

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA


In the Matter of the Complaint by Juhl
Energy LLC against NorthWestern
Corporation dba NorthWestern Energy for
Establishing a Purchase Power Agreement

Docket EL16-021

PREFILED RESPONSE TESTIMONY OF BLEAU J. LAFAVE
ON BEHALF OF NORTHWESTERN ENERGY

Table of Contents

<u>Description</u>	<u>Starting Page No.</u>
Witness Information	3
Purpose of Proceeding	4
Purpose of Testimony	4
Juhl's Avoided Cost Rate	5
Introduction of Witnesses	10
NorthWestern's Avoided Cost Rate	10
NorthWestern's Energy Avoided Cost Rate	11
NorthWestern's Capacity Avoided Cost Rate	15
Juhl Projects Incremental Costs	17
NorthWestern's Total Avoided Cost Rate	19
Roger Schiffman Testimony Rebuttal	20
Contract Terms	25
<u>Exhibits</u>	
Exhibit B JL-001	12



1	Exhibit BJL-002	20
2	Exhibit BJL-003	22
3	Exhibit BJL-004	16

Witness Information

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Q. Please state your name and business address for the record.

A. My name is Bleau J. LaFave. My business address is 3010 West 69th Street, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57108.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what position?

A. Currently, I am Director of Long Term Resources. My responsibilities include overseeing the long-term supply growth strategies for NorthWestern, including large project development, acquisitions, optimization, and planning for the electric and natural gas portfolios.

Q. Please describe your education and business experience and business credentials.

A. I earned a Bachelor of Science in mechanical engineering from the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology in 1994. After I completed my degree, NorthWestern Public Service employed me as a project engineer. Working for NorthWestern, I have held several positions, including operations engineer, Huron area engineer, Aberdeen area engineer, maintenance process leader, support services process leader, corporate procurement manager, director of utility services, director of large project development, director of South Dakota and Nebraska supply planning and development, director of long-term growth, and vice president of operations for NorthWestern Services Corporation. During this period, I served in many operations and administration functions with a focus on operations management, procurement, logistics, contracts, fleet, facilities, utility engineering, measurement, and customer service.

I began my current position in 2011, focusing on long-term growth in supply for Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska and large project development and acquisitions.

1 **Purpose of Proceeding**

2 **Q. Please explain the purpose of this proceeding.**

3 A. This proceeding was initiated by Juhl Energy, Inc. ("Juhl") for purposes of
4 establishing the terms of three purchase power agreements ("PPAs") with
5 NorthWestern. Juhl asserts that it has certified three proposed wind projects
6 ("Projects") as qualifying facilities ("QF") under the Public Utility Regulatory Policy
7 Act of 1978 ("PURPA"), and is entitled to contracts under which it will sell electric
8 energy and capacity from the three proposed wind farms totaling approximately
9 60 megawatts ("MW") at NorthWestern's avoided costs of energy and capacity.
10 Although there are numerous provisions to which the parties must agree for such
11 a contract, the controlling provision is likely the determination of NorthWestern's
12 avoided cost, as that calculation has a significant impact on the financial viability
13 of the proposed project.

14
15 **Q. Has Juhl proposed contract terms?**

16 A. Yes. Juhl and NorthWestern continue to work through the negotiations of the
17 PPAs. In his Prefiled Direct Testimony, Corey Juhl stated, "I expect that Juhl will
18 reach a final agreement on the specific contract language soon, and I do not
19 anticipate that the non-rate terms will prevent an agreement at this juncture."
20 NorthWestern agrees. However, if Juhl and NorthWestern are unable to come to
21 an agreement on the terms and conditions of the PPAs, the open items will need
22 to be addressed in this docket.

23
24 **Purpose of Testimony**

25 **Q. What is the purpose of your prepared direct testimony?**

26 A. The purpose of my testimony is to sponsor and explain NorthWestern's position
27 regarding the necessary and correct contract terms for PPAs with Juhl for its
28 proposed three wind farms that will generate 60 MW of wind energy and will be
29 constructed as QFs under PURPA. My testimony first addresses the required
30 price terms to make the PPAs compliant with PURPA. Second, I rebut the

1 testimony of Juhl's witness, Roger Schiffman, regarding his estimation of
2 NorthWestern's avoided costs and Juhl's assertion that it has established a
3 legally enforceable obligation ("LEO"). Lastly, I address the non-price terms
4 necessary to create a viable unconditional offer by Juhl, which by binding itself to
5 sell, imposes an LEO to purchase on NorthWestern in a manner which will not
6 harm the economic interests of NorthWestern's customers. If necessary, I will
7 file testimony regarding the non-price terms separately.

8 Specifically, in this testimony, I provide:

- 9 • the framework for the federal and state regulatory requirements for
10 qualifying facilities;
- 11 • introduce NorthWestern's witnesses;
- 12 • an overview of NorthWestern's estimated avoided capacity costs
- 13 • rebut avoided costs calculations made by Mr. Schiffman;
- 14 • discuss the customer impact of the differences between NorthWestern's
15 actual avoided costs and Juhl's demand; and,
- 16 • discuss PPA terms that are unresolved in our discussions with Juhl.

