RECEIVED

2016 JUN 22 PM 4:54

IDAHO FUBLIC UTLITTES COMMISSION

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

)

)

)

))

IN THE MATTER OF IDAHO POWER COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF NEW TARIFF SCHEDULE 63, A COMMUNITY SOLAR PILOT PROGRAM.

) CASE NO. IPC-E-16-14

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MATTHEW T. LARKIN

Q. Please state your name, business address, and present position with Idaho Power Company ("Idaho Power" or "Company").

A. My name is Matthew T. Larkin. My business
address is 1221 West Idaho Street, Boise, Idaho 83702. I
am employed by Idaho Power as the Revenue Requirement
Manager in the Regulatory Affairs Department.

8 0. Please describe your educational background. I received a Bachelor of Business 9 Α. Administration degree in Finance from the University of 10 11 Oregon in 2007. In 2008, I earned a Master of Business Administration degree from the University of Oregon. I 12 13 have also attended electric utility ratemaking courses, 14 including the *Electric Rates Advanced Course*, offered by 15 the Edison Electric Institute, and Estimation of Electricity Marginal Costs and Application to Pricing, 16 17 presented by National Economic Research Associates, Inc. 18 Please describe your work experience with Ο. 19 Idaho Power.

A. I began my employment with Idaho Power as a Regulatory Analyst I in January 2009. As a Regulatory Analyst I, I provided support for the Company's regulatory activities, including compliance reporting, financial analysis, and the development of revenue forecasts for regulatory filings.

> LARKIN, DI 1 Idaho Power Company

In January 2012, I was promoted to Regulatory Analyst II, and, in January 2014, I was promoted to Senior Regulatory Analyst. As a Senior Regulatory Analyst, my responsibilities expanded to include the development of complex cost-related studies and the analysis of strategic regulatory issues.

In March of 2016, I was promoted to my current
position of Revenue Requirement Manager. As Revenue
Requirement Manager, I oversee the Company's regulatory
activities related to revenue requirement, such as power
supply expense modeling, jurisdictional separation studies,
and Idaho Power's Open Access Transmission Tariff Formula
Rate.

14 Q What is the Company requesting in this case? 15 A. The Company is requesting that the Idaho 16 Public Utilities Commission ("Commission") authorize the 17 implementation of a voluntary Community Solar Pilot Program 18 ("Program").

Q. Please provide a summary of the proposed pilot
 Program offering.

A. The Company is proposing to build a 500 kilowatt ("kW") single-axis tracking community solar array that will exist to allow a limited number of Idaho Power's Idaho customers the opportunity to voluntarily subscribe to the generation output of the array. Participating

> LARKIN, DI 2 Idaho Power Company

customers will be required to pay a one-time upfront 1 2 Subscription Fee ("Subscription Fee") and in return will 3 receive a monthly bill credit ("Solar Energy Credit") for their designated share of the energy produced from the 4 5 array. The testimonies of David M. Angell and Peter 6 Pengilly will describe in greater detail the community 7 solar array and the proposed Program design, respectively. 8 Ο. How is the Company's case organized? 9 Α. My direct testimony will provide the 10 Commission with an understanding of the Company's 11 objectives for offering this pilot Program and the unique 12 regulatory considerations that guided its design. My 13 testimony will also summarize the total costs of the 14 proposed Program, the determination of the Solar Energy 15 Credit, the proposed regulatory accounting treatment, and 16 an explanation of why the Program is in the public 17 interest.

Mr. Angell will provide testimony that will describe the Request for Bid ("RFB") process for the selection of the contractor and the resulting cost to build the array. In addition, he will detail the operational aspects of offering the Program.

23 Mr. Pengilly will present testimony that will 24 discuss the customer input that led the Company to offer 25 this Program, as well as the Program design. His testimony

> LARKIN, DI 3 Idaho Power Company

will further discuss the ongoing costs associated with
 offering the Program.

