

June 7, 2023

**VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL AND
FEDERAL EXPRESS**

Steven M. Kahl
Executive Director
North Dakota Public Service Commission
State Capitol Building, Department 408
600 East Boulevard
Bismarck, ND 59505-0480

Re: NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY
ADVANCE DETERMINATION OF PRUDENCE
460 MW SHERCO SOLAR FACILITY
CASE NO. PU-21-152
OAH FILE NO. 20210274

Dear Mr. Kahl:

Northern States Power Company, doing business as Xcel Energy, respectfully submits the following Surrebuttal Testimony in the above-noted case:

- Resource Planning – Ms. Farah L. Mandich

Ms. Mandich's Surrebuttal Testimony contains trade secret information. This is the same type of information as identified in the Company's April 26, 2021 Application for Trade Secret Protection, which the North Dakota Public Service Commission approved in its ORDER GRANTING TRADE SECRET PROTECTION issued October 21, 2021 in the above-captioned case.

In accordance with Section 69-02-09-02 of the North Dakota Administrative Code (N.D.A.C.), a single copy of the trade secret version of the Surrebuttal Testimony is provided in a sealed envelope marked **PROTECTED INFORMATION – PRIVATE**. An original and seven copies of the public versions are provided for the following:

- Surrebuttal Testimony of Company witness Ms. Farah L. Mandich; and
- Verification for the testimony of Ms. Mandich.

36 PU-21-152 Filed 06/07/2023 Pages: 26
Prefiled Direct Surrebuttal Testimony of Ms. Farah L. Mandich - redacted
Northern States Power Company
Zeviel Simpser, Dorsey & Whitney LLP

Steven M. Kahl
June 7, 2023
Page 2

Please contact me at (612) 492-6129 or simpser.zev@dorsey.com if you have any questions regarding this filing.

Sincerely,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP



ZEV SIMPSER

Enclosures

- cc: Via Email – Public Version Only:
- Timothy J. Dawson (tjdawson@nd.gov)
 - John M. Schuh (jschuh@nd.gov)
 - Victor Schock (vschock@nd.gov)
 - John Hamre (jghamre@nd.gov)
 - Brian Johnson (brljohanson@nd.gov)
 - Adam Renfandt (arenfandt@nd.gov)
 - Mitch Armstrong (MArmstrong@smithporsborg.com)
 - Jim Heidell (Jim.Heidell@paconsulting.com)

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

Surrebuttal Testimony and Schedule
Farah L. Mandich

**STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA
BEFORE THE
NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the Matter of the Application of Northern States Power Company
for an Advance Determination of Prudence for the 460 MW Sherco Solar Facility

Case No. PU-21-152
OAH File No. 20210274

Exhibit____(FLM-3)

Resource Planning

June 7, 2023

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1
II. PROJECT NEED 3
III. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS..... 7
 A. Sherco Solar Costs 7
 B. Proxy Pricing Alternatives 11
IV. CAPACITY ACCREDITATION 14
V. CONCLUSION 21

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

I. INTRODUCTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND TITLE.

A. My name is Farah L. Mandich. I am Director of Resource Planning and Bidding for Northern States Power Company-Minnesota (NSP or Xcel Energy or the Company).

Q. ARE YOU THE SAME FARAH L. MANDICH WHO SUBMITTED PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY AND REBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. Yes.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. The purpose of my Surrebuttal Testimony is to respond to the Rebuttal Testimony of North Dakota Public Service Commission (Commission) Advocacy Staff witness Mr. James A. Heidell. My testimony responds to Mr. Heidell's assessment of the Company's Application for an Advanced Determination of Prudence (ADP) for the 460 MW solar photovoltaic (PV) facility at our Sherburne County Generation Station site (Sherco Solar or the Project), in light of the Company's most recent Integrated Resource Planning cycle and recent policy developments affecting the energy and capacity markets implemented by the Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO). I also respond to Mr. Heidell's analysis of the alternative cost assignment mechanism proposed by the Company, focusing on the proxy pricing mechanism that the Company proposed.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. AT A HIGH LEVEL, WHAT DOES MR. HEIDELL RECOMMEND?

2 A. Mr. Heidell recommends rejecting the company's ADP application based
3 primarily on uncertainty with the Project's seasonal capacity accreditation under
4 the new MISO seasonal resource adequacy construct. In the alternative, he
5 recommends using a proxy pricing mechanism equal to the cost of a brownfield
6 CT as defined in NSP's 2020-2034 Upper Midwest Resource Plan Alternate
7 Proposal (IRP).¹

8
9 Q. HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO MR. HEIDELL'S RECOMMENDATION?

