

DOCKET NO. UM 1911
EXHIBIT: ODOE/100
WITNESS: ROBERT DELMAR

**Before the
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON**

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Opening Testimony of Robert DelMar

March 16, 2018

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ORGANIZATION.**

2 A. My name is Rob DelMar. I am a Senior Policy Analyst for the Planning and
3 Innovation Division within the Oregon Department of Energy (“ODOE”),
4 working out of the field office in Bend, Oregon with particular expertise in
5 solar energy. I am testifying on behalf of ODOE.

6 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR QUALIFICATIONS.**

7 A. I have a degree in Architectural Engineering from Drexel University and
8 have worked in the solar energy industry for 18 years. I started my
9 career in the private sector as a design engineer and project manager
10 at an engineering firm in New England responsible for the design,
11 construction and monitoring of commercial and residential solar
12 thermal and photovoltaic energy (“PV”) systems. I worked at ODOE
13 from 2007 to 2011 as an operations analyst and policy analyst, and at
14 Energy Trust of Oregon from 2011 to 2013 as a senior project
15 manager in the solar program. In 2013 I returned to ODOE, working
16 as a senior policy analyst responsible for technical and policy support
17 for solar technologies.

18 **Q. PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR TESTIMONY.**

19 A. **Introduction**

20
21 ODOE’s testimony is divided into comments addressed to all three utilities – with
22 recommendations for future improvements to resource value of solar (“RVOS”)
23 calculations and suggestions for future investigations by the stakeholders
24 concerned with the RVOS process – and comments specifically addressed to

1 Idaho Power Company. The general comments are offered in ODOE's testimony
2 in each of the proceedings for UM 1910, UM 1911, and UM 1912, while the utility-
3 specific comments are included only in the respective proceeding.

4 5 **General Comments on RVOS Calculations**

6 ODOE would like to acknowledge the hard work completed by PGE, Pacific Power,
7 and Idaho Power in developing the initial RVOS calculations. It is clear in their UM
8 1910, 1911, and 1912 filings that considerable effort was made to develop the
9 RVOS values and the accompanying testimony. ODOE is committed to seeing
10 accurate and comprehensive RVOS values that undergo regular analysis and
11 revision as described in UM 1716 and by the individual utility filings. The process
12 of analysis and revision will ensure the RVOS maintains accuracy under future
13 market scenarios including higher solar saturation, which may impact hourly
14 pricing scenarios, as well as technology developments that may minimize
15 integration challenges and increase the value of solar on the grid. In the absence
16 of an ancillary services market, the RVOS may also provide market signals that
17 promote the development of solar projects that use innovative technologies to
18 support grid operations.

19 20 **Integration Costs and Grid Service Value**

21 ODOE looks forward to participating in future efforts to quantify the grid services
22 element of the RVOS. ODOE staff is engaged in a number of activities that may
23 support this effort, including interactions with utility and community partners

1 regarding resiliency planning and development of technical workshops regarding
2 battery storage systems. For example, ODOE is a co-sponsor of a resiliency
3 demonstration pilot at Eugene Water & Electric Board (“EWEB”) that will deploy
4 solar PV and battery storage to provide multiple benefits to EWEB customers and
5 grid services for the utility.

6

7 In the Public Utility Commission of Oregon’s (“PUC”) order 17-357, an invitation is
8 extended to Renewable Northwest or other parties to develop a proposal for
9 valuing smart inverters. ODOE would like to offer support to the PUC and other
10 RVOS partners in exploring grid service values and recommends that the
11 discussion also include storage systems and other potential technology advances.

12 Below are a few examples of how advanced technologies may impact RVOS
13 values:

14

15 Smart Inverters: Modify start-up and drop-off characteristics of PV facilities. May
16 impact integration charges. Opportunities also exist to operate the inverters to
17 provide reactive power, including during periods without any solar production.

18 Storage systems: Storage systems may modify the production profile of PV
19 facilities, which would impact energy, capacity, and deferred transmission and
20 distribution (“T&D”) maintenance values. Storage systems may also be operated
21 to provide additional ancillary and load arbitrage services to the grid.

22 Solar Trackers: Tracking systems modify the production profile of PV facilities,
23 which would impact energy, capacity, and deferred T&D maintenance values.

1

2 One outcome of this investigation should be to determine how the benefits of
3 advanced technologies are distributed within the RVOS. One possibility would be
4 to identify the additional value advanced technologies bring to each discreet
5 element within the RVOS. Another option would be to group all of the benefits into
6 a bonus value, which may or may not be the grid services element already
7 identified but currently set at zero. There may be value in identifying a market-
8 based bonus associated with advanced technologies to help facilitate their
9 adoption. There are, however, complications such as how location-specific
10 benefits should be considered and what to do when advanced technologies
11 become common practice. These complications should be considered but not
12 necessarily resolved until future RVOS proceedings.

13

14 Advanced technologies may also impact the negative value of integration costs.
15 The integration charges are developed through utility integrated resource plan
16 (“IRP”) using variable integration value assessments based on acknowledged
17 integration studies. For the purposes of the RVOS, it may be helpful to evaluate
18 the integration charge with the aim of identifying opportunities to reduce the cost
19 through strategic technology adoption.

20

21 **Administration Costs**

22 There is considerable discrepancy between the projected administrative costs
23 presented in the Idaho Power Company’s Compliance Filing Regarding the

1 Resource Value of Solar¹ for “standard sized systems” compared to those
2 presented by PGE and PacifiCorp. As it currently stands, the cost of
3 administration almost completely negates the value of solar to the system for Idaho
4 Power. While Idaho Power justifies the rate based on actual experience in the
5 2016 Pilot Volumetric Incentive Rebate (“VIR”) program, the company and
6 commission should consider strategies to reevaluate or mitigate these costs. One
7 consideration should be the relative size of the community solar program
8 compared to the VIR program. While Idaho Power is likely to have a smaller
9 community solar program in Oregon than PGE and PacifiCorp, Idaho Power’s
10 community solar program is still likely to be much larger than its allocation under
11 the VIR program, which was less than 0.5MW. As such, a similar administrative
12 effort could be spread over more capacity and therefore reduce the unit cost of
13 administration.

14
15 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

16 A. Yes.

1

<http://apps.puc.state.or.us/edockets/edocs.asp?FileType=HAA&FileName=haa131832.pdf&DocketID=21120&numSequence=1>