3 Are you sponsoring any exhibits? 0. 4 Α. Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibits: 5 Exhibit No. 1 - the proposed Solar Energy Credit by rate schedule; and 6 7 Exhibit No. 2 - Subscription Fee calculation. 8 Ι. COMMUNITY SOLAR PILOT PROGRAM DESIGN 9 **OBJECTIVES AND CONSIDERATIONS** 10 11 What led the Company to consider a Community Ο. 12 Solar Pilot Program? The Company is offering the Program based on 13 Α. 14 expressed interest from some customers who desire to have a 15 portion or all of their energy supplied from renewable 16 resources, specifically solar. Mr. Pengilly describes in 17 detail the interaction with customers and stakeholders that 18 led to the Company's proposal in this case. 19 Ο. What role does the proposed Community Solar 20 Pilot Program fill with regard to customer preference for 21 solar energy? 22 For many customers, direct ownership and Α. operation of solar resources is not desirable or feasible. 23 Customer ownership and operation requires upfront capital 24 25 costs, as well as long-term expenses and liabilities

26 associated with system operation and maintenance. Beyond

LARKIN, DI 4 Idaho Power Company 1 cost considerations, rooftop or ground-mounted solar 2 installations are feasible only for certain property 3 owners. Customers who reside in rental properties, multi-4 unit dwellings, or townhomes are necessarily limited in 5 their options, as well as customers that have aging 6 rooftops, shading, or unsuitable rooftop orientation.

7 The Company's proposed Community Solar Pilot Program is designed as an alternative to customers who fall into 8 9 the various categories mentioned above. Additionally, with 10 regard to cost, a 2015 study commissioned by First Solar 11 and authored by The Brattle Group found that utility-scale 12 photovoltaic ("PV") systems are significantly more costeffective than residential-scale PV systems when considered 13 14 as a vehicle for achieving the economic and policy benefits 15 commonly associated with PV solar.¹

16 Q. Does the Company currently have a load-serving 17 need for the proposed solar resource?

A. No. As indicated by the Company's 2015 Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP"), the Company is resource sufficient until 2024.² As discussed above, the Company's proposal in this case was driven by customer preference rather than load-serving need.

¹ Comparative Generation Costs of Utility-Scale and Residential-Scale PV in Xcel Energy Colorado's Service Area, July 2015.

² Idaho Power's 2015 IRP, page 119.

Q. Because there is no current need for the proposed solar resource from a load-serving perspective, how did the Company approach pricing and design for the proposed Program?

5 The pricing methodology for the Subscription Α. 6 Fee and the overall Program design is intended to result in 7 Program participants covering the full cost of the project (less the shareholder subsidy detailed below) with nominal 8 9 impact to non-participating customers assuming full 10 subscription. Because there is no existing load-serving 11 need to construct the solar array, the pricing and design 12 of the Program should ensure that the incremental costs of 13 the Program are borne by customers who choose to 14 participate in this optional pilot, while limiting the 15 potential for non-participating customers to be assigned 16 Program-related costs.

17

II. COMMUNITY SOLAR PILOT PROGRAM COSTS

18 Q. What is included in the Subscription Fee of 19 the proposed Program?

A. The Company is proposing a cost-based method of pricing whereby the Company has set the Subscription Fee for participants to reflect the cost to construct and interconnect the solar PV facility, less an IDACORP, Inc., shareholder contribution of 15 percent, as well as ongoing costs such as operations and maintenance expense ("O&M")

> LARKIN, DI 6 Idaho Power Company

and property tax. Estimated incremental costs associated
 with marketing the Program have been incorporated into the
 Subscription Fee as well.

4 Q. Are land costs included in the total cost of 5 the Program?

A. No. The proposed location at the Boise Bench substation, described in more detail by Mr. Angell, is land that is currently in the Company's plant-in-service. The Company believes that the construction of the array will not affect the utility use of the parcel.

11 Q. How did the Company determine the costs to be 12 reflected in the Subscription Fee?

13 A. As described in the testimony of Mr. Angell, 14 the Company submitted a RFB to establish firm costs to 15 construct the proposed community solar array. The cost to 16 construct provided by the selected contractor is 17 \$1,158,763. Mr. Angell's testimony also details additional 18 interconnection costs to connect the solar facility to 19 Idaho Power's grid of \$81,000.

In his testimony, Mr. Pengilly describes the ongoing expenses reflected in the total project cost, including incremental expected O&M for the life of the project, property taxes, and \$50,000 for incremental Program marketing expenses.

