

## NORTH CAROLINA **PUBLIC STAFF** UTILITIES COMMISSION

October 29, 2019

Ms. Kimberly A. Campbell, Chief Clerk North Carolina Utilities Commission 4325 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-4300

> Re: Docket No. E-22, Subs 577

> > **Dominion Energy North Carolina**

Dear Ms. Campbell:

In connection with the above-referenced docket, the Public Staff filed the testimony of David M. Williamson, on October 22, 2019. We erroneously included a reference to an offshore wind unit on page 7 of Williamson's testimony. The testimony should be corrected on page 7, lines 7-8 of his testimony to delete the phrase "a combustion turbine (CT), and the cost of a Virginia offshore wind unit" and substitute the phrase "and market purchases" in its place. I have attached a corrected version of page 7 of Williamsons' testimony.

By copy of this letter, we are forwarding copies to all parties of record.

Sincerely,

/s/ Heather D. Fennell Staff Attorney heather.fennell@psncuc.nc.gov

HDF/cla

Attachment

**Executive Director** (919) 733-2435

> Accounting (919) 733-4279

Communications (919) 733-5610

**Economic Research** (919) 733-2267

Legal (919) 733-6110 Transportation (919) 733-7766

**Consumer Services** (919) 733-9277

Electric (919) 733-2267

**Natural Gas** (919) 733-4326

Water (919) 733-5610 March 7, 2019 in Docket No. E-100 Sub 157) and the Mechanism. However, the Public Staff noted in its review of the new EE programs, that the Company modeled those programs in a manner that the Public Staff believes could raise some concern with the inputs used to value the avoided capacity benefits. DENC's modeling for the programs included avoided capacity benefits that, in certain years, are based on the cost per kW of a generic solar unit and market purchases as outlined in Plan E of its filed 2018 Compliance IRP. The Public Staff notes that the Compliance IRP calls for new capacity resources in 2021, which requires that the next resource to be renewable capacity. The Public Staff believes that the use of a CT is the appropriate input to the methodology used to determine the avoided cost rate for capacity; as compared to, the use of other generation units which overstate the avoided capacity benefits of the programs. However, the impact was not material to the calculations of the cost effectiveness for the new EE programs. The Public Staff intends to discuss the issue of avoided cost modeling with the Company further in the context of the upcoming Mechanism review and the next rider proceeding.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

## Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE COST EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PORTFOLIO OF PROGRAMS.