

EXHIBIT REVIEW AND APPROVAL TRAINING

DATE BY DSN

FINAL DRAFT ON 2:12:16 TO 5:00 P.

REVIEWED & APPROVED BY: _____ DATE: _____

ADMIN/ASST. _____

OWNER/OWNER HW/GW 2:17:16

SECURITY/ASST. ENG. _____

OTHER: _____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	4
II. SUMMARY	4
III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY	4
IV. COST-OF-SERVICE STUDIES	
NV Energy Position	10
BCP Position	18
Bombard Position	20
SEIA Position	21
SNHBA Position	21
Staff Position	23
TASC Position	29
Vote Solar Position	34
NV Energy Rebuttal Position	39
Commission Discussion and Findings	
MCSS	46
Separate Ratepayer Classes	49
V. RATE DESIGN	
NV Energy Position	53
BCP Position	58
Bombard Position	60
SEIA Position	61
SNHBA Position	62
Staff Position	62
TASC Position	70
WCSD Position	77
Vote Solar Position	77
NV Energy Rebuttal Position	81
BCP Supplemental Position	91
GBSC Supplemental Position	94
NV Energy Supplemental Position	96
SEIA Supplemental Position	106
Staff Supplemental Position	109
TASC Supplemental Position	119
Vote Solar Supplemental Position	123
WCSD Supplemental Position	127
BCP Supplemental Rebuttal Position	129
NV Energy Supplemental Rebuttal Position	131
SEIA Supplemental Rebuttal Position	138
Staff Supplemental Rebuttal Position	138
TASC Supplemental Rebuttal Position	140
Vote Solar Supplemental Rebuttal Position	142
Commission Discussion and Findings	
Statutory Authority	145
Overview	146

Demand Charge.....	147
Basic Service Charge.....	147
TOU.....	149
Net Excess Energy.....	149
Gradualism.....	152
Risk of Rate Changes.....	153
Perpetuity.....	154
No Change for 8-10 or 20 Years.....	155
Payback.....	157
Transition to Cost-Based Rates.....	158
Transparency.....	162
Fairness.....	162
Misrepresentations.....	164
Changes to NEM Systems.....	164
Policies of This State.....	165
VI. MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES	
A. New-Build Solar	
SNHBA Position.....	168
BCP Position.....	170
Staff Position.....	170
NV Energy Rebuttal Position.....	170
Commission Discussion and Findings.....	171
B. Generation Meter	
NV Energy Position.....	171
BCP Position.....	172
TASC Position.....	172
Vote Solar Position.....	173
NV Energy Rebuttal Position.....	173
Commission Discussion and Findings.....	174
C. Interconnection Charges	
BCP Position.....	175
TASC Position.....	175
NV Energy Rebuttal Position.....	175
Commission Discussion and Findings.....	176
D. Regulatory Liability	
NV Energy Rebuttal Position.....	176
Commission Discussion and Findings.....	177
E. Load Data	
WCSD Position.....	177
NV Energy Rebuttal Position.....	178
Commission Discussion and Findings.....	178
VII. ROOFTOP SOLAR INDUSTRY JOBS	
Staff Position.....	179
Commission Discussion and Findings.....	179
ORDERING SECTION	180

The Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (“Commission”) makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

I. INTRODUCTION

Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (“NPC”) filed an Application for approval of a cost-of-service study and net energy metering (“NEM”) tariffs. Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (“SPPC,” and together with NPC, “NV Energy”) filed an Application for approval of a cost-of-service study and NEM tariffs.

II. SUMMARY

The Applications are granted as modified in the discussion and findings below. The Commission revises tariffs and rates for NPC and SPPC.

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

- On July 31, 2015, NPC filed an Application for approval of a cost-of-service study and NEM tariffs.
- On July 31, 2015, SPPC filed an Application for approval of a cost-of-service study and NEM tariffs.
- The Applications were filed pursuant to the Nevada Revised Statutes (“NRS”) and Nevada Administrative Code (“NAC”) Chapter 703 and 704, including but not limited to Section 4.5 of Senate Bill (“SB”) 374 of the 78th Session of the Nevada Legislature (2015) and NAC 703.535.
- On August 3, 2015, the Commission issued Notices of Application in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- The Regulatory Operations Staff (“Staff”) of the Commission participates as a matter of right pursuant to NRS 703.301.
- On August 4, 2015, the Attorney General’s Bureau of Consumer Protection (“BCP”) filed a Notice of Intent to Intervene pursuant to NRS 228.360 in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 14, 2015, the Sierra Club filed a Petition for Leave to Intervene (“PLTI”) in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 17, 2015, the Alliance for Solar Choice (“TASC”) filed a PLTI in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 17, 2015, Bombard Renewable Energy (“Bombard”) filed a PLTI in Docket No. 15-07041.
- On August 17, 2015, Travis G. Miller filed a PLTI in Docket No. 15-07042.