17 18 Juhl's Avoided Cost Rate

19 **Framework**

20 **Q: What is the source of the requirements for a utility concerning a qualifying**
21 **facility requesting to provide energy and capacity?**

22 **A:** South Dakota utilities have requirements under the United States Code, 16
23 U.S.C. § 824(a)-3; Section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of
24 1978 ("PURPA"), 18 C.F.R. pt. 292; Docket No. RM79-55, Order No. 69; and the
25 1982 South Dakota Public Utilities Commission Order F-3365.

26
27 **Q: Please describe generally PURPA.**

28 **A:** Congress passed PURPA in response to the Arab oil embargo in 1973 and 1974.
29 The goal of PURPA was to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and to promote
30 efficient production and use of energy. PURPA was a broad act with many

1 provisions. In this proceeding, we are concerned with only one section of
2 PURPA, Section 210. Section 210 requires the Federal Energy Regulatory
3 Commission ("FERC") to adopt rules that impose a purchase obligation on
4 utilities and prohibits FERC from adopting any rule that provides for a rate that
5 exceeds the incremental cost to the utility for alternative energy. Generally
6 speaking, Section 210, which is codified as 16 U.S.C. § 824(a)-3, has two
7 primary pillars. First, it requires utilities to purchase electric energy from QFs.
8 Second, it requires that the price paid by the utility be set so that the utility's
9 customers are indifferent to the source of their electric energy. These twin pillars
10 are the "purchase obligation" and "consumer indifference" standards.

11
12 **Q: Has FERC adopted rules regarding Section 210 of PURPA?**

13 **A: Yes.** Referring to 16 U.S.C. § 824a-3(a), FERC's cogeneration and small power
14 production rule, provides, in part:

15 [T]he Commission shall prescribe, and from time to time thereafter
16 revise, such rules as it determines necessary to encourage
17 cogeneration and small power production, and to encourage
18 geothermal small power production facilities of not more than 80
19 megawatts capacity, which rules require electric utilities to offer
20 to . . . (2) purchase electric energy from such facilities. . . .

21 Additionally, 16 U.S.C. § 824a-3(b), establishes criteria to be used regarding the
22 rates for purchases by electric utilities:

23 The rules prescribed under subsection (a) of this section shall
24 insure that, in requiring any electric utility to offer to purchase
25 electric energy from any qualifying cogeneration facility or qualifying
26 small power production facility, the rates for such purchase—

27 (1) shall be just and reasonable to the electric consumers of the
28 electric utility and in the public interest, and

1 (2) shall not discriminate against qualifying co-generators or
2 qualifying small power producers.

3 No such rule prescribed under subsection (a) of this section shall
4 provide for a rate which exceeds the incremental cost to the electric
5 utility of alternative electric energy. (emphasis added)

6 The assumption underlying a utility's purchase obligation provision was that QFs
7 would be able to produce electric energy at a lower cost than the utility.
8 However, to protect against the possibility that QFs could not produce at a lower
9 cost, the consumer indifference provision was included. It is important to note
10 that the costs that a utility can actually avoid by purchasing the QF's output
11 determine the price paid to QFs. The QFs costs are not material to determining
12 a utility's avoided cost. Nothing in PURPA requires that utilities pay QFs a rate
13 that makes them financially viable or allows them to obtain financing. Nor is there
14 any provision in PURPA that permits QFs to dictate contract terms contract to the
15 utility.

16
17 **Q: What are the requirements for a utility concerning a qualifying facility**
18 **requesting to provide energy and capacity under PURPA?**

19 **A:** Under PURPA, utilities have the obligation to purchase from QFs in accordance
20 with 18 C.F.R. § 292.304, unless exempted by §§ 292.309 and 292.310, any
21 energy or capacity made available by a QF. The purchasing rate must be just
22 and reasonable to the electric consumers of the electric utility and in the public
23 interest. The rate must not discriminate against QFs.

24
25 PURPA requires that any electric utility pay no more than the utility's avoided
26 costs for purchases.

27
28 **Q: Has NorthWestern sought an exemption under 18 C.F.R. §§ 292.309 and**
292.310 under PURPA for the Projects?

1 A: No. NorthWestern filed for relief from PURPA's mandatory purchase obligation
2 on October 4, 2016. Although NorthWestern believes that the Juhl Projects
3 would have the same access to the markets as any other generator within the
4 SPP footprint, FERC's rebuttable presumption under PURPA does not include
5 QFs with a nameplate capacity of 20 MW or less. NorthWestern has not sought
6 an exemption applicable to these proposed Projects.

7
8 **Q: Has the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission ("SDPUC") adopted any**
9 **rules or orders concerning requirements for QFs?**

10 A: Yes, Order F-3365.

11
12 **Q: What are the requirements for a utility concerning a qualifying facility**
13 **requesting to provide energy and capacity under 1982 South Dakota Public**
14 **Utilities Commission Order F-3365?**

15 A: Under Order F-3365, the SDPUC found that rates for purchases from QFs with a
16 design capacity of more than 100 kW should be set by contact negotiations
17 between the QF and the electric utility. The SDPUC would act as a dispute
18 arbitrator between the parties in accordance with this rule and PURPA
19 requirements if agreement between the parties cannot be reached.

