

BEFORE THE

RECEIVED

2023 NOV 15 PM 4:29

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION)
OF IDAHO POWER COMPANY FOR)
AUTHORITY TO INCREASE ITS RATES)
AND CHARGES FOR ELECTRIC SERVICE)
IN THE STATE OF IDAHO AND FOR)
ASSOCIATED REGULATORY)
ACCOUNTING TREATMENT)

CASE NO. IPC-E-23-11

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TAYLOR THOMAS
IN SUPPORT OF THE STIPULATION
AND SETTLEMENT

IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

NOVEMBER 15, 2023

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

3 A. My name is Taylor Thomas. My business address is
4 11331 W. Chinden Blvd., Ste. 201-A, Boise, ID 83714.

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

6 A. I am employed by the Idaho Public Utilities
7 Commission ("Commission") as a Program Manager overseeing
8 the Technical Analysis department of the Utilities
9 Division.

10 Q. Please describe your educational background and
11 professional experience.

12 A. I was hired by the Commission in 2020 and I have
13 provided numerous recommendations in proceedings before
14 the Commission. My educational background and professional
15 experience are provided in more detail in Exhibit No. 102.

16 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this
17 proceeding?

18 A. The purpose of my testimony is to describe the
19 proposed comprehensive Stipulation and Settlement
20 ("Settlement") reached by the signing parties ("Parties")
21 in this case based on the Application for Idaho Power
22 ("Company") to increase its rates and charges for electric
23 service and explain Staff's support for the Settlement.

24 Q. How is your testimony organized?

25 A. My testimony is subdivided under the following

1 headings:

- 2 - Cost-of-Service Methodology Page 2
- 3 - Rate Design Page 3
- 4 - Separate Informal Proceedings Page 6
- 5 - Non-Revenue Agreements Page 7

6

7 **Cost-of-Service Methodology**

8 Q. How does the Settlement discuss the Company's
9 Cost-of-Service methodology?

10 A. The Parties did not agree to a cost-of-service
11 methodology within this Settlement. However, the Parties
12 used the filed cost-of-service study as a guide to allocate
13 the revenue requirement of \$54.7 million among the
14 different customer classes.

15 The Parties generally recognized that certain
16 customer classes were paying more or less than their
17 relative cost of service. The Parties agreed to a method
18 of increasing the rates for each customer class by at least
19 a factor of 0.5 times, but not more than 1.3 times, with
20 no increase for any customer class above 120 percent of
21 the cost-of-service index.

22 Staff believes this is in the interest of customers
23 because it spreads the overall revenue increase of 4.25
24 percent across all classes in an equitable manner in
25 relation to their cost-of-service.

1 Q. Was the cost-of-service study updated to reflect
2 the settled revenue requirement?

3 A. Yes, but the updated version was used on a limited
4 basis. It was necessary to update the cost of service to
5 ensure the following were accurately derived: the Sales
6 Based Adjustment Rate ("SBAR") used in the PCA, the fixed
7 cost per customer and the fixed cost per energy used in
8 the Fixed Cost Adjustment ("FCA"), Schedule 20 Speculative
9 High-Density Load Interruption Compensation, and certain
10 special contract rates.

11

12 **Rate Design**

13 Q. Did the Parties discuss rate design?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Did the parties agree to change the summer
16 season?

17 A. Yes. The Parties agreed to extend the summer
18 season from June 15 through September 15 to June 1 to
19 September 30, as proposed by the Company.

20 Q. Please explain what the Settlement accomplished
21 for rate design for residential services: Schedule 1,
22 Residential Service Standard Plan, and Schedule 6,
23 Residential Service On-Site Generation.

24 A. For Schedules 1 and 6, the Parties agreed to use
25 the customer billing determinants proposed by the Company

1 in this case but maintain the current percentage
2 differential between each block. For Schedules 1, 5, and
3 6, the Parties agreed to increase the residential service
4 charge from \$5 per month to \$10 per month on January 1,
5 2024, and to \$15 per month on January 1, 2025.

6 Q. Why are these changes reasonable?

7 A. Staff believes that the current residential
8 service charge does not allow the Company to recover the
9 fixed costs associated with customer charges (billing and
10 meter reading) or distribution; therefore, an increase is
11 necessary to allow more recovery of fixed cost from the
12 residential service charge. However, in conjunction with
13 an increase to the service charge, an elimination of the
14 blocked tiered rates, as proposed by the Company, could
15 send customers price signals that no longer encourage
16 energy conservation. Therefore, Staff believes the
17 Settlement is reasonable as an increase in the service
18 charge will increase recovery of fixed costs while the
19 blocked tiered rates continue to encourage customers to
20 conserve energy.

