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This document is the culmination of an Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) investigation of Distributed Generation and Interconnections (DGI) under Docket No. E-00000A-99-0431. The investigation began with a DGI Workshop on June 28, 1999. The numerous issues and concerns identified at the workshop were then investigated utilizing a formal workgroup process. Three DGI Workgroup committees were formed to consider the DGI Workshop concerns and issues. The three committees completed their assigned tasks with individual committee reports dated November 22 and 30, 1999. A DGI Advisory Committee was then formed to complete the workgroup process by producing this report. This report documents the entire DGI investigation process. It also consolidates and contrasts key results of the three DGI Workgroup committees’ efforts into one document. The members of the DGI Advisory Committee are as follows:
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The stakeholder participation in the entire investigation has been extensive and diverse. Many individuals, representing many different firms and interests, have endured the many hours of meetings to discuss and document the issues and concerns while working towards a consensus or agreeing to disagree in a cordial manner. However, it is the members of the DGI Advisory Committee that has assumed the greatest burden. They have been asked to produce a report documenting results of the investigative process independent of their own views or their firm’s position on issues.

Therefore, I take this opportunity to record my deepest appreciation to each of the DGI Advisory Committee members for their candor, persistence and dedicated commitment to purpose. Their efforts have produced a document that will serve as an excellent resource for the ACC Staff as it commences to draft new rules to ensure distributed generation is a choice available to retail consumers. Congratulations and thank you for a job well done!

Jerry D. Smith  
ACC Staff  
Chairman of DGI Investigation
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Section 1:  Executive Summary

On June 28, 1999 the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) sponsored a workshop on distributed generation and interconnections. In general terms, distributed generation (DG) is small-scale power generation units strategically located near consumers and load centers. DG has the potential to provide benefits to customers and support the economic operation of the power distribution grid. It has recently received significant interest both nationally and in Arizona. Technological improvements are making DG an option for a broader range of retail consumers including commercial, industrial, and residential customers.

Furthermore, DG goes hand in hand with the ongoing effort to restructure the electric energy markets in Arizona. Competition brings the benefits of new technologies, enhanced information about energy use, and greater options for customers. Once regulatory, interconnection, economic, and safety considerations are addressed, distributed generation may become a vital part of this increased choice. Competition also necessitates an expanded outlook for utility planning and operations. As vertically integrated utilities divest of generation assets and transform into utility distribution companies, an increased level of flexibility (and perhaps complexity) will be required in their management processes.

1.1 Authorization of Investigation

In July 1999, the Arizona Corporation Commission initiated a “General investigation of Distributed Generation and Interconnections (DGI) for potential retail electric competition rules consideration” under Docket No. E-00000A-99-0431. This report documents the results of that investigation. It includes the identification of key stakeholder issues and recommendations for developing standards, policies and tariffs for distributed generation through the rulemaking process.

1.2 Purpose of Investigation

The purpose of the DGI investigation was to address issues raised at the June 28, 1999 DGI Workshop and related issues arising during consideration of the DGI topic. In addition, the investigation was to develop a framework for accommodating DG applications as a retail consumer choice in Arizona.

1.3 Framework of Investigation

The DGI investigation was accomplished by formation of a workgroup of all interested parties. This larger group was referred to as the DGI Workgroup. Three committees were then formed within the DGI Workgroup for the purpose of undertaking certain aspects of the investigation. The three committees were:

1. Siting, Certification and Permitting (SCP)
2. Access, Metering, and Dispatch (AMD)
3. Interconnection Standards (IS)
Each issue identified in the June 28, 1999 DGI Workshop was assigned to one of the three DGI Workgroup committees with an associated number of the following work scope objectives:

- Identify siting, certification and environmental permitting issues.
- Develop a standardized application process for DG projects.
- Assess the potential impacts of DG on the planning and operation of the utility distribution grid and recommend necessary changes to utility planning and operations.
- Explore tariff, pricing, contract, and other business arrangements needed to facilitate the installation of DG.
- Recommend interconnection standards necessary to streamline the implementation of DG, while maintaining safety standards.

The three DGI Workgroup committees researched and debated assigned issues while considering various stakeholder views. Each committee effectively completed its assigned work scope and published a final report. Conclusions and recommendations provided in each committee report document the consensus achieved solely within each respective committee.

A DGI Advisory Committee was formed for the purpose of reviewing the three DGI Workgroup committee reports and associated docketed comments and reference material. This committee was also charged with the responsibility of extracting key investigation results from the three committee reports and then consolidating and contrasting those key results in this DGI Workgroup final report.

### 1.4 Key Findings and Recommendations for Rulemaking

An Advisory Committee review of the three DGI Workgroup committee reports, associated reference material and docketed comments reveals that a committee consensus was achieved for some issues and in other instances a difference of opinion remained among committee participants or between workgroup committees. Nevertheless, the Advisory Committee identified several key issues that emerged from the workgroup process. For several of the issues, the DGI Advisory Committee recommends that workshops be held to acquire additional information. The Advisory Committee recommends that the ACC rulemaking process:

1. Design fair and reasonable tariffs considering proper recovery of utility costs, backup power or partial-requirements tariffs, and PURPA Qualifying Facilities (QF) tariffs while providing consistent treatment of DG relative to other consumer services. The Advisory Committee recommends a workshop to be held on these issues concurrent with rulemaking.¹

2. Consider the benefits and costs of DG to the utility distribution grid.²

3. Address operational issues, such as the scheduling and accounting of DG energy transactions, the control of DG by a control area operator, and operational protocols for system disturbances. The Advisory Committee believes that workshops may be needed following ACC rulemaking efforts to address issues that arise during implementation of DG.³

4. Address certain technical issues and processes necessary to interconnect DG to the grid.⁴

5. Define DG and related terminology consistent with ACC Electric Competition Rules and FERC.⁵

---

¹ Section 3.1.1
² Section 3.1.2
³ Section 3.1.3
⁴ Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2
⁵ Section 3.2.3
6. Define planning processes needed for DG operating in parallel with the distribution grid, and 
   consider appropriateness of public access to distribution system operational information.  
7. Address DG applications on network distribution systems. Due to the complex and technical 
   nature of this issue, the Advisory Committee recommends that a workshop be held on this topic.  
8. Establish a periodic review process for monitoring the progress of implementing the policies and 
   standards necessary for distributed generation.  
9. Consider how to extend DGI rules to electric utilities not subject to ACC jurisdiction.

---

6 Sections 3.2.4, 3.4.4 and 3.4.7
7 Section 3.4.5
Section 2: Overview of Distributed Generation and Interconnections Investigation

At the close of the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) retail electric competition rulemaking process the Distributed Energy Association of Arizona (DEAA) requested that a workshop be held to investigate applications of Distributed Generation (DG). ACC Staff solicited suggestions for such a workshop and filed them under Docket No. E-00000A-99-0431. This docket was opened for the purpose of performing a “General investigation of Distributed Generation and Interconnections for potential retail electric competition rules consideration.”

