



**Susan Vercheak\***  
Assistant General Counsel

May 8, 2017

Hon. Kathleen H. Burgess  
Secretary to the Commission  
New York State Public Service Commission  
Agency Building 3  
Albany, New York 12223-1350

Re: Case 14-M-0101 – Proceeding on Motion of the Commission in Regard to Reforming  
the Energy Vision, and

Case 16-M-0429 – In the Matter of Earnings Adjustment Mechanism and Scorecard  
Reforms Supporting the Commission's Reforming the Energy Vision

Dear Secretary Burgess:

Pursuant to the Public Service Commission's Order Directing Modifications to the Joint  
Utilities' Proposed Interconnection Earnings Adjustment Mechanism Framework in the  
above matter, attached is the Modified Interconnection Survey Process and Proposed Earning  
Adjustment Mechanism of the Joint Utilities.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

Susan Vercheak

Attachment

\*Admitted only in New Jersey

**STATE OF NEW YORK  
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

---

Proceeding on Motion of the Commission in Regard to Reforming the Energy Vision	X X X	<b>Case 14-M-0101</b>
In the Matter of Earnings Adjustment Mechanism and Scorecard Reforms Supporting the Commission's Reforming the Energy Vision	X X X X	<b>Case 16-M-0429</b>

---

**MODIFIED INTERCONNECTION SURVEY PROCESS AND  
PROPOSED EARNING ADJUSTMENT MECHANISM  
FILING OF THE JOINT UTILITIES**

May 8, 2017

## **I. Introduction and Summary**

Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation (“Central Hudson”), Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (“Con Edison”), New York State Electric & Gas Corporation (“NYSEG”), Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation d/b/a National Grid (“National Grid”), Orange and Rockland Utilities, Inc. (“O&R”), and Rochester Gas and Electric Corporation (“RG&E”) (collectively the “Joint Utilities”) provide this modified interconnection survey process and interconnection Earning Adjustment Mechanism (“IEAM”) framework (the “Modified IEAM Proposal”) as required by the Public Service Commission’s (“Commission”) Order Directing Modifications to the Joint Utilities’ Proposed Interconnection Earnings Adjustment Mechanism Framework (“IEAM Order”) in this proceeding.<sup>1</sup>

The Commission in its May 19, 2016 Order in the *Proceeding on Motion of the Commission in Regard to Reforming the Energy Vision* (“REV”) directed the Joint Utilities to file an IEAM.<sup>2</sup> The Commission also required that the IEAM address: (1) the ability of utilities to meet Standardized Interconnection Requirements (“SIR”) timeliness deadlines; (2) the satisfaction of SIR applicants with the interconnection process as measured by a survey instrument; and (3) a review by an independent third party of utility activities with regard to failed, withdrawn, or abandoned SIR applications.<sup>3</sup> The Joint Utilities, having retained ICF

---

<sup>1</sup> Cases 14-M-0101, *Proceeding on Motion of the Commission in Regard to Reforming the Energy Vision* (“REV Proceeding”) and 16-M-0429, *In the Matter of Earnings Adjustment Mechanism and Scorecard Reforms Supporting the Commission’s Reforming the Energy Vision* (“IEAM Proceeding”), Order Directing Modifications to the Joint Utilities’ Proposed Interconnection Earnings Adjustment Mechanism Framework (issued March 9, 2017) (“IEAM Order”).

<sup>2</sup> REV Proceeding, Order Adopting a Ratemaking and Utility Revenue Model Policy Framework (issued May 19, 2016) (“Track Two Order”), p. 156.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, pp. 86-87.

Resources, LLC (“ICF”), a consultant with survey expertise, to aid in the development and implementation of the survey instrument, filed an Initial IEAM Proposal on September 2, 2016.<sup>4</sup>

After considering the Initial IEAM Proposal, the Commission rejected certain elements, required modifications in other areas, and directed the Joint Utilities to work with Department of Public Service Staff (“Staff”) to develop a modified filing for submission by May 8, 2017.<sup>5</sup> This Modified IEAM Proposal is consistent with the Commission’s determinations and reflects discussions with Staff in several key areas. The Joint Utilities believe the modifications in this proposal will enable continued improvement in the distributed generation (“DG”) interconnection process and provide meaningful incentives for increasing the pace and scale of such interconnections. The specific modifications are:

1. Establishing SIR timeliness requirements as a threshold condition to unlock IEAM earning opportunities, with certain exceptions to 100 percent compliance due to events outside of utility control;
2. The development of a “mid-point survey” and the modified continuation of the “completion survey;” the core questions of each forming the basis of each of the Joint Utilities’ earnings opportunities;
3. A proposal for the weighting of each respective survey, as well as the core survey questions;
4. The creation of a multi-modal survey format, offering web- and telephone-based options for SIR applicants; and
5. A process to collect data on recent abandoned or withdrawn SIR applications, as well as supplementary information on the Joint Utilities’ proposed closeout process.

Taken together, the Joint Utilities’ efforts to implement the IEAM framework with the proposed modifications will advance the Commission’s REV objectives and New York State’s clean energy goals.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> IEAM Proceeding, Interconnection Survey Process and Proposed Earnings Adjustment Mechanism Filing of the Joint Utilities (filed September 2, 2016) (“Initial IEAM Proposal”).

<sup>5</sup> IEAM Proceeding, IEAM Order, p. 16.

<sup>6</sup> Case 15-E-0302 *et al.*, *Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Implement a Large-Scale Renewable Program and a Clean Energy Standard*, Order Adopting a Clean Energy Standard (issued August 1, 2016).

## II. Background

The Initial IEAM Proposal had three main elements: (1) an earnings opportunity based on the Joint Utilities' ability to meet certain SIR timeliness requirements; (2) an earnings opportunity based on the results of a telephone-based interconnection survey for completed projects and a process for administering it; and (3) a process aimed at better understanding the reason(s) for withdrawn and abandoned applications to improve the interconnection process going forward.

In the IEAM Order, the Commission determined that the Initial IEAM Proposal needed revision and directed the Joint Utilities to file a modified proposal.<sup>7</sup> The Commission also made several determinations related to the Joint Utilities' proposed survey incentive metric and survey instrument:<sup>8</sup>

1. Utilities may have different targets;<sup>9</sup>
2. Targets and the monetary value<sup>10</sup> of the IEAM should be established in individual utility proceedings with input from stakeholders;
3. Targets should be set at levels equal to or higher than a baseline level;
4. The survey should be administered to SIR applicants twice: when the applicants receive preliminary review from the utility (mid-point survey) and upon completion of the application and energization of the associated DG project (completion survey);
5. A proposal for the relative weighting of the mid-point survey compared to the completion survey should be submitted to Staff for review;
6. A proposal detailing when telephone- versus web-based surveys will be employed should be provided;

---

<sup>7</sup> IEAM Proceeding, IEAM Order, pp. 10-11.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.*, pp. 11-14.

<sup>9</sup> In the context of this filing, a "target" is a quantitative level of satisfaction calculated from survey results that a utility must meet to be eligible for a positive EAM. The target must be at or above a "baseline" level of satisfaction established from historical survey results for the utility. A "metric" is what is used for measurement – in this case it is based on the survey instrument, the specific questions measured, and the weighting between the two surveys. The metric is calculated on a fixed subset of "core" survey questions.

