

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UM 1610

In the Matter of

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF
OREGON,

Investigation into Qualifying Facility
Contracting and Pricing.

RULING

DISPOSITION: OBJECTIONS DISMISSED AS MOOT; MOTION FOR
CLARIFICATION GRANTED

Objections to Approval of Idaho Power's Compliance Filing

On May 28, 2014, the Commission issued Order No. 14-181, adopting Commission Staff's recommendation to investigate the Schedule 85 compliance filing made by Idaho Power Company. Staff recommended that the Commission decline Idaho Power's request for the proposed revisions in its compliance filing of April 25, 2014 arguing that Idaho Power's filing requires additional time for review and analysis by Staff and docket parties.

On May 19, and May 21, 2014, respectively, the Community Renewable Energy Association (CREA) and Renewable Energy Coalition (REC) filed objections to approval of Idaho Power's compliance filing, requesting that the compliance filing be held in abeyance pending approval of Idaho Power's Integrated Resource Plan. Because the Commission has now opened an investigation into Idaho Power's filing, I dismiss CREA's and REC's requests as moot.

Motion for Clarification

On April 24, 2014, Obsidian Renewables LLC (Obsidian) moved to clarify how the Capacity Adder described in Staff's testimony in this docket would be applied to renewable solar QF resources.¹ Also on April 24, 2014, OneEnergy Inc. and CREA jointly filed a motion for clarification supporting Obsidian's motion.² OneEnergy and CREA concur with Obsidian's motion requesting clarification of Staff's methodology for adjusting rates to reflect a solar QF's capacity contribution.

¹ See Obsidian Motion for Clarification at 1, citing Staff/103, Bless/2-3.

² OneEnergy's and CREA's filing also included an application for reconsideration on a separate matter. The application for reconsideration will be addressed separately, and is not resolved in this ruling.

On May 9, 2014, Staff filed a response to the requests for clarification. Staff agreed with the concerns raised by Obsidian, CREA, and OneEnergy regarding the application of Staff's methodology to renewable solar QF resources, but stated it would not be possible to find an appropriate solution to the issue without further input from stakeholders. As a result, Staff requested that the Commission allow parties to address the issue in the investigations currently open to address the utilities' recent compliance filings.³

The request for clarification of Staff's methodology for adjusting rates to reflect a solar QF's capacity contribution is granted. The parties should address the methodology applicable to renewable solar QF resources, raised by Obsidian's motion for reconsideration, in the investigations currently taking place for Pacific Power's and Idaho Power's compliance filings in this docket.

Dated this 10th day of June, 2014, at Salem, Oregon.



Shani Pines

Administrative Law Judge

³ See Order No. 14-148 (Apr 30, 2014) (adopting Staff's recommendation to investigate Pacific Power's Schedule 85 compliance filing); Order No. 14-181 (May 28, 2014) (adopting Staff's recommendation to investigate Idaho Power's Schedule 85 compliance filing).