- On August 17, 2015, Nevadans for Clean Affordable Reliable Energy (“NCARE”) filed a PLTI in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 17, 2015, the Southern Nevada Homebuilders Association (“SNHBA”) filed a PLTI in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 17, 2015, the United States Green Building Council, Nevada Chapter (“USGBC”) filed a PLTI in Docket No. 15-07041.
- On August 17, 2015, Vote Solar filed a PLTI in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 18, 2015, Shawn O’Meara (on behalf of SUNworks, Black Rock Solar, Inc., The Power Company, and Alternative Energy Solutions) filed a late-filed PLTI in Docket No. 15-07042.
- On August 18, 2015, the Solar Energy Industries Association (“SEIA”) filed a late-filed PLTI in Docket No. 15-07042.
- On August 18, 2015, the Washoe County School District (“WCSD”) filed a PLTI in Docket No. 15-07042.
- On August 19, 2015, the Commission held a prehearing conference. BCP, Bombard, Mr. Miller, NCARE, NV Energy, SEIA, SNHBA, Staff, TASC, USGBC, Vote Solar, and WCSD made appearances. The Presiding Officer excused the Sierra Club and Mr. O’Meara from appearing. The Presiding Officer consolidated Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042 for hearing purposes. The Presiding Officer granted the PLTIs filed by Bombard, NCARE, TASC, Vote Solar, and WCSD. The Presiding Officer conditionally granted the PLTIs filed by Mr. O’Meara, SEIA, Sierra Club, SNHBA, and USGBC, subject to those parties filing supplemental information. The Presiding Officer denied the PLTI filed by Mr. Miller.
- On August 19, 2015, the Sierra Club filed a Reply to Staff Response to Petition to Intervene in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 20, 2015, the Great Basin Solar Coalition (“GBSC”), formerly Mr. O’Meara, filed supplemental information in Docket No. 15-07042.
- On August 20, 2015, SEIA filed a Supplement to Late-Filed Petition for Leave to Intervene in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 20, 2015, SNHBA filed a Supplement to the Petition for Leave to Intervene in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On August 20, 2015, USGBC filed a letter rescinding its PLTI in Docket No. 15-07041.
- On August 20, 2015, Vote Solar filed a Supplemental and Errata Filing in Support of Vote

Solar's Petition for Leave to Intervene in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.

- On August 21, 2015, the Commission held a hearing in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042. BCP, Bombard, GBSC, NCARE, NV Energy, SEIA, Sierra Club, SNHBA, Staff, TASC, and Vote Solar made appearances.
- On September 1, 2015, the Commission issued an Interim Order.
- On September 4, 2015, the Presiding Officer issued a Procedural Order establishing a procedural schedule in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042.
- On October 26, 2015, the Presiding Officer held a discovery conference with NV Energy and TASC.
- On October 28, 2015, the Presiding Officer issued Procedural Order No. 2.
- On November 2, 2015, NV Energy and Vote Solar notified the Presiding Officer, via electronic mail to the Administrative Attorney, of an agreement to revise the procedural schedule as it pertains to work papers.
- On November 6, 2015, Sierra Club submitted a letter requesting to withdraw as a party and participate as a commenter.
- On November 12, 2015, the Presiding Officer issued Procedural Order No. 3.
- On November 18-20, 2015 the Commission held a continued hearing in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042. BCP, Bombard, GBSC, NCARE, NV Energy, SEIA, SNHBA, Staff, TASC, Vote Solar, and WCSD made appearances. Exhibits 1A-102A were admitted to the record pursuant to NAC 703.730.
- On December 1, 2015, the Presiding Officer issued Procedural Order No. 4.
- On December 2, 2015, BCP, NCARE, NV Energy, SEIA, Staff, TASC, and Vote Solar filed legal briefs. On December 9, 2015, BCP, NCARE, NV Energy, Staff, TASC, and Vote Solar filed reply briefs.¹
- At the December 22, 2015 Agenda meeting, the Commission voted to approve the Draft Order. The Commission issued the Final Order on December 23, 2015 ("December 23rd Order").

¹ Several parties also included analyses of SB 374 and the relevant statutes and regulations in witness testimony. (See Ex. 29A (NV Energy) at 15-17; Ex. 30A (NV Energy) at 15-17; Ex. 40A (WCSO) at 3; Ex. 41A (SNHBA) at 3-4; Ex. 44A (Vote Solar) at 7-9, 11, 13, 46-47, 50-51, 60, 62; Ex. 49A (TASC) at 6-7, 9-10; Ex. 62A (BCP) at 2; Ex. 64A (Staff) at 3, 11-12, 23-24; Ex. 76A (TASC) at 34, 48; Ex. 99A (NV Energy) at 5, 7-15, 79; Ex. 101A (NV Energy) at 6-7, 21-23, 26-31, 35-37, 39, 41-42; Tr. at 89-90 (NV Energy), 99-100 (NV Energy), 357-359 (TASC), 406 (Bombard), 442-443 (BCP), 474-477 (Staff), 503-505 (Staff), 552-554 (Staff), 580-583 (Staff), 595-596 (Staff), 1103-1104 (NV Energy), 1132-1133 (NV Energy), 1140-1144 (NV Energy).)