21 Q. Did the Settlement discuss Schedule 5,
22 Residential Service Time-of-Use ("TOU") Plan?

23 A. Yes. The Parties agreed to align the optional
24 TOU plan to the Company's hours of highest risk and to
25 introduce larger differentials, as discussed in the

1 Company's Application. Additionally, the Parties agreed to
2 introduce a summer mid-peak period from 3 p.m. to 7 p.m.

3 Q. Why is it necessary to introduce a mid-peak
4 period to Schedule 5?

5 A. Staff believes the mid-peak creates alignment
6 with Schedule 9, Large General Service, and Schedule 19,
7 Large Power Service. Additionally, Staff believes it sends
8 price signals to TOU customers to conserve during a time
9 of moderate risk for the Company. Finally, in the Company's
10 concurrent Export Credit Rate filing, Case No. IPC-E-23-
11 14, the Company proposed a Summer On-Peak period of 3-10
12 p.m. for customer generators exports. Staff believes the
13 mid-peak proposal for Schedule 5 helps to create alignment
14 between the hours of highest risk for the Company between
15 the two filings.

16 Q. Please discuss additional areas of rate design
17 in the Settlement.

18 A. The Parties agree the Small General Service
19 Charge will increase from \$5 to \$25 per month on January
20 1, 2024. Additionally, the revenue requirement allocated
21 to Schedule 30, U.S. Department of Energy Special Contract,
22 will be effectuated by setting the demand charge at
23 \$9.75/kW and the energy charge at \$0.040951/kWh. Lastly,
24 the Schedule 8 tariff sheet will be updated to reflect the
25 inclusion of September as part of the summer season as

1 reflected in Attachment No. 2 to the Motion.

2 **Separate Informal Proceedings**

3 Q. Does the Settlement include agreements for other
4 actions to follow this rate case?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Please explain how the Settlement addresses what
7 the Company and Parties will need to do following this
8 case.

9 A. First, Clean Energy Opportunities for Idaho
10 ("CEO") will coordinate and lead two series of workshops.
11 The first workshop will explore revenue neutral bill
12 protection for residential customers taking service on TOU
13 schedule, and a second series of workshops to explore
14 class-cost-of-service methodology and analysis, TOU option
15 for irrigators, and TOU concerns and opportunities.

16 Second, the Company and IdaHydro will meet to discuss
17 Qualified Facility interconnection operations and
18 maintenance charges after updating Schedule 72 to reflect
19 current operation costs and assumptions.

20 Third, the Company will work with Staff and interested
21 parties to discuss an evaluation of the Company's
22 transmission system related to radial transmission lines.

23 Fourth, the Company will work with Staff to discuss
24 test year sales derivation methodology prior to the filing
25 of the Company's next general rate case.

1 Fifth, to aid in future prudence review of the
2 Company's Wildfire Mitigation Plan ("WMP"), the Company
3 will add a component that breaks down internal labor costs
4 within its WMP. Additionally, the Company will expand the
5 WMP to forecast each version for five years.

6
7 **Non-Revenue Agreements**

8 Q. Please explain the non-revenue agreements that are
9 included in the Settlement between the Company and the
10 Parties.

11 A. There are several agreements including:

12 1. The Parties agreed that the Company's share of
13 all capital expenditures at the jointly owned Jim Bridger
14 Power Plant ("Bridger") and North Valmy Power Plant
15 ("Valmy") through year end of 2022 were prudently incurred.
16 Staff believes that the Company has sufficiently shown
17 prudence of its coal partnered plants.

18 2. At the time of signing the Settlement, Staff had
19 not completed its review of all of the Company's capital
20 investments. For Settlement purposes, Staff agreed to
21 include the full amount of capital investments into test
22 year rate base. Staff will update the Company on our
23 progress by November 15, 2023, and will have the capital
24 investment prudence review finalized by December 1, 2023.
25 If there are any prudence concerns, Staff agreed to

1 determine prudence of those identified items in the
2 Company's next general rate case. Additionally, Staff and
3 the Company will have further discussion on capital project
4 information and documentation necessary for Staff and other
5 parties to effectively conduct prudence reviews for all
6 capital projects, including the Company's partnered
7 plants.

8 3. The Settlement uses a new base system Net Power
9 Supply Expense "NSPE" of \$484,907,243. The Parties agreed
10 to transfer \$168.3 million base level NPSE from the PCA to
11 base rates. Staff supports this transfer as the Company
12 will be able to recover these expected expenses within base
13 rates and ratepayers get the benefit of a reduced PCA
14 charge. In addition, the Parties agreed to use the filed
15 class cost-of-service updated to reflect the settled
16 revenue requirement for purposes of determining the SBAR
17 to be applied in the PCA. As proposed by the Company in
18 the case, the resulting SBAR is \$30.90 per megawatt-hour.

19 4. The Settlement reflects changes to the FCA due
20 to increased monthly Service Charges to the Residential
21 and Small Commercial customer classes. For Residential
22 customer classes, the monthly service charge will be \$10
23 per month in 2024 and \$15 per month in 2025. The monthly
24 service charge for Small Commercial will be \$25 per month.
25 Staff supports these changes as the recovery of fixed

1 expenses shifts away from the volumetric charges.

2 5. Tracking of Third Party Wheeling: The Settlement
3 identified \$46,361,643 of Idaho's jurisdictional share of
4 third-party point-to-point wheeling revenues.
5 Identification of this amount complies with Commission
6 Order No. 32821 and will be used as a baseline for potential
7 annual tracking and adjustments in the PCA.