10 A. Given the low levelized cost of the Sherco Solar project, volatility risk in MISO's
11 Planning Resource Auction (PRA), the Company's status as the largest power
12 supplier in MISO's Zone 1, and the lack of other least cost resources available
13 to come online by 2026, the Commission should grant the Company's ADP
14 application for the Project. The Sherco Solar project will provide needed
15 capacity and is a prudent addition to the Company's portfolio of generation
16 resources in every situation. However, if the Commission wishes to use a proxy
17 pricing method as previously proposed by NSP, the appropriate proxy pricing
18 mechanism remains MISO's Cost of New Entry (CONE) value, which is based
19 on the cost of a new, or greenfield, combustion turbine (CT), because the
20 Company is already pursuing a brownfield CT project within its system and
21 there are no other brownfield sites that present a practicable alternative to
22 Sherco Solar.

¹ The Minnesota Public Utilities Commission granted its approval of the IRP in April, 2022. IN THE MATTER OF THE 2020-2034 UPPER MIDWEST INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLAN OF NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY D/B/A XCEL ENERGY, MPUC Docket No. E-002/RP-19-368, Order Approving Plan with Modifications and Establishing Requirements for Future Filings (Apr. 15, 2022). The Commission was kept apprised of the IRP proceeding by means of informational filings made in Case No. PU-19-220.

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

1 Q. HOW IS YOUR TESTIMONY ORGANIZED?

2 A. My testimony is comprised of three main sections:

- 3 • First, I discuss the continued need of the Project based on the Company's
4 IRP and concerns associated with relying on MISO's PRA.
- 5 • Next, I discuss the Company's economic analysis which demonstrates
6 that Sherco Solar is a least-cost resource to help meet the Company's
7 capacity deficit in 2026. This section also details why MISO CONE
8 would be the most appropriate proxy pricing mechanism if the
9 Commission rejects the Company's ADP application.
- 10 • Finally, I provide an update on MISO's seasonal capacity accreditation
11 methodology process and explain why the unfiled methodology is
12 currently too speculative to use in this case.

13

14

II. PROJECT NEED

15

16 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

17 A. In this section, I respond to points Mr. Heidell made in his testimony regarding
18 the need for the Project. In particular, I address portions of his testimony in
19 which Mr. Heidell suggested that the project is not necessary. In response, I
20 explain why it would not be prudent to plan to use purchases to obtain the
21 capacity that the Project is meant to provide.

22

23 Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE COMPANY'S APPROACH TO RESOURCE ADEQUACY.

24 A. As I discussed in my rebuttal testimony, the Company conducts its resource
25 planning consistent with Fixed Resource Adequacy Planning (FRAP) principles,
26 meaning we plan to meet our full capacity needs plus our MISO-required
27 planning reserve with resources that NSP either owns or for which we have

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 long-term contracts. If the Company does not follow FRAP principles and add
2 capacity resources over the next several years to meet our full MISO obligations,
3 we would become reliant on bilateral zonal resource credit purchases and/or
4 the PRA to obtain the additional capacity credits that forecasts indicate will be
5 needed.

6
7 Q. DOES MR. HEIDELL IDENTIFY ANY RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH RELYING ON
8 BILATERAL ZONAL RESOURCE CREDIT PURCHASES OR THE PRA TO MEET THE
9 COMPANY'S MISO OBLIGATIONS?

10 A. No. Mr. Heidell does not identify any risks associated with a "short-term
11 reliance on the PRA."²

12
13 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS ASSESSMENT?

14 A. No, for several reasons. First, relying on the PRA or bilateral zonal purchases
15 violates the Company's long-standing FRAP principles. The Company has not
16 traditionally relied on MISO's capacity market to meet customer needs and
17 planning reserve margin requirements and we view such reliance as a backstop
18 option to be used only if other acquisition approaches have not been successful.
19 This long-standing approach of owning or entering into contracts for
20 generation has traditionally served NSP well and it would not be prudent to
21 depart from it unless there was a compelling reason to do so.

22
23 Second, the Company is the largest supplier of capacity in MISO Zone 1 and
24 accounts for approximately half the load planning requirements in Zone 1. If
25 the Company changed its approach in the coming years and relied on the PRA

² Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Heidell, line 22, page 12.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 to meet its own resource adequacy needs, the transformation of NSP from a
2 self-supplier of capacity to a purchaser would fundamentally alter the dynamics
3 of the Zone 1 market. This could have reliability impacts not just for the
4 Company but for other utilities in Zone 1. Essentially, given NSP’s size and
5 traditional role in Zone 1, it could significantly impact the availability of short-
6 term purchased capacity and could increase the cost of capacity credits if we
7 relied on the market to meet our capacity needs.