<sup>10</sup> The "monetary value" describes the relationship between utility survey performance at or above "target" levels and positive adjustments to utility earnings. For example, if a utility reaches performance at its target, it may be eligible for an increase in earnings of one (1) basis point. If a utility reaches performance at a defined percent above its target, it may be eligible for an increase in earnings of three (3) basis points.

7. A revised list of survey questions should reflect cognitive and field testing results as well as experience in Con Edison's most recent rate case ("Con Edison Rate Case Proceeding");<sup>11</sup>
8. The survey should contain a core set of questions and weightings, developed with Staff, that are applicable to the Joint Utilities; and
9. The Joint Utilities are encouraged to survey projects below 50 kW and above 5 MW for informational purposes.

Finally, the Commission addressed withdrawn or abandoned interconnection applications. In light of its recent restructuring of the interconnection queue,<sup>12</sup> the Commission determined it inappropriate to base part of the IEAM metric on abandoned or withdrawn applications<sup>13</sup> – a finding that comported with the Initial IEAM Proposal. Nevertheless, the Commission directed the Joint Utilities to collect data on recently abandoned or withdrawn applications for the purpose of providing insight about improvements that could be made to the interconnection process in the future. Finally, the Commission required utilities to "provide supplementary information regarding the operation of their proposed closeout process and causes of withdrawn or abandoned applications in its revised filing."<sup>14</sup>

The Joint Utilities note at the outset that they agree with the Commission's determinations regarding items 1 through 3 above, and believe that the details of these items are most appropriately addressed in individual utility rate cases and other regulatory proceedings. This filing does not, therefore, address those items. All other remaining matters raised by the Commission, however, are addressed in this filing. Section III presents an approach to the

---

<sup>11</sup> Cases 16-E-0060, *et al.*, *Proceeding on Motion of the Commission as to the Rates, Charges, Rules and Regulations of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. for Electric Service et al.* ("Con Edison Rate Case Proceeding"), Order Approving Electric and Gas Rate Plans, (issued January 25, 2017) ("Con Edison Rate Case Order").

<sup>12</sup> Case 16-E-0560, *Joint Petition for Modifications to the New York State Standardized Interconnection Requirements and Application Process for New Distributed Generators 5MW or Less Connected in Parallel with Utility Distribution Systems* ("SIR Proceeding"), Order Adopting Interconnection Management Plan and Cost Allocation Mechanism, and Making Other Findings (issued January 25, 2017) ("Queue Management Order").

<sup>13</sup> IEAM Proceeding, IEAM Order, p. 15.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

timeliness threshold concerns identified in the IEAM Order. Section IV addresses the specific survey instrument matters identified in items 4-9 above. Finally, Section V discusses processes related to withdrawn or abandoned applications.

### **III. Timeliness Threshold Measure**

The IEAM Order stated that a utility's ability to meet or surpass the SIR timeliness requirements may not form the basis for an IEAM incentive metric. Rather, utilities must first satisfy the SIR timeliness requirements to have the opportunity to earn an incentive based on the survey results.<sup>15</sup> The Joint Utilities, after consulting with Staff, propose a timeliness threshold metric that holds utilities accountable for meeting SIR threshold requirements while also providing a meaningful opportunity to earn an incentive and improve upon current performance levels.

The timeliness threshold would continue to be linked to three key steps during the SIR process: (1) the 10-business day requirement to review and determine application completeness; (2) the 15-business day requirement to complete the preliminary screening; and (3) the 60- or 80-business day requirement to complete the Coordinated Electric System Interconnection Review ("CESIR").

The Joint Utilities propose that the timeliness threshold metric have a 100 percent compliance requirement subject to adjustment for events that are beyond utility control. While the IEAM Order implies that a utility must comply with the three SIR timeliness requirements on 100 percent of all applications, such a standard does not consider that events outside the control of the utility can lead to a failure to meet a timeline requirement thereby eliminating the utility's opportunity to earn an IEAM for an entire year. For example, if in February a storm event or the failure of an applicant to provide accurate information results in a utility missing a deadline on a

---

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*, p. 10.

single application, the utility would lose the opportunity to earn an incentive regardless of how well it performed on all other applications for the remainder of the year. This result is inconsistent with the REV objective of creating incentives for timely distributed energy resource interconnections. Following discussion with Staff, the Joint Utilities propose certain exceptions that would address the issue above by tolling the respective SIR timeliness requirements for the following reasons.

- *Force majeure* events such as major storms: The Joint Utilities propose to exclude the days during a storm event that triggers a scorecard to be filed, as well as the storm preparation period. As the Commission noted in the Scorecard Order, major storms require significant utility activities before an event to “reduce the impacts of the storm event and/or increase consumer safety and security.”<sup>16</sup> Given these considerations, the Joint Utilities believe it is appropriate to adjust timeline performance in recognition of utility activities both before and during a storm event.
- Applicant-driven delays: It is not unusual for utilities to stop the application process due to the applicant’s project changes, delays in filing of information, and/or inconsistency of information (*e.g.*, differences between inverters on the three-line drawing and the inverter specification sheet). In these situations, each utility acts in good faith to continue to work with an applicant on deficiencies, rather than require a project to be resubmitted. The Joint Utilities propose to work with Staff to modify the publicly available monthly report template to reflect stop and restart dates, and calculate the number of days for tolling the SIR deadlines. This will provide transparency to the process, and facilitate the ability of the utility to continue to work with an applicant on project changes and application errors.
- Exceptional application volumes: The Joint Utilities have staffing levels capable of meeting the normal ebbs and flows of application volume and in doing so avoid incremental expenses associated with maintaining higher staffing levels for unusual application peaks. Nevertheless, abrupt and unexpected increases in application volumes above normal levels do occur for reasons outside of utility control. For example, changes in regulatory requirements and project grants or have previously resulted in sudden increases in application and CESIR volume. Such events not only strain utility resources, but also may make it more difficult to find and retain consultants qualified to perform CESIR-related technical analyses within the specified time intervals. Therefore, when volumes for any of the three SIR steps specified in the timeline exceeds 30 percent of the average weekly volume of the

---

<sup>16</sup> Case 13-E-0140, *Proceeding on Motion of the Commission to Consider Utility Emergency Performance Metrics*, Order Approving the Scorecard for Use by the Commission as a Guidance Document to Access Electric Utility Response to Significant Outages (“Scorecard Order”), (December 23, 2013), p. 2.

previous year, the Joint Utilities propose extending the timelines by an appropriate amount.

- Other events: The current SIR requirements are relatively new; the Joint Utilities have about a year of experience with them. Thus, the Joint Utilities believe there should be an additional category of timeline adjustments for other unanticipated events that are outside of utility control. Under this provision, the utility would have to demonstrate that an event or series of events beyond its control had a corresponding deleterious effect on its ability to meet a deadline.

