

RECEIVED

2013 MAY 31 PM 4: 50

IDAHO PUBLIC  
UTILITIES COMMISSION

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION )  
OF IDAHO POWER COMPANY FOR )  
AUTHORITY TO MODIFY ITS NET ) CASE NO. IPC-E-12-27  
METERING SERVICE AND TO INCREASE )  
THE GENERATION CAPACITY LIMIT. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

OF

MATTHEW T. LARKIN

1 Q. Please state your name.

2 A. My name is Matthew T. Larkin.

3 Q. Are you the same Matthew T. Larkin that  
4 previously presented direct testimony?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Have you had the opportunity to review the  
7 pre-filed direct testimony of the City of Boise's witnesses  
8 Ms. Gassner, Mr. Woods, and Mr. Gilliam; the Idaho Clean  
9 Energy Association, Inc.'s ("ICEA") witnesses Mr. Dunay,  
10 Mr. Elgethun, and Ms. White; the Idaho Conservation  
11 League's ("ICL") witness Mr. Beach; Pioneer Power, LLC's  
12 witness Ms. Cardwell; and the Idaho Public Utilities  
13 Commission ("Commission") Staff's ("Staff") witness Mr.  
14 Elam?

15 A. Yes, I have.

16 Q. What is the scope of your rebuttal testimony?

17 A. My rebuttal testimony will begin with a  
18 discussion of technical issues raised by each party related  
19 to the various components of Idaho Power Company's ("Idaho  
20 Power" or "Company") proposed rate design and the use of  
21 the class cost-of-service study in developing these rates.  
22 I will then discuss the parties' proposals related to the  
23 treatment of excess net energy, and describe the Company's  
24 proposed modifications to the kilowatt-hour ("kWh") credit  
25 system detailed in its initial filing. My testimony will

1 close with a description of proposed interconnection tariff  
2 language resulting from settlement discussions between the  
3 Company, Staff, and ICEA, and address the disputes raised  
4 by the City of Boise's witness Mr. Gilliam.

5 **I. RATE DESIGN AND COST-OF-SERVICE**

6 **Commission Staff**

7 Q. Does Staff support the Company's proposed rate  
8 design?

9 A. No. On page 4 Staff states five reasons why  
10 it does not support the Company's rate design proposal:  
11 (1) it singles out one small group of customers within  
12 broader rate classes with similar customers, (2) it  
13 includes a Basic Load Capacity ("BLC") charge which is new  
14 for Residential and Small General Service customers, (3) it  
15 incents high usage standard service customers to install  
16 small generation facilities to qualify for more favorable  
17 net metering rates, (4) it is based on a class cost-of-  
18 service study that was never intended to be used for  
19 changing base rates, and (5) the current overall dollar  
20 impact of net metering is small.

21 Q. Do you believe the Company's rate design  
22 unfairly singles out a small group of customers within a  
23 broader rate class?

24 A. No. As discussed in the rebuttal testimony of  
25 Mr. Gregory W. Said, state law indicates that different