2.1 DGI Workshop

A Distributed Generation and Interconnections (DGI) Workshop was sponsored by the ACC on June 28, 1999. Sarah McKinley, Executive Director of Distributed Power Coalition of America, opened the DGI Workshop with a keynote address entitled “An Overview of State and Federal Initiatives for Distributed Generation.” Then two diverse groups of panelists discussed relevant workshop topics. Jerry Smith, representing ACC Staff, served as moderator for both panels.

Panel A was comprised of panelists representing three stakeholder groups: the DG provider community, utility distribution companies, and consumers with actual distributed generation projects. This panel considered the status of DG technology, three actual DG projects in Arizona and the overall DG operational experience of Arizona utilities. The panel established a “state of the art” point of reference regarding DG and technical requirements for interconnecting with electric utility systems. Panel A participants are listed below.

Panel A: Local Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributed Generation Providers</th>
<th>Actual Consumer Projects</th>
<th>Utility Distribution Companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Davidson</td>
<td>Mike Busquart</td>
<td>Phillip Asbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Vice President</td>
<td>Central Plant Mgr.</td>
<td>Planning /Design Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsite Sycom Energy Corp.</td>
<td>Phoenician Resort</td>
<td>SSVEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Townley</td>
<td>(SSVEC)</td>
<td>Steve Bischoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP – Business &amp; Product Dev</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Operations &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Energy Technology</td>
<td>Bonita Nursery</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Jacobson</td>
<td>(TEP, SWGas)</td>
<td>Bob Hess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager, Large Customer Programs</td>
<td>Bob’s Auto Spa</td>
<td>Principal Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt River Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Panel B was also comprised of panelists representing three stakeholder groups: the jurisdictional and regulatory community, retail market advocates, and restructured utility organizations. This panel considered standards and jurisdictional requirements affecting siting and interconnecting DG to the utility; the framework of retail electric competition in Arizona; and consumer issues unique to DG applications. Panel B participants are listed below.

**Panel B: DG & Retail Competition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictional &amp; Regulatory Community</th>
<th>Retail Market Advocates</th>
<th>Restructured Utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Murphy</td>
<td>Michael C. Burke</td>
<td>Chuck DeCorse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dep. Director, Public Works</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Technical Advisor Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
<td>NEV Technologies</td>
<td>Tucson Electric Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Franquero</td>
<td>Mark Skowronski</td>
<td>Bob Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E., Utilities Division</td>
<td>Manager, Power Marketing</td>
<td>Manager, Power Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Honeywell</td>
<td>Arizona Public Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prem Bahl</td>
<td>Laurel Whisler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Engineer</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RUCO</td>
<td>Arizona ISA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The workshop concluded with a group exercise designed to identify concerns that may warrant regulatory consideration. Attendees split into two breakout groups to discuss and clarify issues relevant to the DGI investigation. One group addressed issues related to implementation of DG units and the other group addressed interconnections with the utility grid. A summary list of issues identified by this process is provided in Appendix A.

**2.2 DGI Workgroup Process**

The ACC sponsored a special open meeting on August 30, 1999 to form a DGI Workgroup. ACC Staff presented a workgroup organizational proposal including associated committees to investigate issues raised at the June 28th DGI Workshop. Those in attendance adopted the proposal without change. Therefore, the DGI Workgroup was organized into three committees:

- Siting, Certification and Permitting Committee (SCP)
- Market Access, Metering, and Dispatch Committee (AMD)
- Interconnection Standards Committee (IS)

By unanimous consent, tasks and DGI Workshop issues were assigned to each committee per the August 30th ACC Staff proposal. Each committee assumed a responsibility to complete its assigned work scope and submit a consensus committee report to the DGI Workgroup by December 1, 1999. The work scope assigned to each DGI Workgroup committee is outlined in subsections 2.2.1 through 2.2.3 of this report.

Attendance and participation in workgroup and committee activities was open to anyone desiring to participate. Those in attendance at the August 30th meeting were given the opportunity to select the committee that they wanted to serve on. ACC Staff requested committee participation
of some organizations and individuals to ensure adequate stakeholder representation while maintaining a manageable size group.

The DGI Workgroup met on three additional occasions. Each committee gave a status report at each of the workgroup meetings. The workgroup meetings were also used to facilitate the exchange of information among committees and introduce new ideas. For example, Scott Castelaz of Encorp gave a presentation entitled “The Business Case for the Virtual Power Plant,” that discussed how new technology is being implemented in the utility industry to affect the deployment of DG. Mr. Castelaz advised that the US might benefit from looking at how Sweden, the United Kingdom and New Zealand have accommodated distributed resources. In addition, he suggested that the IEEE interconnection standards would have a weak influence in Arizona’s process because their development is progressing too slowly. He cited numerous US system experiences that serve as examples of why DG is needed now to provide quick short-term solutions to system problems.

Each committee met between DGI Workgroup meetings as documented below. It was in those meetings that assigned issues were refined and discussed in detail and at length. In some cases committee consensus was achieved and in other instances a difference of opinion remains regarding specific issues. On other occasions, certain issues were identified but not adequately addressed. Each committee prepared and submitted a report documenting its efforts and conclusions.

### List of Meeting Dates for DGI Workgroup and Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>SCP Committee</th>
<th>AMD Committee</th>
<th>IS Committee</th>
<th>Workgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>16 and 29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7, 17 and 23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>7, 19 and 25</td>
<td>12, 20 and 25</td>
<td>4, 13 and 18</td>
<td>4 and 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>4 and 16</td>
<td>4, 12, and 19</td>
<td>1, 8, 15, 18 and 29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.2.1 Siting, Certification & Permitting Committee Work Scope

This committee was formed to consider the siting, certification and permitting of new DG projects. The primary focus of its investigation included but was not limited to the following:

1. Identify thresholds for which siting is a public issue regarding:
   - air quality, fuel supply, noise, and safety.
2. Establish how the above siting thresholds are affected by:
   - type of unit, unit size, location of project, intended operational uses (self-providing, emergency backup, sell excess to others, etc.) and residential vs. commercial applications.
3. Recommend circumstances warranting training, certification or licensing of personnel or pre-certification of distributed generation system packages.
4. Recommend a standardized application process and identify required information.
5. Recommend jurisdiction appropriate for each siting, certification and permitting issue.
2.2.2 Access, Metering & Dispatch Committee Work Scope

This committee was formed to consider market access, metering and dispatch control of DG projects proposing to operate in parallel with the existing electric system. The primary focus of this committee’s investigation included but was not limited to the following:

1. Develop a framework for DG customers accessing the energy market for the purpose of
   - supplementing self-provided energy with purchases from ESPs; selling excess energy
to others; and contributing to ancillary services requirements.
2. Identify a means of accurately scheduling and accounting for the above transactions so
   system constraints are not exceeded.
3. Determine conditions when control area operator needs dispatch control over customer’s
   unit.
4. Develop an operating protocol to effectively manage system disturbances when DG is
   connected.
5. Identify technical requirements associated with the above functions.
6. Identify conditions where system benefits or stranded cost may warrant pricing
   consideration.
7. Develop tariff concepts that facilitate the above transactions in a consistent and equitable
   fashion.