8
9 Finally, while MISO’s PRA has cleared at low prices in many years, including in
10 2023, the market can be volatile and increasing exposure to it puts customers at
11 risk for high, unplanned costs in future years. In its presentation of the 2023
12 PRA results, MISO reiterated this point, pointing out that currently low prices
13 “do not reflect the continued risks posed by the portfolio transition.”³
14 Projections based on MISO-member-announced plans show a continued
15 decline in accredited capacity over the last several years. This trend is likely to
16 continue. Further, although the market cleared at relatively low prices this year,
17 MISO has indicated capacity could be tight this summer and potentially require
18 reliance on load modifying resources and operating reserves. Given these trends
19 within Zone 1—and within MISO more broadly—it remains prudent for the
20 Company to continue using FRAP principles to plan its system, adding physical
21 generation resources to the system, and not rely on the PRA or other forms of
22 market purchases to meet its MISO planning reserve requirements.

³ *MISO Planning Resource Auction Results for Planning Year 2023-24*, Page 9, accessed at [2023 Planning Resource Auction \(PRA\) Results628925.pdf \(misoenergy.org\)](https://www.misoenergy.org/2023-Planning-Resource-Auction-(PRA)-Results628925.pdf).

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL THOUGHTS ABOUT MR. HEIDELL'S
2 CHARACTERIZATION OF THE PROJECT NEED?

3 A. Yes. While Mr. Heidell seems to suggest that the Company could meet its short-
4 term capacity needs through the PRA when discussing the need for Sherco
5 Solar,⁴ he also notes that the North Dakota IRP Alternate Plan contains nearly
6 1,500 MW of additional CT resources when compared to the approved IRP
7 Alternate Plan by 2030.⁵ In other words, Mr. Heidell questions the need for
8 capacity expansions when discussing solar resources, but apparently
9 acknowledges a need for additional capacity when that capacity is supplied by
10 CTs. Either the Company has properly identified the need for new generation
11 resources or it has not; the need for capacity does not depend on whether that
12 capacity will be supplied by solar resources or gas-powered CTs.

13

14 Q. ARE THERE ANY OTHER REASONS WHY THE COMPANY HAS IDENTIFIED THE
15 PROJECT AS ONE OF THE NEAR-TERM SOLUTIONS FOR CAPACITY NEED?

16 A. One reason why the Company has identified the Project to meet the near-term
17 current capacity deficit is because it can come online relatively quickly, especially
18 when it is not reliant on the MISO generator interconnection queue. We can
19 often construct renewable resources in less time than some other utility-scale
20 resources, and Sherco Solar is being built in proximity to the site of an existing
21 Company generation facility. As discussed in previous testimony, this allows
22 the Company to utilize existing interconnection rights, thereby eliminating the
23 delays associated with the MISO interconnection queue. Both the North
24 Dakota IRP Alternate Plan and the Company's approved Alternate Plan

⁴ Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Heidell, lines 18-23, page 12.

⁵ *Id.* at lines 6-7, page 16.

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

1 underscore this reality, selecting solar to meet near term needs and only
2 beginning to add greenfield CT resources—which can take longer to receive
3 interconnection rights for and construct—in the 2027-30 timeframe.

III. ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

4
5
6
7 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

8 A. In this section, I respond to Mr. Heidell’s economic analysis and reiterate why
9 the Project remains the least cost resource to help fulfil the Company’s
10 identified capacity need in 2026. I also respond to Mr. Heidell’s analysis of the
11 Company’s recommended proxy price and explain why his proposal to use the
12 cost of a brownfield CT is misguided.

13
14 **A. Sherco Solar Costs**

15
16 Q. DOES THE COMPANY’S RESOURCE PLANNING ANALYSIS INDICATE THAT
17 SHERCO SOLAR IS PART OF THE LEAST COST PLAN TO FULFILL THIS IDENTIFIED
18 CAPACITY NEED?

19 A. Yes. Consistent with my earlier testimony, our most recent resource planning
20 analysis indicates that Sherco Solar is part of a least cost plan to prudently meet
21 the Company’s identified capacity need in 2026. Critically, this is the case even
22 when North Dakota assumptions are used. The North Dakota Scenario
23 presented in the Company’s 2021 IRP filing clearly shows that the next
24 incremental resource selected to meet system needs is a utility-scale solar
25 resource.