The timeline adjustments proposed here will require regular tracking of storm events, applicant-driven delays in the interconnection process, application volumes, and the identification of other events outside of utility control impacting timeline performance. This information will be included as part of each utility's monthly SIR Inventory Report<sup>17</sup> and annual EAM reports. The Joint Utilities look forward to working with Staff to develop and refine appropriate procedures for tracking, reporting, and verifying such events.

Finally, the Joint Utilities propose that each utility periodically report average results<sup>18</sup> for each of the three timeline requirements. While this data is not required to determine a utility's survey earnings opportunity under the timeliness threshold, the data would provide the Commission, Staff, DG developers, and other stakeholders with baseline information indicating the extent to which each of the utilities are, on average, achieving the SIR threshold requirements. Such information could also be used to help identify utility improvement opportunities and to establish baseline performance should the Commission decide to establish a timeliness IEAM earnings opportunity in the future.

#### **IV. The IEAM Survey Instrument**

The IEAM Order, as noted above, contained nine findings related to the survey instrument and the IEAM incentive structure, the first three of which would be addressed in

---

<sup>17</sup>SIR Proceeding, Queue Management Order, Attachment C, p. 29.

<sup>18</sup> Average results would show the arithmetic mean number of business days that applications are in each measured step of the SIR. For example, if applications moved through a 10-business day SIR step in an average of 9.0 days, the utility's average performance would be 110 percent.

utility rate cases or regulatory filings and as such are not the subject of this filing. The last six determinations are addressed in this section.

#### A. Final Survey Questions

The Commission required that the revised list of survey questions be based on field and cognitive testing results as well as experience in the recent Con Edison Rate Case Proceeding (Section II, item 7 above). The existing questionnaire for energized projects, which covers all interconnection steps, is provided in Attachment 1, the proposed mid-point questionnaire is provided in Attachment 2, and the proposed completion questionnaire is provided in Attachment 3. The questions in the attachments differ from those provided as part of the Initial IEAM Proposal in several respects: three questions were added, one question was deleted, and 23 questions received minor enhancements. Those changes resulted from the cognitive testing process that ICF conducted in October 2016 as well as from stakeholder input. Cognitive testing is a survey design technique that examines underlying comprehension and retrieval processes among the survey respondent population to identify survey changes that can increase response rates and data quality.

ICF also conducted a field test of the questionnaire in accordance with the Initial IEAM Proposal. That field test was conducted between February and April 2017 and involved administering the full survey for 25 interconnection applications above 50 kW and up to 5 MW in capacity that were submitted and energized under the current SIR. The field test showed excellent understanding of the questionnaire by respondents, and no further changes to the existing questionnaire were warranted. For that reason, the field test results are eligible to be included in setting utility-specific baselines.

It is also important to note that the Commission's determination that there should be a survey at two points within the interconnection process will not have an impact on the questions

in the existing questionnaire because the interconnection process itself remains unchanged.<sup>19</sup> The Joint Utilities also note that, consistent with the IEAM Order, the questionnaires contain a core set of questions that are applicable to all utilities and are the basis for the earnings opportunity. Consistent with industry standards and survey best practices, the Joint Utilities are providing these core questions to Staff today by means of a filing with the Records Access Officer.

#### B. Mid-point and Completion Surveys

The Commission requires the survey to be administered to SIR applicants at two points in time: the mid-point survey upon applicant's receipt of the utility preliminary review and the completion survey upon energization of the project. The Joint Utilities note that the completion of the preliminary review should include the preliminary results meeting with the utility if one occurs. The Joint Utilities are prepared to implement the mid-point survey by August 2017. As described further below, an early launch yields more baseline data and information to inform the utilities' interconnection process improvement efforts.

Consistent with the IEAM Order, the Joint Utilities propose to conduct the mid-point survey after the applicant has received the preliminary screening and the completion survey once the application is complete and the associated DG project is energized. The existing survey will be phased out after the mid-point and completion surveys begin.

The Commission also required that the Joint Utilities submit to Staff for review a proposal for weighting the mid-point and completion surveys in relation to each other and weighting of individual core questions for metric calculation purposes in each survey (Section II, items 5 and 8 above). The Joint Utilities have discussed these topics with Staff and, consistent

---

<sup>19</sup> Two questions were added to the mid-point questionnaire to capture information on the applicant's intention to proceed with the interconnection process. Such questions were not relevant in the existing questionnaire because it was only administered for completed applications.

with industry standards and best survey practices, the Joint Utilities are providing this information to Staff today by means of a filing with the Records Access Officer.

#### C. Telephone- and Web-Based Surveys

The Commission found that the surveys should also be conducted using a multi-mode approach (with web and telephone options for survey respondents) and required the Joint Utilities to provide a proposal detailing when telephone- versus web-based surveys should be employed. The Joint Utilities propose to implement multi-modal surveys by August 2017. The Joint Utilities will implement a multi-modal approach consisting of an initial emailed invitation to complete the survey, followed by an invitation to non-respondents to complete the same survey by telephone. ICF, on behalf of each of the Joint Utilities, will use this approach for both the mid-point and completion surveys. Each utility will inform applicants of this change in survey modes by letter.<sup>20</sup>

#### D. Baseline and Sample Size

The IEAM Order recognized that obtaining a statistically meaningful sample size to develop survey baseline results and targets for each utility generally poses challenges.<sup>21</sup> Establishing separate mid-point and completion surveys creates the need for two separate baseline results for each utility because the mid-point and completion surveys measure different SIR activities, and the survey results for each utility could differ.

To address this issue, the Joint Utilities propose that each utility will develop two sets of baseline survey results and two sets of targets that reflect the specific survey administered. In establishing IEAM targets, there are at least three important questions to consider. First, how should targets be established prior to collecting a statistically meaningful number of baseline

---

<sup>20</sup> IEAM Proceeding, IEAM Proposal, p. 9.

<sup>21</sup> IEAM Proceeding, IEAM Order, pp. 12-13.

results?<sup>22</sup> Second, once a meaningful number of baseline results are available, how should the IEAM targets be established relative to the baseline results? Finally, as larger numbers of results under the SIR are collected, when should baselines be updated?

Establishing IEAM targets prior to the availability of a statistically meaningful number of baseline results is currently a common issue for each of the Joint Utilities, and it is unclear when a meaningful number of results can be obtained for each utility. Nevertheless, the question of establishing IEAM targets in the absence of such results will be addressed in collaborative processes involving recent rate case or regulatory filings by National Grid, NYSEG and RG&E, and O&R, as well as the upcoming rate case filing by Central Hudson. Finally, the Con Edison Rate Case Order already has specific provisions requiring parties to reconvene in 2017 and 2018 to consider survey results and targets.<sup>23</sup> Thus, the targets will be developed in specific proceedings for each of the Joint Utilities.

Establishing targets once a statistically meaningful number of baseline results<sup>24</sup> is available is also a challenge. Even though baseline results based on statistically meaningful numbers will more accurately predict the true satisfaction level of customers (and form a better basis for judging future improvement or deterioration in customer satisfaction) than earlier baselines, the spread of satisfaction scores can complicate target setting. If baseline scores vary widely along the 0-10 scale used for many questions, that will place a wide range of scores within the baseline's 95 percent statistical confidence interval.<sup>25</sup> In turn, that means that utilities

---

<sup>22</sup> A statistically meaningful number depends on both the number of responses and the number of applications in the eligible population.

