Comments of Sorenson Engineering Peter J. Richardson OSB # 066687 RICHARDSON & O'LEARY PLLC 515 N. 27th Street PO Box 7218 Boise, Idaho 83700 Telephone: (208) 938-7900 Fax: (208) 938-7904 peter@richardsonandoleary.com

Attorneys for Sorenson Engineering, Inc.

BEFORE THE

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

IN THE MATTER OF RULEMAKING TO ADOPT RULES RELATED TO SMALL GENERATOR INTERCONNECTION

CASE NO. AR 521 FINAL COMMENTS OF SORENSON ENGINEERING, INC.

COMES NOW, Sorenson Engineering, Inc. ("Sorenson") by and through its attorney

of record, Peter J. Richardson, and pursuant to the schedule established by the

Administrative Law Judge in the above captioned matter and hereby lodges its Final

Comments to the Commission Staff's proposed rules and forms.

I INTRODUCTION

Sorenson is an engineering firm with offices in Idaho Falls, Idaho. It is a successful engineer, developer, owner and operator of numerous small power production facilities in the Northwest. Sorenson also provides consulting services to parties which either own small power production facilities in Oregon or are in the planning stages of developing new small power production facilities in Oregon. Currently, in addition to Sorenson's own interest in acquiring or developing small power production facilities in Oregon is

Final Comments of Sorenson Engineering, Inc. 1

formally representing the following entities in this proceeding: Central Oregon Irrigation District, Swalley Irrigation District, Real Energy LLC, and PaxStar Energy.

The following final comments have been prepared with the assistance of John R. Lowe, director of Business Development for Sorenson Engineering. Mr. Lowe has significant experience in the matter of interconnections and interconnection agreements for small power production facilities.

II

SUMMARY OF SORENSON'S COMMENTS

Sorenson and its clients continue to strongly believe, as demonstrated in its November 27, 2007 comments and its June 11, 2008 comments that the costs associated with interconnection are of paramount concern. Any reasonable means by which to reduce interconnection costs to the interconnection customer, provided there are no negative impacts upon safety and reliability, along with ensuring that the public utility costs are fully reimbursable, should be advanced in the rules. Key areas of concern are the operation and maintenance reimbursement for interconnection facilities, the ability of interconnection customers to study, design, construct, own and operate interconnection facilities and equipment, the threshold for telemetry, the application of secondary metering versus primary metering, and the requirement for telephonic access of metering. Sorenson also recognizes that some of its comments related to cost control may be more suitable for addressing by means other than changes to the actual rules. The operation and maintenance reimbursement for interconnection facilities needs to be directly addressed either in the body of the rules or in the form interconnection agreement. Sorenson has requested that the actual verified cost of operation and maintenance of the interconnection facilities by the public utility be considered as the reasonable basis for such costs. The rules as proposed do not provide certainty with regard to this very significant interconnection cost element. In addition Sorenson endorses the Comments filed by the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities with respect to limiting cost recovery to just those costs that are demonstrably reasonable and necessary.

The telemetry requirement threshold of 3MW, while a significant improvement over the traditionally applied threshold of 1MW, still requires demonstration of its appropriateness. Until the basis for any telemetry threshold can be "proved", Sorenson suggests such threshold either be removed or raised to a significantly higher value. Sorenson suggests that the Commission consider a timeline for the public utilities to each provide an evaluation and demonstration of their needs for telemetry.

In reference to PacifiCorp's third set of comments, Sorenson's does agree that with most small generating facilities the requirement for telephonic meter access can be reasonably applied. However, there are a number of cases and conditions in which this requirement is cost prohibitive, i.e. very small remotely located facilities, and other creative means to resolve the access to metering data can be reasonably applied.

SORENSON'S ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

860-082-0020

Pre-Application Process

Sorenson suggests that, provided the interconnection customer is reimbursing the public utility all reasonable costs, the pre-application process include a Scoping Meeting in which limited technical expertise can be made available. One of the stated purposes of the preapplication process is to understand the feasibility, which should include the optional points of interconnection and the magnitude of cost, timing and complexity (i.e. ownership opportunities for interconnection facilities). A significant number of potential small generating facilities will benefit by a more robust pre-application process especially since proceeding with a completed interconnection application may not practical.

860-082-0005

Scope and Applicability

Sorenson suggests that the Commission consider, recognizing a unique circumstance, that small generating facilities that have entered into pre-AR521 vintage interconnection agreements while waiting for the conclusion of this docket but have not yet been interconnected, be afforded right and benefit to convert their interconnection agreements to the AR-521 approved form interconnection agreement within thirty days of its availability.

860-082-0080

Arbitration of Disputes

Sorenson suggests that the Commission consider as an alternative to this section of the rule the California Rule 21 based process presented in the last workshop by Sorenson's client RealEnergy, LLC. This process for dispute resolution has been tested on many occasions by RealEnergy and others and has proven to be a very effective and efficient means to resolve the interconnection parties' differences. One of the distinct advantages of the California Rule 21 procedure is that it allows for an informal process prior to going to the formal complaint stage allowing the parties to often resolve disputes without having to involve the PUC.