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

1 Q. WHAT IS THE COMPANY’S CURRENTLY PROJECTED ESTIMATE OF THE
2 LEVELIZED COST OF ENERGY (LCOE) FOR THE PROJECT?

3 A. We currently estimate a LCOE of **[PROTECTED DATA BEGINS**
4 **[PROTECTED DATA ENDS]**. This estimate assumes that the
5 project qualifies for the full 10-year production tax credit (PTC) plus a 10
6 percent “energy community” bonus credit available under the Inflation
7 Reduction Act.

8
9 Q. DOES THIS LCOE REMAIN COMPETITIVE IN COMPARISON TO OTHER SOLAR
10 PROJECTS IN THE REGION?




11 A. Yes. NSP recently completed a request for proposals (RFP) seeking at least 900
12 MW of solar or solar-plus-storage hybrid resources to come online by the end
13 of 2025, including up to 300 MW of capacity to replace the remainder of the
14 open transmission interconnection rights from Sherco Unit 2 that will not be
15 utilized by the Project. The RFP was open to projects connected directly to the
16 distribution system in our five-state Upper Midwest system, in addition to
17 transmission-interconnected assets located in MISO Zone 1. Sherco Solar has
18 an LCOE **[PROTECTED DATA BEGINS]** **[PROTECTED**
19 **INFORMATION EDNS]** lower than the cheapest shortlisted project.
20 Moreover, that project was unable to proceed because the developer could no
21 longer maintain its pricing quoted in the RFP.

22
23 Outside of our own RFP, the MISO market more broadly has experienced
24 rising prices for solar PPAs. As of Q1 2023, median solar PPA prices in MISO
25 are over \$60/MWh or nearly **[PROTECTED DATA BEGINS]**
26 **[PROTECTED DATA ENDS]** more than the LCOE for Sherco Solar. This
27 price difference emphasizes our commitment to selecting low-cost solar

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

1 projects and the success we have been able to achieve in the face of persistent
2 inflation and macroeconomic factors that have pushed prices higher.

3
4 Q. WILL SHERCO SOLAR BE CHEAPER TO OPERATE THAN CONTINUING TO
5 OPERATE SHERCO UNIT 2?

6 A. Very likely, yes. Even if the Company could change course on the planned
7 retirement for Sherco Unit 2 this year, operating the unit past 2023 would likely
8 be more expensive than transitioning to Sherco Solar and reutilizing Sherco
9 Unit 2's interconnection rights. As I explained in my rebuttal testimony, the
10 MISO CONE is **[PROTECTED DATA BEGINS** 
11 
12  **PROTECTED**
13 **DATA ENDS]**. Furthermore, that analysis has not been updated for increased
14 costs due to the persistent inflation that have raised energy costs at Sherco Unit
15 2 over the last two years. Taken together, the comparatively low costs to
16 construct and operate the Project and the rising costs to operate Sherco Unit 2
17 make it increasingly clear that the Project's output will be cheaper on an LCOE
18 basis than Sherco Unit 2.

19
20 Q. DOES MR. HEIDELL AGREE THAT SHERCO SOLAR IS A LEAST COST RESOURCE IN
21 THE 2024-26 TIMEFRAME UNDER NORTH DAKOTA PLANNING PRINCIPLES?

22 A. No. Mr. Heidell states that a "CT is the least cost resource in the ND Alternate
23 Plan in 2025, 2026, and 2027."⁶

⁶ Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Heidell, lines 21-22, page 13.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. DOES THIS STATEMENT ALIGN WITH THE ACCREDITED CAPACITY ADDED BY
2 YEAR IN THE NORTH DAKOTA ALTERNATE SCENARIO?

3 A. No. In Table 1 on page 15 of Mr. Heidell's rebuttal testimony, he provides the
4 accredited capacity added by year in the North Dakota Scenario in the
5 company's Alternate Plan. As the table reflects, the Project is selected for
6 inclusion in 2024 in both the Company's Alternate Plan and its North Dakota
7 Alternate Scenario.

8

9 Q. WHAT DOES THIS INDICATE?

10 A. Because the North Dakota Alternate Scenario was allowed to select for as many
11 CTs as possible for every year of the IRP, solar's inclusion in 2024 indicates that
12 new solar is a least cost resource needed to meet anticipated capacity deficits
13 under North Dakota planning principles, and the Project under consideration
14 here is a fulfillment of that need.