2.2.3 Interconnection Standards Committee Work Scope

This committee was formed to consider standards for interconnecting DG projects to existing
electric systems. The primary focus of this committee’s investigation included but was not
limited to the following:

1. Research and review existing and developing national, industry and regulatory
   interconnection standards.
2. Recommend interconnection standards that should be referenced and adopted by Arizona
   for interconnection of small, medium and large distributed generation units considering:
   - type of proposed generating unit; system voltage class of interconnection; parallel vs.
islanded generator operation; and inverter vs. synchronous connection of units.
3. Identify conditions when site specific interconnection requirements should be considered.
4. Recommended interconnection standards should address the following:
   - safe construction, maintenance, and operational practices; power quality impacts;
   system reliability impacts; and coordinated management of and response to
   disturbances.

2.2.4 Formal Comment Period

The three DGI Workgroup committees published their final reports on November 22, 1999 and
November 30, 1999. The three reports were filed with ACC Docket Control and distributed
electronically to all interested parties participating in the DGI process. A review period was then
provided for all interested parties to submit formal comments regarding the three reports and the
DGI investigation process. Eleven parties submitted formal comments by the December 22,
1999 dateline. All written comments were also filed with ACC Docket Control. Section 4 of
this report documents the nature of the comments filed.
2.3 DGI Advisory Committee

An action plan to form an Advisory Committee to complete the remaining DGI Workgroup tasks was proposed and adopted at the November 22, 1999 DGI Workgroup meeting. Jerry Smith of ACC Staff agreed to chair the committee. Committee membership consisted of the six DGI Workgroup committee chairmen, co-chairmen, and subcommittee chairmen and an equal number of at-large members. The DGI Workgroup Chairman selected at-large Advisory Committee members from those parties that formally submitted comments regarding the DGI Workgroup committee final reports and that declared an interest in participating. The Advisory Committee Chairman reserved the right to invite participation by someone not meeting the stated prerequisite when a stakeholder group would otherwise not be adequately represented. Committee meetings were open to anyone desiring to attend and participate.

The DGI Workgroup Advisory Committee was formed for the purpose of reviewing the three DGI Workgroup committee reports and associated docketed comments, evaluating and critiquing the DGI Workgroup process, and publishing a DGI Workgroup final report documenting the aforementioned tasks. This committee was also charged with the responsibility of recommending how endorsement might be obtained from stakeholders that have not participated in the DGI Workgroup process. The DGI Workgroup Advisory Committee completed its efforts during the months of January and February 2000.

The Advisory Committee met on the 10th, 24th and 31st of January 2000 and 7th, 22nd and 28th of February 2000 to perform its assigned tasks. Three or four committee members were assigned to each task. Each team of committee members drafted a portion of this report and submitted it to the committee for review, modification and adoption. By submittal of this final report the DGI Workgroup Advisory Committee has fulfilled its obligations. ACC Staff will use this final report and all of the docketed DGI Workgroup material as a reference when drafting proposed DGI rules. A review and comment period will likely precede Staff’s filing of the proposed DGI rules with the ACC for rulemaking. The rulemaking process will likely span a period of three to four months.

2.4 Stakeholder Participation

ACC Staff designed the DGI investigation process to encourage and enable participation by any stakeholder that elected to do so. The process included but was not limited to the following features:

1. A docket number was opened for the DGI investigation process.
2. Agendas, notices, and minutes were prepared in accordance with open meeting laws.
3. All related correspondence and meeting materials were filed in Docket Control as a matter of public record.
4. Information was posted on the ACC website to inform interested parties not participating in the process.

Organizations participating in the DGI investigation are listed on the following page. A summary table is also provided on page 10 that documents the level of stakeholder participation experienced during the DGI investigation. Appendix B lists each individual participant and documents their involvement in the DGI Workshop, Workgroup and Committees.
Participating Organizations

Arizona Corporation Commission
Arizona Electric Power Cooperative
Agra Simons
Allied Signal / Honeywell
Arizona Public Service
APS Energy Services
Arizona Utilities Investors Association
AZ Independent Scheduling Administrator
Brown & Bain
Baltes Valentino & Associates
Capstone Turbine
City of Phoenix
City of Scottsdale
City of Tempe
City of Tucson
Cummins Southwest
Distributed Energy Association of AZ
Distributed Power Coalition of America
Diversified Technical SVCS
Empire Power Systems
Engine World
Energy Strategies Inc
ETA Engineering
Generac
Gen-Tech
Grand Canyon State Electric Cooperative
IBEW
Industrial Consultants Group
Maricopa County
ME Consultants
NewEnergy
On Site Sycom Energy
Phaser Advanced Metering Service
Phoenician Resort
Photovoltaic Resources
Robert s. Lynch
RPD Abbott Labs
RUCO
RW Beck
Sierra Southwest
Snell & Wilmer
Southwest Energy Solutions
Southwest Gas
SRP
Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative
Stewart & Stevenson
SW Wind Power
Touchstone Energy
Trico Electric Cooperative
TRW Vehicle Safety Systems
Tucson Electric Power
## Participation Summary

**ACC Distributed Generation & Interconnections Investigation**  
**Docket No. E-00000A-99-0431**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Parties Represented</th>
<th>Number of Meetings</th>
<th>Participant Mtg Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siting, Certification and Permitting Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access, Metering and Dispatch Committee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnection Standards Committee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workgroup</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Comments</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2142</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 The participant hours reflected in this table do not reflect the amount of time each participant worked between formally scheduled meetings.
Section 3: Workgroup Process
Assessment and Critique

Each of the three DGI Workgroup committees published a final committee report. These reports document conclusions and recommendations for which a consensus was achieved within each respective committee. In this section of report, the Advisory Committee documents issues the three committees failed to adequately address, did not address, or that remain without committee consensus. This section also documents where opinions differ among committees. The Advisory Committee thereby provides an assessment and critique of the whole DGI Workgroup process.

3.1 Assigned Committee Work Scope and Issues
This section addresses whether the three DGI Workgroup Committees adequately addressed the assigned work scope and issues and identifies what requires additional attention. The issues presented in Section 3.1 were assigned only to the AMD Committee and the references below are directed only to that committee’s work.

3.1.1 Tariff Issues
In the AMD Committee Report tariff issues were discussed and a general consensus was conceptually reached on the following issues:

1. Under the new world of retail competition, the UDC would provide backup service for standard offer customers, through a bundled generation, transmission, and distribution tariff.  
2. Under the current ACC Competitive Rules, the UDC would not have an obligation or opportunity to provide backup generation service to direct access service. Some DG Providers felt that the Competitive Rules most likely did not fully contemplate the policies concerning DG.
3. The economics of partial requirements tariffs (both existing and proposed) will need to be addressed to ensure that the rates appropriately recover the costs, including transmission and distribution (T&D) costs, associated with providing bundled partial requirements electric service to DG Customers.
4. A partial-requirement direct access tariff is needed to properly recover T&D and any other relevant plant investment from customers using DG.
5. Classic demand/energy rates vs. competition. The existing partial requirements tariffs were developed under the “bundled regime” of the past. These tariffs should be reviewed and revised, where appropriate, to ensure conformance with an “unbundled world.”