20
21 The SDPUC ruled that a contract term of fewer than 10 years is a short-term
22 contract and more than 10 years is a long-term contract. Additionally, the SDPUC
23 determined the basis for short-term and long-term capacity avoided cost.

24
25 According to Order F-3365, the SDPUC held that both short-term and long-term
26 contracts should include an overall energy credit based on the average of the
27 expected hourly incremental avoided costs calculated over the appropriate on-
28 peak and off-peak hours as defined by the utility.

29
30 The SDPUC's order also states that interconnection costs are to be assessed to

1 the QF on a non-discriminatory basis and that capacity credits be included in any
2 purchase rates. The order specified that contractual or otherwise, costs of
3 capacity credits should be based on capacity actually avoided; and if the
4 purchase does not enable a utility to avoid capacity costs, capacity credits should
5 not be allowed.
6

7 **Q: What is an LEO, and where does that fit into the FERC regulations?**

8 A: As described in the FERC rules that I cited earlier, FERC created the concept of
9 an LEO to protect QFs from a utility's refusal to sign a contract. By taking certain
10 actions, a QF can unconditionally obligate itself to deliver electric energy and
11 capacity over a set period. When a QF incurs an LEO, the utility has the ability to
12 enforce the delivery obligation against the QF. When or how an LEO is
13 established varies from state to state. The SDPUC has not determined what is
14 necessary to establish an LEO in South Dakota. However, the touchstone of an
15 LEO is the QF's unconditional commitment to sell energy and capacity to a utility.
16

17 **Q: If Juhl asserts that it has created an LEO, would you agree?**

18 A: No. NorthWestern's position is that there needs to be some certainties around
19 purchasing from a QF before an LEO can exist. For example, NorthWestern feels
20 a QF must make an offer to sell electricity at NorthWestern's avoided cost. Juhl
21 has never indicated a willingness to sell electric energy to NorthWestern at
22 NorthWestern's avoided cost.
23

24 Certainty of delivery of energy from a QF is important. Juhl has never offered any
25 assurances of delivery of any electric energy that NorthWestern would be able to
26 rely on or enforce an obligation to deliver expected energy and capacity. In order
27 to provide assurance of delivery, Juhl Energy would need to complete the
28 interconnection process for each project. Because each of the projects exceed
29 10 MW and are located within the Southwest Power Pool ("SPP") Balancing
30 Authority ("BA"), each project needs to work through the SPP process for

1 interconnection. Juhl has yet to complete the interconnection process with SPP.
2 Until it executes generator interconnection agreements, Juhl cannot provide any
3 assurance as to the timing or even if energy can be delivered. If the project
4 comes online prior to the completion of any upgrades, the project will not be able
5 to guarantee that the output can be delivered to NorthWestern's customers. Any
6 delay would need to be reflected in the avoided cost.

7
8 An LEO is a substitute for, not a path to, a contract. Without agreeing to the
9 utility's avoided cost or providing any assurance of delivery, it is NorthWestern's
10 opinion that a QF does not create an LEO under PURPA; there is nothing the
11 utility can enforce.

12 13 Introduction of Witnesses

14 **Q: Who will be testifying concerning this docket and what will they be**
15 **discussing?**

16 **A:** NorthWestern will have two additional witnesses:

- 17 • Luke Hansen's testimony will discuss the energy avoided cost modeling
18 for the Juhl projects.
- 19 • Autumn Mueller's testimony will provide an overview of the transmission
20 issues.

21 NorthWestern's Avoided Cost Rate

22 **Q: Under PURPA, what are the major factors in calculating avoided costs?**

23 **A:** Valuation of the output of any QF begins by asking what costs will the utility avoid
24 and what additional expenses will it incur by purchasing from the QF.
25 NorthWestern examines this question in light of its portfolio.

26
27 **Q: What value and costs do the Juhl wind projects provide to NorthWestern**
28 **customers?**

29 **A:** The Juhl wind projects provide energy, capacity, and Renewable Energy Credits
30 ("REC") to NorthWestern's portfolio. They also impose increased customer costs

1 for regulation in SPP and rate base recovery costs of asset investments for the
2 interconnections and network upgrades.

3
4 **NorthWestern's Avoided Energy Cost Rate**

5 **Q: How is the value (avoided cost) of energy provided by the Projects**
6 **evaluated and calculated?**

7 **A:** The value of the energy provided by the Juhl wind projects is a function of the
8 electric market forecast, NorthWestern's generation portfolio, and
9 NorthWestern's customer load. As outlined in the Prefiled Response Testimony
10 of Luke Hansen, NorthWestern uses PowerSimm™ ("PowerSimm") from Ascend
11 Analytics to calculate the value of the energy. PowerSimm economically
12 dispatches NorthWestern's generation portfolio in combination with market
13 forecasts to meet customer load. For each hour of the forecast, three dispatch
conditions result from this economic dispatch.

- 14
15 1. The portfolio is short energy and is purchasing from the market
16 2. The portfolio is long energy and assets in the portfolio have been
17 dispatched and can be backed down, or
18 3. The portfolio is long energy and no assets in the portfolio can be backed
19 down.

