template: H:\MSOFFICE\TEMPLATE\NORMAL.DOT
Title: ACC DIG WORKSHOP
Subject:
Author: z61960
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 11/01/99 13:11
Change Number: 9
Last Saved On: 11/03/99 08:49
Last Saved By: z61960
Total Editing Time: 244 Minutes
Last Printed On: 12/07/99 10:19
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 2
Number of Words: 581 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 3,317 (approx.)

Distributed Generation & Interconnection Workgroup

Siting, Certification and Permitting Committee
Approved Meeting Minutes – November 16, 1999

The following individuals were present

<u>Name</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>	<u>E mail</u>
James P Barry	Tucson Elec/IBEW 1116	520-745-3490	jbarry@tucsonelectric.com
Jana Brandt	SRP	602-236-5028	jkbrandt@srpnet.com
Greg Czaplewski	Cummins Southwest	602-257-5981	gczaplew@notesbridge.cummins.com
Art Fregoso	Tucson Electric	520-884-3624	afregoso@tucsonelectric.com
Tom Friddle	APS	602-371-7176	H36143@aps.com
Bryan Gernet	Arizona Public Service	602-371-6959	h37614@apsc.com
Jeff Hagen	SW Gas	702-364-3072	jeff.hagen@swgas.com
Larry Holly	SW Gas	602-395-4082	larry.holly@swgas.com
Barbara Keene	ACC	602-542-0853	bkeene@cc.state.az.us
Sharon Madden	APS	602-250-2027	smadden@apsc.com
Doug Nelson	DEAA	602-395-1612	dcn@netwrx.net
Brian O'Donnell	DEAA	602-395-4058	brian.odonnell@swgas.com
Matt Puffer	Engine World	818-353-3617	mannfred@earthlink.net
Chuck Skidmore	City of Scottsdale	480-312-7606	cskidmore@ci.scottsdale.az.us
Jerry Smith	ACC	602-542-7871	jsmith@cc.state.az.us
Tony Turturro	ICG	602-532-9606	icg.inc@ix.netcom.com
Chris Weathers	APS	602-371-6563	cweather@apsc.com
Ray Williamson	ACC	602-542-0828	rwilliamson@cc.state.az.us

The November 4th meeting minutes were approved.

Tony Turturro/Bryan Gernet outlined an alternate procedure for the application process. Tony indicated that this procedure could be used for larger sized distributed generation units. Bryan Gernet indicated that applications for smaller sized units could be completed in 20 to 30 days. Tony and Bryan will re-work their procedure and send it to the committee preparing the final committee report by the morning of Friday, November 18th.

Chuck Skidmore submitted written comments as follows:

Whether considering rules regarding siting, permitting or certification the actual granting of permits, certifications, or siting is not within the jurisdiction of the Commission. There are legislative and regulatory bodies that have jurisdiction.

The job of the Commission in these issues is to assure that all parties are fairly treated and that a healthy energy market exists while treating the utilities fairly as they discharge their obligation to serve. Commissioners need to consider the following.

Chuck Skidmore (Continued)

- ◆ Utilities have both a right and an obligation to be involved in permitting and certification related issues for technical, commercial, and safety reasons.
- ◆ The fact that utilities must be involved also presents an opportunity to abuse the process and to slow it down. The market can be affected by the added development costs and the cost of capital associated with less than expeditious review action by a utility.
- ◆ The utilities cannot reasonably be forced to a fixed turn-around time for review because of the technical issues involved and unique nature of each DG installation. However DG applicants have a right to a timely review.

The Commissioners' job is to make rules that assure that all this happens ... not to site, certify and permit.

Brian O'Donnell presented a draft outline of the Siting, Certification & Permitting Committee, which had been sent out to all members. Sharon Madden presented a draft report that could not be sent to all members because of time constraints. The following was decided:

1. A committee consisting of Brian, Sharon (or Chris Weathers), Greg Czaplewski, and Matt Puffer will prepare the report on Friday, November 19th.
2. The report will have an executive summary, purpose (with bulleted items), final recommendations and review assigned work scope items. Meeting minutes, white papers and other exhibits handed out at the meetings will be attached to the document.
3. 75 copies are required for the November 22nd meeting.

Jerry Smith gave a brief overview of the ACC process that will follow the submittal of the three- (3) committee reports

The next meeting of the committee will be Monday, November 22nd at 10:00 am at the ACC.