---

9 AMD report page 14, Section A.1.
10 AMD Report page 14, Section A.2.
11 AMD report page 14, Section B.1.b.
12 AMD Report page 15, Section B.2.d.
13 AMD Report pg. 14, Section B.1.c.
While a conceptual consensus was reached on these issues, the AMD Committee did not have time (nor was it in their work scope) to address the application of these issues into specific tariffs.

There are divergent opinions on tariffs assessed for recovery of distribution costs and back up or parallel energy provision. This is involved in a discussion of standard offer and direct access tariffs as well as issues of fixed charge vs. commodity based recovery rates. The discussion includes issues such as:

1. Unrecovered distribution costs
2. DG subsidization
3. Cost shifting
4. Flexibility of standard offer and direct access rates responding to DG
5. Shareholder return
6. Stranded cost recovery
7. Potential Settlement Agreement conflicts
8. Rate freeze impacts
9. Reduced price signals for energy efficiency
10. Create rate shocks or windfalls
11. Consistency with comparison to similar load reductions due to efficiency or business practice changes
12. Distribution wheeling charge as duplicative

Additionally, the following tariff related issues were not specifically addressed in the AMD Committee Report:

1. Disparity of treatment between customers with and without generation.
2. Standardized interconnect study fee schedules.
3. How will power factor be treated in rates and is a standard necessary statewide?
4. Tariff adjustment for UDC disconnect when it causes a peak (emergency & Maintenance).
5. Curtailable tariffs (DA Distribution Interruptible and Unbundled Delivery Partial Requirements Rates).
6. Disparity of treatment between regulated and non-regulated UDC’s.

The Advisory Committee recommends that the ACC initiate a Tariffs and Rates Workshop to address both the application of the tariff issues addressed in the AMD Committee report and the above-mentioned issues that were not specifically addressed in this report. This workshop should occur simultaneously with the writing of draft DG rules by the ACC staff. The results of this workshop should be considered in the draft DG rules prior to these rules being Docketed (Docket No. E-00000A-99-0431).

### 3.1.2 Value and Cost Impacts of DG to the System

Although the value of DG was not a specific issue assigned to a committee, the AMD Committee did have a general discussion regarding potential benefits that DG could provide to the distribution grid. Additionally, the following representations were outlined in a white paper

---

14 AMD pgs. 18–23
15 AMD pg. 13
submitted to the SCP Committee describing the following criteria for utilization in determining the viability and value of DG to a UDC:

1. Opportunities should be evaluated on a case-by-case-basis.
2. What investment would the DG allow the UDC to Defer?
3. Are there sites on the feeder to locate DG?
4. Does the UDC need to schedule or control the DG unit?
5. Can the UDC “count on” the DG to be available?
6. Will the UDC lose revenues when the DG in on-line that it is entitled to recover?
7. Does the DG customer receive a subsidy when the unit allows the UDC to defer T&D investment?

Concerns also exist regarding the following:

1. System impact costs associated with DG.
2. Who is responsible for paying any additional costs.
3. Who is responsible for proving system benefits.
4. Equitable access to interconnection with the grid.

The Advisory Committee recognizes that the criteria and methodology for identifying the value and cost impacts of DG to the System needs to be established and remands any decision on these issues to the ACC Staff for incorporation into the draft DG Rules. Consideration should be given to the above-mentioned criteria in determining the viability and value of DG to a UDC.

3.1.3 Operations Issues

The following operational issues were included in the work scope for the AMD Committee and were not specifically addressed in their report:

1. Identify a means of accurately scheduling and accounting for the above transactions (exports) so system constraints are not exceeded.
2. Determine conditions when the control area operator needs dispatch control over customer’s DG unit.
3. Develop an operational protocol to effectively manage system disturbances in the presence of distributed generators.

In reference to issue 1 above, the AMD Committee specifically discussed the fact that the Scheduling Coordinator (SC) for the DG will schedule in accordance with NERC and WSCC guidelines. After the AZ Independent System Administration (AZ-ISA) protocols are adopted the SC will then schedule in accordance with the AZ-ISA Scheduling Protocol until an Independent System Operator (ISO) is in place. The SC will then schedule in accordance with the ISO protocols. However, this discussion was not included in the AMD Committee final report.

The Advisory Committee finds that an implementation workshop will likely need to be held after the rulemaking process to address several operational issues as operational protocols are recognized to have an effect on DG implementation.
3.2 Issues and Concerns Not addressed by Committees

This section identifies DGI related issues or concerns that were not included in the original work scope of the IS Committee, the AMD Committee or the SCP Committee. The Advisory Committee has discussed the issues and concerns documented in this section and recommends that they be remanded to the ACC staff for consideration in their writing of draft DG rules:

3.2.1 Technical Issues

1. **Set points** used to maximize DG benefits for system control and protective equipment.
   
   Set points for UDC and DG protective equipment could be optimized to allow DG to support the system frequency and voltage during system disturbances thereby aiding system reliability.

2. **Grounding**. What is acceptable? Should there be a ground mat around working areas? What does NEC and IEEE Std. 80 say?
   
   The Interconnections Standards Committee discussed this issue and it was agreed that a review of the adequacy of existing standards for grounding is needed. However, the Interconnection Standards Committee did not have time to address this issue.

3. Any **Technical Standards** developed need a provision for review and revision.
   
   This is especially important because, like any code or regulation set in a changing technical or legislative landscape, adaptations have to be made for inevitable changes and developments, and furthermore to make additions and corrections for circumstances which could not have been foreseen until they have played themselves out.

3.2.2 Interconnection Process Issues

**Dispute resolution and protocols**: All parties are currently willing to attempt to work together on all aspects of DG interconnections. However, this issue may need to be re-addressed in the future. This is an issue that needs to be remanded to the ACC staff for draft rulemaking.

3.2.3 Policy Issues

Where **Definitions** exist in the ACC Electric Competition Rules they should be consistent with any definitions determined in any DG rulemaking. The DG rulemaking should include a definitive ruling on what constitutes DG that is consistent with FERC and other regulatory bodies.

3.2.4 Distribution Planning/Impacts Issues

With many current and emerging technologies, there needs to be contract standards regarding the reliability of the DG unit and its effect on the UDC’s distribution system. The following planning issues have not been addressed in the original work scope of the three DG Committees.

1. Repercussions if DG suppliers decide to leave. Who must supply their customers and at what cost?
2. Increased uncertainty and increased risks to the UDC for these repercussions.
3. How long is it required to stay in service?
4. Provision of DG projected site location and capacity information to UDCs for planning purposes.