20 As described in Mr. Hansen's testimony, each condition has a value and provides
21 a forecasted avoided cost for the output from each of the proposed Juhl projects.

22
23 **Q: Is there a guideline for the appropriateness of the avoided cost of energy**
24 **calculation?**

25 **A:** Yes. The avoided cost of energy cannot exceed the energy price forecast.
26 Since all assets in SPP, including NorthWestern's assets, are economically
27 dispatched, the highest variable cost paid by NorthWestern customers is
28 NorthWestern's node Locational Marginal Price ("LMP") in SPP. Because
29 NorthWestern's portfolio includes generation from owned resources and energy
30 from power purchase agreements, NorthWestern is not making market

1 purchases 100% of the time. When NorthWestern is relying on its owned
2 resources, its avoided cost for energy is less than the market forecasted price.

3
4 **Q: What is the forecasted energy price for NorthWestern's SPP load LMP for
5 the duration of the requested contract for Juhl?**

6 A: The 20-year levelized energy price forecast from 2017 through 2036 for
7 NorthWestern's load LMP is \$30.85 and is provided in my Exhibit BJL-001. This
8 price is not NorthWestern's avoided cost. At times when NorthWestern is not in
9 the market, NorthWestern's avoided cost is less in value in those hours.

10
11 **Q: Why is the forecast proposed by NorthWestern appropriate to use?**

12 A: NorthWestern's electric price forecast described in Mr. Hansen's testimony
13 consists of two components, real market transactions and EIA's escalation rate
14 forecasts, that are publicly available and represent the most reliable fundamental
15 forecast for NorthWestern Energy's LMP. Using basis adjusted prices from the
16 closest liquid LMP provides short-term future prices that are based on actual
17 transactions. Escalating the observed market prices by the nominal escalation
18 rate published by EIA for market prices for the remaining years represents a solid
19 fundamental industry forecast that is available to the public. This calculation is
20 valid, repeatable, and publicly available. NorthWestern uses this method in the
21 evaluation of all of NorthWestern's planning and portfolio decisions.

22
23 **Q: Why does NorthWestern's existing generation portfolio lower the avoided
24 cost and how does that benefit NorthWestern customers?**

25 A: Because NorthWestern has a significant internal generation and PPA portfolio to
26 serve its customers, NorthWestern customers are protected from high market
27 prices. Under certain dispatch conditions, NorthWestern generates more power
28 than customers need, resulting in off-system sales revenues that flow back to
29 customers through the fuel adjustment rate.

1 **Q: In dispatch condition three listed above, NorthWestern's position is that if**
2 **NorthWestern is long in generation and no assets can be backed down in**
3 **NorthWestern's portfolio, the avoided cost for that hour is zero. Please**
4 **explain why?**

5 **A: In this situation, NorthWestern cannot avoid any cost by purchasing from the QF.**
6 **NorthWestern cannot avoid market purchases; there are none. NorthWestern**
7 **cannot avoid the variable cost of its owned-generation. Market prices are lower**
8 **than the variable cost of the owned-generation. NorthWestern customers receive**
9 **the benefit of any sales to the market when NorthWestern is long generation. If**
10 **NorthWestern pays a fixed estimated market price to the QF, NorthWestern's**
11 **customers are paying more than they would otherwise.**

12
13 In the FERC Docket No. RM79-55, Order No. 69 referring to PURPA, in a section
14 292.303 concerning electric utility obligations under this subpart, the order states:

15 “A qualifying facility may seek to have a utility purchase
16 more energy or capacity than the utility requires to meet its
17 total system load. In such case, while the utility is legally
18 obligated to purchase any energy or capacity provide by a
19 qualifying facility, the purchase rate should only include
20 payment for energy or capacity which the utility can use to
21 meet its total system load. These rules impose no
22 requirement on the purchasing utility to deliver unusable
23 energy or capacity to another utility for subsequent sale.”

24 If NorthWestern is unable to use the energy delivered under this condition
25 to serve the “total system load”, the value of the energy delivered under
26 this scenario for this hour is zero.

27
28 **Q: What happens to the revenues/losses if energy from the QF is sold to the**

1 **market because it cannot be used?**

2 A: The value of the sale is credited/debited back to customers.

3
4 **Q. If market sales for periods when NorthWestern cannot back down its**
5 **generation or reduce its market purchases are included in the avoided cost**
6 **for the Projects, do customers lose the value of the sale credit?**

7 A. Yes, customers are paying the project owner for the value of the sale in the
8 levelized rate.

9
10 **Q: Why was it important for FERC to include this language in Order 69?**

11 A: Requiring utilities to provide sales values when the energy is not needed to serve
12 load makes NorthWestern customers a long-term fixed market price guarantor for
13 the developers. Customers would be locking in long term market rates for
14 developers whether they needed the power or not. This requirement protects
15 customers from high market prices when the energy is not needed to serve the
16 utility's generation portfolio.

17
18 **Q: Is there any value included for non-carbon emission generation?**

19 A: Yes, but it is not large addition. It is limited to the forecasted value of the RECs
20 and the fundamental forecast effects included in the Energy Information
21 Association ("EIA"). Arbitrarily including an estimate for an additional unknown
22 carbon cost is not appropriate; NorthWestern customers may or may not avoid
23 such a cost in the future. Similar to the administrative rules used for rate filings in
24 South Dakota, (SD Administrative Rule 20:10:13:44), utility costs are not included
25 in rates unless they are "known with reasonable certainty and measurable with
26 reasonable accuracy".

