1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON		
2	UM 1610 – PHASE IIA		
3	In the Matter of		
4	PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF	JOINT MOTION TO CLOSE PHASE IIA	
5	OREGON Investigation into Qualifying Facility		
6	Contracting and Pricing.		
7	I. INTRODUCTION		
8	In accordance with OAR 860-001-0420, Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon		
9	(Staff), Idaho Power Company (Idaho Power), Portland General Electric Company (PGE), PacifiCorp		
10	dba Pacific Power (PacifiCorp), the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE), Gardner Capital Solar		
11	Development (Gardner Capital), the Renewable Energy Coalition (REC), and Renewable Northwest		
12	(collectively, the Joint Parties) submit this joint motion requesting that the Public Utility Commission		
13	of Oregon (Commission) close Phase IIA of docket UM 1610, which was opened to address the		
14	treatment of solar integration costs in utility avoided cost prices, and instead allow utility specific solar		
15	integration dockets. The Joint Parties represent every party that participated in the Phase IIA		
16	prehearing conference, except Obsidian Renewables (Obsidian). Obsidian's position is that the		
17	Commission can only approve a solar integration charge through rulemaking.		
18	After much discussion regarding the scope of Phase IIA, and at the request of Staff and the non-		
19	utility parties, the Joint Parties have concluded that they will be unable to meaningfully examine solar		
20	integration costs in the generic, non-utility-specific manner contemplated by the Commission when it		
	opened Phase IIA. As discussed below, the Joint Parties agree that an investigation into solar		
21	integration costs should be based on a utility-spe	ecific filing. Therefore, the Joint Parties request that in	
22	addition to closing Phase IIA of docket UM 1610, the Commission address Idaho Power's pending		
23	request for approval of a solar integration charge in an Idaho Power-specific case, as discussed below.		
24		est is contrary to the Commission's clearly articulated	
25	preference, the Joint Parties believe that their recommended approach will result in both administrative		
26	protoronoo, the sound ratifies believe that their for	commended approach will result in both administrative	
Page 1	- JOINT MOTIONTO CLOSE PHASE IIA	L .	

SSA/mme/6775970

Department of Justice 1162 Court Street NE Salem, OR 97301-4096 (503) 947-4520 / Fax: (503) 378-3784 1

efficiency and allow Staff and intervenors a reasonable opportunity to examine solar integration

2 charges.

3

II. BACKGROUND

On April 24, 2015, Idaho Power filed an application requesting approval of a solar integration
charge to be incorporated into avoided cost prices, along with Idaho Power's solar integration study and
supporting testimony. Idaho Power's filing was docketed as UM 1725.

7 On June 23, 2015, the Commission issued Order No. 15-199 in docket UM 1725, which directed

8 the parties to address the level of solar integration charges to incorporate into avoided cost prices in the

9 ongoing generic PURPA investigation, docket UM 1610.¹ Idaho Power sought clarification of this

10 aspect of Order No. 15-199 to determine whether Idaho Power's individual filing would be deferred or

11 delayed pending the outcome of docket UM 1610. In Order No. 15-230, the Commission denied Idaho

12 Power's request

13The issues presented by Idaho Power's application for approval of a
solar integration charge should be addressed in a general investigation
docket, rather than treated as an Idaho Power-specific issue or a subset
of issues. To accomplish this, we direct the Administrative Hearings
Division to open a Phase IIA in docket UM 1610 to address, on an
expedited basis, whether the impact of solar QF projects on electric
utilities' avoided costs warrants the imposition of a solar integration
charge and, if so, how such a charge should be calculated.²

Thus, the Commission directed the parties to address two questions in Phase IIA of this docket:

18 19

20

(1) Whether the impact of solar QF projects on electric utilities' avoided costs warrants the imposition of a solar integration charge?