The Advisory Committee recommends that these issues be addressed during the workshop recommended in Section 3.1.1 to address Tariffs and Rates. In addition there may be operational concerns related to these planning issues. Therefore, these issues should also be addressed in the implementation workshop recommended by the Advisory Committee in Section 3.1.3.

3.3 Conflicting and Divergent Committee Issues
This section identifies areas where more than one committee dealt with a subject and differing views exist. Where possible, the differing views are identified as representing a committee consensus or in some circumstances the issues differed between stakeholders. These are issues that may require further study and work.

3.3.1 Categorizing Distributed Generation (DG) by Size
The AMD and IS Committees diverged on their proposed size categories for DG. The AMD Committee selected its size categories primarily considering project economics and grid impacts. The IS Committee chose size classifications based upon protective requirements and safety. Whereas, the AMD Committee outlined associated size issues in their report, the IS Committee simply provided a size breakdown in their Interconnection Requirements document.

The size categories presented by the two groups are based on a different set of criteria, each set important within it’s own respect. The specifics of each approach are outlined in the respective committee reports. There does not appear to be any compelling reason to reconcile these differences regarding DG size categories provided the ACC rulemaking process addresses both committees' concerns.

The following table shows a comparison of the recommended generator size categories established by the two committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMD Committee</th>
<th>IS Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 300 kW</td>
<td>0 - 50 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 kW –1,000 kW</td>
<td>51 kW – 300 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001 kW –10,000 kW</td>
<td>301 kW - 5,000 kW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 10,000 kW</td>
<td>Above 5,000 kW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 DG Unit Size Impact on Operational Concerns
Both the AMD and IS Committees determined that the DG impact depends on several factors: unit size, the capacity of the distribution circuit, proximity to UDC generation source or substation, and whether the customer is served from a radial circuit, looped circuit, transfer switch, or spot network. The operating hours of the DG relative to daily and seasonal peak of the feeder also impacts the grid. Other factors to consider are basic DG technologies such as an inverter, synchronous generator, or induction generator.

In general, according to the AMD Committee, there is a lower level of concern for the 0-300 kW DG applications from a planning or operational perspective. The capacity for most distribution
circuits are in the 5 to 10 MW range, therefore, DG applications above 1 MW can be significant relative to size of the circuit.

The AMD and IS Committees discussed two possible rules of thumb to determine when DG would be considered significant relative to the capacity of a feeder and, therefore, would require increased information and design considerations by the affected UDC. Some UDCs did not favor the following rules of thumb because they do not take into account variables like seasonal loading, DG location relative to the load or the source (substation), and circuit switching. Also feeder protection requirements are minimal for smaller installations, but increase as the size of the customer’s generation increases.

1. The size of a single DG unit should not exceed 50% of the feeder capacity. Aggregate DG capacity on the same feeder could go above this level before being considered prohibitive due to the diversity of the units.
2. Aggregate DG capacity would be considered significant if it could cause actual feeder loading to drop below the normal minimum load level for a feeder.

3.4 Areas Lacking Consensus
This section outlines topics discussed by multiple committees that failed to achieve a consensus within or among DGI Workgroup Committees or stakeholders. The following documentation of these topics cites references to the three Workgroup Committee reports when possible.

3.4.1 Obligation to Buy From DG
There was significant discussion regarding the obligation to buy from the DG Provider in all three committees. This concerned both QF facilities under PURPA and non-QF that are outside the context of PURPA laws. Formally, only the AMD Committee Final Report presented the question of whether there was or ought to be an obligation to purchase generation from DG Providers. It is generally agreed that this issue needs specific attention in the rulemaking process.

DG Providers agreed that the buyback of excess power from interconnected DG should not, in general, be made mandatory. However, this assumes effective competition is present such that an ESP or other provider can and will contract with DG owners/operators to purchase their excess power. Absent effective competition, the Arizona Corporation Commission (ACC) may need to review this provision. If the purchase of excess power from DGs is solely at the discretion/election of UDCs, the ACC should emphasize and monitor that the UDC fairly includes DG power when it competitively procures power for standard offer service.

In the AMD Committee discussions, there was agreement that PURPA is no longer the benchmark to use for either pricing power or buying it back, but that instead the "market" was the appropriate mechanism to use. It was the non-UDC representatives on the committee whose position was that PURPA was no longer relevant since we were looking at a DG related policy on a "go-forward" basis.
3.4.2 Application Process

Both the IS Committee and the SCP Committee addressed the issue of a DG application process. Both provide discussion and samples of applications and alternate process models in their respective reports. There is general agreement regarding the purpose and intent of applications. Disagreement exists primarily between the UDCs and DG Providers regarding response timeframes for applications. DG advocates state that the process with the UDC should be expeditious and time certain. UDCs have stated that they do not have an objection to some completion guideline, provided other relevant factors are taken in consideration.

The SCP committee report stated that 30 days should be adequate for a sufficiency review while allowing timeframe adjustments if all parties agreed to the delay.16 This committee's conclusion was that for smaller unit installations the process should be shortened, especially if there have been previous installations that have gone through the process. Some committee members held the view that the process needed to be iterative and interactive.

The IS report17 describes an iterative process with recommended timeframes. The IS process was specific regarding UDC responses to applications but also encouraged flexibility with the customer. Within the IS Committee there was some disagreement whether the timeframes could be met due to staffing considerations and an understanding that the process needs to be flexible.

Some participants have stated that requirements for the application process should be variable but agree that the application for smaller systems should be a simplified process. Certain aspects of an interconnection are not always well suited to fixed time frame response. Nevertheless, an application process framework should be adopted and the resulting document used as a guideline for what needs to be done prior to final interconnection.

3.4.3 Current Technology & SCADA Requirements

All three committees discussed the issues of how the use of current technologies and Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems (items such as dispatch power, dispatch power factor, alarms, status of breakers, etc.) could be applied to maintain a safe and reliable system with DG connected. However, this area needs specific attention due to a lack of detail of what the current technologies include specifically and how well it will integrate with the existing (and future) distribution systems.

The UDC position agrees that any proven technology could certainly be reviewed/addressed, provided it does not compromise (1) equipment or personnel safety, (2) protective relaying and control functions, or (3) utility system reliability, integrity and power quality.

All three committees discussed the issue of real time flow analysis. This issue is also embedded contextually in the topic of mapping the system. UDCs are concerned with the cost of such analysis and the benefits to them of such a Geographic Information System (GIS) based system. Some argue that access to real time information is necessary for informed UDC and consumer decisions, to avoid areas of constraint or design projects for optimal impact.

---

16 SCP pgs. 7 & 8
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The Advisory Committee acknowledges that new technology and SCADA requirements will likely emerge and accompany retail competition and industry restructuring. It therefore suggests new tariffs may need to consider technological enhancements that might benefit both the UDC and DG customers. This topic is well suitable for the tariff and implementation workshops recommended in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.1.3.