25

1 Does the Company project to receive federal 0. 2 Investment Tax Credits ("ITC") for the Program? 3 Α. Yes. Under current law, the 30 percent ITC 4 for eligible facilities will be available through 2019. 5 The ITC will be subject to normalization, as required for 6 public utilities by the Internal Revenue Code. 7 Ο. Did the Company pass on the ITC benefits to 8 customers in this Program? 9 Α. Yes. The calculation of the upfront 10 Subscription Fee recognizes the ITC benefits in the same 11 manner as the Company records them for income tax 12 accounting purposes. 13 Will the Company earn a return on the project? 0. 14 No. All project costs are borne by the Α. 15 voluntary participants upfront, and the Company will not 16 earn a return on this project. 17 Why is the Company proposing to include a 0. 18 shareholder-funded subsidy of 15 percent of the solar 19 facility construction costs? 20 Α. The Company is building a solar facility that 21 is smaller in size than what is considered the industry 22 standard for "utility scale" solar. As detailed in Mr. 23 Pengilly's testimony, one of the learning objectives of the 24 Community Solar Pilot Program is to gauge customer 25 commitment toward participating in a community solar

> LARKIN, DI 8 Idaho Power Company

option, potentially to inform a larger scale offering in the future. Because larger projects achieve economies of scale in relation to the 500 kW system proposed in this Program, the Company has committed to a contribution of 15 percent of the solar facility costs to help facilitate this learning objective.

Q. How did the Company determine that a 158 percent shareholder funding was appropriate?

The Company arrived at a 15 percent 9 Α. contribution through the RFB process. In the RFB process, 10 the Company requested that the bidders provide an alternate 11 12 bid for the full build-out of the selected site. The difference in price per kW between the proposed project 13 14 (500 kW) and the full build-out (approximately 1 megawatt ("MW")) was approximately 15 percent. The Company believes 15 that the 15 percent difference in price represents the 16 economies of scale that a larger project would experience 17 as compared to the pilot Program. 18

Q. Please quantify the shareholder funding
 contribution.

A. As discussed above, the shareholder contribution is calculated as 15 percent of the cost to construct the solar facility. Based on the cost provided by the successful contractor of \$1,158,769, 15 percent is approximately \$173,815.

> LARKIN, DI 9 Idaho Power Company

1 What is the resulting Subscription Fee after 0. 2 taking into account the costs described above? 3 Based on the costs described above, less the Α. 4 shareholder contribution of 15 percent, the proposed 5 Subscription Fee is \$740, the equivalent of a 320 watt 6 ("W") panel, as shown in Exhibit No. 2. The Subscription 7 Fee is a one-time upfront payment that will result in a 8 Solar Energy Credit on the customer's monthly bill for the 9 25-year life of the Program.

How many subscriptions will be available? 11 There will be approximately 1,563 Α. 12 subscriptions available. The Company determined that the 13 total number of subscriptions available should be the 14 equivalent of the number of panels equal to the project's 15 expected capacity of 500 kW. As Mr. Angell details in his 16 testimony, the selected contractor will install 320 W 17 panels. Based on this information, the number of 18 subscriptions is calculated as follows: (a) $500 \text{kW} \times 1,000 =$ 19 500,000W, (b) $500,000W \div 320W = 1,563$.

10

Ο.

20 Q. Did the Company consider other payment options for the Program aside from the upfront Subscription Fee? 21 22 Yes. The Company also considered a monthly Α. 23 payment option, but determined the upfront Subscription Fee 24 was the least risk in terms of potential unrecovered costs 25 for both the Company and non-participating customers.

> LARKIN, DI 10 Idaho Power Company

Q. Why is the Company proposing the upfront
 Subscription Fee rather than the monthly option?

3 In light of the fact that the pilot Program is Α. designed solely for the subscribers of the Program and in 4 recognition that the Company's need for additional 5 generation does not occur until 2024, the Company felt that 6 7 the financial risk for non-participants and the Company 8 would be too great under the monthly payment option if panels went unsubscribed throughout the life of the 9 10 Program. Under the monthly payment option, if customers 11 were to drop out of the Program prematurely, the remaining 12 unpaid portion of the subscription would be borne by the Company and/or non-participating customers. This risk does 13 14 not exist under the upfront Subscription Fee option. 15 Ο. Is the Company investigating a third-party

16 financing option that would effectively provide

17 participants with a monthly payment option?