27
28 **Q: What is the avoided cost for ENERGY for the proposed Juhl projects?**

29 A: The 2017 20-year levelized avoided cost for energy from the proposed Juhl wind
30 projects is \$28.49 per MWh as provided in Mr. Hansen's testimony.

1 NorthWestern's portfolio reduces the avoided cost from the market price forecast
2 of \$30.85 by \$2.38 per MWh. This is reasonable considering the low market
3 prices and forecasts currently existing in SPP and EIA. If forecast were
4 increased, this difference would also increase.
5

6 **Q: Why is this method of calculating the avoided cost used by NorthWestern**
7 **the most appropriate and accurate method?**

8 A: NorthWestern uses publicly available, market driven, and fundamentals based
9 energy forecasts. Applying this forecast to the same economic dispatch model
10 used for planning, portfolio optimization, and evaluation of new internal or
11 external resources provides consistent, non-discriminatory, and repeatable
12 calculations of the total portfolio used to provide generation to NorthWestern.
13

NorthWestern's Avoided Capacity Cost Rate

15 **Q: How is the value (avoided cost) of capacity provided by the Juhl wind**
16 **projects evaluated and calculated?**

17 A: NorthWestern currently meets its Minimum Required Capacity Margin as
18 required by SPP in their SPP Effective 2016 Planning Criteria attached as Exhibit
19 BJL-001. NorthWestern will need to replace the expiring contracts starting in
20 2019.
21

22 **Q: What value is used for the avoided cost of capacity?**

23 A: In order to meet its existing capacity requirement, NorthWestern has contracted
24 with a third party to supply capacity for that last 30 to 35 MW of capacity need
25 through the end of 2018. NorthWestern escalated the capacity value of the last
26 year (currently \$3.50 per Kw-month through the end of 2018) of the contract by a
27 2% escalation rate to reflect the escalation of fixed cost associated with capacity
28 units. Through NorthWestern's 2016 capacity RFP, NorthWestern has an
29 executable offer of \$3.50 for 35 MW starting in 2019.
30

1 **Q: How much capacity was accredited to the proposed Juhl wind projects?**

2 A: SPP has very specific criteria for the net capability of intermittent resources to
3 provide capacity that change based on the penetration of these resources in the
4 SPP footprint. These criteria are described in the SPP Effective 2016 Planning
5 Criteria attached as Exhibit BJL-004. The accredited capacity is specifically
6 determined by each project and its production. For the first three years of wind
7 production data, projects are accredited with 5% of nameplate capacity. After that
8 the initial three years of operation, the historic production of the facility is used to
9 calculate the next year's accredited capacity. This process is defined by SPP in
10 the planning documents referenced above that are effective for those years.

11
12 **Q: What are the effects of the SPP planning criteria and NorthWestern's
13 portfolio on the avoided capacity cost for the proposed Juhl projects?**

14 A: The value of the avoided cost is determined for the 20-year levelized contract
15 term based on the current value of the executed capacity contracts. No costs
16 can be avoided by NorthWestern customers until 2019. In 2019, Juhl will receive
17 a 5% accreditation of capacity paid in accordance with contract terms. At the
18 end of 2020, the accredited capacity for the Juhl wind projects will be calculated
19 in accordance with the then current SPP Planning Criteria. Juhl will be paid the
20 calculated accredited capacity times the capacity value for that year. This will be
21 repeated each year for the remaining term of the agreement.

22
23 **Q: Why would it be inappropriate to provide the proposed Juhl projects with a
24 flat accredited capacity amount?**

25 A: NorthWestern customers will only avoid capacity costs that are accredited by the
26 SPP process. If a factor is assumed for the Juhl projects and NorthWestern is
27 unable to get accreditation for the output, NorthWestern's customers would be
28 paying for a benefit they do not receive. Since this requirement as to how
29 capacity credits for renewable resources will be calculated has changed since
30 the SPP Planning Criteria were established in 2013 , it is not unreasonable to

1 assume that future criteria will change too. It would be inappropriate to establish
2 a fixed or flat accredited capacity in this docket as the capacity accredited value
3 established through SPP may vary year to year. Customers should only be
4 expected to pay the appropriate rate for capacity as determined by SPP and not
5 pay a rate that is arbitrarily established under current conditions. Similar to
6 energy, under PURPA the utility is required to provide a value (price) for energy.
7 The utility does not guarantee the amount of energy that the intermittent resource
8 will provide. NorthWestern has provided the projects an accredited capacity
9 price supported by the SPP criteria. The determination of what is actually
10 delivered by Juhl will be evaluated at that time.

11 12 Juhl Projects Incremental Costs

13 **Q: What increased customer costs are being evaluated for the proposed Juhl
14 wind projects?**

15 **A:** The Juhl projects will impose incremental costs associated with regulation, rate
16 base recovery costs associated with the interconnection of each project, and rate
17 base recovery costs associated with any transmission service upgrades required
18 due to the proposed projects.