3.4.4 Critical Information Needs Regarding Distribution Planning

There is a need for improving access and exchange of information between consumers and UDCs in regards to DG implementation. This information exchange primarily effects two areas:

1. Planning distribution system improvements reflecting the potential impacts of DG
2. Data requirements as it relates to system operations for UDC’s and consumers

A primary concern is how the information is managed and the security and privacy needs that accompany system security practices and confidential UDC and consumer business data.

The Advisory Committee recommends that rulemaking needs to consider how to factor all of these issues in the process of developing rules for DG.

3.4.5 Study DG on Network Systems

Both the IS and AMD Committees addressed the impact of DG on the grid and future design factors related to DG interconnecting with a distribution network system. This task was assigned to the IS Committee and discussed at length without consensus being reached as to under what circumstances and at what cost such interconnections can be safely accomplished. Network systems differ from radial distribution systems in that have multiple lines interconnected for service. This leads to additional technological considerations when considering DG interconnections.

Therefore, to achieve further resolution, the Advisory Committee suggests that the ACC sponsor a workshop specifically designed to further research the matter with statewide and nationwide experts before any ruling prescribes one solution versus another.

3.4.6 Disparity of treatment between customers with and without DG

An important issue that emerged from all three committees is a perception that there may be a disparity of treatment between customers with and without DG. The following list identifies examples of where there may be disparity in how UDCs’ deal with interconnection of new customer load and DG customer interconnections:

1. Upgrade of system infrastructure
2. Study requirements
3. Protection issues as they relate to the above points

Technical and economic issues may merit special consideration depending on the specific characteristics of a project. Avoiding disparity in treatment needs to be addressed in the ACC rulemaking process.
3.4.7 Distribution Planning With DG

Section F.4 of the AMD Committee report reflects current utilities views regarding distribution planning with DG. Many of the DG technologies are unproven and DG implementation is in an infancy stage. This shapes the existing distribution planning paradigm described in the above-mentioned report. However, the AMD committee agrees that future distribution planning should consider modeling implementation of DG.

Tariffs can affect the certainty of when generation would be on during a distribution capacity constraint. DG on a feeder does affect the capacity utilization of the feeder. The benefit of that freed-up capacity is variable depending on local conditions. Taking into account the DG, the tariffs used, system conditions, and other factors will all influence the planning process.

It appears that much work remains to be done here. Benefits to system need to be identified and addressed. UDCs may need to take into account DG when forecasting system improvements. Procedures need to be established that allows the UDC to plan.

3.4.8 Pre-certification of Equipment

Both the IS and the SCP Committees dealt with pre-certification. The SCP Committee drafted a white paper discussing options for types of equipment certification. Equipment pre-certification falls into two categories: (1) certification of the generation equipment, and (2) certification of interconnected DG systems. The SCP Committee\textsuperscript{18} agreed that certification of the generation equipment was optional to the DG Provider. The Committee found that residential units 10kW or smaller should not require certification and permitting, other than normal local jurisdictional requirements.

The Committee also allowed that all DG interconnections are subject to both local jurisdiction permitting compliance and UDC approval. However, it was felt that a streamlined approach could be taken once the local jurisdictions and UDCs experienced several installs of the same type.

Discussions from the IS Committee and UDC representatives reflect that they do not have an objection to 3rd party certification (ETL/UL) for individual gensets. The UDCs will continue to require verification that all interconnection requirements have been met on a site-specific basis prior to interconnection with the distribution system.

3.4.9 UDC Ownership of DG

No committee was assigned the task of specifically dealing with UDC ownership of DG. However, two specific viewpoints emerged in committee discussions of this issue. One view is that UDC ownership in the form of a small central station could be economic in some instances for system reliability purposes. Therefore, UDCs take the view that they should not be prohibited from owning DG.

On the other hand, DG advocates believe that a serious potential for conflict of interest would exist if a DG was owned by an UDC. Participants supporting this view feel that UDCs could

\textsuperscript{18} SCP pgs. 6 & 7
issue RFPs to realize DG benefits in a specific area, but contend that with UDC ownership and operation of DG there is the potential for an unfair market advantage over other competitors and a potential double standard for interconnection requirements.

The two above positions are counterpoised and need to be brought into the DG rulemaking process for consideration. Given restructuring of the electric industry via the ACC’s Retail Electric Competition Rules, there is a perception that DG ownership may also potentially conflict with a utility’s Code of Conduct and Settlement Agreements.

3.5 Value of Additional Stakeholder Input

Section 2.4 of this report documents that participants in the DGI investigation process represent a variety of stakeholders including utilities, competitive energy service providers, equipment manufacturers, distributors, contractors, customers, as well as other organizations. However, the Advisory Committee recommends that the DGI Workgroup results be reviewed by a wider audience to better assess the work product and gain additional input for critical unresolved issues. To be clear, the DGI Workgroup is not intending to expand its mission to issues that are under the jurisdiction of other state, county or local entities. Rather, the purpose of the proposed additional review is to ensure that parties who may be impacted by the ACC’s DG rule-making proceedings are aware of the DGI investigation information and proposed recommendations.

Organizations targeted for additional review of the DGI investigation work product are grouped and listed below. The recommended additional review will be accomplished by distributing the DGI Workgroup Final Report to the identified groups and following up for comments or questions. Additionally, some organizations such as the rural utilities and state, county and local officials may merit a presentation and discussion of the DG report and related issues.

3.5.1 Rural Utilities

The major Arizona utilities were key participants in the process. However, the Advisory Committee recommends that planning and rate representatives from the smaller rural utilities should also review any proposed rules and tariffs.

1. Electrical Cooperatives
2. Citizens Utilities
3. Municipals

3.5.2 Additional Customers

A few customers, such as several Arizona cities, were involved in the initial process, and Advisory Committee. However, proposed standards, tariffs, and policies should be reviewed by a broader range of industrial, commercial, and perhaps even residential customers. Examples include:

1. Industrial Customers or Associations
2. Hospitals
3. Universities and colleges
4. Commercial Chain Accounts
5. Government/military customers
3.5.3 Other Certified Energy Service Providers
A certified energy service provider (ESP) may offer DG as a competitive option for customers. They may also serve as a customer’s energy broker for the excess power from DG. The Advisory Committee recommends that a number of licensed ESPs review the policies during the rulemaking process. Examples include:

1. NewEnergy  
2. Sierra Southwest  
3. Enron  
4. Sempra  
5. APS Energy Services  
6. New West Energy

3.5.4 Other Manufacturers and Contractors
Several major DG equipment manufacturers were represented in the workgroup. Nevertheless, the Advisory Committee recommends that the proposed standards be reviewed by a broader range of manufacturers and contractors.

3.5.5 Arizona Independent System Administrator
Several issues such as the operational procedures, the potential use of DG for ancillary services, and the scheduling of power sales from DG should be reviewed by the ISA.