18 The Company has reached out to several Α. Yes. 19 lending institutions to see if there is interest in 20 offering a special rate for financing of a community solar 21 subscription. This option is still currently in-process. 22 If there is interest by a third-party lender, the Company 23 will make this offering known to prospective subscribers 24 during the recruitment period.

25

1

III. SOLAR ENERGY CREDIT AND BILL OFFSETS

2 Q. How will a participant's monthly energy 3 production be calculated?

4 Α. The total energy output of the array will be measured on a monthly basis at a production meter connected 5 at the generation source. Line losses of 3.3 percent, as 6 7 described by Mr. Angell, will be applied to the total 8 output to determine loss-adjusted actual production. The 9 resulting energy will be divided by the total number of subscriptions, and participants will receive their 10 11 proportionate share of the energy commensurate with their 12 level of subscription. The forecast annual energy per 13 subscription is approximately 638 kWh.³

14 Q. What is the credit that participants will 15 receive for their share of the solar production?

16 Α. The Company is proposing a per kilowatt-hour ("kWh") Solar Energy Credit for the solar production. 17 The 18 Solar Energy Credit is based on the Company's embedded 19 energy-related costs as determined by the most recently 20 reviewed class cost-of-service methodology filed in Case 21 No. IPC-E-11-08, adjusted to reflect revenue requirement 22 changes that were subsequently authorized by the Commission 23 which impact the authorized level of energy-related cost 24 recovery.

 $^{^3} Estimated$ average annual loss-adjusted energy of 996,977 kWh \div 1,563 subscriptions = 638 kWh/year per subscription.

Q. Please describe what kinds of costs are
 classified as "energy-related" in the class cost-of-service
 study.

Consistent with the cost-of-service 4 Α. 5 methodology in the Company's last general rate case, energy-related costs are generally the variable costs 6 associated with the operation of the generating plants, 7 such as fuel. However, due to the hydro production 8 9 capability of the Company, a portion of the hydro and 10 thermal generating plant investment has historically been 11 classified as energy related.

12 Q. Why should the Solar Energy Credit reflect13 embedded energy-related costs?

Providing participants with a bill credit 14 Α. 15 based on embedded energy costs reflects the general concept that participants are choosing to subscribe to the 16 17 community solar facility for a portion of their electricity supply rather than receiving electricity generated from the 18 Company's overall system resources. By basing the bill 19 20 credit on embedded energy-related costs, the Solar Energy 21 Credit allows for a transparent and repeatable methodology 22 that can be easily updated over time. This methodology 23 will ensure that participating customers are able to offset the energy-related portion of base rates, while still 24 25 contributing to the recovery of fixed costs related to

> LARKIN, DI 13 Idaho Power Company

infrastructure needed to serve all customers, as well as
 other non-variable costs, such as customer service and
 billing. The Company believes this methodology is
 consistent with the objective of limiting adverse rate
 impacts to non-participating customers.

6 Q. Will the Solar Energy Credit be fixed for the 7 life of the Program?

8 A. No. The Company proposes to update the Solar 9 Energy Credit as needed based on changes to its embedded 10 energy-related costs recovered through base rates.

11 Q. Does the Company's proposed Solar Energy 12 Credit reflect the seasonal production of the proposed 13 solar facility?

14 Α. Yes. The Company is proposing a Solar Energy 15 Credit that reflects the seasonal nature of solar 16 production. The energy produced at a solar facility in 17 Idaho will experience peak production in the summer months 18 when energy costs are generally higher. By incorporating 19 this seasonality, the Solar Energy Credit will be reflective of the seasonal differences in the cost of 20 21 energy.

Q. Is the Company proposing to reflect the seasonal nature of the solar production by offering seasonal Solar Energy Credit rates?