- On December 24, 2015, BCP filed a Motion for Stay and Request for Order Shortening Time for Responses. On December 29, 2015, BCP filed an Amendment to Motion for Stay and Request for Order Shortening Time for Responses and Request for Modification of Procedural Order No. 5. On December 29, 2015, BCP filed a Corrected Amendment.
- On December 24, 2015, TASC filed a Motion for Stay of Final Order and Tariffs and Request for Order Shortening Time. On December 30, 2015, TASC filed an Amendment to Motion for Stay of Final Order and Tariffs and Request for Order Shortening Time and Request for Modification of Procedural Order No. 5.
- On December 28, 2015, the Presiding Officer issued Procedural Order No. 5, establishing an expedited timeframe for filing responses and replies to the Motions for Stay and a hearing date.
- On December 29, 2015, SNHBA filed a Response to BCP's Motion to Stay. On December 30, 2015, Vote Solar and SEIA filed Responses to the Motions for Stay. On January 4, 2016, NCARE, NV Energy, and Staff filed Responses to the Motions for Stay. On January 6, 2016, BCP and TASC filed Replies.
- On December 31, 2015, the Presiding Officer issued Procedural Order No. 6, suspending GBSC's representative, Shawn O'Meara, from further participation in these proceedings.
- On January 7, 2016, the Commission held a hearing on the Motions for Stay. BCP, Bombard, GBSC, NV Energy, SEIA, SNHBA, Staff, TASC, and Vote Solar made appearances. NCARE and WCSO were excused.
- On January 8, 2016, the Presiding Officer issued Procedural Order No. 7, requiring NV Energy to file notification that it has updated its website with customer education explaining the December 23rd Order.
- On January 8, 2016, BCP filed a Petition for Reconsideration and/or Rehearing,
- On January 8, 2016, SNHBA filed a Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration.
- On January 8, 2016, SEIA filed a Petition for Reconsideration.
- On January 8, 2016, TASC filed a Petition for Reconsideration.
- On January 8, 2016, Vote Solar filed a Petition for Reconsideration.
- On January 13, 2016, GBSC late-filed a Petition for Reconsideration.²

² Pursuant to NAC 703.530(3), the Commission will liberally construe the pleadings and disregard any defects that do not affect the substantial rights of any party. GBSC's late-filed Petition for Reconsideration affects the substantial rights of all other parties because it responds to the Petitions for Reconsideration filed on or before the deadline prescribed in NAC 703.801(3). The Commission construes GBSC's late-filed Petition for Reconsideration as an Answer to the Petitions for Reconsideration.

- On January 19, 2016, the Commission issued an Order, denying the Motions to Stay.
- On January 20, 2016, the Presiding Officer issued a draft Order on BCP's Petition for Reconsideration and/or Rehearing, granting rehearing on grandfathering, and SNHB's Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration, denying rehearing.
- On January 21, 2016, BCP filed a letter withdrawing the rehearing portion of its Petition for Reconsideration. On January 22, 2016, BCP filed a supplement to its letter.³
- On January 22, 2016, SNHBA filed an Errata to its Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration, removing all references to rehearing.
- On January 22, 2016, SNHBA filed a letter with the Commission regarding the draft Order.⁴
- On January 22, 2016, TASC filed a letter with the Commission regarding the draft Order.⁵
- On January 25, 2016, NV Energy filed an Answer to Petitions for Rehearing.
- On January 25, 2016, BCP, NV Energy, NCARE, Staff, and TASC filed Answers to the Petitions for Reconsideration.
- On January 25, 2016, GBSC filed an Answer to Petitions for Reconsideration. On January 26, 2015, GBSC filed an Amendment.⁶
- On January 25, 2016, the Commission issued an Order to conduct a rehearing in Docket Nos. 15-07041 and 15-07042 to allow the parties to present additional evidence on grandfathering.
- On January 25, 2016, the Commission issued a Notice of Hearing.

³ Pursuant to NAC 703.530(3), the Commission will liberally construe the pleadings and disregard any defects that do not affect the substantial rights of any party. Portions of BCP's letter and supplement to the letter affect the substantial rights of all other parties because they respond to the draft Order issued by the Presiding Officer on January 20, 2016. There is no regulation allowing a party to comment on a draft order filed by a commissioner. The portions of the letter and supplement that respond to the draft Order (beyond withdrawing the request for rehearing) are impermissible and, therefore, are stricken from the record.