<sup>23</sup> Con Edison Rate Case Proceeding, Con Edison Rate Case Order, Attachment A, pp. 84-86.

<sup>24</sup> Utilities may update their baseline results periodically as more survey results are obtained to increase the predictive accuracy of the baseline data. The concept of periodically-updated (or "rolling") baselines is a valid survey research practice in this context. If and how utilities will be updating their baselines will be identified in their individual filings.

<sup>25</sup> A 95 percent confidence interval means that, if repeated samples were taken, the actual results will fall within the identified interval range in 95 percent of those samples.

may establish valid targets at or above the average baseline levels, but those targets may still be well below the upper range of the 95 percent confidence level.<sup>26</sup>

#### E. Surveys of Other Projects

The Commission encouraged the Joint Utilities to survey projects at or below 50 kW and above 5 MW for informational purposes (Section II, item 9 above). Implementation of this suggestion will require development of new survey questions because the interconnection process and requirements for projects at or below 50 kW and above 5 MW differ from the SIR for projects above 50 kW and up to 5 MW. The Joint Utilities propose to focus initially on developing a statistically significant sample of survey results for the IEAM eligible projects and will subsequently explore the development of new surveys for smaller and larger applications that do not fall under Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) jurisdiction.

#### V. **Withdrawn or Abandoned Applications**

The Joint Utilities envision a closeout process under which utilities will contact SIR applicants to explore the reasons for the withdrawal or abandonment of an application. This will involve the use of a brief closeout survey to identify the major contributing factors leading to the withdrawal or abandonment of the application from a list of possible business reasons that was vetted through a public stakeholder process.<sup>27</sup> The utility will then compile and review the results of the closeout survey. The resultant data will be reported to Staff on an annual basis and will break out results by application submission date to illustrate possible effects of the Queue

---

<sup>26</sup> For baselines established with fewer survey results, this issue will likely be more prevalent.

<sup>27</sup> As noted in the Initial IEAM Proposal (pp. 13-14), the contributing reasons for a withdrawn or abandoned application could include: (1) financing difficulties; (2) site control and related contractual issues; (3) construction cost overruns rendering the project uneconomic; (4) insufficient community DG participation; (5) permitting problems; (6) changes in the value of benefits at the proposed location; (7) changes in applicant priorities; (8) utility interconnection queue backlog; (9) the estimated cost of utility system modifications to be borne by applicant; and (10) changes in incentives, laws, or regulations. The Joint Utilities held an IEAM stakeholder meeting on October 17, 2016, at which DG developers validated that this list is comprehensive. Developers also indicated that frequently there is more than one reason for an application to be withdrawn or abandoned. Therefore, the utility closeout survey would be structured to allow multiple reasons for application withdrawal and abandonment to be captured and ranked.

Management Order. This information would also be periodically shared with the DG Ombudsperson Group, the Interconnection Technical Working Group, and the Interconnection Policy Working Group. The analysis and dissemination of this information may help identify process improvements that the Joint Utilities, developers, host customers, the Commission, Staff, New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, local governments, and others could implement.

**VI. Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, the Joint Utilities respectfully request that the Commission approve the Joint Utilities' Modified IEAM Proposal.

Dated: May 8, 2017

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the  
Joint Utilities in this Proceeding:

**CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF  
NEW YORK, INC. and ORANGE AND  
ROCKLAND UTILITIES, INC.**

By: */s/ Susan Vercheak*

Susan Vercheak\*  
Assistant General Counsel  
Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.  
4 Irving Place  
New York, New York 10003  
Tel.: 212-460-4333  
Email: [vercheaks@coned.com](mailto:vercheaks@coned.com)

\* Admitted only in New Jersey

**CENTRAL HUDSON GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION**

By: /s/ *Paul A. Colbert*

Paul A. Colbert,  
Associate General Counsel  
Regulatory Affairs  
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation  
284 South Avenue  
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601  
Tel: (845)486-5831  
[pcolbert@cenhud.com](mailto:pcolbert@cenhud.com)

**NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION d/b/a NATIONAL GRID**

By: /s/ *Kristoffer P. Kiefer*

Kristoffer P. Kiefer  
Senior Counsel I  
National Grid  
300 Erie Boulevard West  
Syracuse, New York 13202  
Tel: 315-428-329  
Email: [Kristoffer.Kiefer@nationalgrid.com](mailto:Kristoffer.Kiefer@nationalgrid.com)

**NEW YORK STATE ELECTRIC & GAS CORPORATION and ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION**

By: /s/ *Jeffrey A. Rosenbloom*

Jeffrey A. Rosenbloom  
Deputy General Counsel  
Avangrid Networks  
99 Washington Avenue, Suite 2018  
Albany, New York 12210  
Tel: (585) -724-8132  
Email: [jeffrey.rosenbloom@avangrid.com](mailto:jeffrey.rosenbloom@avangrid.com)

# Attachment 1



Joint Utilities of New  
York (JU) Survey for  
Interconnection Earning  
Adjustment Mechanism  
(IEAM)

Questionnaire –  
**Existing (Energized Project)  
Survey**

May 8, 2017

Submitted to:

Joint Utilities of New York

Submitted by:

ICF Resources, LLC  
9300 Lee Highway  
Fairfax, VA 22031

## Attachment 1: Existing (Energized Project) Survey Questionnaire

### Screening:

(If someone other than the respondent answers or someone does not answer by giving his/her name) Hello, this is (name) calling from ICF on behalf of (Utility). May I please speak with (Name from Sample File)? [INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF RESPONDENT IS UNAVAILABLE, ASK FOR A GOOD TIME TO REACH THE RESPONDENT AND RECORD IN CATI FOR A CALL-BACK.]

(If respondent answers, or when the respondent comes on the line after the call is transferred by a gatekeeper). Hello, this is (name) calling from (Research Firm) on behalf of (Utility). We are conducting a survey to obtain feedback about the interconnection process for (Project Name 1, if more than one project insert up to three projects separated by “and”). You may have received a letter about this survey from (Utility), as this survey is very important in their interconnection process.

SC1. Are you the best person at your organization to answer questions about the interconnection process for (project name), or is there someone else?

01. Yes

02. No → [IF NO, ASK FOR NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THAT PERSON, THANK THE PERSON, TERMINATE THIS CALL, AND THEN CALL THE NEW SUGGESTED RESPONDENT.]

SC2INT. In answering these questions, please think only about the interconnection process for (Project Name), regardless of other projects you may have managed in New York State. Also, you may not know the answers to all of my questions, so just say “don’t know” if that is the case.

[IF ASKED] This interview will take approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete, depending upon your answers.

SC2. Approximately how many interconnection applications of 50 to 5,000 kW have you personally managed with a New York State utility during the past 12 months, including this application?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF RESPONDENT HESITATES, SAY “YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IS FINE”.]

