

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UM 2024

In the Matter of

ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY
CONSUMERS,

Petition for Investigation Into Long-Term
Direct Access Programs.

STIPULATED MOTION TO
ADOPT PHASING PROPOSAL AND
PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

Expedited Consideration Requested

Following the December 12, 2019 Commission workshop in this proceeding, the parties to this docket have continued to discuss the issues list and phasing proposals in order to allow for Commission resolution of the issues subject to this investigation. The parties have come to agreement on an issues list and phasing proposal, which is included as Attachment A to this motion. The parties have also agreed to the following Phase I schedule:

EVENT	DATE
All-Party Opening Comments	March 16, 2020
All-Party Closing Comments	April 6, 2020
Commission Workshop	TBD

Accordingly, pursuant to OAR 860-001-0420(2) and OAR 860-001-0420(6), Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (Staff) moves that the above procedural schedule be adopted for Phase 1, as well as the parties' stipulated issues list and phasing proposal included in Attachment A. Staff has conferred with all parties to this proceeding and no party objects to this

///

///

///

///

///


///

///

1 motion. In light of the Prehearing Conference currently schedule for February 21, 2020, Staff
2 respectfully requests expedited treatment of this motion.

3 DATED this 18th day of February, 2020.

4 Respectfully submitted,
5 ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
6 Attorney General

7 
8 _____
9 Sommer Moser, OSB # 105260
10 Assistant Attorney General
11 Of Attorneys for Staff of the Public Utility
12 Commission of Oregon
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

UM 2024 – Parties’ Issues List and Phasing Proposal

Phase 1: non-contested case phase

- Two rounds of simultaneous comments on each party’s perspective on the policy and background issues raised in Questions 1 and 6 from the agreed issues list, including:
 - What are the potential benefits and potential costs to customers from long-term direct access participation?
 - what are the potential cost shifts?
 - How are other states handling customer choice and access to wholesale markets for different customer classes (with a focus on other WECC states, per Commissioner Tawney’s request)?
 - Issues including:
 - provider of last resort obligations
 - price disclosure
 - data disclosure
 - general enforcement authority
 - pricing of departing load
 - market design and alignment with customer choice
 - oversight, compliance and reliability responsibilities
 - capacity and reliability
 - What has worked well and what hasn’t?
 - How can these findings be applied to Oregon, including consideration of the fact that Oregon’s direct access market is limited to non-residential customers?
 - Resource adequacy
 - what is it?
 - how is it provided?
 - what regulatory requirements or market structures are used in other states with direct access to ensure resource adequacy?
 - why is it important or not important?
 - issues that may/should be considered in the contested case phase
- Commission workshop following comments
- Potential settlement conference to narrow the issues, if possible.

Phase 2: contested case phase – legal briefing

- Two rounds of simultaneous legal briefing on applicable legal requirements and Commission authority on legal issues related to direct access, including:
 - the meaning of “unwarranted” in ORS 757.607(1) and the Commission’s discretion to interpret this term;
 - the Commission’s oversight authority over electricity service suppliers and/or direct access customers, including its ability, if any, to impose resource adequacy requirements on ESSs or otherwise ensure that all direct access customers are obtaining a Commission-established level of resource adequacy service from either the incumbent utility or an ESS;
 - the Commission’s authority over provider of last resort obligations;
 - the Commission’s role in ensuring a competitive market place, including whether the direct access statute requires the Commission to allow customers to choose from whom to purchase resource adequacy/capacity services;
 - the legal requirements applicable to utilities in planning for load and resource adequacy; and

UM 2024 – Parties’ Issues List and Phasing Proposal

- the Commission’s authority to approve rates for resource adequacy provided by utilities.
- Commission order, if necessary, to resolve any disagreements among the parties with respect to the legal issues raised in this phase.

Phase 3: contested case phase – testimony

- workshop/settlement conference prior to testimony to incorporate Commission order
- Three rounds of simultaneous opening and rebuttal testimony on the following:
 - Regarding potential benefits and costs of direct access programs:
 - How should long-term direct access programs be structured to maximize these potential benefits?
 - How should long-term direct access programs be structured to minimize or eliminate these potential costs?
 - What cost shifts occur when load departs a utility?
 - What constitutes “unwarranted” cost-shifting?
 - Are PGE’s and PacifiCorp’s current long-term direct access programs structured in a way that avoids unwarranted cost-shifting? Topics may include:
 - transition adjustments and the potential for capacity credits or capacity charges
 - consumer opt-out charge
 - resource intermittency
 - freed up RECs
 - legislative mandates (state and federal) and the bypassability of costs
 - load growth
 - return-to-cost-of-service restrictions
 - resource adequacy
 - if not, how should these programs be structured to avoid unwarranted cost-shifting?
 - What limits, if any, should be placed on the ability of a customer to participate in a long-term direct access program? Including:
 - caps
 - notice requirements
 - election windows
 - return notice
 - energization notice/timing
 - customer size requirements
 - How should load serving entities plan in the short and long-term for direct access and all jurisdictional load to ensure resource adequacy?
 - Are current rules, regulations and other programs recognizing the current state of wholesale power markets while preserving and protecting those markets?
 - Commission’s role in removing barriers to a competitive marketplace.
- Settlement conferences after each round of testimony
- Hearing
- Simultaneous opening and closing briefs on issues raised in the contested phase, and incorporating policy issues raised in phase 1.

UM 2024 – Parties’ Issues List and Phasing Proposal

Phase 4: rulemakings or other additional proceedings necessary to effectuate the Commission’s decision(s).