25

LARKIN, DI 14 Idaho Power Company A. No. For billing simplicity and ease in customer understanding, the Company is proposing a single Solar Energy Credit rate for each class; however, these year-round rates were appropriately adjusted to reflect the summer/non-summer weighting of solar production.

6 Q. How will the community solar bill credit be 7 calculated?

8 The community solar bill credit will equal the Α. 9 product of (a) the proposed Solar Energy Credit rate 10 specified in tariff Schedule 63 and (b) the subscriber's 11 share of the total monthly production for that month. The 12 total dollar value of the Solar Energy Credit reflected on 13 a customer's bill will fluctuate monthly as production from 14 the solar facility fluctuates.

15 Q. Will participation in the Program affect any 16 other components of a customer's bill?

17 Α. The Company is proposing that the Yes. 18 participant's share of the monthly output will also be 19 applied as a kWh credit toward billed kWh subject to the 20 annual Power Cost Adjustment ("PCA") rate. As detailed 21 above, participation in the Community Solar Pilot Program 22 is effectively replacing energy supplied from the Company's 23 existing resources and recognizing that the energy produced 24 from the solar facility has no variable fuel cost 25 component. Because the Solar Energy Credit reflects the

> LARKIN, DI 15 Idaho Power Company

1 embedded energy-related cost in base rates, the participant 2 should also be able to offset year-over-year variations in these energy-related costs tracked through the PCA. 3 4 Ο. Has the Company provided an example of a 5 residential participant's bill? 6 Α. Yes. Company witness Mr. Pengilly provides a 7 billing example for the average residential customer as 8 Exhibit No. 4 to his testimony. 9 IV. REGULATORY ACCOUNTING TREATMENT 10 Please describe the objective of the proposed Ο. 11 regulatory accounting treatment for the Program. 12 Α. The key regulatory accounting objective of the 13 Program is that non-participants will not bear any 14 incremental costs of the Program. 15 Please describe the Company's proposed Ο. 16 accounting for the project. 17 Α. The project will be considered utility plant 18 and will close to electric plant-in-service, Federal Energy 19 Regulatory Commission ("FERC") Account 101, in the same 20 manner as any other Company-owned asset. The shareholder 21 contribution of 15 percent of the plant-related costs will 22 be written off of the plant-in-service account and the 23 Company will record a Contribution in Aid of Construction 24 (CIAC) for the remaining balance assuming a 100 percent 25 subscription rate. The combination of the two entries will

> LARKIN, DI 16 Idaho Power Company

effectively zero out the plant balance on the Company's books. The portion of the upfront Subscription Fees related to ongoing costs such as incremental O&M, marketing, and property tax will be recorded a deferred revenue account. The balance of the deferred revenue account will be amortized over the life of the project.

Q. How will the Company ensure that the Program8 is neutral for non-participants?

9 Α. The community solar plant-related costs will 10 be zero on the Company's books based on the accounting 11 entries described above; therefore, any future change in 12 base rates will exclude any community solar plant-related 13 costs. With regard to incremental Program expenses 14 (marketing, ongoing O&M, property taxes), during future 15 ratemaking proceedings, a test year adjustment will be made 16 based on the annual amortization of the deferred revenue 17 account. The result of the adjustment will effectively 18 offset the ongoing incremental costs of the Program in the 19 Company's revenue requirement determination in future rate 20 cases.

However, it should be noted that because the annual amortization amount will be based on estimated costs, actual costs may differ from that estimate. The Company does not believe these differences will result in material

> LARKIN, DI 17 Idaho Power Company

costs or benefits being assigned to non-participating
 customers in the future.

3 Q. Is the Company planning to track differences
4 between estimated and actual costs through the life of the
5 Program?

A. No. While the deferred revenue account will be amortized over the life of the Program, the Company does not intend to track differences between estimated costs embedded in the upfront Subscription Fee and actual costs incurred throughout the life of the Program.