19
20 **Q: How were the costs for regulation (integration) determined?**

21 **A:** On February 2, 2016, SPP issued a report for the Regulation Support for Wind
22 Integration. On page 5 of the report, SPP determined that the average cost of
23 regulation per MWh of wind energy is \$0.24 for 2015. This rate reduction was
24 increased by the actual year over year forecasted rate escalation published in the
25 2016 EIA AEO report for the natural gas wholesale price estimates similar to the
26 electric pricing forecast. This escalation assumes natural gas generation will be
27 the marginal resource for providing regulation.

28
29 **Q: How were the costs for rate base recovery costs associated with the**

1 **interconnection of each project determined?**

2 A: NorthWestern Supply received copies of the Brule County Facilities Study,
3 Davison County Facilities Study, and the Aurora County Facilities Study.
4 Included in each estimate is a breakdown of charges into two categories of
5 Transmission Provider Interconnection Facilities ("TPIF") and Network charges.

- 6 • TPIF are costs that are paid directly by the interconnection customer.
7 There is no cost to customers in this category so the avoided cost is not
8 affected by this amount.
- 9 • Network charges are paid for up front by the interconnection customer.
10 Once the project is commercial, the interconnection customer is
11 reimbursed the entire amount plus interest over time. The cost for the
12 interconnection network upgrades will be included in NorthWestern's
13 South Dakota rate base and recovered from NorthWestern customers.
14 These costs directly impact NorthWestern's customers through their rates
15 and the recovery costs are deducted from the avoided costs for the
16 projects.

17 The network upgrade charges for the Brule, Davison, and Aurora projects are
18 estimated to be \$2,617,719; \$2,304,741; and \$2,368,792 respectively totaling
19 \$7,291,252. The revenue requirement for this investment was included as a cost
20 deducted from the avoided costs for these projects. The calculation is included
21 in my Exhibit B JL-001.

22
23 **Q: How were the costs for rate base recovery costs associated with the
24 network upgrades for each project determined?**

25 A: As shown in my Exhibit B JL-001 REV tab, NorthWestern calculated the revenue
26 requirement of the total network upgrade charges of \$7,291,252 using the rates
27 from the last rate case. Because the life of the assets are longer than the
28 contract term, the net present value of the annual cost to customers was
29 calculated. Using the net present value, a payment stream was calculated for
30 the 20-year life of the contract. The increase costs through rates are

1 appropriately reflected in lowering the avoided cost rate keeping NorthWestern
2 customers indifferent.

3
4 **Q: Are there other transmission costs or concerns with these projects?**

5 A: NorthWestern's Transmission Group has not identified any transmission service
6 network upgrade costs for facilities that are not in SPP. For facilities in SPP,
7 SPP has not completed the study. NorthWestern does not know if there will be
8 upgrades required or not. If upgrades are required that will be included in the
9 South Dakota rate base, the costs should be treated similar to the
10 interconnection costs above.

11
12 If the SPP upgrades cannot be completed until after the projects COD, these
13 projects will be unable to deliver all the energy to NorthWestern's customers.
14 Energy that is not able to be delivered is an uncompensated curtailment. These
15 project planning costs should not be passed to customers.

16
17 The contract will need to correctly reflect these unknown costs and the timing of
18 the completion of the upgrade.

19
20 **NorthWestern's Total Avoided Cost Rate**

21 **Q: In light of your testimony above, what is the total avoided cost rate of**
22 **energy and capacity for the three proposed Juhl Wind projects totaling 60**
23 **MW?**

24 A: The 20-year levelized avoided cost rate for this project is \$25.72 per MWh with
25 an additional payment of \$42,840 per MW-year of accredited capacity starting in
26 2019 as defined by the SPP tariff. This rate is based on an October 4, 2016
27 forecast starting in 2017 and continuing until 2036.

28
29 NorthWestern's portfolio reduces the avoided cost from the market price forecast
30 discussed previously in my testimony of \$30.85 by \$5.13 per MWh. This is

1 reasonable considering the low variable cost to operate NorthWestern's owned
2 generation and market prices and forecasts currently existing in South Dakota
3 and escalations forecasted by the Energy Information Administration. If the
4 forecasts were to increase, this difference would also increase.

5
6 The 20-year levelized avoided cost rate for 2018 through 2037 is \$26.86 per
7 MWh. (Exhibit BJL-002)

8
9 **Roger Schiffman Testimony Rebuttal**

10 **Q: Do you agree with the avoided cost for the Juhl project as represented by**
11 **Mr. Roger Schiffman in Table 1?**

Table 1 – Summary of Juhl Energy Avoided Cost Projections

Differential Revenue Requirement Levelized Avoided Cost - NPV @7.24% (\$/MWh)	
CO2 Compliance Cost Incremental Impact (\$/MWh)	
Adjusted Avoided Cost, with CO2 (\$/MW)	
Capacity Value of Juhl Projects	
Total Levelized Avoided Cost, with CO2 and Capacity Value (\$/MWh)	

12
13 **A:** No. The avoided cost for NorthWestern customers cannot exceed the forecasted
14 market price. As I stated earlier, the most NorthWestern customers would pay
15 for energy that is replaced by the proposed Juhl projects is the market forecast
16 price. The current market price forecast of a 20 year levelized price is \$30.85
17 per MWh. A properly calculated avoided cost calculation for NorthWestern
18 Energy customers could never exceed that market forecast amount or even be
19 close to the suggested \$47.29.