⁴ Pursuant to NAC 703.530(3), the Commission will liberally construe the pleadings and disregard any defects that do not affect the substantial rights of any party. SNHBA's letter affects the substantial rights of all other parties because it responds to the draft Order issued by the Presiding Officer on January 20, 2016. There is no regulation allowing a party to comment on a draft order filed by a commissioner. The letter is a fugitive document and, therefore, is stricken from the record.

⁵ Pursuant to NAC 703.530(3), the Commission will liberally construe the pleadings and disregard any defects that do not affect the substantial rights of any party. TASC's letter affects the substantial rights of all other parties because it responds to the draft Order issued by the Presiding Officer on January 20, 2016. There is no regulation allowing a party to comment on a draft order filed by a commissioner. The letter is a fugitive document and, therefore, is stricken from the record.

⁶ On February 1, 2016, GBSC filed the same information as supplemental direct testimony.

- On January 27, 2016, Staff filed a Motion to Strike New Evidence Presented in GBSC's Answer to Petitions for Reconsideration and Amendment Thereto.⁷
- On January 28, 2016, Vote Solar filed a letter responding to Staff's Answer to Petitions for Reconsideration, attempting to explain why the Commission should not suspend Vote Solar's representatives from further participation in these proceedings for the misrepresentations in its Petition for Reconsideration.
- On January 28, 2016, TASC filed a Motion for Extended Procedural Schedule Regarding Rehearing. On January 29, 2016, TASC filed an Errata. On January 29, 2016, NV Energy filed a Response. On February 2, 2016, TASC filed a Reply. On February 8, 2016, the Presiding Officer denied the Motion.
- On February 1, 2016, NV Energy filed a Motion to Strike Portions of "Answers" to Petitions for Reconsideration. On February 8, 2016, BCP and TASC filed Responses.⁸
- On February 1, 2016, SNHBA filed a Response to PUC's January 25, 2016, Order.⁹
- On February 2, 2016, TASC filed a Motion Requesting Adequate Public Notice of Proposed Rate Adjustment. On February 3, 2016, NV Energy and Staff filed Responses. On February 8, TASC provided an oral Reply. On February 8, 2016, the Presiding Officer denied the Motion.
- On February 2, 2016, Staff filed a Motion to Strike Portions of the Supplemental Direct Testimonies Filed On Behalf of Vote Solar, GBSC and BCP. On February 4, 2016, Vote Solar filed a Response. On February 5, 2016, NV Energy filed a Joinder in Staff's Motion. On February 5, 2016, BCP filed a Response to Staff's Motion. On February 5, 2016, BCP filed a Response to NV Energy's Joinder. On February 8, 2016, TASC filed a Response. On February 8, 2016, GBSC provided an oral Response. On

⁷ The Commission grants Staff's Motion to Strike New Evidence Presented in GBSC's Answer to Petitions for Reconsideration and Amendment Thereto. GBSC filed the same information as supplemental direct testimony on February 1, 2016, asserting that Staff's Motion was rendered moot by the filing. However, GBSC did not withdraw its Answer and Amendment filed on January 25 and 26, 2016. GBSC attempts to impermissibly introduce new evidence, ignoring the fact that the Commission takes evidence through a formal hearing process that guarantees due process to all parties involved.

⁸ The Commission grants NV Energy's Motion to Strike Portions of "Answers" to Petitions for Reconsideration. GBSC attempts to impermissibly introduce new evidence, ignoring the fact that the Commission takes evidence through a formal hearing process that guarantees due process to all parties involved. The Commission notes that GBSC's Answer was also the subject of Staff's Motion to Strike New Evidence Presented in GBSC's Answer to Petitions for Reconsideration and Amendment Thereto; the Commission granted Staff's Motion (*see* footnote 7). TASC's arguments starting at page 1, line 18, through page 6, line 3, are an improper attempt to address the Commission's January 19, 2016, Order that is not subject to the Petitions for Reconsideration. BCP's counterarguments at page 4, lines 3-14, are in response to hypothetical arguments that no party made in the Petitions for Reconsideration. All are impermissible answers to the Petitions for Reconsideration.

⁹ Pursuant to NAC 703.530(3), the Commission will liberally construe the pleadings and disregard any defects which do not affect the substantial rights of any party. SNHBA's filing affects the substantial rights of all other parties because it responds to the Order in a manner not prescribed by the Commission's regulations. The filing is a fugitive document and, therefore, is stricken from the record.

February 8, 2015, Staff and NV Energy provided oral Replies. On February 8, 2016, the Presiding Officer granted in part and denied in part the Motion and Joinder.