11

V. PUBLIC INTEREST

12 Why does the Company believe offering the Ο. Community Solar Pilot Program is in the public interest? 13 14 Α. The Company believes the pilot Program is in 15 the public interest because the Program is the direct 16 result of customers expressing their desire for additional 17 choices when it comes to renewable energy. By offering 18 access to community solar on a pilot basis, the Company is 19 hoping to expand the renewable energy options available to 20 customers who are interested in supporting solar energy. 21 In addition, participation through a Company-sponsored 22 renewable energy program provides for better consumer 23 protection through Idaho Power's regulated business 24 practices as compared to third-party installations or 25 leasing of rooftop solar installations.

> LARKIN, DI 18 Idaho Power Company

Q. How is the Program design in the public
 interest?

3 Α. The Program is structured to minimize the impacts to non-participating customers while offering a 4 5 community solar project in the most cost-effective way The Company's proposal is designed such that the 6 possible. costs associated with this customer option are borne by 7 those customers who choose to pursue the option. 8 9 What benefits will the Community Solar Pilot 0. 10 Program bring to the Company? 11 As discussed in the testimonies of Mr. Α.

Pengilly and Mr. Angell, the Company will use the Community Solar Pilot Program as a learning opportunity. The Company will evaluate each aspect of the Program to determine what areas could be improved upon and identify best practices in the event the Company proposes additional community solar projects in the future.

18

VI. CONCLUSION

19 Q. Please summarize your testimony.

A. The Company is requesting that the Commission approve the proposed voluntary Community Solar Pilot Program. The proposed Program is the direct result of customers who have expressed a desire to have a portion or all of their energy supplied from renewable resources. Because the Program is the result of customer interest and

> LARKIN, DI 19 Idaho Power Company

1 there is no load-serving need to construct the proposed solar facility, the Program has been designed such that the 2 3 costs of offering the Program are borne by the participants. In return for their participation, Program 4 5 participants will receive a monthly bill credit for the 25-6 year term of the Program. The proposed Solar Energy Credit 7 rate reflects the Company's embedded energy-related costs. 8 Additionally, the Company is proposing the participant's 9 share of the monthly output also be applied as a kWh credit 10 toward billed kWh subject to the annual PCA rate. Offering 11 the Program as a pilot will provide a learning opportunity 12 that may inform additional community solar projects in the future. The Company believes that the Program, as 13 14 proposed, is in the public interest and should be approved. Does this complete your testimony? 15 Ο. 16 Yes, it does. Α. 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	ATTESTATION OF TESTIMONY
2 3 4 5	STATE OF IDAHO)) ss. County of Ada)
6 7	I, Matthew T. Larkin, having been duly sworn to
8	testify truthfully, and based upon my personal knowledge,
9	state the following:
10	I am employed by Idaho Power Company as the Revenue
11	Requirement Manager in the Regulatory Affairs Department
12	and am competent to be a witness in this proceeding.
13	I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of
14	the state of Idaho that the foregoing pre-filed testimony
15	and exhibits are true and correct to the best of my
16	information and belief.
17	DATED this 22 nd day of June, 2016.
18	
19 20	Matthew T. Larkin
21 22	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 22 nd day of
23	June, 2016.
24 25 26 27 28 29	BEARD BEARD Notary Public for Idaho Residing at: <u>BOISE</u> <u>Idaho</u> My commission expires: <u>OZJO4J2021</u>

LARKIN, DI 21 Idaho Power Company

BEFORE THE

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION CASE NO. IPC-E-16-14

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

LARKIN, DI TESTIMONY

EXHIBIT NO. 1

Idaho Power Company Community Solar Pilot Program Solar Energy Credit by Rate Schedule

		Solar Energy Credit
Schedule	Description	<u>¢ per kWh</u>
1 and 5	Residential Service	3.0246
7	Small General Service	3.0209
9S	Large General Service	2.9936
9P and 9T	Large General Service	2.7352
19	Large Power Service	2.7735
24	Irrigation Service	2.6559
26	Micron Special Contract	2.5167
29	Simplot Special Contract	2.5371
30	DOE Special Contract	2.4915

Exhibit No. 1 Case No. IPC-E-16-14 M. Larkin, IPC Page 1 of 1

BEFORE THE

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION CASE NO. IPC-E-16-14

IDAHO POWER COMPANY

LARKIN, DI TESTIMONY

EXHIBIT NO. 2

Idaho Power Company Community Solar Pilot Program - Subscription Fee Calculation

Plant	\$1,158,769	
Shareholder Contribution	15%	
Net Plant	\$984,954	
Plant Value for Tax Basis	\$837,211	
Book Life	25	
Tav life	u	

