

BEFORE THE

RECEIVED

2015 MAY 14 PM 4:41

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF IDAHO POWER)
COMPANY'S PETITION TO MODIFY)
TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF)
PURPA PURCHASE AGREEMENTS)

CASE NO. IPC-E-15-01

IN THE MATTER OF AVISTA)
CORPORATION'S PETITION TO)
MODIFY TERMS AND CONDITIONS)
OF PURPA PURCHASE)
AGREEMENTS)

CASE NO. AVU-E-15-01

IN THE MATTER OF ROCKY)
MOUNTAIN POWER COMPANY'S)
PETITION TO MODIFY TERMS AND)
CONDITIONS OF PURPA)
PURCHASE AGREEMENTS)

CASE NO. PAC-E-15-03

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF RICK STERLING

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

MAY 14, 2015

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

3 A. My name is Rick Sterling. My business address
4 is 472 West Washington Street, Boise, Idaho.

5 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

6 A. I am employed by the Idaho Public Utilities
7 Commission as the Engineering Supervisor.

8 Q. Are you the same Rick Sterling that previously
9 submitted testimony in this proceeding?

10 A. Yes, I am.

11 Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?

12 A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to
13 address several issues raised by Clearwater/Simplot
14 witness Dr. Reading and ICL/Sierra Club witness Beach.

15 Q. Various witnesses have suggested that there is
16 unequal treatment between QFs and utility-owned resources.
17 Do you agree?

18 A. I would agree that QFs and utility-owned
19 resources are not treated the same. However, much of the
20 different treatment is because PURPA requires it. A
21 significant difference is the pricing of QF generation.
22 PURPA dictates that the price or rate a utility pays for
23 the purchase of QF power be based on the avoided cost of
24 the utility—not the QFs cost of producing the power. In
25 particular, a QF that places its facility into service