15

16 Q. GIVEN THESE RESULTS, WHAT DO YOU RECOMMEND?

17 A. I recommend that the Commission approve the Company's ADP application
18 for Sherco Solar because the Project represents one of the least-cost resources
19 to meet our anticipated upcoming capacity needs under North Dakota planning
20 principles.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

B. Proxy Pricing Alternatives

1 **B. Proxy Pricing Alternatives**
2
3 Q. DOES THE COMPANY CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE USE OF MISO CONE AS A
4 REASONABLE PROXY PRICE FOR ACCREDITED CAPACITY IF THE COMMISSION
5 CHOOSES TO REJECT THE COMPANY’S ADP APPLICATION?

6 A. Yes. As the Commission knows, MISO CONE is an industry-standard, third-
7 party generated estimate of the cost of constructing a greenfield CT. The
8 Company continues to support the use of the MISO CONE for the 2024-25
9 planning year as a reasonable proxy price because the CONE value represents
10 an unbiased calculation of the true cost of a greenfield CT, and the Company
11 already uses MISO CONE as a proxy price for some solar resources in South
12 Dakota.

13
14 Q. WHY IS MISO CONE A REASONABLE PROXY PRICE FOR SHERCO SOLAR?

15 A. MISO CONE represents the reasonable cost of an alternative resource the
16 Company would need to procure to meet its capacity deficit in 2026. Apart from
17 the Wheaton Repowering Project being developed by Northern States Power—
18 Wisconsin (NSPW)—which is already accounted for in the Company’s IRP
19 plans to meet capacity needs—Xcel Energy does not have another viable
20 brownfield site where it can construct a CT to meet its forecasted 2026 capacity
21 deficit. Consequently, the likely least-cost alternative resource to meet the deficit
22 would be a greenfield CT. Because MISO CONE represents an unbiased
23 assessment of current construction costs for a greenfield CT, it would act as the
24 most accurate proxy for replacing Sherco Solar’s accredited capacity on our
25 system.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. YOU MENTIONED THE WHEATON REPOWERING PROJECT, COULD YOU PLEASE
2 DESCRIBE THE CURRENT STATUS OF THAT PROJECT?

3 A. Yes. NSPW's Wheaton Repowering Project will be located at the site of the
4 existing Wheaton Generation Station and is expected to be in service by 2026.
5 It will include a new F-class CT generator and five new reciprocating internal
6 combustion engine (RICE) units. It will have a total combined capacity of 255
7 MW. NSPW applied for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity and
8 Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Utility Permit to construct and
9 operate the Wheaton Repowering Project with the Public Service Commission
10 of Wisconsin in January of 2023.⁷

11

12 Q. WHY DID XCEL ENERGY DECIDE TO LOCATE A REPOWERING PROJECT AT THE
13 EXISTING WHEATON GENERATION STATION?

14 A. Proximity to the existing station was an important siting consideration because
15 the Wheaton Repowering Project can benefit from the existing infrastructure
16 of a brownfield site, including the availability of natural gas; and, like the Sherco
17 solar projects, it will reuse the interconnection rights currently utilized by the
18 existing plant.

19

20 Q. IS THIS PROJECT ALREADY INCLUDED IN THE NORTH DAKOTA ALTERNATE
21 PLAN?

22 A. Yes. The North Dakota Alternate Plan includes the addition of a brownfield
23 CT at the Wheaton site in 2026, consistent with the Company's current plans.

⁷ JOINT APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY AND WDNR UTILITY PERMIT, Docket No. 4220-CE-185.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. REGARDLESS, DOES MR. HEIDELL CONTINUE TO RECOMMEND USING THE COST
2 OF A BROWNFIELD CT AS A REASONABLE PROXY PRICE FOR THE PROJECT?

3 A. Yes. Mr. Heidell continues to state that the reasonable proxy price for Sherco
4 Solar is “the least cost CT option,” which he identifies as a brownfield CT.⁸

5

6 Q. DO YOU AGREE THAT THE PROXY PRICE FOR SHERCO SOLAR SHOULD BE THE
7 LEAST COST CT OPTION?

8 A. I agree that if a proxy price is used, it is appropriate to use a price based on a
9 CT. However, the price should be based on the least cost *viable* CT option. In
10 fact, Mr. Heidell never identifies this hypothetical brownfield CT in his
11 testimony because such a site does not exist. To be clear, Xcel Energy is not
12 forgoing the opportunity to develop a viable brownfield CT site by pursuing
13 Sherco Solar. Instead, Xcel Energy is actively developing both Sherco Solar and
14 a viable brownfield site—Wheaton—at the same time. However, there is not
15 an additional, practical brownfield site that could be used as an alternative to
16 Sherco Solar.