39.095%	35.000%	35.000%	6.300%	32.795%
Composite Tax Rate	Deferred Tax Rate	Federal Tax Rate	State Tax Rate	I Tax Rate, net of State

		1		
50.040% Debt Cost	0.000% Preferred	19.960% Common Equi	Ave Cost	
50.040%	%000.0	49.960%	100.000% Ave Cost	
Debt	Preferred	Common	Total	

295,486	\$ 147,743	51,710	243,776	
ŝ	ŝ	\$	s	
30% ITC Earned \$ 295,486	0.000% 50% ITC - Reduces Tax Depr basis of plant \$	Fed Tax on Basis Reduction	Net ITC Benefit	
5.728%	0.000%	10.000%	7.863%	
ebt Cost	referred	ommon Equi	ve Cost	

	Plant Value for Lax Basis		State lax kate	6.300%	-		TUU.UUU% AVE COST		1.863%		Ne		243,170
	Book Life 25		Legeral lax hate, het of state	%CE/.7C									
-													
	DATE DAGE GI MAMADY	1 2007	5 2007	6 2007	1	2222	2000	F 2007	8	0.000	01X	11	51X
		1 201 7	1 201 7		1001			1 201 /	1 201 0	1001	100 10	1 2 81 77	1001 14
	Intercent of Service	0	,			0	5	9	,	0		2	3
	Production Plant	984 954	084 954	984 954	080 050	084 954	084 954	080 054	084 954	984 954	080 050	084 954	984 954
									+		100,100		
	ransmission Flant	. '	•			•						,	
					•	•	•	•			•		
	General Plant												
	Total Electric Plant in Service	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954
	Less: Accumulated Depreciation	39,398	78,796	118,194	157,593	196,991	236,389	275,787	315,185	354,583	393,981	433,380	472,778
	Less: Amortization of Other Plant				×							3	
	Net Electric Plant in Service	945,556	906.157	866.759	827.361	787,963	748,565	709.167	669.768	630.370	590.972	551.574	512.176
	Less: Customer Adv for Construction									,			'
	Lass: Archimitated Deferred Income Taves	86 183	107 188	234 143	750 801	750 847	763 184	255 103	A15 1AC	177 57A	713 735	100 046	186 156
		COT'00	001'/CT	CHT'HC7	100'007	140'007	+01'CD7	COT'007	4TC/T47	47C' 177	CC / CT 7	046'661	oct oot
	Add: Plant Heid for Future Use	•		•	,	•		•	•		•	•	
	Add: Working Capital								,	,	•		,
	Add: Conservation - Other Deferred Prog					•					•		•
	Add: Subsidiary Rate Base							•	•				
	TOTAL COMBINED RATE BASE	859,372	708,970	632,616	576,560	528,116	485,381	454,064	428,455	402,846	377,237	351,628	326,020
	NET INCOME CALCULATION						12						
	Total Operating Revenues				·								
	Operating Expenses					007.0	COL 0		0.1.0	101 0			011.01
	Uperation and Maintenance Expenses	28,054	8,064	8,064	8,2/4	8,489	8,703	8,430	80T'A	3,407	TCO'A	2,902	TO, TOU
	Depreciation Expenses	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398
	Amortization of Limited Term Plant		,	,	ž	•	,	•	•	•	ĩ		•
	Taxes Other Than Income	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373
	Regulatory Debits/Credits				·		,		•	•			
	Provision for Deferred Income Taxes	172,367	49,642	24,269	9,046	9,046	(2,372)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)
	Investment Tax Credit Adjustment				(11,819)	(11,819)	(11, 819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)
	Current Income Taxes - Interest Sync	(11,038)	(9,631)	(7,945)	(060'2)	(6,461)	(5,918)	(5,440)	(5,089)	(4,802)	(4,515)	(4,228)	(3,941)
	Current Income Taxes	(209,073)	(65,435)	(41,519)	(27,251)	(27,335)	(16,659)	(5,985)	(6,076)	(6,169)	(6,265)	(6,363)	(6,464)
	Total Operating Expenses	56,091	28,411	28,641	16,931	17,690	17,712	17,674	18,166	18,599	19,034	19,474	19,918
	Operating Income	(56,091)	(28,411)	(28,641)	(16,931)	(17,690)	(17,712)	(17,674)	(18,166)	(18,599)	(19,034)	(19,474)	(19,918)
	Add: IERCO Operating Income												
	Consolidated Operating Income	(56,091)	(28,411)	(28,641)	(16,931)	(17,690)	(17,712)	(17,674)	(18,166)	(18,599)	(19,034)	(19,474)	(19,918)
	REVENUE DEFICIENCY CALCULATION												
	Proposed Rate of Return	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%
	Earnings Deficiency	128,601	90,071	81,385	64,470	61,121	57,558	54,608	52,863	51,281	49,703	48,130	46,560
Ex	Net-to-Gross Tax Multiplier	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642
hib	Revenue Deficiency	211,163	147,896	133,635	105,859	100,360	94,510	89,667	86,800	84,204	81,613	79,029	76,451
it No	Solar Rev Req NPV Interconnection Rev Reg NPV	\$1,064,896 \$89,950											
	Total Rev Req NPV Subscription Cost	\$1,154,846 \$740											
;-E													