3.5.6 National Organizations
The interconnections and safety standards should be reviewed by and compared with other national organizations, which are also formulating DG standards and policies. These organizations include:

1. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)  
2. National Electric Manufacturers Association (NEMA)  
3. Edison Electric Institute (EEI)  
4. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)  
5. National Electrical Code (NEC)  
6. National Environmental Safety Compliance (NESC)  
7. National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)  
8. Underwriters Laboratories (UL)

3.5.7 State, County, and City Agencies
Finally, the policies and standards adopted by the ACC may impact or influence the policies of other governmental agencies in Arizona. The Advisory Committee recommends that these organizations should be included in the review process where appropriate. Potential organizations include:

1. Arizona Legislature  
2. State of Arizona agencies  
3. Maricopa County  
4. Pima County  
5. Major Cities  
6. Rural Counties and Cities
A review period was provided for all interested parties to submit formal comments following publication of the final reports of the three DGI Workgroup Committees. Eleven parties submitted comments by the December 22, 1999 dateline. Those comments were filed with ACC Docket Control and are listed among the referenced material in Appendix C. Many of the concerns and issues raised in the formal comments have already been addressed in Section 3 of this report. This section summarizes the residual issues submitted as comments by stakeholders and interested parties. This section includes an analysis of whether consensus is feasible, along with suggested courses of action for the ACC.

4.1. Is a Visible Disconnect Switch Necessary at all Sites?
All parties agree that an accessible, lockable disconnect switch to isolate the DG from the grid is an essential part of safe operation of DG on the UDC's distribution system. Utilities are requiring that the device be a "visible, open" disconnect switch. Some parties have requested that the disconnect use electronic verification rather than physical verification. The Advisory Committee agrees there needs to be a clear definition of what a visible, open disconnect is as it applies to the UDC interconnection for DG.

4.2 Metering
Comments were submitted concerning what type of metering should be required for DG interconnection. The Advisory Committee agrees a consensus should be reached on statewide metering standards that can be adopted for DG. Proposed ACC rules need to reflect technical solutions available for metering purposes. Some consensus was reached in the AMD Committee on various situations where specific metering equipment would be needed for various tariff options.

4.3 DG Policy
Parties’ comments included asking that: a) the ACC oversee the DG market in its formative stages and b) the ACC prescribe the role of the UDC vis-à-vis DG. The Advisory Committee suggests that ACC Staff proceed to clarify jurisdictional issues that may impact the potential deployment of DG in Arizona. These would include rulings on PURPA or PUHCA regulations that may either hinder or unduly advantage such deployment, especially considering the movement in Washington to repeal both these acts as part of a federal restructuring bill pertaining to electricity. Additionally, the ACC’s upcoming DG rulemaking may provide a platform for modifying the current Arizona Competition Rules as appropriate.
Appendix A: Summary List of DGI Workshop Group Breakout Issues

Safety

1. Ensure Protection of Workers / Customers
2. Safe Practices for Connection / Isolation of Distributed Generation to / from System
3. Training and Certification / Licensing Process for Workers
4. Standardized Safety Requirements Conforming to NEC / OSHA, etc.
5. Zero Tolerance on Unsafe Conditions
6. Distinguish Safety Requirements for Large vs. Small Customer Applications

Siting

1. Size Thresholds for Which Siting Is a Public Issue
2. Tracking / Mapping of Distributed Generation for UDC Capacity Planning
7. Who Pays for Underutilized Distribution Facilities Resulting From Distributed Generation Siting

Certification / Permitting

1. Certification of Distributed Generation System Package
2. Who has Jurisdiction Over
   - Tariffs, Cost Shifting
   - Grid Access
   - Reliability

Distributed Generation Fuel Requirements

1. Is a Fuel Preference Policy Needed (Gas, Solar, Wind, H₂, etc.)
2. Is a Fuel Pressure Standard Needed for Distributed Generation
3. Who Pays For Fuel Delivery Infrastructure
4. Delivery of H₂ as By Product of Fuel Cell Application

Location and Types of Distributed Generation Connections

1. Consider Standards for Inverter vs. Synchronous Connections
2. Should Standards Distinguish Between Trans., Dist., and Customer’s Service System Connections
3. Can a Location Match be Achieved for Mutual Benefit of Customer and UDC
4. Application Process Standardized and Streamlined
5. Must be an Electric Service Provider to Re-Sale?
Points of & Types of Interconnection

1. UDC’s Total Control a Concern - Jurisdiction of All Utilities (Including SRP) for Interconnections
2. Standardize Equipment for Monitoring and Verification of Interconnection
3. Site Specific Considerations vs. Interconnection Standards
4. Parallel vs. Islanded Operations of Distributed Generators
5. Is There a Distributed Generator Size Limit for Particular Interconnections

Power Quality

1. Distributed Generation Compliance with WSCC / NERC / IEEE and Industry Standards
2. Power Factor, Harmonics, Voltage Flicker, Frequency and Voltage Control Concerns
3. Bilateral Power Quality Impacts of Distributed Generators, Utilities and Other Customers
4. How to Monitor and Enforce

Operational Interdependence

1. How will Distributed Generator Customers Contribute to Ancillary Service Requirements
2. Interface Equipment Must Provide Bilateral (Mutual) Protection / Voltage Control
3. System Dispatch / Control for Mutual System Benefit
4. Management of / Response to Disturbances
5. More Complex Operational Requirements When Many Distributed Generators Co-exist
6. Customers Reliance on Utility for Operational and Engineering Expertise

System Dynamics

1. Automatic Voltage Regulation / Power System Stabilizer / Unit Testing Requirements
2. Distributed Generator Load Following Capability
3. Real-time Pricing Affect on System Dispatch and Operation
4. Automation via Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition

Operational Controls

1. Who Should Control Distributed Generator - Customer vs. Control Area Operator
2. Should Manual or Automatic Controls Be Used
3. Customer Issue: Controls Need To Follow Load To Maximize Investment
4. If Control Area Operator Dispatches Unit-Standards for Control & Telemetry Equip. Interface
   - Voltage Control
   - Power System Stabilizer
   - Governor Response (Frequency)
5. Dynamic Signal if Regulating or Load Following
6. If Utility Benefits From Dispatch of Units - How is Customer Compensated

Telemetry

1. Telemetry Required For Parallel Operation (Sell Back)
2. Distributed Generator Telemetry to Send Real Time Data to Control Area Operator
3. Transfer Tripping Distributed Generator for Disturbance on Distribution System
4. Who Owns the Information / with Whom is Information Shared
5. Who Pays the Cost for Telemetry
6. Is Net Metering Allowed
**Protection Requirements**

1. Uniform Standards or Utility Specific  
2. Balance Economics / Safety  
3. How Much Control Should Utility Have In Defining Requirement  
4. Dependent Upon Unit Size and Location in System  
5. Define by Type of Unit and Type of Utility Interconnection