- On February 5, 2016, BCP filed a Legal Brief in Lieu of Rebuttal on Particular Issue Raised by Regulatory Operations Staff. On February 8, 2016, the Presiding Officer struck the document from the record.
- On February 8, 2016, the Commission held a rehearing. BCP, Bombard, GBSC, NCARE, NV Energy, SEIA, Staff, TASC, Vote Solar, and WCSD made appearances. SNHBA was excused. Exhibits 103A-137A were admitted into the record pursuant to NAC 703.730.

IV. COST-OF-SERVICE STUDIES

NV Energy Position

1. NV Energy recommends that the Commission approve the marginal cost-of-service studies (“MCSS”) prepared for NPC and SPPC and find that the MCSS are appropriate for designing rates for classes of customer-generators (“NEM ratepayers”).¹⁰ (Ex. 1A at 18; Ex. 4A at 18.)

2. NV Energy states that while it is appropriate to develop NEM ratepayer classes for all sizes of NEM ratepayers, NV Energy limited the MCSS and the new NEM tariffs to those classes that are not currently subject to more cost-based pricing (e.g., time-of-use (“TOU”) demand charges, facilities charges). For NPC, the affected ratepayer classes are the single family residential (“RS”), multi-family residential (“RM”), large single family residential (“LRS”), and small general service (“GS”) classes. For SPPC, the affected ratepayer classes are the single-family residential (“D-1”), multi-family residential (“DM-1”), and small general service (“GS-1”) classes. The rate structures for the larger ratepayer classes have cost-based

¹⁰ NEM ratepayers who have completed applications that were accepted or approved by NV Energy prior to the cumulative capacity of all NEM systems reaching the 235 megawatts (“MW”) are referred to as NEM1 ratepayers. NEM ratepayers who have completed applications that were accepted or approved by NV Energy after the cumulative capacity of all NEM systems reaching the 235 MW are referred to as NEM2 ratepayers.

customer and facility distribution charges and recover a significant portion of the transmission and generation costs through TOU demand charges. (Ex. 2A at 26; Ex. 5A at 26.)

3. NV Energy states that the MCSS guides the development of each ratepayer class's total revenue requirement and rate design. The MCSS develops the revenues at full marginal costs that would be realized if hourly differentiated prices equal to NV Energy's marginal costs were charged to each ratepayer class. Through Statement O, the ratepayer class marginal revenues are used to allocate the embedded revenue requirement to the various classes. (Ex. 2A at 26, 46-47, 164-167; Ex. 5A at 26, 46-47, 158, 160.)

4. The MCSS demonstrate that NEM ratepayers have unique service and cost characteristics. The average NEM ratepayer and non-NEM ratepayer have distinctly different load shapes, load factors, and billing determinants. The load levels and hourly usage differences (let alone the partial-requirements nature of their service) are sufficient to justify separate rate classes. Further, the ability for the NEM ratepayers to flow energy back into the utility systems is something NV Energy does not allow larger partial-requirements (stand-by) ratepayers to do. The result is a substantial cost shift from NEM ratepayers to non-NEM ratepayers. (Ex. 2A at 11, 21, 33-35, 163, 177-184, 187; Ex. 5A at 11, 21, 32-35, 162, 166-172, 174; Tr. at 167-168.)

5. NV Energy states that while the MCSS redistributed the revenue requirement to all ratepayer classes, no other ratepayer class rate changes are being proposed. The sole objective of the Applications is to establish NEM ratepayer classes and rates based on the MCSS. NV Energy prepared the MCSS consistent with: (1) the Commission's regulations; (2) NV Energy practices that have evolved over 30 years; (3) previous MCSS that have been vetted and approved in the past by the Commission; and (4) the presentation made by NV Energy at the

May 1, 2015, workshop in Docket No. 14-06009. (Ex. 2A at 9-10, 14, 16, 25, 46; Ex. 5A at 9-10, 14, 16, 25, 46.)

6. NV Energy states that it updated numerous inputs for the MCSS. NV Energy updated the marginal energy cost and hourly loss of load probability, which is used in the marginal generation cost allocation. NV Energy used the PROMOD results to reflect NPC's integrated resource plan filing (Docket No. 15-07004) preferred plan. NPC's integrated resource plan filing PROMOD results are used for both NPC and SPPC for marginal energy costs due to joint dispatching. The marginal energy costs cover the period 2016-2018, which is the potential rate effective period. NPC's and SPPC's loss of load probabilities are determined separately because neither utility's resources can prevent a loss of load occurrence for the other utility. The hourly loss of load probability is the hourly cost responsibility factor used to spread generation unit demand costs to each ratepayer class. The loss of load probability data was for the period prior to the forecasted significant capacity addition in 2020 (i.e., 2016-2019). NV Energy updated the probability of system peak cost responsibility factor used in the ratepayer class allocation of distribution demand and transmission costs. NV Energy also updated the historical ten-year period data to 2005-2014 and the forecasted period year to 2016. NV Energy updated NPC's rate of return to reflect the authorized rate in the Docket No. 14-05004 Stipulation. NV Energy used the billing determinants for the twelve-month period that ended May 2014 for NPC and the twelve-month period that ended March 2015 for SPPC. The NEM2 class load shapes were developed for the twelve months ended May 2015 and were removed from the otherwise full requirements class. The Customer Weighing Factor Study ("CWFS") was updated to include the new NEM classes. New surveys of the pertinent departments serving NEM ratepayers were made to determine the relative proportion of customer service and accounts