01. Record response \_\_\_\_\_ (Range = 1 to 200)

95. More than 200

97. Don’t know

99. Refused

SC3. (If project is 50 to 300 kW in capacity) And just to confirm, did your project fall under the expedited application process or the standard application process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: If respondents express confusion or uncertainty about either the expedited processes or the standard process, please read the either or both of the following definitions:

- Expedited Process: Fast-paced and simplified application review process based on project size and equipment certification. Systems up to 50 kW are eligible for a simplified or expedited six-

step process. Systems up to 300 kW may be eligible for this provided that the inverter based system is UL 1741 certified and tested

- Standard Process: Regular review process applies to all system larger than 50kW up to 5MW, and projects between 50kW and 300kW that have not been certified and tested according to UL-1741 standards. Applicants must use the basic 11 step process for interconnection as outlined in the NY SIR.]

01. Expedited process

02. Standard process

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### Overall Ratings

O1. Thinking about the entire interconnection process for (PROJECT NAME), how satisfied were you with each of the following? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "very dissatisfied" and 10 means "very satisfied". [If multiple projects: Again, please think only about this project regardless of others you may have completed with this utility or other utilities in New York State.] (ROTATE THE ORDER OF ITEMS B TO G.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

A. (Always ask first in this series) Your overall satisfaction with the interconnection process for this project?

B. Communications from the utility throughout the project, including both in response to what you requested and what the utility provided?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Communications includes all information and communication from the utility, including both what you requested and what the utility provided to you on their own.]

C. The accessibility of utility staff to your organization during the interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Accessibility means to what degree was someone at the utility accessible when you reach out to them with questions and/or issues.]

D. The responsiveness of utility staff in addressing your questions and issues during the interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Responsiveness means the caliber of the responses provided by the utility to questions and/or issues brought to their attention by the developer.]

E. The overall timeliness of responses from the utility during the interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Timeliness means the degree to which a utility provided responses according to the SIR requirements.]

F. The utility's compliance with the official standard interconnection process for this project?

G. Your ability to access the status of your application in the interconnection process for this project?

O2. Overall, how easy was it to understand the interconnection process? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all easy" and 10 means "very easy":

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

O3. (Ask if O2= 0 to 6) What about the interconnection process was difficult to understand?

01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Pre-application Process**

Now I have some questions about the details of the interconnection process. Again, please think only about the application process for (PROJECT NAME).

PA1. Did you request a pre-application report for this project from (Utility)?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't Know

99. Refused

PA2. (If PA1 = Yes (01)) Did you receive your pre-application report from (Utility) within 10 business days from receipt of payment?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't Know

99. Refused

PA3. (If PA1 = Yes (01)) How useful was the feedback you received from the utility on the Pre-application Report? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "Not very useful" and 10 means "Very useful".

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

PA4. (Ask if PA3= 0 to 6) What would have improved the usefulness of the feedback you received?

01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### Application Process

A1. Turning now from the pre-application process to the regular application process, how easy was it to complete the interconnection application for (PROJECT NAME)? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "Not at all easy" and 10 means "Very easy".

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

A2. Did you receive a response to your application from (Utility) within 10 business days? This would have been in addition to an automated response to your submission.

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't Know

99. Refused

A3. Was your application deemed complete and accepted by the utility or were you asked to provide additional information in support of your application?

01. Deemed complete

02. Asked to submit additional information

97. Don't know

99. Refused

A4. (Ask if A3 = Asked to submit additional information (02)) Did you provide the required information to the utility within 30 days?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

A5. How useful was the response you received from the utility about your application? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "Not at all useful" and 10 means "Very useful".

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 No feedback received 97 Don't know 99 Refused

A6. (Ask if A5= 0 to 6) What would have made the response more useful to you?

01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Preliminary Screening Analysis**

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: If respondents express confusion or uncertainty about either the preliminary screening analysis, please read the following summary:

- Preliminary Screening Analysis: An initial review of the generator-owners proposed system capacity, location on the utility system, system characteristics, and general system regulation to determine if the interconnection is viable]

PS1. Did you receive the results from the preliminary screening analysis for (PROJECT NAME) within 15 business days of your completed application?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

PS2. Did your project pass all of the relevant technical screens in the preliminary screening analysis?

01. Yes → Skip to Question C1.

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

PS3. (If PS2 = No (02)) Did you initially decide to proceed to:

01. A preliminary analysis report meeting

02. A supplemental analysis, or → Skip to Question SA1

03. A Full Coordinated Electric System Interconnection Review (CESIR) → Skip to Question SIR1

97. Don't know → Skip to Question C1

99. Refused → Skip to Question C1

## **Preliminary Analysis Results Meeting**

PM1. (IF PS3 = Yes (01)) Did you request a preliminary analysis report meeting with the utility?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question C1
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question C1

PM2. (IF PM1 = Yes (01)) How helpful was the service provided during the preliminary analysis report meeting. Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “not at all helpful” and 10 means “very helpful”.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

PM3. (IF PM1 = Yes (01)) Did the utility identify any upgrades that allowed your project to go directly to the construction process?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question PM5
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question PM5
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question PM5

PM4. (If PM3 = Yes (01)) Did you receive a non-binding cost estimate for these upgrades?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: This cost estimate does not have to be included as part of results meeting. The utility has 15 business days to provide it after the results meeting if the upgrade is agreed to.]

- 01. Yes → Skip to Question C1.
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1.
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

PM5. (IF PM3 = 02, 97, or 99) Did you request a supplemental analysis or did you go straight to the CESIR process?

- 01. Supplemental analysis
- 02. Straight to the CESIR process → Skip to Question SIR1
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question C1
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question C1

## Supplemental Analysis Results Meeting

SA1. (If PS3 = 02 or PM5 = 01) Did the utility complete the supplemental review of your application within 20 business days after receiving your response with the \$2,500 fee?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SA2. (SA1 = Yes (01)) How helpful was the service provided during the supplemental analysis report meeting. Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all helpful" and 10 means "very helpful".

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

SA3. (SA1 = Yes (01)) Were any upgrades required by the utility as a result of the supplemental review of your application?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SA4. (If SA3 = Yes (01)) Did you receive a non-binding cost estimate for these upgrades?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SA5. (If SA4 = Yes (01)) Was the cost estimate:

- 01. About what you expected
- 02. Lower than you expected, or
- 03. Higher than you expected?
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SA6. (If SA1 = Yes (01)) As a result of the supplemental analysis report and/or meeting, did you decide to proceed to a full Coordinated Electric System Interconnection Review (CESIR)?”

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question C1
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question C1

**Full CESIR**

SIR1. (If PS3 = 02 or PM5 = 02 or SA6=01) Did you receive an initial Coordinated Electric System Interconnection Review (CESIR) cost estimate within 5 business days of notifying the utility that you wanted to proceed to the CESIR process?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1
- 97. Don't Know
- 99. Refused

SIR2. (If SIR1 = Yes (01)) How easy was it to complete the detailed interconnection package to allow your application to move forward in the full CESIR process? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not at all easy” and 10 means “Very easy”.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

SIR3. (If SIR1 = Yes (01)) Did you encounter any issues in obtaining approval for the design package required for CESIR review or for CESIR?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SIR4. (IF SIR3 = Yes (01)) What issues did you encounter?