20
21 **Q: Why is there such a big discrepancy between the numbers provided by Mr.**
22 **Schiffman and the numbers provided by NorthWestern Energy?**

23 **A:** The numbers provided by NorthWestern are specific to the costs that are paid by
24 NorthWestern's South Dakota customers considering the market forecast, the
25 economic dispatch of NorthWestern's resources, and the NorthWestern customer

1 load. The numbers provided by Mr. Schiffman are a regional evaluation of the
2 change in pricing resulting from adding 60 MW of wind generation to the region
3 starting with a very elevated market price in Year One. Mr. Schiffman based his
4 analysis on outdated projections, the Fall 2015 Ventyx Reference Case.
5 NorthWestern also has no knowledge of what assumptions about inputs were
6 used or how they were used because this information was not provided. Errors
7 and bad assumptions can affect the output of adding a small generator to such a
8 large regional footprint.

9
10
11 **Q: Do you believe there would be a significant change in SPP market pricing**
12 **by adding 60 MW of wind to the region?**

13 **A:** It is unlikely. SPP has a significant portfolio of both load and generation that
14 currently includes over 12 GW of wind generation. Because the SPP system is
15 economically dispatched, such a small addition of 60 MW would have little effect
16 on the LMP pricing unless the generation causes local congestion issues on the
17 system.

18
19 **Q: Are there any congestion issues associated with these proposed projects?**


20 **A:** SPP has not completed their review of the new generation assets. There has not
21 been a determination of any congestion issues at this time. If there are
22 congestion issues that restrict the ability of the project to deliver the energy to the
23 load, the impacts of that congestion would need to be included in the avoided
24 cost determination.

25
26 **Q: What do you mean by “the forecast used by Roger Schiffman is an elevated**
27 **rate”?**

28 **A:** Schiffman’s forecast has an increased escalation rate over the EIA forecast and
29 the first year in Roger Schiffman’s model contains a significant jump over the
30 rates that are currently being paid in SPP. Attached is a graph of the average

1 price NorthWestern has paid over the last year with SPP and moving forward
 2 with each annual forecast. Over the last year, NorthWestern customers have
 3 paid an average of \$18.78 per MWh, reflecting nine months of 2016 and three
 4 months of 2015.

5
 6 The Ventyx Reference forecast starts in 2016 with a price of \$26.04 per MWh
 7 including a jump of \$7.26 dollars in the first year of the forecast and an average
 8 escalation rate of 5.66%. There is no supportable reason for the first year jump
 9 from the prices that NorthWestern customers have experienced over the last
 10 year. Additionally, using an escalation rate that would exceed the rates provided
 11 in the EIA AEO 2015 forecast of 4.32% or the more recent escalation rate in AEO
 12 2016 of 3.36% for the years 2018 to 2037, further escalates future years
 13 increasing market risk well beyond the annual EIA forecast. (Exhibit B JL-003)



15
 16
 17 **Q: Do you believe Mr. Schiffman's recommended carbon adder should be**

1 **reflected in an avoided cost for NorthWestern customers?**

2 A: No. As stated previously, it would not be appropriate to arbitrarily include an
3 unknown carbon cost that NorthWestern customers may or may not avoid in the
4 future. Similar to the administrative rules used for rate filings in South Dakota,
5 Administrative Rule 20:10:13:44, utility costs are not included in customer rates
6 unless they are "known with reasonable certainty and measurable with
7 reasonable accuracy". In addition, no carbon penalties have been identified to
8 be applied to carbon producing resources in South Dakota, on a regional basis,
9 within SPP, or at the national level.

10
11 **Q: Do you believe Mr. Schiffman's recommended capacity payment should be**
12 **reflected in an avoided cost for NorthWestern customers?**

13 A: No. The requested capacity payment by Mr. Schiffman equates to approximately
14 \$500,000 per year. As stated earlier, our current capacity contracts that cover
15 NorthWestern's need through 2018 are priced at \$3.50 per kW-month or just over
16 \$42,000 per MW-year. For 2018, the avoided capacity cost is zero. No
17 additional capacity is needed. Under the current SPP tariff, for the first three
18 years of operation of a wind farm, the accredited capacity is 5%. Using SPP's
19 5% accredited capacity with NorthWestern's current capacity rate, the value once
20 capacity is needed would be about \$142,000 per year. After the initial three
21 years, the capacity accreditation will be evaluated according to the SPP tariff for
22 those years. The \$500,000 per year far exceeds the value of capacity to
23 NorthWestern customers or that can be supported considering current
24 NorthWestern contracts or capacity accreditation through SPP.

25
26 **Q: Do you believe Mr. Schiffman's description and development of his QF-**
27 **In/QF-Out is an appropriate calculation of avoided cost for NorthWestern**
28 **customers?**

29 A: No. Mr. Schiffman is proposing that when NorthWestern needs energy the
30 project output would be valued at market price. When NorthWestern is long, Mr.