17

18 Q. GIVEN THE COMPANY’S VIABLE OPTIONS FOR A REPLACEMENT PROJECT FOR
19 SHERCO SOLAR, WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE IS THE APPROPRIATE PROXY PRICE FOR
20 SHERCO SOLAR?

21 A. Because the only viable projects that the Company could use to replace Sherco
22 Solar are greenfield CTs, if the Commission decides to adopt a proxy price
23 approach, it should use the MISO CONE price as the proxy price for the
24 Project because MISO CONE represents an unbiased cost of a new greenfield
25 CT.

⁸ Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Heidell, lines 15-18, page 20.

**PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED**

IV.CAPACITY ACCREDITATION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS SECTION OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. In this section, I respond to Mr. Heidell’s discussion of the Company’s approach to analyzing the Project based on future changes to how MISO will accredit non-thermal capacity. I describe the current state of MISO’s changes to its resource adequacy construct and explain why it is not practical for the Company to postpone or alter resource planning based on forthcoming changes that are uncertain.

Q. PLEASE BRIEFLY DISCUSS MISO’S APPROACH TO RESOURCE ADEQUACY.

A. MISO’s approach to assessing resource adequacy is a complex topic. In this testimony, I will provide only a high-level, general overview focused on issues relevant to points made by Mr. Heidell in his testimony. Under the current MISO program, load serving entities (LSEs), like the Company, are required to maintain resources that exceed their expected level of demand by a specific margin – the Planning Reserve Margin (PRM) – to cover uncertainty with regard to the availability of resources and level of demand. An LSE is able to demonstrate that they meet their Planning Reserve Margin Requirement (PRMR) through the FRAP⁹ and offer their excess capacity or bid to acquire additional capacity through the PRA.

⁹ In its FRAP, an LSE identifies resources that it owns or for which it has contractual rights that can be relied upon to meet its PRMR.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. TRADITIONALLY, WHAT TIMEFRAME DID MISO USE WHEN CONSIDERING
2 RESOURCE ADEQUACY?

3 A. In the past, MISO looked at resource adequacy on an annual basis and
4 conducted an annual PRA. As NSP is a summer peaking utility, the Company
5 was required to ensure that we have enough capacity to cover the expected
6 summer peak plus PRM.

7

8 Q. BROADLY SPEAKING, HOW HAS MISO CHANGED ITS APPROACH TO RESOURCE
9 ADEQUACY?

10 A. MISO proposed changing to a seasonal resource adequacy approach, and the
11 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approved some proposed
12 Tariff revisions on August 31, 2022.¹⁰ Under the new tariff, the Company and
13 other LSEs are required to separately consider load obligations and generator
14 capacity for the summer, fall, winter, and spring seasons. MISO now conducts
15 separate resource adequacy auctions for each season. MISO also updated its
16 methodology for accrediting the capacity of thermal resources, such as coal,
17 nuclear, and gas-fired generators.

18

19 Q. DID THE APPROVED TARIFF REVISIONS ALSO INCLUDE REVISED CAPACITY
20 ACCREDITATIONS FOR SOLAR RESOURCES?

21 A. No. MISO is currently working on a new methodology for accrediting non-
22 thermal resources such as renewable generation and demand response
23 programs. In the future, this new methodology will be used to determine the
24 Project's capacity value in various seasons. At the present time, stakeholders
25 are providing MISO with input regarding the methodology.

¹⁰ *Midcontinent Indep. Sys. Operator, Inc.*, 180 FERC ¶ 61,141 (2022).

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. HAS MISO DECIDED YET ON THE METHODOLOGY FOR NON-THERMAL
2 RESOURCES TO PROPOSE IN ITS FERC FILING?

3 A. No. At this time, MISO intends to file the new methodology at FERC in late
4 2023, but no decision has yet been made.

5

6 Q. DID MISO'S CHANGES TO ITS APPROACH TO RESOURCE ADEQUACY PLAY A
7 ROLE IN THE RESOURCE PLANNING THAT IDENTIFIED THE CAPACITY NEED THE
8 PROJECT IS MEANT TO HELP ADDRESS?

9 A. No. The Company's IRP began in 2019 and concluded in April of 2022. In the
10 IRP, the Company used then-current MISO annual solar capacity accreditation
11 values—with an assumption of declining capacity value—to present the near-
12 term capacity value of solar. It is well-known that the capacity value will decline
13 over time as solar penetrations increase system-wide. Since MISO's capacity
14 accreditation methodology for solar did not consider this, NSP valued generic
15 solar in the IRP, and subsequently this Project, consistent with assumptions
16 included in the MISO Transmission Expansion Plan (MTEP) at the time. This
17 resulted in an accreditation value of 50 percent for 2020 to 2023, which then
18 declines to 30 percent by 2033 at a rate of 2 percent annually.¹¹

¹¹ Schedule 1_IRP Alternate Plan, page 14-15, June 25, 2021, *accessed at* [023-010.pdf \(nd.gov\)](https://www.nd.gov).