- 01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SIR5. (If SIR1 = Yes (01)) Overall, how satisfied were you with the CESIR process? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “very dissatisfied” and 10 means “very satisfied”:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

SIR6. (IF SIR5 = 0 to 6) Why were you dissatisfied with the CESIR process?

01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_

97. Don't know

99 Refused

### **Construction Approval/Executed Contract**

C1. Did (Utility) require any system upgrades because of your projects?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

C2. Did you receive an executed contract for your project from the utility after completion of the review process, provided no upgrades were identified as a result of the review?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Verification and Cost Reconciliation**

VC1. Did the utility witness the verification test for the interconnection of your project?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

VC2. Were there any deficiencies that had to be corrected as a result of the verification testing?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

VC3. Within 30 days of the formal letter of acceptance for the interconnection, did you receive an invoice for the final reconciliation of project interconnection costs?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 03. Not required
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

VC4. Was the final cost to connect your project within the accuracy level of the estimate, that is, plus or minus 25 percent of the estimate provided within the CESIR results?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

**Process Improvement**

Now I have some general questions about the interconnection process. Again, please think only about the application process for (PROJECT NAME).

P1. Were there any unexpected developments during the application process?

- 01. Yes (RECORD RESPONSE) \_\_\_\_\_
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

P2. Do you have any suggestions to improve the interconnection process?

- 01. Gave response (RECORD) \_\_\_\_\_
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

P3. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about the interconnection process, either specifically about this project or more generally about the (Utility) interconnection process?

- 01. Gave response (RECORD) \_\_\_\_\_
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

### **Benchmarking**

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: The following Benchmarking Questions are intended to help the Joint Utilities understand how the interconnection process in New York compares with that of other states. In answering these questions, please think only about your personal experience, and not about the more general activity of your company.]

B1. Are you personally involved in the interconnection of any distributed generation projects of similar scale (50 to 5,000 kW) in states other than New York?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

B2. (ASK IF B1 = YES) In how many other states are you personally involved in projects?

- \_\_\_\_\_ (RANGE = 01 TO 49)
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

B3. (ASK IF B1 = YES) How would you rate the interconnection process in New York State overall compared with these other states? Would you say that the process in New York State is:

- 01. Better
- 02. Worse, or
- 03. About the same as the process in other states?
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

Those are all the questions I have for you today. Thank you very much for your feedback.

# Attachment 2



Joint Utilities of New  
York (JU) Survey for  
Interconnection Earning  
Adjustment Mechanism  
(IEAM)

Questionnaire –  
**Mid-Point Survey**

May 8, 2017

Submitted to:

Joint Utilities of New York

Submitted by:

ICF Resources, LLC  
9300 Lee Highway  
Fairfax, VA 22031

## Attachment 2: Mid-Point Survey Questionnaire

### Screening:

(If someone other than the respondent answers or someone does not answer by giving his/her name) Hello, this is (name) calling from ICF on behalf of (Utility). May I please speak with (Name from Sample File)? [INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF RESPONDENT IS UNAVAILABLE, ASK FOR A GOOD TIME TO REACH THE RESPONDENT AND RECORD IN CATI FOR A CALL-BACK.]

(If respondent answers, or when the respondent comes on the line after the call is transferred by a gatekeeper). Hello, this is (name) calling from (Research Firm) on behalf of (Utility). We are conducting a survey to obtain feedback about the interconnection process for (Project Name 1, if more than one project insert up to three projects separated by “and”). You may have received a letter about this survey from (Utility), as this survey is very important in their interconnection process.

SC1. Are you the best person at your organization to answer questions about the interconnection process for (project name), or is there someone else?

01. Yes

02. No → [IF NO, ASK FOR NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THAT PERSON, THANK THE PERSON, TERMINATE THIS CALL, AND THEN CALL THE NEW SUGGESTED RESPONDENT.]

In answering these questions, please think only about the interconnection process for (Project Name), regardless of other projects you may have managed in New York State. Also, you may not know the answers to all of my questions, so just say “don’t know” if that is the case. We realize that the interconnection process for this project is not yet complete, but we want to want to obtain your feedback about the process through the preliminary analysis portion of the interconnection process.

[IF ASKED] This interview will take approximately 10-12 minutes to complete, depending upon your answers.

SC2. Approximately how many interconnection applications of 50 to 5,000 kW have you personally managed with a New York State utility during the past 12 months, including this application?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF RESPONDENT HESITATES, SAY “YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IS FINE”.]

01. Record response\_\_\_\_\_ (Range = 1 to 200)

95. More than 200

97. Don’t know

99. Refused

SC3. (If project is 50 to 300 kW in capacity) And just to confirm, did your project fall under the expedited application process or the standard application process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: If respondents express confusion or uncertainty about either the expedited processes or the standard process, please read the either or both of the following definitions:

- Expedited Process: Fast-paced and simplified application review process based on project size and equipment certification. Systems up to 50 kW are eligible for a simplified or expedited six-step process. Systems up to 300 kW may be eligible for this provided that the inverter based system is UL 1741 certified and tested
- Standard Process: Regular review process applies to all system larger than 50kW up to 5MW, and projects between 50kW and 300kW that have not been certified and tested according to UL-1741 standards. Applicants must use the basic 11 step process for interconnection as outlined in the NY SIR.]

01. Expedited process

02. Standard process

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### Overall Ratings

O1. Thinking about the interconnection process through the preliminary analysis portion (PROJECT NAME), how satisfied were you with each of the following. Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "very dissatisfied" and 10 means "very satisfied". [If multiple projects: Again, please think only about this project regardless of others you may have completed with this utility or other utilities in New York State.] (ROTATE THE ORDER OF ITEMS B TO G.)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

A. (Always ask first in this series.) Your overall satisfaction with the interconnection process for this project?

B. Communications from the utility throughout the project, including both in response to what you requested and what the utility provided?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Communications includes all information and communication from the utility, including both what you requested and what the utility provided to you on their own.]

C. The accessibility of utility staff to your organization during the interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Accessibility means to what degree was someone at the utility accessible when you reach out to them with questions and/or issues.]

D. The responsiveness of utility staff in addressing your questions and issues during the interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Responsiveness means the caliber of the responses provided by the utility to questions and/or issues brought to their attention by the developer.]

E. The overall timeliness of responses from the utility during the interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Timeliness means the degree to which a utility provided responses according to the SIR requirements.]

F. The utility's compliance with the official standard interconnection process for this project?

G. Your ability to access the status of your application in the interconnection process for this project?

O2. Overall, how easy was it to understand the interconnection process through the preliminary analysis portion? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all easy" and 10 means "very easy":

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

O3. (Ask if O2= 0 to 6) What about the interconnection process was difficult to understand?

01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Pre-application Process**

Now I have some questions about the details of the interconnection process. Again, please think only about the application process through the preliminary analysis portion for (PROJECT NAME).

PA1. Did you request a pre-application report for this project from (Utility)?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't Know

99. Refused

PA2. (If PA1 = Yes (01)) Did you receive your pre-application report from (Utility) within 10 business days from receipt of payment?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't Know

99. Refused

PA3. (If PA1 = Yes (01)) How useful was the feedback you received from the utility on the Pre-application Report? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not very useful” and 10 means “Very useful”.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

PA4. (Ask if PA3 = 0 to 6) What would have improved the usefulness of the feedback you received?