expense attributable to the separate NEM ratepayer classes. (Ex. 2A at 26-28, 35, 38, 63; Ex. 5A at 26-27, 35, 38, 60-61, 68.)

7. NV Energy states that the MCSS have four functional components: facilities; customer; demand-related (non-revenue distribution feeders, substations, transmission, and generation); and energy. Other than facilities and customer costs, the marginal costs are determined using hourly data, developed from PROMOD outputs and historical data. Additionally, facilities and customer costs are recovered through the monthly basic service charge. (Ex. 2A at 26, 31-32; Ex. 5A at 26, 30, 32.)

8. NV Energy states that the facilities costs represent NV Energy's investment in distribution facilities installed closest to the ratepayer (e.g., service drops, transformers, secondary distribution). The facilities investments are limited to those allowed pursuant to NV Energy's line extension rules ("Rule 9"). As the density of NEM systems increases, additional costs or savings may be identified, but no differences have been identified to date. (Ex. 2A at 30, 73-77, 110; Ex. 5A at 29, 72-76, 102.)

9. NV Energy states that customer costs are comprised of the revenue requirement associated with meter investment, and related meter expenses, customer accounting expenses, and customer service expenses. The meter investment was developed by class, and a generation meter was also developed for each NEM ratepayer class. While NEM and full-requirements ratepayers use identical billing meters, the NEM ratepayers' meters need to be programmed to measure bi-directional flow. The skillset requirements for replacing a standard-billing meter with the NEM-modified version necessitate that journeyman electricians or meter technicians perform such installations. The NEM ratepayer meter costs exceed those for the residential full-requirements ratepayer. (Ex. 2A at 68-71, 111; Ex. 5A at 64-66, 103.)

10. NV Energy states that the customer accounting and service costs are allocated to each class through the use of a CWFS, with the results applied to the historical costs used in the last MCSS. NV Energy states that there are two causes for the increase in NEM ratepayer customer costs: fully dedicated employees and the Renewable Energy Department. NPC has three customer service representatives plus one supervisor's allocated time, and SPPC has 1.5 customer service representatives to handle phone calls and manually review NEM ratepayers' bills. The department heads anticipate the cost per NEM ratepayer not to change, but there will be an increase overall in costs due to the increase in the number of NEM ratepayers. 94 percent of the Renewable Energy Department internal labor costs are allocated to NEM ratepayer classes. The Renewable Energy Department processes the NEM applications. As the program transitions from an incentive program to serving the NEM ratepayer classes, the internal labor costs will still be incurred. The MCSS determined that the NEM ratepayer classes have greater customer accounting and service expenses. (Ex. 2A at 29, 64-66, 69-73, 75; Ex. 5A at 28, 62-64, 68-72; Ex. 17A; Ex. 18A.)

11. NV Energy states that the marginal distribution demand related costs (non-revenue distribution feeders, substations, and high voltage distribution) are allocated between ratepayer classes based upon the class load shapes (e.g., contribution to the hourly load) and the hourly normalized probability of peak cost responsibility factor.¹¹ The NEM ratepayer's load shape for each fifteen-minute interval is the greater of the excess generation returned to the utility's system or the total load. The total load is the sum of the deliveries to the NEM ratepayer by the utility and the NEM ratepayer generation consumed by the NEM ratepayer during the fifteen-minute interval. The total load represents the maximum potential burden on the

¹¹ Probability of peak is based upon those hours during which there is a 90-percent probability that the system peak will occur. (Ex. 2A at 40-41; Ex. 5A at 40-41.)

distribution system if the NEM ratepayer were to lose their own generation. The excess generation above the NEM ratepayer's total load represents additional use of the distribution system by the NEM ratepayer to facilitate sending energy to the utility. The distribution system is designed to meet the ratepayer's estimated peak load demand, which is total load. No quantifiable primary distribution costs reductions have been identified for NEM customers. The excess generation component accounts for 0.1 percent of the NEM increase in marginal distribution costs, attributable to the excess energy occurring at times of relatively low distribution demand cost (primarily winter season). (Ex. 2A at 23, 40-41, 75, 78; 5A at 23, 37-40, 72.)

