- 1 Q. (Re: Pre-filed Testimony of P. Bowman and H. Najmidinov, page 3, lines 37 to 2 40). It is stated with regard to interruptible/curtailable load "the COS representation of both of these offerings should parallel the methods used in the 3 past for Interruptible B (i.e., costs to make incentive payments to customers are 4 included in COS, but peak loads are calculated based on the non-interrupted 5 levels)". Should peak loads in the cost of service study be calculated 6 independent of customer owned generation as well; i.e., should customer-7 owned generation be addressed separately from the cost of service study? If 8 9 not, why not?
- 10 A. No. As a prescriptive rule, customer owned generation should not automatically be addressed separately from the cost of service study.

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

26

2728

29

30

31

32

- It is important to distinguish between customer owned generation that is baseload (such as NP hydraulic generation, or CBPP hydraulic generation) and customer owned generation that is a reliability-focused peaking resource (like NP thermal, or comparable industrial customer backup thermal units if there are any on the system).
 - Customer-owned hydraulic generation is intended to be utilized throughout the year as a primary supply to the customer's own load. This generation should not be excluded from the Cost of Service study and customer energy and demand forecasts for the cost of service study should be net of hydraulic generation.
 - In contrast, rarely used intermittent resources such as NP thermal generation should not receive any credit in the COS study. Although not addressed in the InterGroup evidence, a thermal generation credit is currently provided to NP (35.993 MW) for the production function which is not justified. These thermal units are primarily intended to provide for reliable service to the end-user, in times of radial transmission line outages, blackouts, power restoration, etc. They are not first and foremost designed to support grid operation. There should further be rules to prevent the customer from "gaming" the system by running their thermal generation at peak times when it is not needed from an integrated economy and efficiency standpoint solely to profit from reduced power bills

May 22, 2014 Page 1 of 2

1 (as this is effectively offside the legislation as set out in Section 3(b)(i) of 2 the EPCA, 1994).

May 22, 2014 Page 2 of 2