

**-BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH-**

---

)  
)  
**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF** )                   **DOCKET NO. 20-035-04**  
**ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER FOR AUTHORITY TO** )                   **Exhibit No. DPU 4.0 R**  
    **INCREASE ITS RETAIL ELECTRIC UTILITY** )  
    **SERVICE RATES IN UTAH AND FOR APPROVAL** )  
    **OF ITS PROPOSED ELECTRIC SERVICE** )  
    **SCHEDULES AND ELECTRIC SERVICE** )  
    **REGULATIONS.** )  
)

---

FOR THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
STATE OF UTAH

Rebuttal Testimony of

ROBERT A. DAVIS

October 5, 2020

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	1
III. RECOMMENDATION	2
IV. UTAH CLEAN ENERGY'S PROPOSALS	3
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	6

## I. INTRODUCTION

**2 Q: Please state your name and occupation.**

3 A: My name is Robert A. Davis. I am employed as a Utility Technical Consultant at the  
4 Utah Department of Commerce-Division of Public Utilities (“Division”).

**5 Q:** Are you the same Robert A. Davis who filed direct testimony in this matter.

6 A: Yes.

## **II. PURPOSE OF DIRECT TESTIMONY**

8 Q: **What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony in the Phase I revenue requirement  
9 of this proceeding?**

10 A: My rebuttal testimony offers the Division’s conclusions and recommendations in  
11 response to Utah Clean Energy’s (“UCE”) witness Sarah Wright’s proposal to open a  
12 docket for the proposed Subscriber Solar Program (“Program”) and proposal to offer  
13 subscriber solar blocks to low income customers.

14 Q: Can you offer a brief summary of the Division's conclusions?

15 A: Yes. The Division has reviewed the testimony of Office of Consumer (“OCS”) witness  
16 Alyson Anderson and UCE witness Sarah Wright. The Division generally agrees with the  
17 OCS’s observations concerning Rocky Mountain Power’s (“RMP”) Program. Unless  
18 RMP provides the parties with ample evidence of the resource costs and accounting of  
19 the Program, the Division recommends RMP withdraw its proposal and open it as a  
20 stand-alone docket when the resource costs and accounting become available.

21 The Division's review of UCE's testimony raises concerns of potential contradictions  
22 between UCE's proposals and the current and proposed Subscriber Solar Program that  
23 might violate Schedule 73. UCE's proposal to carve out blocks for low income customers  
24 reduces the chance that the Program will be self-supportive and changes the scope of both  
25 programs. I will discuss this concern and others in my testimony below.

26 To the extent that my testimony or the testimony of other Division witnesses fails to  
27 address a particular issue in RMP's Subscriber Solar proposal does not preclude the  
28 Division's acceptance or rejection of that issue. The Division reserves its right to provide  
29 additional comments on the proposed Program or respond to other parties' comments in  
30 future filings or at hearing.

### III. RECOMMENDATION

34 A: The Division finds RMP's solar subscriber proposal reasonable in structure and generally  
35 supports its proposal with the recommendations stated in my direct testimony.<sup>1</sup> However,  
36 unless RMP provides the parties with ample evidence of the resource costs and  
37 accounting of the Program as part of this general rate case docket, it should withdraw its

<sup>1</sup> See Division witness Robert A. Davis, 20-035-04\_RMP GRC Subscriber Solar\_DPU 4.0\_Davis\_DIR\_9-2-20, September 2, 2020. <https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/20docs/2003504/315249PhsIDirTestRobertADavisDPU9-2-2020.pdf>.

38 proposal and open it as a stand-alone docket.

#### 39 IV. UTAH CLEAN ENERGY PROPOSALS

40 **Q:** Please explain the Division's concerns with UCE's proposal.

41 A: The Division appreciates UCE's interest in making renewable energy available to low  
42 income customers. However, the lack of critical cost and accounting information for the  
43 proposed Program makes it difficult to contemplate how UCE's proposal might work.  
44 The concept of carving out blocks for low income customers presents problems and  
45 contradictions within the construct of the proposed and existing Program.

46 **Q:** Does the Division have concerns with setting aside blocks for low income customers?

47 A: Yes. Both programs are constructed to be self-supporting which is necessary for the  
48 programs to be in the public interest. The current program has been fairly successful so  
49 far but not one-hundred percent self-supported, as the OCS appropriately points out in its  
50 direct testimony.<sup>2</sup> RMP openly admits that it expects the uptake of its proposal to be  
51 longer than the current program. The resource cost is a power purchase agreement  
52 ("PPA") with fixed cost for the life of the contract. The energy from the resource that is  
53 not subscribed will be booked to the energy balancing account ("EBA") as a net power  
54 cost and paid by all customers. Carving out blocks for low income customers may have  
55 an impact if those blocks are not subscribed. Additionally, offering blocks to low income

---

<sup>2</sup> See OCS witness Alyson Anderson's Direct Testimony at lines 72-82.

56       customers at a reduced rate will cause pricing issues within the Program and Schedule  
57       73.<sup>3</sup>

58   **Q:** **Does the Division have concerns regarding the pricing of the blocks for low income  
59       customers and cost shifting to other Schedule 73 customers?**

60   A: Yes. Current customers and future customers of the proposed Program pay a premium  
61       and administrative costs to participate in the program which makes the programs self-  
62       supportive. The Division is unclear how low income customers might pay these  
63       premiums if they are not currently able to afford the full cost of normal electrical service  
64       and require assistance through other programs to pay their electric bills. UCE proposes  
65       that other Schedule 73 customers be required to pay a premium on top of their  
66       subscription premiums to help low income customers pay for their subscriptions to keep  
67       the program(s) self-supportive.<sup>4</sup>

68       To the extent that Schedule 73 customers do wish to subsidize low income customer  
69       participation in the program, other alternative options may be available but the Division  
70       opposes additional premiums being added to the solar subscriber subscription purchases.