Respectfully submitted this 20th day of August, 2008.

RICHARDSON & O'LEARY PLLC

By: /s/ <u>Peter J. Richardson</u> Peter J. Richardson RICHARDSON & O'LEARY, PLLC Attorneys for Sorenson Engineering, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have caused to be served the foregoing FINAL COMMENTS OF SORENSON ENGINEERING, INC., in OPUC Docket No. AR 521 by electronic mail only. Dated this 20th day of August, 2008.

<u>/s/ Nina M. Curtis</u> Nina Curtis Richardson & O'Leary PLLC

SAMUEL R JUSTICE PO BOX 480 MCMINNVILLE OR 97128 sjustice@onlinemac.com	VOLTAIR WIND ELECTRIC ROBERT MIGLIORI 24745 NE MOUNTAIN TOP RD NEWBERG OR 97132 windy@freewirebroadband.com
SUNEDISON RICK GILLIAM 590 REDSTONE DR BROOMFIELD CO 80020 rgilliam@sunedison.com	PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC MARK OSBORN 121 SW SALMON ST PORTLAND OR 97204 mark.osborn@pgn.com
JOE HENRI 5013 ROBERTS AVE STE B MCCLELLAN CA 95652 jhenri@sunedison.com	PATRICK HAGER RATES & REGULATORY AFFAIRS 121 SW SALMON ST 1WTC0702 PORTLAND OR 97204 pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com
COMMUNITY RENEWABLE ENERGY ASSOCIATION PAUL R WOODIN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR 282 LARGENT LN GOLDENDALE WA 98620-3519 pwoodin@communityrenewables.org	OREGON RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE AS SANDRA FLICKER 1750 LIBERTY ST SE SALEM OR 97302-5159 sflicker@oreca.org
DAVISON VAN CLEVE IRION A SANGER ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY 333 SW TAYLOR - STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97204 ias@dvclaw.com	PACIFICORP OREGON DOCKETS (W) OREGON DOCKETS 825 NE MULTNOMAH ST STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97232 oregondockets@pacificorp.com
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE MICHAEL T WEIRICH ASSISTANT ATTORNEY 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4096 michael.weirich@doj.state.or.us	LOVINGER KAUFMANN LLP (W) JEFFREY S LOVINGER 825 NE MULTNOMAH STE 925 PORTLAND OR 97232-2150 lovinger@lklaw.com

Final Comments of Sorenson Engineering, Inc. 6

PACIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL ADV CENTER AUBREY BALDWIN STAFF ATTORNEY/CLINICAL PROFESSOR 10015 SW TERWILLIGER BLVD PORTLAND OR 97219 abaldwin@lclark.edu	PORTLAND OR 97225 jravene@comcast.net
RICHARDSON & O'LEARY PETER J RICHARDSON PO BOX 7218 BOISE ID 83707 peter@richardsonandoleary.com	MCMINNVILLE WATER AND LIGHT (W) GAIL SHAW PO BOX 638 MCMINNVILLE OR 97128 gails@mc-power.com
MIDDLEFORK IRRIGATION DISTRICT CRAIG DEHART PO BOX 291 PARKDALE OR 97041 mfidcraig@embarqmail.com	IDAHO POWER COMPANY(W)PO BOX 70BOISE ID 83707-0070RANDY ALLPHIN rallphin@idahopower.com
CENTRAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE INC ALAN GUGGENHEIM MEMBER SERVICES DIRECTOR PO BOX 846 REDMOND OR 97756 aguggenheim@cec.coop	DAVE ANGELL daveangell@idahopower.com SANDRA D HOLMES sholmes@idahopower.com
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CO J RICHARD GEORGE 121 SW SALMON ST 1WTC1301 PORTLAND OR 97204 richard.george@pgn.com	LISA D NORDSTROM ATTORNEY Inordstrom@idahopower.com MICHAEL YOUNGBLOOD SENIOR PRICING ANALYST myoungblood@idahopower.com
ROUSH HYDRO INC TONI ROUSH 366 E WATER STAYTON OR 97383 tmroush@wvi.com	ENERGY TRUST (W) ALAN COWAN 851 SW SIXTH AVENUE, SUITE 1200 PORTLAND, OR 97204 alan.cowan@energytrust.org
OR DEPT OF ENERGY - RENEWABLE ENE DIV CAREL DEWINKEL SENIOR POLICY ANALYST 625 MARION ST NE SALEM OR 97301-3737 carel.dewinkel@state.or.us	MCDOWELL & RACKNER PC(W)520 SW 6TH AVE STE 830PORTLAND OR 97204WENDY MCINDOOwendy@mcd-law.comLISA F RACKNERATTORNEYlisa@mcd-law.com

TRIAXIS ENGINEERING	PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT (W)
DIANE BROAD	MICHELLE R MISHOE
1600 SW WESTERN BLVD	LEGAL COUNSEL
CORVALLIS OR 97333	825 NE MULTNOMAH STE 1800
dbroad@triaxiseng.com	PORTLAND OR 97232
	michelle.mishoe@pacificorp.com