

Statewide NetMetering and InterConnection	
Pro	Con
Consistent treatment of consumer throughout the state	Legislative mandate for regulation
Equal response to voter initiatives (A37)	Impairs local control of customer-own utilities. Need to address regional concerns.
More efficient to implement policies	Concern with establishing precedent.
Time value of electricity generated	
Grow business throughout the State	
System size to match annual load	
Avoids discriminatory treatment	Administrative costs greater burden for coops translating to increased rates.
Benefit of lessening generation, distribution and transmission costs	Technologies are intermittent capturing related benefits cannot be done by net-metering. (TOU pricing concerns) Net-metering may not capture all costs and benefits and may do so differently for different utilities
Addresses concern of unearned utility income	Fixed cost recovery and operating costs could result in differing customer impacts
Allows development of technologies where they work best or occur	Too much DG on distribution feeders; system reliability problems, revenue requirement recovery issues. Excessive penetration can magnify cost recovery impacts.
Provide impetus for change among REA's	Plug and Play may not be compatible for each REA
Decreased social costs, i.e. fossil fuel	One-size fits all policy may not work for all utilities. Details need to be discussed
Single meter single register metering easiest to understand and implement	Might be easier to create policies for net-metering on small systems (under xxx kW)
Economies of scale	Need to address subsidization issues. Concern over unequal treatment of customers.
Minimize free-riders,	Already addressed though EPACT

Linking DG to the RES	
Electric	
1. Simple steps to expand RES rebates/incentive to other electric technologies.	
2. Make subsidies for other electric technologies proportional to the solar incentive levels.	
3. Expand carve out to include all electric generation technologies then let market decide allocation within the carve out. May or may not include rebates for solar DG.	
4.	
Thermal	
5. Thermal offsetting electric generation (thermal only not included?). Offset electric applies to existing RES, thermal only new standard.	
6. Coordinate with gas conservation programs.	
7. Dilutes the RES' limited funds by including thermal technologies.	
8. Passing a thermal TRC is difficult	
9. Entire new standard for thermal inefficient use of funds.	
10. Necessary to understand system benefits of various technologies (solar/thermal/conservation/DSM).	

Financial Incentives and Budget

1. System benefit charges should be investigated. Non-bypassable electric surcharge. Carbon tax is a fair way to make the allocation. (generally on a kWh basis and have a cap)

Utility become administer of fund or
State agency or
Private entity (non-profit)

2. Net-metering is not sufficient to move the market.

3. Tax credits, Oregon 50%, Utah 10%. 2010 Tabor limit reassessed/updated.

4. Should in-state renewable energy manufactured equipment be given additional tax credits

5. Small pool of money (\$4 million) for solar thermal (more affordable) to move the market.

6. Rural communities best opportunity for small wind requires further economic development.

7. \$3 to \$4 million for small wind

8. Ground source heat pumps difficult to assign benefit (DSM or thermal energy)

--	--