Note: The Company anticipates that the Federal ITC will be recognized by the Company in Year 4. The full amortization of the ITC will extend into Year 28 even though the Program ends in Year 25.

Exhibit No. 2 Case No. IPC-E-16-14 M. Larkin, IPC Page 1 of 2

Idaho Power Company Community Solar Pilot Program - Subscription Fee Calculation

\$ 50,000	\$ 16	2.60%	0.55%
Marketing Expense	O&M Expense (\$/kW)	O&M Escalation	Property Tax Rate

984	- 984,954 98	- 984,954	- 984,954	- 984,954	- 984,954	- 984,954	- 984,954	- 984,954	- 984.954	- 984,954	- 984,954	- 984,954
				•				•			•	,
2		,		,					,	•		
1								•				,
984,954		984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954
9,768		709,167	748,565	787,963	827,361	866,759	906,157	945,556	984,954	984,954	984,954	984,954
315 105	5		- 200	106 001	157 503	110101			,	, c	, [,]	, c
-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	, ,	, ,	,	,
117,209	10	103,420	89,631	75,841	62,052	48,263	34,473	20,684	6,895			
,		. '		. •			. •		•			
,												
,		,					,			,	,	
2			•			-			•	•		
197,976	11	172,367	146,758	121,149	95,541	69,932	44,323	18,714	(6,895)	0	•	0
,												
.,551	Ч	1,851	12,159	12,475	12,800	13,133	13,474	13,824	14,184			
39,398	a1	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398	39,398			•
•										¢		·
6,373		6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	6,373	·	ł	ŝ
	12			-		-					ł	
(13,789)	-	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	(13,789)	•		•
(,819)	Ξ,	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)
(anc'z)		(617'7)	(756'T)	(C+0'T)	(8CE'T)	(T/0'T)	(184)	(764)		•		c
(/00'/)		(7,125)	(7,245)	(7,369)	(7,496)	(7,626)	(7,759)	(7,896)	(8,037)			
1000 001	• 5	1023 22	23,145	23,024	24,109	24,599 1007 PC1	460,62	75 F04	26,100	(618,11)	(618/11)	(F18,11)
-	2		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	CT0/TT	CTD'TT	CT0 ⁽ TT
(22,200)	(3	(22,670)	(23,145)	(23,624)	(24,109)	(24,599)	(25,094)	(25,594)	(26,100)	11,819	11,819	11,819
7.86%		7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%	7.86%
38,774		37,230	35,691	34,157	24,109	24,599	25,094	25,594	26,100	(11,819)	(11,819)	(11,819)
1.642	2	1.642	1.642	1.642	1.642	1 642	1 642	1 642	1 647	1 642	1 642	1.642
63.667								10.1			10.1	

Exhibit No. 2 Case No. IPC-E-16-14 M. Larkin, IPC Page 2 of 2