71   **Q:** **Does the Division support UCE's proposal to dedicate future rounds of subscriber  
72       solar to participation of customers who cannot otherwise access solar energy?**

---

<sup>3</sup> Rocky Mountain Power predicts that both Subscriber Solar programs will eventually merge as customers move from old to new and free up blocks. See Comeau's Direct Testimony at lines 143-146.

<sup>4</sup> See UCE witness Sarah Wright's Direct testimony at lines 133-134.

73 A: At lines 84-88, UCE witness Wright states: *Future rounds of the Subscriber Solar*  
74 *Program should not duplicate opportunities to access solar energy that already exist*  
75 *through other utility programs or tariffs or through general service from the Company.*  
76 *Instead, future rounds of Subscriber Solar should seek to expand participation from*  
77 *categories of customers who cannot otherwise access solar energy.*" The Division does  
78 not understand UCE's proposal or the necessity of the proposal. The Subscriber Solar  
79 program, current and proposed, is designed to provide another opportunity for all eligible  
80 customers to receive their energy needs from renewable resources that cannot otherwise  
81 do so under other programs. The Division is unclear on what group of customers is not  
82 eligible to participate in subscriber solar now that UCE is seeking access for. Therefore,  
83 the Division recommends that UCE's proposal be rejected at this time.

84 Q: **Does the Division agree with UCE witness Sarah Wright's disagreement with**  
85 **RMP's assumption that the cost of solar resources will always be higher than**  
86 **avoided cost?**

87 A: The Division is unclear whether Ms. Wright is referring to the solar resource for the  
88 proposed Program or solar resources in general. Ms. Wright's statement at lines 43-46  
89 "*The Company's proposed Program redesign is premised on the assumption that the cost*  
90 *of solar resources will always be higher than avoided cost, and I do not agree that the*  
91 *purchase of solar energy will necessarily come at a premium in the future.*"

The Division understands that the PPA pricing of the solar resource dedicated to either of the subscriber solar programs will most likely always be higher than similar solar resources used in the calculation of avoided cost. If a solar resource is known to be at or below the avoided cost and capable of being developed, the Division expects that the resource would be pursued as part of the generation system for all customers. Subscriber Solar's purpose is to allow customers to choose incremental additional solar that would not otherwise be part of the normal generation system. As a result, it is expected that in most cases incremental solar not already pursued as least cost generation would therefore be higher than avoided cost.

The solar resources developed for the solar subscriber programs are dedicated systems located within Utah where ample acreage and transmission capacity exists for the facilities. Although, excess generation might be transported to the regional market as available energy and booked as net power costs in the EBA, the primary purpose of the facility is to provide energy to the Program where the costs of the facility are recovered through subscription revenues. These dedicated resources serve a different purpose than the generation supplied by utility owned solar resources or third party qualifying facilities (“QFs”) and priced accordingly. The Division seeks clarification how UCE intends to lower the premium price after the PPA is established for the Program’s resource.

## V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

111   **Q: Will you summarize your analysis and findings for RMP's proposed subscriber**  
112   **solar program and offer your recommendations?**

113   A: Yes. RMP's proposed Subscriber Solar Program mirrors the current subscriber solar  
114   program with the exception of customer billing, including large customers over 100  
115   MWh, and treatment of net power costs in the EBA. The Division has several concerns  
116   regarding how RMP intends to keep the two programs separate or blend the programs,  
117   mitigate customer migration from the original program to the new program, EBA  
118   impacts, and subscription ramp rate.

119           The Division understands that PacifiCorp/RMP plans to retain ownership of the  
120   Renewable Energy Credits ("RECs") and all other environmental attributes including but  
121   not limited to carbon emission reduction credits. PacifiCorp plans to retire those credits  
122   on behalf of subscribers as it does for the current program.

123           If approved, the Division recommends the Commission direct RMP to report annually in  
124   a similar format and concurrently with the current subscriber solar program. The Division  
125   generally supports RMP's proposed Subscriber Solar Program based upon the limited  
126   information it has received to this point. However, unless RMP provides the parties with  
127   ample evidence of the resource costs and accounting of the Program, the Division  
128   recommends RMP withdraw its proposal and open it as a stand-alone docket when the  
129   information becomes available.

130           Specifically, the Division recommends the following:

- 1) Refer to the current program as Solar Subscriber I and the proposed program as  
Solar Subscriber II;

2) Direct RMP to report the progress of the proposed Solar Subscriber II similar to  
and concurrently with the current Solar Subscriber I including administrative, billing,  
and marketing costs, subscribership uptake and costs, tracking and reporting plan, and  
other factors mentioned herein;

3) Direct RMP to provide parties with billing examples for residential and non-  
residential subscriber solar customers under both programs in a timely manner;

4) Direct RMP to provide the parties with a plan to mitigate customer migration from  
Solar Subscriber I to Solar Subscriber II;

5) Direct RMP to make clear how released capacity from Solar Subscriber I will be  
treated and how any unrecovered costs will be treated;

6) Direct RMP to support its proposal with the missing information stated herein for  
the resource; and

7) Direct RMP to demonstrate how program costs will be allocated among ratepayers  
should the program not reach full subscribership within five years of the resource's  
operation date.

148 The Division reserves its rights to make further recommendations as information  
149 becomes available.

150 Q: Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

151 A: Yes, it does.