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. DID MR. HEIDELL ACKNOWLEDGE THAT MISO HAS NOT YET PROPOSED A
2 CAPACITY ACCREDITATION METHODOLOGY FOR SOLAR RESOURCES UNDER ITS
3 SEASONAL RESOURCE ADEQUACY PROGRAM?

4 A. Yes. Mr. Heidell states that MISO has not yet developed the methodology to
5 calculate capacity accreditation for solar resources and further states that the
6 program will likely not be implemented until the 2024-2025 planning period.¹²

7

8 Q. BASED ON MR. HEIDELL'S TIMELINE, COULD NSP HAVE ANTICIPATED AND
9 USED MISO'S CHANGE TO ITS SOLAR CAPACITY ACCREDITATION
10 METHODOLOGY WHEN IT BEGAN ITS IRP PROCESS IN 2019?

11 A. No. The Company plans its resource acquisitions based on the current MISO
12 tariff along with our own FRAP to prudently plan our system to meet future
13 power needs. Since FERC has yet to evaluate—let alone approve—MISO's
14 forthcoming solar capacity accreditation approach, the Company could not
15 have anticipated and reflected this forthcoming change during our planning
16 process. Even today, NSP does not know what methodology MISO will
17 ultimately propose for non-thermal resources.

18

19 Q. SHOULD THE COMPANY WAIT TO ACQUIRE THE PROJECT UNTIL THE
20 FORTHCOMING SEASONAL CAPACITY METHODOLOGY IS DETERMINED?

21 A. No. In the most recent IRP, the Company identified a capacity need for our
22 system starting in 2026. Utility-scale generation projects like Sherco Solar
23 require lead time for construction and regulatory approval. It would be
24 imprudent and impractical to put capacity expansions on hold for every
25 regulatory change that could affect the net economic benefits of future projects.

¹² Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Heidell, lines 16-22, page 10.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Furthermore, regardless of the forthcoming construct, the Company’s demand
2 is summer peaking, which is the season in which solar provides the most benefit
3 toward meeting capacity requirements. I will note that the Company is due to
4 file its next IRP in 2024, and the modelling and planning presented in that
5 matter, which the Commission will fully evaluate, will include an updated
6 approach reflecting seasonal accreditation and sensitivities based on MISO’s
7 then-filed, non-thermal accreditation methodologies.

8
9 Q. WHY IS SUMMER CAPACITY ACCREDITATION MORE VALUABLE TO THE COMPANY
10 THAN OTHER SEASONAL CAPACITY ACCREDITATION VALUES?

11 A. As I have noted above, the Company’s demand peaks during the summer
12 season. Consequently, resources which will have higher summer capacity
13 accreditation values than winter accreditation values provide more benefit to
14 NSP’s system. Obviously, standalone solar resources, like the Project, will have
15 significantly lower accredited capacity during the winter season than other
16 seasons. For that reason, the Project is not expected to make a meaningful
17 contribution toward meeting MISO winter capacity requirements. However, the
18 Company’s anticipated need is for summer capacity and Sherco Solar (and other
19 PV solar projects) will contribute to meeting that need.

20
21 Q. DOES NSP ANTICIPATE A CAPACITY NEED DURING THE WINTER SEASON IN THE
22 2025-26 TIMEFRAME?

23 A. No. Our identified capacity needs are for the summer peaking season in the
24 2025-26 timeframe. Therefore the stronger accreditation values of solar during
25 the summer season align the benefits of solar generation with the Company’s
26 near term capacity needs.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 Q. HAS THE COMPANY TAKEN ANY MEASURES TO ACCOUNT FOR FUTURE
2 REDUCTIONS IN THE PROJECT'S CAPACITY ACCREDITATION?

3 A. Yes. By declining the accreditation value of the project by 2 percent annually
4 over the next ten years, we have accounted for the reality that solar resources
5 will lose some accreditation value as more solar resource come online
6 throughout MISO's system.

7

8 Q. DOES MR. HEIDELL AGREE WITH THE COMPANY'S ACCREDITATION VALUES
9 FOR SHERCO SOLAR?

10 A. No. Mr. Heidell points to various MISO proposals discussed over the past 18
11 months to suggest that MISO's eventual capacity accreditation values will be
12 lower than what the Company proposed in this proceeding. However, he also
13 concedes that "the issue is being actively studied by MISO and there are
14 different estimates of the long-term summer accredited capacity for solar."¹³

15

16 Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH MR. HEIDELL'S APPROACH TO THIS ISSUE?

