## Modifications - SIR Amendments

Changes to the SIR:

## X. Modifications

Applicants may propose a Modification at any time by submitting a request to the utility through the utility's on-line application portal and /or via email. Submission of such a request will not suspend any deadlines applicable to the pending application. The utility will review the request to determine whether the proposed Modification is a Material Modification and provide its determination to the applicant within 10 business days, unless the utility first notifies the applicant that additional information is needed to make the evaluation. In that case, the utility will have 10 Business Days from receipt of the additional information to determine whether the proposed Modification is a Material Modification is a Material Modification.

A Material Modification to a project will require a new application, and new queue position, and subsequent removal of the original application if not yet interconnected.

The utility reserves the right to make the final determination as to whether a proposed change is a Material Modification.

When making the materiality determination, the utility will consider the DPS Staff posted guidance on DER Material and Non-material Modifications and will provide the applicant with a written explanation of its finding. At the applicant's request, the utility will meet with the applicant to discuss the materiality determination.

A Modification that is not determined to be <u>Mm</u>aterial may still <u>be</u>-require evaluation and acceptance by the utility through the process described below. The interconnecting customer is obligated to pay any necessary study costs of the evaluation. The utility will notify the interconnecting customer of any additional funding and/or information that may be required to evaluate the Modification within 5 Business Days of providing the materiality determination. The applicant shall have 10 Business Days to provide any requested information and pay the associated fees, or choose to <u>proceed-remain</u> with the original interconnection application <u>with associated uninterrupted timeline</u>.

If the proposed change is not a Material Modification, and is proposed prior to the start of a CESIR, the utility will study the modified project in the CESIR process.

If the change is not a Material Modification, and is proposed following the start of a CESIR but no later than 40 Business Days after the start date, the utility may have an additional <u>240</u> Business Days to complete the CESIR incorporating the change, but shall not exceed 80 Business Days from the start of the study.

Changes proposed at a later date, or after completion of a CESIR, that are not Material Modifications, may require further study and will require mutual agreement between the utility and the applicant. The utility retains the right to determine the extent of evaluation necessary but will endeavor to complete any necessary study within a timeframe no longer than a standard CESIR. The applicant will be responsible **Commented [SG1]:** And withdrawal of old application if it's a project not yet interconnected and applicable (i.e. if they moved POI to another circuit)?

**Commented [CV2]:** DPS is publisher. Who is controller? ITWG? IPWG? Do we need to define? Maybe this could be covered in a header title of the document?

**Commented** [CV3]: Do we need to establish a time frame?

**Commented** [CV4R3]: LG - Not sure you gain anything with this. Timeframe to make determination is there.

**Commented [SG5]:** Ability to remove after 30 business days if no movement on the project (as in current SIR requirements)?

**Commented [CVGR5]:** Standard SIR timeline does not stop. This would be a separate parallel timeline

**Commented [CV7]:** This seems to conflict with the original time frame commitments?

**Commented [CV8R7]:** LG sees this point and will also review.

**Commented [DK9]:** Sir allows for up to 40 business days

**Commented [CV10R9]:** LG - This time frame was negotiated by the parties. Keep in mind this is a non-mm.

Commented [CV11R9]: See Step 6 extension

**Commented [CV12]:** Recommend striking language. No need to frame a backstop for utilities on this as there are already rules in place for time frames.

for any costs related to the change.

Section III Definitions:

**Modification:** A change to the ownership, equipment, equipment ratings, equipment configuration, <u>or</u> operating conditions <u>of the facility described in the application</u>.

Material Modification: <u>A Modification to a Unit that may have adverse impacts on the utility's system</u>, utility customers, other projects, applications in the interconnection queue. <del>A Modification that may have</del> adversewhose study, and/or incorporation of application revisions, adversely impacts on other queued interconnection requests.

Changes to the Standard Contract:

**Modification:** A change to the ownership, equipment, equipment ratings, equipment configuration, <u>or</u> operating conditions <u>of the Unit</u>.

Material Modification: A Modification to a Unit that may have adverse impacts on the utility's system, utility customers, other projects, applications in the interconnection queue., or the scope of proposed system modifications.

**3.1 Modifications to the Unit:** The Interconnection Customer may request a Modification at any time after commencement of parallel operation. The Utility shall evaluate the request and determine whether the proposed change is a Material Modification in accordance with the rules for requesting changes to applications in the SIR. A Material Modification will be studied pursuant to the procedures in the SIR for new applications. In the case of a non-material modification that is accepted by the Utility, the parties will execute an amendment to this Agreement describing the Unit changes that have been approved.

**Commented [CV13]:** How is this applied? In queue, any time?

**Commented [CV14R13]:** Based on the Guide, this definition seems to no longer provide adequate coverage.

**Commented [CV15]:** Is there a reason there are 2 different definitions for "modification" and "material modification?"

**Commented [GE(16]:** Shyam: I went back to an earlier definition proposed by Jeff Lord.

**Commented [CV17]:** What does this mean? This seems out of place for an existing project under contract.

Commented [CV18R17]: LG agreed