01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Application Process**

A1. Turning now from the pre-application process to the regular application process, how easy was it to complete the interconnection application for (PROJECT NAME)? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “Not at all easy” and 10 means “Very easy”.

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

A2. Did you receive a response to your application from (Utility) within 10 business days? This would have been in addition to an automated response to your submission.

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't Know

99. Refused

A3. Was your application deemed complete and accepted by the utility or were you asked to provide additional information in support of your application?

01. Deemed complete

02. Asked to submit additional information

97. Don't know

99. Refused

A4. (Ask if A3 = Asked to submit additional information (02)) Did you provide the required information to the utility within 30 days?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

A5. How useful was the response you received from the utility about your application? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "Not at all useful" and 10 means "Very useful".

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 No feedback received 97 Don't know 99 Refused

A6. (Ask if A5 = 0 to 6) What would have made the response more useful to you?

- 01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

### **Preliminary Screening Analysis**

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: If respondents express confusion or uncertainty about either the preliminary screening analysis, please read the following summary:

- Preliminary Screening Analysis: An initial review of the generator-owners proposed system capacity, location on the utility system, system characteristics, and general system regulation to determine if the interconnection is viable.]

PS1. Did you receive the results from the preliminary screening analysis for (PROJECT NAME) within 15 business days of your completed application?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

PS2. Did your project pass all of the relevant technical screens in the preliminary screening analysis?

- 01. Yes → Skip to Question I1.
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

PS3. (If PS2 = No (02)) Did you initially decide to proceed to:

- 01. A preliminary analysis report meeting
- 02. A supplemental analysis, or → Skip to Question I1
- 03. A Full Coordinated Electric System Interconnection Review (CESIR) → Skip to Question I1
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question I1
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question I1

### **Preliminary Analysis Results Meeting**

PM1. (IF PS3 = Yes (01)) Did you request a preliminary analysis report meeting with the utility?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question I1
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question I1
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question I1

PM2. (IF PM1 = Yes (01)) How helpful was the service provided during the preliminary analysis report meeting. Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all helpful" and 10 means "very helpful".

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

PM3. (IF PM1 = Yes (01)) Did the utility identify any upgrades that allowed your project to go directly to the construction process?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question PM5
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question PM5
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question PM5

PM4. (If PM3 = Yes (01)) Did you receive a non-binding cost estimate for these upgrades?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: This cost estimate does not have to be included as part of results meeting. The utility has 15 business days to provide it after the results meeting if the upgrade is agreed to.]

01. Yes → Skip to Question I1.

02. No → Skip to Question I1.

97. Don't know

99. Refused

PM5. (IF PM3 = 2, 97, or 99) Did you request a supplemental analysis or did you go straight to the CESIR process?

01. Supplemental analysis

02. Straight to the CESIR process

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Intention to Proceed with the Interconnection Process for this Project**

I1. (Ask ALL) Do you intend to proceed with the interconnection process for this project?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

I2. (IF I1 =02) Why aren't you planning to proceed with the interconnection process for this project?  
(RECORD RESPONSE)

### **Benchmarking**

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: The following Benchmarking Questions are intended to help the Joint Utilities understand how the interconnection process in New York compares with that of other states. In answering these questions, please think only about your personal experience, and not about the more general activity of your company].

B1. Are you personally involved in the interconnection of any distributed generation projects of similar scale (50 to 5,000 kW) in states other than New York?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

B2. (ASK IF B1 = YES) In how many other states are you personally involved in projects?

\_\_\_\_\_ (RANGE = 01 TO 49)

- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

B3. (ASK IF B1 = YES) How would you rate the interconnection process in New York State overall compared with these other states? Would you say that the process in New York State is:

- 01. Better
- 02. Worse, or
- 03. About the same as the process in other states?
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

Those are all the questions I have for you today. Thank you very much for your feedback.

# Attachment 3



Joint Utilities of New  
York (JU) Survey for  
Interconnection Earning  
Adjustment Mechanism  
(IEAM)

Questionnaire –  
**Completion Survey**

May 8, 2017

Submitted to:

Joint Utilities of New York

Submitted by:

ICF Resources, LLC  
9300 Lee Highway  
Fairfax, VA 22031

## Attachment 3: Completion Survey Questionnaire

### Screening:

(If someone other than the respondent answers or someone does not answer by giving his/her name) Hello, this is (name) calling from ICF on behalf of (Utility). May I please speak with (Name from Sample File)? [INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF RESPONDENT IS UNAVAILABLE, ASK FOR A GOOD TIME TO REACH THE RESPONDENT AND RECORD IN CATI FOR A CALL-BACK.]

(If respondent answers, or when the respondent comes on the line after the call is transferred by a gatekeeper). Hello, this is (name) calling from (Research Firm) on behalf of (Utility). We are conducting a survey to obtain feedback about the interconnection process for (Project Name 1, if more than one project insert up to three projects separated by “and”). You may have received a letter about this survey from (Utility), as this survey is very important in their interconnection process.

SC1. Are you the best person at your organization to answer questions about the interconnection process for (project name), or is there someone else?

01. Yes

02. No → [IF NO, ASK FOR NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION FOR THAT PERSON, THANK THE PERSON, TERMINATE THIS CALL, AND THEN CALL THE NEW SUGGESTED RESPONDENT.]

In answering these questions, please think only about the interconnection process for (Project Name), regardless of other projects you may have managed in New York State. Also, you may not know the answers to all of my questions, so just say “don’t know” if that is the case. We realize that may you have completed an earlier survey about the interconnection process for this project, but we want to obtain your feedback about the process since that time.

[IF ASKED] This interview will take approximately 10 to 12 minutes to complete, depending upon your answers.

SC2. Approximately how many interconnection applications of 50 to 5,000 kW have you personally managed with a New York State utility during the past 12 months, including this application?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: IF RESPONDENT HESITATES, SAY “YOUR BEST ESTIMATE IS FINE”.]

01. Record response \_\_\_\_\_ (Range = 1 to 200)

95. More than 200

97. Don’t know

99. Refused

SC3. (If project is 50 to 300 kW in capacity) And just to confirm, did your project fall under the expedited application process or the standard application process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: If respondents express confusion or uncertainty about either the expedited processes or the standard process, please read the either or both of the following definitions:

- Expedited Process: Fast-paced and simplified application review process based on project size and equipment certification. Systems up to 50 kW are eligible for a simplified or expedited six-step process. Systems up to 300 kW may be eligible for this provided that the inverter based system is UL 1741 certified and tested
- Standard Process: Regular review process applies to all system larger than 50kW up to 5MW, and projects between 50kW and 300kW that have not been certified and tested according to UL-1741 standards. Applicants must use the basic 11 step process for interconnection as outlined in the NY SIR.]