17 A. No. Attempting to estimate what the MISO summer capacity accreditation
18 value for the Project will be without any filed proposal from MISO is far too
19 speculative to provide value now for current resource planning. For example,
20 the limited values Mr. Heidell proposes for solar capacity accreditation in 2031
21 range from 1 percent to 23 percent.¹⁴ Such a broad range does not provide any
22 meaningful basis to use in evaluating the Project. The Company's proposal to
23 use the known values in the MTEP and decrease the capacity accreditation over

¹³ Rebuttal Testimony of Mr. Heidell, lines 17-18, page 11.

¹⁴ *Id.* at lines 14-20, page 11.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 the next ten years provides a better basis to use in evaluating summer capacity
2 accreditation.

3
4 Q. BASED ON THE CURRENT INFORMATION KNOWN TO THE COMPANY AND THE
5 COMMISSION, WHAT CAPACITY ACCREDITATION VALUE SHOULD THE
6 COMMISSION USE TO EVALUATE THE PROJECT?

7 A. The Commission should use a 2023 accreditation value of 50 percent based on
8 the current MTEP, with a decreasing accreditation value of 2 percent annually
9 to account for increasing solar penetration in the MISO north region.

10
11 Q. IF THE COMMISSION REJECTS THE ADP FOR SHERCO SOLAR AND INSTEAD
12 DETERMINES THAT A CAPACITY PROXY SHOULD BE USED, HOW WOULD A
13 CHANGE TO THE MISO SUMMER CAPACITY ACCREDITATION OF SOLAR AND THE
14 PROJECT IMPACT THE USE OF CONE AS A CAPACITY PROXY?

15 A. The Company's proxy price would only apply CONE to the actual MISO
16 accredited capacity of the Project. Lower actual MISO capacity accreditation
17 would result in a lower overall cost. Likewise, a higher actual MISO capacity
18 accreditation would result in a relatively higher overall cost. The proxy would
19 only be applied to the actual accredited capacity available to the Company to
20 meet our resource adequacy obligations.

21
22 Q. COULD YOU PROVIDE AN EXAMPLE OF HOW THIS WOULD WORK IN PRACTICE?

23 A. Yes. Assume MISO decides that the capacity accreditation factor for the Project
24 in a particular season is 20 percent. In such a scenario, the Company's proposed
25 proxy pricing mechanism would multiply the nameplate capacity of the Project
26 by the MISO accreditation factor to get the accredited capacity for the full
27 project. In this example, we would take the Project's nameplate capacity—460

PUBLIC DOCUMENT
NOT PUBLIC DATA HAS BEEN EXCISED

1 MW (or 460,000 kW)—times 20 percent for the accreditation capacity—or 92
2 MW (or 92,000 kW). This number would be further multiplied by CONE and
3 the North Dakota allocation factor to determine the total amount recoverable
4 from North Dakota customers for accredited capacity in the given season. For
5 example, if accredited capacity in the season was 92 MW, and CONE was
6 \$8.70/kW-month, and the jurisdictional allocation factor was approximately 6
7 percent, the value of capacity for that season would be calculated in the
8 following way:

9

$$\begin{aligned} & \textit{Total seasonal capacity cost in North Dakota (\$)} \\ & = \textit{Nameplate kW * Accreditation factor} \\ & * \textit{CONE (\$ per kWmonth} \\ & * \textit{North Dakota allocation factor * months} \end{aligned}$$

10
11
12
13
14 Or in this specific example:

$$15 \quad \$144,072 = 460,000\text{kW} * 20\% * \$8.70 * 6\% * 3$$

16

17 **V. CONCLUSION**

18
19 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY?

20 A. Yes, it does.

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA**

NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY
ADVANCE DETERMINATION OF PRUDENCE –
460 MW SHERCO SOLAR PROJECT

CASE NO. PU-21-152

VERIFICATION


STATE OF MINNESOTA)
)SS.
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN)

Farah L. Mandich, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that she is Director of Resource Planning and Bidding for Applicant Northern States Power Company, a Minnesota corporation, in the above-captioned matter, that the surrebuttal testimony submitted in the above-captioned matter under her name was prepared under her direction, that she knows the contents thereof, and that the same is true and correct to the best of her knowledge and belief.



Farah L. Mandich

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 7th day of June, 2023



Notary Public
My Commission expires: JAN. 31, 2026