**Other Issues / Concerns**

1. Environmental  
2. Customer Education  
3. Who has Jurisdiction - ACC vs. FERC, ISO, Local, etc.  
4. Scheduling Requirement  
5. Pricing - Rates / Incentives
   - Utility Tariffs - Backup, Stand-By, Supplemental, Emergency, Buy-Back  
   - Cost -Shifting - Who Pays Cost of Departing Customer  
   - Should Distributed Generation be Allowed to Bypass Wires Charges  
   - Monetary Compensation for Grid Benefits of Distributed Generation  
   - Providing Opportunity / Encouragement for Smaller Dist. Generation (i.e. Residential)  
   - ACC Incentives for some DG, if Cost Increases for Others, But Overall Cost is Reduced
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<td>PHIL CLARK</td>
<td>TUCSON ELECTRIC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANNE COBB</td>
<td>TRICO ELECTRIC COOP</td>
<td>P C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = Chairman, Co-Chairman, Committee Member or Panelist
P = Participant

List of Participants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Workgroup</th>
<th>SCP Committee</th>
<th>AMD Committee</th>
<th>IS Committee</th>
<th>Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KENT CROUSE</td>
<td>SW GAS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUCK CULLOM</td>
<td>SW WIND POWER</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREG CZAPLEWSKI</td>
<td>CUMMINS SOUTHWEST</td>
<td>P P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID DAER</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEITH DAVIDSON</td>
<td>ON SITE SYCOM ENERGY CORP</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE DEBAILLE</td>
<td>MARICOPA COUNTY</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUCK DECORSE</td>
<td>TUCSON ELECTRIC</td>
<td>C P C C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM DELONG</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST GAS</td>
<td>P P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDY DESPAIN</td>
<td>CITY OF PHOENIX</td>
<td>P P C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID T. DRUMMOND</td>
<td>NEW ENERGY</td>
<td>P P C C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEVIN DUGGAN</td>
<td>CAPSTONE TURBINE CORP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REBECCA EICKLEY</td>
<td>CITY OF SCOTTSDALE</td>
<td>P P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES EMERSON</td>
<td>TRICO</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRUCE EVANS</td>
<td>AEPCO</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL FITCHITT</td>
<td>CITY OF TEMPE</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON FRANQUERO</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>C P C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART FREGOSO</td>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM FRIDDLE</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>P P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REBEKAH FRIEND</td>
<td>IBEW</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINDY FUNKHouser</td>
<td>RUCO</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAROLINE GARDINER</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST ENERGY SOLUTIONS</td>
<td>P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANE GARRETT</td>
<td>ETA ENGINEERING INC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENNIS GERLACH</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>C P C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYAN GERNET</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>P P P P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED GIESEKING</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST GAS</td>
<td>P P C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALT GOODMAN</td>
<td>IBEW LOCAL 266</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL GOODRICH</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>P P C C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELENA GORELLE</td>
<td>MARICOPA COUNTY</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF GULDNER</td>
<td>SNELL&amp;WILMER</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = Chairman, Co-Chairman, Committee Member or Panelist  
P = Participant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>SCP Committee</th>
<th>AMD Committee</th>
<th>IS Committee</th>
<th>Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JEFF HAGEN</td>
<td>SW GAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOM HANSEN</td>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF HANSON</td>
<td>PHASER ADVANCED METERING SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB HESS</td>
<td>SALT RIVER PROJECT</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARRY HOLLY</td>
<td>SW GAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE HOUSLEY</td>
<td>APS ENERGY SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinnie Hunt</td>
<td>CITY OF TUCSON</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF JACOBSON</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST GAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda James</td>
<td>ROBERT S. LYNCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Jun</td>
<td>TEP</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kaszeta</td>
<td>PHOTOVOLTAIC RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Keene</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Klemstine</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Kreuzer</td>
<td>GENERAC</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimitros Lalaudaus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Larubeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Linde</td>
<td>AGRA SIMONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Louis</td>
<td>ALLIED SIGNAL POWER SYSTEM</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Madden</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Mann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott McCulloough</td>
<td>MARICOPA COUNTY PLANNING DIVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim McDonald</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Mcguirk</td>
<td>ME CONSULTANTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Mckinley</td>
<td>DISTRIBUTED POWER COALITION OF AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Mclellan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Mcquire</td>
<td>TOUCHSTONE ENERGY</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aidar Mcsheffrey</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = Chairman, Co-Chairman, Committee Member or Panelist
P = Participant

List of Participants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Workgroup</th>
<th>SCP Committee</th>
<th>AMD Committee</th>
<th>IS Committee</th>
<th>Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATT MEDVRA</td>
<td>ESI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W W MEEK</td>
<td>AUIA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW J MEYER</td>
<td>TUCSON ELECTRIC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUCK MIESSNER</td>
<td>NEV</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATRIE MORRIS</td>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL MURPHY</td>
<td>CITY OF PHOENIX</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS NELSON</td>
<td>DEAA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVE NICHOLS</td>
<td>TRW VEHICLE SAFETY SYSTEMS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIAN O'DONNELL</td>
<td>DEAA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON ONATE</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN PARMLER SR</td>
<td>DIVERSIFIED TECHNICAL SVCS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL PATTEN</td>
<td>BROWN &amp; BAIN</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALD PAULOS</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATT PUFFER</td>
<td>ENGINE WORLD</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE RASH</td>
<td>NEW ENERGY</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEATRICE RIVERA</td>
<td>ALLIED SIGNAL</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELLY ROGERS</td>
<td>RPD ABBOTT</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHAEL ROSS</td>
<td>RW BECK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID RUMOLO</td>
<td>GRAND CANYON STATE ELECTRIC COOP ASSOC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANDY SABLE</td>
<td>SOUTHWEST GAS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDWARD SALGIAN</td>
<td>BVA</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFF SAMS</td>
<td>SSVEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROY SAPP</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVE SCHMOLLINGER</td>
<td>TEP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICK SCHUMM</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE SCWINDENHAMMER</td>
<td>SSVEC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAN SEITZ</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRYAN SIEVERS</td>
<td>EMPIRE POWER SYSTEMS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHUCK SKIDMORE</td>
<td>CITY OF SCOTTSDALE</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = Chairman, Co-Chairman, Committee Member or Panelist
P = Participant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Workgroup</th>
<th>SCP Committee</th>
<th>AMD Committee</th>
<th>IS Committee</th>
<th>Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK SKOWRONSKI</td>
<td>ALLIED SIGNAL</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERRY SMITH</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOB SMITH</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JERRY SMITH</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTT SWANSON</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUL TAYLOR</td>
<td>RW BECK</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM THOMAS</td>
<td>RPD ABBOTT</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVID TOWNLEY</td>
<td>NEW ENERGY INC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TONY TURTURRO</td>
<td>INDUSTRIAL CONSULTANTS GROUP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEITH VAN AULSDAL</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICK VOGEL</td>
<td>TOUCHSTONE ENERGY</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERNEST WAKEFIELD</td>
<td>SRP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRIS WEATHERS</td>
<td>APS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUB WHEELER</td>
<td>ENGINE WORLD INC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAUREL WHISLER</td>
<td>AZ INDEP. SCHEDULING ADMIN ASSOC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAY WILLIAMSON</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C = Chairman, Co-Chairman, Committee Member or Panelist
P = Participant
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