1	Q.	Are you the same A. Richard Walje who submitted direct and rebuttal
2		testimony in the revenue requirement portion of this proceeding on behalf of
3		PacifiCorp dba Rocky Mountain Power ("the Company")?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?
6	А.	My rebuttal testimony introduces the Company rebuttal witnesses that support the
7		Company's revised request to recover \$4.65 monthly through a facilities charge
8		from residential customers using the net metering rate with their photovoltaic
9		("PV") distributed generation.
10	Q.	What areas will be covered by Company witnesses?
11	А.	Ms. Joelle R. Steward will present information supporting the \$4.65 per month
12		facilities charge to recover some of the costs net metering customers no longer pay
13		for their use of the local distribution network and customer services. Mr. Douglas
14		Marx will describe the impacts that distributed PV generation has on the
15		distribution network and that the contribution from PV generation to meet the
16		Company's daily summer peak load serving requirement is negligible. Finally, Mr.
17		Gregory N. Duvall will show that the value of net metering PV solar energy should
18		not be valued higher than the value given to Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act
19		("PURPA") qualifying facility solar projects under the approved avoided cost
20		methodology in place in Utah.

21 Q. Why has the requested amount of the net metering facility charge changed?

A. The amount increased from the \$4.25 in the Company's initial filing due to the
lower residential customer charge of \$6.00 agreed to by parties in the settlement,

Page 1 – Rebuttal Testimony of A. Richard Walje

which is \$2.00 less than the customer charge the Company recommended in its direct case. This is consistent with the direct testimony of Ms. Steward in which she indicated this amount would increase if the residential customer charge decreased.

Q. Will the Company collect additional revenues from the \$4.65 per month net
 metering facility charge, and therefore make a larger profit?

- A. No. As explained in Ms. Steward's testimony the charge is revenue neutral to the
 Company. The charge is also revenue neutral within the residential class. Therefore
 the Company does not additionally profit from the charge.
- 33 Q. Why is a net metering facility charge necessary?
- 34 A. As presented by Ms. Steward, the charge is meant to recover some of the 35 distribution system and customer service costs that do not go away when a customer 36 installs distributed generation. Because of how the current net metering tariff 37 works, net metering customers pay less for their use of the distribution system and 38 customer services than they did before they installed distributed generation. In 39 essence, that portion of those distribution system and customer service costs that 40 are not paid for by net metering customers still exist for the Company and are 41 therefore recovered from non-net metering residential customers.
- 42 Q. Are there other methods to establish a facilities charge or a different net
 43 metering tariff that would be better than the one currently used in Utah?
- 44 A. Yes, Ms. Steward's testimony describes an alternative way to determine a facilities
 45 charge based on the capacity of the PV solar installation. She also describes how a
 46 rate structure with three parts is a better design for residential partial requirements

Page 2 – Rebuttal Testimony of A. Richard Walje

47 customers with distributed generation.

48 Q. Some parties in this rate case have presented information supporting a "value
49 of solar" above the costs and benefits typically considered in a general rate
50 case. How do you respond?

A. Mr. Duvall's testimony shows that the range of credits net metering customers
receive for their PV generation is well above the value of PV solar determined in
the Qualifying Facilities docket. And that this value is applicable to distributed solar
generation provided by net metering customers.

Some say because of the minimal number of Utah customers currently taking advantage of net metering rates and the number of issues described in the net metering testimony filed by all parties, the Commission should not grant the Company's request for a facilities charge and should address the request in a future docket. How do you respond?

A. I believe the Company's witnesses have made an irrefutable case that net metering
rates, as currently structured, do not adequately recover costs from net metering
customers for their use of the distribution network and customers services
compared to what other residential customers pay. There are no compelling reasons
not to address this specific situation now.

65 Net metering has become a particular concern in the western United States 66 where, based on Solar Electric Power Association data, approximately 70 percent 67 of the rooftop systems in the United States are located. The passionate debates on 68 these issues affect tens of thousands of net metering customers. The Company 69 wants to arrive at solutions before the issues reach the magnitude of those being

Page 3 – Rebuttal Testimony of A. Richard Walje

70 experienced in other areas.

Q. Because of the Company's position in this case, it is being accused of being anti-renewable energy, anti-solar, and anti-net metering. How do you respond?

74 I disagree with these contentions for the following reasons. We have the second A. 75 largest portfolio of owned wind generation by a rate regulated utility in the country. 76 We developed one of the first geothermal plants outside of California. Our Blue 77 Sky tariff is one of the oldest and best, as recognized by federal agencies, for its 78 support of renewable energy and has funded over 100 community renewable energy 79 projects. Over 30,000 Utah customers voluntarily participate in Blue Sky. We 80 recently announced a plan to build a solar project that would be available to all 81 customers through the Blue Sky program. Our holding company is developing 82 several of the largest photovoltaic projects in the world and we will be delighted to 83 introduce that expertise into Utah when it is economically feasible. As far as net 84 metering goes, we want a rate structure that will assure that those using the system 85 pay a fair amount for that use and that we have adequate understanding of the 86 impacts on the distribution system, and funding, to assure we can effectively 87 connect more distributed generation to the grid.

88

Q. Please summarize the Company's testimony regarding net metering.

A. The Company's proposed net metering facilities charge is meant to assure that all
customers equitably pay for their use of the distribution system and for customer
services. Ms. Steward's testimony shows that a \$4.65 monthly net metering
facilities charge is a fair amount and near the amount net metering customers

Page 4 – Rebuttal Testimony of A. Richard Walje

previously paid for using the distribution system before they installed their
generation. Though many other issues and approaches to determining distributed
generation costs and benefits can continue to be debated, the Company believes
implementing this facilities charge now is a good first step in that process.

- 97 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?
- 98 A. Yes.