12. NV Energy states that until further studies are performed, no basis exists for altering the distribution planning at this time. Additional costs may be incurred in the future, depending on the level of NEM system penetration and additional clustering of NEM systems. NV Energy is conducting studies on the matter. (Ex. 2A at 77-79; Ex. 5A at 75-76.)

13. NV Energy states that the marginal transmission system demand costs were calculated consistent with calculations for all other ratepayer classes. As with distribution demand cost, the class transmission marginal cost allocation is calculated using the probability of peak and the class load shape. Consistent with the distribution demand, NEM generation is assumed to be contained within the distribution system; therefore, the NEM ratepayer class total load shape is used in the transmission cost allocation. Further, recognizing some load diversity does exist, the total hourly load was reduced by the ratio of the NEM class non-coincident peak to the total load non-coincident peak.¹² This reduction results in a transmission cost that is roughly eleven percent lower than that which would result if the total load shape were used, and

¹² The reduction was accomplished by comparing, on an hourly basis, the maximum delivered kilowatts ("kW") to the total load kW in the load shape. (Ex. 2A at 42; Ex. 5A at 42.)

it appropriately reflects the diversity of the NEM system self-generation and its impact on the loads of all ratepayers within the class. (Ex. 2A at 42-43; Ex. 5A at 42-43).

14. NV Energy states that it has not experienced any documented beneficial effects of NEM systems on the transmission system. NV Energy also states that it has not seen dramatic shifts in operational complexity or costs caused by NEM systems, but it notes that significant penetration relative to load during any time of the year could cause dramatic shifts in reactive power switching, generation dispatch, and unit ramping requirements. (Ex. 2A at 79, 81-82; Ex. 5A at 76, 78-79.)

15. NV Energy states that marginal generation demand costs were calculated in the same manner as those calculated for other ratepayer classes.¹³ The NEM ratepayer class' delivered load shapes were used. The delivered load shapes recognize load diversity and NV Energy's inability to quantify the standby reservation and load-following costs. However, because system peaks are later in the day when rooftop solar production is in decline, the NEM ratepayer delivered load shape still results in significant capacity costs being allocated to these NEM ratepayer classes. (Ex. 2A at 24-25, 37, 39; Ex. 5A at 24-25, 37, 39.)

16. NV Energy states that the marginal energy costs were calculated in the same manner as they are calculated for other ratepayer classes. The NEM ratepayer class delivered load shapes were used. Marginal energy costs were developed consistent with the approved methodology used in NV Energy's last general rate case. The marginal energy costs were calculated hourly using the utilities' preferred integrated resource plan PROMOD for the

¹³ Marginal generation costs allocated to each ratepayer class were determined by using the hourly loss of load probability calculated using PROMOD for the period of time before the next significant generation capacity addition. In the MCSS, with the next significant capacity addition forecasted to occur in 2020, the loss of load probability period was 2016-2019. (Ex. 2A at 38; Ex. 5A at 38.)

anticipated three-year rate effective period (2016-2018). The hourly data were averaged. The marginal energy costs were adjusted for line losses to the secondary distribution voltage level for each NEM ratepayer class. The adjusted hourly rate was multiplied by the NEM ratepayer class's delivered load shape. The resulting hourly amounts were aggregated by TOU period. (Ex. 2A at 25, 35-36, 61; Ex. 5A at 25, 35-36, 60.)

17. NV Energy states that the NEM ratepayer class load shapes were developed using all active NEM ratepayers as of March 31, 2015, for the entire study period of June 2014 through May 2015. Actual generation data was used when available. Missing hourly generation data was estimated using the average of those ratepayers that have at least 95 percent of the necessary fifteen-minute generation data. The compiled data was then compared to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory's averages for reasonableness. (Ex. 2A at 52-54; Ex. 5A at 50-52.)

18. NV Energy states that the E3 Study¹⁴ is a cost/benefit study. A cost/benefit study does not estimate marginal costs or prices of any kind. Rather, it focuses on whether a specific investment, policy, or program is desirable or not. (Ex. 29A at 14-15; Ex. 30A at 14-15.)

19. NV Energy limited any ratepayer class revenue requirement change to that driven by the MCSS. The proposed rate revenue requirement represents the embedded revenue requirement allocated to each customer class using the MCSS developed class marginal revenue requirement through Statement O. Both the proposed and present rate revenue requirements were developed using the total general and base tariff energy rates effective July 1, 2015. (Ex. 2A at 46-47; Ex. 5A at 46-47.)