- 01. Expedited process
- 02. Standard process
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

### Overall Ratings

O1. Thinking about the ENTIRE interconnection process for (PROJECT NAME), how satisfied were you with each of the following. Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means “very dissatisfied” and 10 means “very satisfied”. [If multiple projects: Again, please think only about this project regardless of others you may have completed with this utility or other utilities in New York State.] (ROTATE THE ORDER OF ITEMS B TO G)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

A. (Always ask first in this series) Your overall satisfaction with the ENTIRE interconnection process for this project?

B. Communications from the utility throughout the ENTIRE project, including both in response to what you requested and what the utility provided?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Communications includes all information and communication from the utility, including both what you requested and what the utility provided to you on their own.]

C. The accessibility of utility staff to your organization during the ENTIRE interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Accessibility means to what degree was someone at the utility accessible when you reach out to them with questions and/or issues.]

D. The responsiveness of utility staff in addressing your questions and issues during the ENTIRE interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Responsiveness means the caliber of the responses provided by the utility to questions and/or issues brought to their attention by the developer.]

E. The overall timeliness of responses from the utility during the ENTIRE interconnection process for this project?

[INTERVIEWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: Timeliness means the degree to which a utility provided responses according to the SIR requirements.]

F. The utility's compliance with the official standard interconnection process for this project?

G. Your ability to access the status of your application in the interconnection process for this project?

O2. Overall, how easy was it to understand the interconnection process? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all easy" and 10 means "very easy":

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

O3. (Ask if O2 = 0 to 6) What about the interconnection process was difficult to understand?

01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Preliminary Analysis Results Meeting**

PM1. (ASK ALL) Let's now turn to the specifics of the interconnection process. After the preliminary screening analysis, did you:

01. Request a preliminary analysis report meeting with the utility

02. Proceed to supplemental analysis → Skip to Question SA1

03. Proceed straight to the CESIR process → Skip to Question SIR1

97. Don't know → Skip to Question C1

99. Refused → Skip to Question C1

PM2. (IF PM1 = Yes (01)) How helpful was the service provided during the preliminary analysis report meeting. Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all helpful" and 10 means "very helpful".

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

PM3. (IF PM1 = Yes (01)) Did the utility identify any upgrades that allowed your project to go directly to the construction process?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question PM5
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question PM5
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question PM5

PM4. (If PM3 = Yes (01)) Did you receive a non-binding cost estimate for these upgrades?

[INTERVEIWER NOTE, READ AS NECESSARY: This cost estimate does not have to be included as part of results meeting. The utility has 15 business days to provide it after the results meeting if the upgrade is agreed to.]

- 01. Yes → Skip to Question C1.
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1.
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

PM5. (IF PM3 = 02, 97, or 99) Did you request a supplemental analysis or did you go straight to the CESIR process?

- 01. Supplemental analysis
- 02. Straight to the CESIR process → Skip to Question SIR1
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question C1
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question C1

### **Supplemental Analysis Results Meeting**

SA1. (If PM1 = 02 or PM5 = 01) Did the utility complete the supplemental review of your application within 20 business days after receiving your response with the \$2,500 fee?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SA2. (SA1 = Yes (01)) How helpful was the service provided during the supplemental analysis report meeting. Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "not at all helpful" and 10 means "very helpful".

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

SA3. (SA1 = Yes (01)) Were any upgrades required by the utility as a result of the supplemental review of your application?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SA4. (If SA3 = Yes (01)) Did you receive a non-binding cost estimate for these upgrades?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SA5. (If SA4 = Yes (01)) Was the cost estimate:

- 01. About what you expected
- 02. Lower than you expected, or
- 03. Higher than you expected?
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SA6. (If SA1 = Yes (01)) As a result of the supplemental analysis report and/or meeting, did you decide to proceed to a full Coordinated Electric System Interconnection Review (CESIR)?"

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1
- 97. Don't know → Skip to Question C1
- 99. Refused → Skip to Question C1

**Full CESIR**

SIR1. (If PM1 = 03 or PM5 = 02 or SA6 = 01) Did you receive an initial Coordinated Electric System Interconnection Review (CESIR) cost estimate within 5 business days of notifying the utility that you wanted to proceed to the CESIR process?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No → Skip to Question C1
- 97. Don't Know
- 99. Refused

SIR2. (If SIR1 = Yes (01)) How easy was it to complete the detailed interconnection package to allow your application to move forward in the full CESIR process? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "Not at all easy" and 10 means "Very easy".

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

SIR3. (If SIR1 = Yes (01)) Did you encounter any issues in obtaining approval for the design package required for CESIR review or for CESIR?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SIR4. (IF SIR3 = Yes (01)) What issues did you encounter?

- 01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

SIR5. (If SIR1 = Yes (01)) Overall, how satisfied were you with the CESIR process? Please use a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 means "very dissatisfied" and 10 means "very satisfied":

- 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 NA 97 Don't know 99 Refused

SIR6. (IF SIR5 = 0 to 6) Why were you dissatisfied with the CESIR process?

01. Record Response \_\_\_\_\_

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Construction Approval/Executed Contract**

C1. Did (Utility) require any system upgrades because of your projects?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

C2. Did you receive an executed contract for your project from the utility after completion of the review process, provided no upgrades were identified as a result of the review?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

### **Verification and Cost Reconciliation**

VC1. Did the utility witness the verification test for the interconnection of your project?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

VC2. Were there any deficiencies that had to be corrected as a result of the verification testing?

01. Yes

02. No

97. Don't know

99. Refused

VC3. Within 30 days of the formal letter of acceptance for the interconnection, did you receive an invoice for the final reconciliation of project interconnection costs?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 03. Not required
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

VC4. Was the final cost to connect your project within the accuracy level of the estimate, that is, plus or minus 25 percent of the estimate provided within the CESIR results?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

### **Process Improvement**

Now I have some general questions about the ENTIRE interconnection process. Again, please think only about the application process for (PROJECT NAME).

P1. Were there any unexpected developments during the application process?

- 01. Yes (RECORD RESPONSE) \_\_\_\_\_
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

P2. Do you have any suggestions to improve the interconnection process?

- 01. Gave response (RECORD) \_\_\_\_\_
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

P3. Is there anything else that you would like to tell me about the interconnection process, either specifically about this project or more generally about the (Utility) interconnection process?

- 01. Gave response (RECORD) \_\_\_\_\_
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

### **Benchmarking**

[INTERVIEWER NOTE: The following Benchmarking Questions are intended to help the Joint Utilities understand how the interconnection process in New York compares with that of other states. In answering these questions, please think only about your personal experience, and not about the more general activity of your company].

B1. Are you personally involved in the interconnection of any distributed generation projects of similar scale (50 to 5,000 kW) in states other than New York?

- 01. Yes
- 02. No
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

B2. (ASK IF B1 = YES) In how many other states are you personally involved in projects?

- \_\_\_\_\_ (RANGE = 01 TO 49)
- 97. Don't know
  - 99. Refused

B3. (ASK IF B1 = YES) How would you rate the interconnection process in New York State overall compared with these other states? Would you say that the process in New York State is:

- 01. Better
- 02. Worse, or
- 03. About the same as the process in other states?
- 97. Don't know
- 99. Refused

Those are all the questions I have for you today. Thank you very much for your feedback.