

From: Allen, Meredith  
Sent: 2/3/2014 9:07:39 PM  
To: Edward F. Randolph (edward.randolph@cpuc.ca.gov)  
(edward.randolph@cpuc.ca.gov); Sterkel, Merideth Molly  
(MeridethMolly.Sterkel@cpuc.ca.gov); Borak, Mary Jo  
(maryjo.borak@cpuc.ca.gov) (maryjo.borak@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc: Redacted  
Bcc:  
Subject: Timing Concern on Sun Edison Interconnection Project NOC

Ed, Molly, Mary Jo,

I know Laura sent an email on Samsung earlier and I am sorry to add another request to the list but we also have a timing issue with an NOC for work to connect a 20 MW Sun Edison solar project. The NOC was protested by Randell Parker on behalf of Kern County Advocates for Agriculture in October of last year. We replied to the protest on 10/30/13. As indicated in our response, which is attached, the protest does not set forth valid grounds for contesting an NOC. Mr. Parker is protesting the solar project and not the PG&E work.

The solar project has an in service date of 3/10 and we need 3 weeks to complete the construction. We currently have clearances for February and if the work is delayed, it will be very challenging to get clearances again until the Fall given drought impacts and increased load demands, which could push the in-service date to November.

When our attorney checked in on timing, the response she received is that this NOC would need to be addressed by CPUC resolution rather than an Executive Director letter, as allowed by GO 131-D. I know that the last time Mr. Parker protested a project, the decision was made to resolve by CPUC resolution, but unfortunately, waiting for the March meeting for a resolution will jeopardize the in service date. In order to meet, we would need an Executive Director letter by next week.

Would you please let me know whether this approach can be taken for this NOC? Please let me know if you need more information or would like to discuss.

Thanks,

Meredith