20. NV Energy states that the introduction of NEM systems coupled with the legacy

¹⁴ The E3 Study was completed in Docket No. 13-07010, an investigation to examine the costs and benefits of net metering in Nevada pursuant to Assembly Bill 428 of the 77th Legislature (2013).

two-part rate structure has resulted in the shifting of costs and revenues. The utilities receive less revenue from ratepayers who continue to pay two-part rates after these ratepayers install NEM systems; however, the fixed and demand costs incurred by the utilities to serve the NEM ratepayers largely remain the same. Responsibility for these costs then shifts to non-NEM ratepayers during the reallocation of costs resulting from lower billing determinants (due to reduced energy use by the NEM ratepayers) in the next general rate case. As a result, NEM ratepayers are subsidized by non-NEM ratepayers when a simple two-part rate design that relies primarily on volumetric rates to recover demand and fixed costs continues to be used. (Ex. 29A at 10-13; Ex. 30A at 10-13.)

BCP Position

21. BCP states that it is concerned that the marginal distribution facilities costs (a portion of the ratepayer-related costs), developed by NV Energy in the most recent general rate cases and used in this proceeding, are unreasonable for all residential ratepayers. Rule 9 allowances have been skewed upward by an unrepresentative sample of new construction based on the small amounts of home building that occurred during the recession. The skewed study, in combination with higher Rule 9 allowances, resulted in higher marginal facilities costs. As a result, many residential ratepayers are in fact paying twice for their facilities—(1) through higher house prices arising from the lower Rule 9 allowances in place when their houses were built in the decade before the allowances were changed, and (2) through the marginal facilities costs based on current Rule 9 allowances. Therefore, BCP is concerned that all residential ratepayers, including residential NEM ratepayers, could be significantly overcharged. BCP was prepared to litigate this issue in NPC's last general rate case (Docket No. 14-05004) until that case settled with a zero rate change for everyone, which BCP believed was more advantageous than litigating

the case. BCP states that it believes that the proper forum for litigating the correct level of marginal facilities costs is in a general rate case. Piecemeal solar rates should not be developed based on marginal costs that have not been adequately vetted and which contain serious conceptual flaws. (Ex. 62A at 4-6.)

22. BCP states that the customer accounting effort studies prepared by NV Energy over the past two decades have always resulted in fairly accurate estimates but may not be totally accurate for small ratepayer classes. NEM ratepayers are a very small class for both utilities. In the past, BCP found anomalies in the overall marginal ratepayer accounting costs. Further, the supervisors and managers who fill out the forms used for the studies know that NV Energy is concerned about NEM, so choosing a higher number rather than a lower number within a range might not be surprising. Finally, some of the costs associated with NEM systems are likely to be one-time costs of connecting new NEM ratepayers, not ongoing costs for maintenance. Perhaps a one-time fee should be considered to collect some of those costs; however, such a fee cannot be estimated from the record before the Commission and should be an issue in a general rate case. (Ex. 62A at 6-7.)

23. BCP states that it is concerned that the load analysis conducted by NV Energy is overloading NEM ratepayers with transmission and distribution costs. Using the higher of total ratepayer loads or energy delivered to the utility in each hour to establish the distribution load pattern is not reasonable. Unless whole neighborhoods are solar, the feedback into the distribution system will be absorbed in a localized area and will not affect most of the distribution system, other than to reduce line loadings and losses. If a NEM ratepayer feeds power to its close neighbors for a few hours, the rest of the distribution system is largely unaffected. The same issue applies to transmission demands. While NV Energy points to the

construction of transmission to serve bulk power needs of various sorts, many of these lines are not load-related transmission but are in fact interties that are historically excluded from MCSS because they are theoretically considered to be incorporated in the marginal generation costs. NEM ratepayers who do not use as much peak energy as other ratepayers should not pay more for bulk power just because there is a generator behind the meter. (Ex. 62A at 7-9.)

Bombard Position

24. Bombard states that the Commission should not adopt NEM ratepayer classes that penalize ratepayers for contributing to Nevada's sustainable energy future. Any concern about cost-shifting between NEM ratepayers and non-NEM ratepayers can be handled adequately through a TOU rate. (Ex. 59A at 3).

25. Bombard states that TOU rates are designed to encourage ratepayers to reduce demand when energy prices are higher and to reward ratepayers by lowering energy prices to the ratepayer when the utility experiences lower energy costs. Accordingly, the utility value, and inherently the non-NEM ratepayer value, is included in the TOU rate. Further, TOU rates can and will be adjusted based upon economic principles of supply and demand through a general rate case adjudicated before the Commission, providing both the utility and ratepayers protection. If high penetration of NEM systems is experienced, then the Commission will have the opportunity to adjust the TOU rate in a general rate case. (Ex. 59A at 3.)

26. Bombard states that the E3 Study concluded that NEM policies do not result in NEM ratepayer free-riding and unreasonable cost-shifting; further, NEM ratepayers create an estimated total net present value to the non-NEM ratepayer of \$36 million during the systems' lifetimes. NV Energy's attempts to demonstrate that NEM creates a burden on the system while providing little or no benefit does not make common or logical sense. (Ex. 59A at 4-5.)