- (2) If so, how such a charge should be calculated?
- 21 ///
- 22
- 23

Page 2 - JOINT MOTIONTO CLOSE PHASE IIA SSA/mme/6775970

 ²⁴ ¹ Re Idaho Power Co. Application to Lower Standard Contract Eligibility Cap and to Reduce the Standard Contract Term, for Approval of Solar Integration Charge, and for Change in Resource
 ²⁵ Sufficiency Determination, Docket No. UM 1725, Order No. 15-199 at 7 (June 23, 2015).

 ² Re Idaho Power Co. Application to Lower Standard Contract Eligibility Cap and to Reduce the Standard Contract Term, for Approval of Solar Integration Charge, and for Change in Resource Sufficiency Determination, Docket No. UM 1725, Order No. 15-230 at 4 (Aug. 6, 2015).

1

III. DISCUSSION

2 On September 2, 2015, the Joint Parties participated in a prehearing conference in Phase IIA of 3 docket UM 1610. In addition to adopting a procedural schedule, Administrative Law Judge Sarah 4 Rowe also invited the parties to discuss the scope of Phase IIA.

5 The Joint Parties held discussions for nearly an hour, focusing much of their attention on defining 6 the proper scope for Phase IIA. During those discussions, Staff and the non-utility intervenors 7 indicated that it would be difficult to answer the Commission's questions in the abstract, as opposed to 8 responding to a completed solar integration study, including proposed charges.³ Similarly, the Joint 9 Parties agree that it would be extremely difficult to develop broad, universally applicable principles or 10 standards for solar integration charges without extensive reference to a utility study. Given that Idaho 11 Power is the only utility that has completed a solar integration study, Staff and intervenors contend that 12 the Idaho Power-specific study would need to serve as the centerpiece of the generic Phase IIA 13 investigation. Thus, the Joint Parties realize that the desired generic investigation would, as a practical 14 matter, become a utility-specific proceeding based on Idaho Power's study.

Moreover, the Joint Parties are in general agreement that the methodology used by Idaho Power is specific to its system and the Joint Parties recognize that Idaho Power's methodology will not necessarily work for PacifiCorp and PGE. Just as each utility's wind integration study is specifically tailored to each utility's system, so too each utility's solar integration studies will be specifically tailored to its system. Therefore, the Joint Parties agree that a generic investigation focusing on Idaho Power' study could have limited applicability when PacifiCorp and PGE conduct their own studies.

The Joint Parties recognize that the Commission was clear that it wished to address solar integration in a generic proceeding. After much discussion, however, the Joint Parties ask the Commission to reconsider its prior decision and allow Idaho Power's solar integration application to proceed on a utility-specific basis. Idaho Power is nearing completion of its second solar integration

25

³ The Joint Parties discussion centered on the second question, after largely agreeing that is reasonable to account for solar integration costs to the extent the utilities can demonstrate the costs are material.

Page 3 - JOINT MOTIONTO CLOSE PHASE IIA SSA/mme/6775970

1	study, which is expected to be completed by the end of the year. Once this study is complete, the Joint
2	Parties ask the Commission to allow Idaho Power to file the study, either as part of docket UM 1725 or
3	as a stand-alone filing, and recommend that the Commission allow Idaho Power's proposal to move
4	forward on a stand-alone basis.
5	When PacifiCorp and PGE have conducted their own integration studies, they can present those
6	studies to the Commission to demonstrate that solar penetration on their respective systems warrant an
7	integration charge.
8	IV. CONCLUSION
9	The Joint Parties request that the Commission close Phase IIA of docket UM 1610 and allow
10	Idaho Power's request for a solar integration charge to proceed on a utility-specific basis.
11	Respectfully submitted this day of September, 2015.
12	Respectfully submitted,
13	
14	ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
15	Attorney General
16	Milke tor)
17	Stephanie S. Andrus, #925123 Senior Assistant Attorney General
18	Of Attorneys for Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
Page 4	- JOINT MOTIONTO CLOSE PHASE IIA

SSA/mme/6775970

Department of Justice 1162 Court Street NE Salem, OR 97301-4096 、 (503) 947-4520 / Fax: (503) 378-3784