1 Schiffman's model values the output as a market sale. In other words, he is
2 proposing that NorthWestern customers give market price for all of the output
3 from the Juhl projects whether the energy is needed or not to meet customer
4 demand. Under Mr. Schiffman's proposal, NorthWestern customers become a
5 market energy broker locking in a price for 20 years while taking all of the market
6 risk. This scenario is not supported by PURPA's avoided cost regulations.
7

8 **Q. Mr. Schiffman used Promod to calculate NorthWestern avoided cost. You**
9 **used PowerSimm. Why is PowerSimm better?**

10 **A.** Mr. Schiffman configured the Promod model to provide the projects' market price
11 for every MWh delivered calling it a QFin/QFout method. Then, Mr. Schiffman
12 suggests that the installation of 60 MW of wind will lower the price of the SPP
13 UMZ region and the LMP that serves NorthWestern's load by at least \$47.39 per
14 MWh of energy delivered by these wind projects. With all of these assumptions
15 which include each piece of equipment, each load, and the detail required to
16 evaluate such a small generator, it would be extremely difficult to attribute any
17 definitive change in price to this small addition of energy into the SPP market.
18 The repeatability, certainty, and probability of Mr. Schiffman's proposed approach
19 would depend on the software's ability to maintain each piece of information from
20 all of the utilities, generators, and transmission operators located within SPP.
21

22 NorthWestern's Power Simm model is specific to NorthWestern's system with
23 NorthWestern's equipment, NorthWestern's load, and NorthWestern's LMP. By
24 forecasting NorthWestern' load and economically dispatching NorthWestern's
25 portfolio according an appropriate public forecast, NorthWestern is able to
26 provide a valid, repeatable, and appropriate avoided costs calculation that
27 provided developers with equal treatment in regards to other QFs, PPAs, and
28 utility owned projects. This method also ensures that customers are treated fairly
29 and in accordance with all of the requirements of PURPA.
30

Contract Terms

1

2 **Q: Have NorthWestern and Juhl Wind agreed to all of the terms of the PPAs**
3 **with the exception of price?**

4 **A: No. NorthWestern and Juhl have had good discussion concerning the PPAs, but**
5 **there are still some remaining items.**

6

7 **Q: What terms should be changed or negotiated?**

8 **A: As stated previously, if needed, I will file supporting testimony regarding any**
9 **remaining contract issues at a later time.**

10

11 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

12 **A: Yes**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that on the 17th day of October, 2016, true and correct copies of the foregoing, PREFILED RESPONSE TESTIMONY OF BLEAU J. LAFAVE ON BEHALF OF NORTHWESTERN ENERGY and the exhibits of Bleau J. LaFave in Docket No. EL16-021, were served on the following via electronic mail:

Ms. Patricia Van Gerpen
Executive Director
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Patty.vangerpen@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201- voice

Ms. Kristen Edwards
Staff Attorney
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Kristen.edwards@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201- voice

Ms. Amanda Reiss
Staff Attorney
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Amanda.Reiss@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201- voice

Mr. Darren Kearney
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Darren.kearney@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201- voice

Mr. Joseph Rezac
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Joseph.rezac@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201- voice

Mr. Jon Thurber
Staff Analyst
South Dakota Public Utilities Commission
500 E. Capitol Ave.
Pierre, SD 57501
Jon.thurber@state.sd.us
(605) 773-3201- voice

Mr. Michael Uda – Representing: Juhl Energy, Inc.
7 W. Sixth Ave.
Power Block West, Ste. 4H
Helena, MT 59601
michaeluda@udalaw.com
(406) 457-5311 – voice

William Taylor – Representing: Juhl Energy, Inc.
Attorney
Taylor Law Firm, LLC
2921 E. 57th Street
Mailbox 10
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
Bill.taylor@taylorlawsd.com
(605) 212-1750 – cell
(605) 782-5304 – voice

Mr. John E. Taylor - Representing: Juhl Energy, Inc.
Attorney
Taylor Law Firm, LLC
2921 E. 57th Street
Mailbox 10
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
john.taylor@taylorlawsd.com
(605) 782-5304 - voice

Mr. Corey Juhl
VP of Project Development
Juhl Energy, Inc.
1502 17th St. SE
Pipestone, MN 56164
cjuhl@juhlenergy.com


Ms. Pamela Bonrud
Director Government and Regulatory Affairs
NorthWestern Energy
3010 West 69th St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
Pam.bonrud@northwestern.com
(605) 978-2990 – voice
(605) 978-2910 – fax

Mr. Al Brogan
Corporate Counsel
NorthWestern Energy
Ste. 205
208 N. Montana Ave.
Helena, MT 59601
Al.brogan@northwestern.com
(406) 443-8903 – voice

Mr. Jonathan M. Oostra
Corporate Counsel
NorthWestern Energy
3010 West 69th St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
Jon.oostra@northwestern.com

Mr. Bleau LaFave
Director Long-Term Resources
NorthWestern Energy
3010 West 69th St.
Sioux Falls, SD 57108
Bleau.lafave@northwestern.com
(605) 978-2897 – voice

NORTHWESTERN CORPORATION
d/b/a NORTHWESTERN ENERGY



Jonathan M. Oostra