8 6. Lastly, the Parties agreed that the Company defer
9 without carrying charge and amortize annual differences
10 between certain periodic maintenance costs at the Company's
11 natural gas-fired power plants.

12 Q. Do you have any other comments on the Settlement?

13 A. Yes. Staff looked at each revenue requirement
14 adjustment, class cost-of-service study, proposed rate
15 design, and other issues under consideration and determined
16 that the Settlement between the Parties was as good or
17 better than what could be expected by fully litigating the
18 case. Staff believes that the rate stability and certainty,
19 along with the reduced revenue increases, provided in the
20 Settlement, represents a fair, just, and reasonable
21 compromise of the positions put forth by the Parties and
22 is in the public interest. Therefore, Staff recommends that
23 the Commission approve the Settlement without material
24 changes or modification.

25 Q. Does this conclude your testimony in this

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

proceeding?

A. Yes.

Professional Qualifications
Of
Taylor Thomas
Program Manager - Technical Analysis
Idaho Public Utilities Commission

EDUCATION

Mr. Thomas earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Environmental Economics from California State University at Chico in 2016. Studies for this degree focused on energy, the environment, and sustainability. In addition to his formal education, Mr. Thomas has attended National Association of Regulatory Commissioners ("NARUC") Utility Rate School and the Practical Regulatory Training program by the New Mexico State University Center for Public Utilities.

BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

Prior to joining the Idaho Public Utilities Commission ("IPUC"), in 2017, Mr. Thomas was a Service Supervisor for a solar company in Granite Bay, California. In that capacity, Mr. Thomas analyzed, designed, and supervised multiple solar system projects to include integration, installation, and maintenance of commercial sized solar arrays and residential utility systems. He completed analysis of all company solar system projects to maintain optimal efficiency and provided maintenance for projects when defects or optimal efficiency rates were not being met.

Mr. Thomas joined the IPUC in 2020 as a Technical Analyst with a focus on Energy Efficiency. In 2022, he was promoted to Program Manager of the Technical Analysis Department within the Utilities Division. During his employment at IPUC, he has supervised Staff and worked on a variety of cases to regulate electric, natural gas, and water utilities. His assignments and responsibilities include cases involving prudence determination of major utility investments, integrated resource plans, distributed energy resources, cost adjustment mechanisms, demand-side management, sales of utilities and their assets, wildfire, and rate design. Mr. Thomas participates in Energy

Efficiency Advisory Groups and External Stakeholder Advisory Committees for Idaho Power, Avista Utilities, Rocky Mountain Power, and Intermountain Gas Company. He is a member of the NARUC State Working Group on Electric Vehicles, Regional Technical Forum, Demand Response Advisory Committee, and Conservation Resource Advisory Committee.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE THIS 15th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2023, SERVED THE FOREGOING **DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TAYLOR THOMAS IN SUPPORT OF THE STIPULATION AND SETTLEMENT**, IN CASE NO. IPC-E-23-11, BY E-MAILING A COPY THEREOF, TO THE FOLLOWING:

LISA D NORDSTROM
DONOVAN E WALKER
MEGAN GOICOECHEA ALLEN
IDAHO POWER COMPANY
PO BOX 70
BOISE ID 83707-0070
E-MAIL:
lnordstrom@idahopower.com
dwalker@idahopower.com
mgoicoecheaallen@idahopower.com
dockets@idahopower.com

KELSEY JAE
LAW FOR CONSCIOUS LEADERSHIP
920 N CLOVER DR
BOISE ID 83703
E-MAIL: kelsey@kelseyjae.com

ERIC L OLSEN
ECHO HAWK & OLSEN PLLC
PO BOX 6119
POCATELLO ID 83205
E-MAIL: elo@echohawk.com

PETER J RICHARDSON
RICHARDSON ADAMS PLLC
515 N 27TH ST
BOISE ID 83702
E-MAIL: peter@richardsonadams.com

TIMOTHY TATUM
CONNIE ASCHENBRENNER
MATT LARKIN
IDAHO POWER COMPANY
PO BOX 70
BOISE ID 83707-0070
E-MAIL: ttatum@idahopower.com
caschenbrenner@idahopower.com
mlarkin@idahopower.com

MICHAEL HECKLER
COURTNEY WHITE
CLEAN ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES
3778 PLANTATION RIVER DR
STE 102
BOISE ID 83703
E-MAIL:
mike@cleanenergyopportunities.com
courtney@cleanenergyopportunities.com

LANCE KAUFMAN PhD
2623 NW BLUEBELL PLACE
CORVALLIS OR 97330
E-MAIL: lance@aegisinsight.com

DR DON READING
280 SILVERWOOD WAY
EAGLE ID 83616
E-MAIL: dreading@mindspring.com

JIM SWIER
MICRON TECHNOLOGY INC
8000 S FEDERAL WAY
BOISE ID 83707
E-MAIL: jswier@micron.com

AUSTIN RUESCHHOFF
THORVALD A NELSON
AUSTIN W JENSEN
HOLLAND & HART LLP
555 17TH ST STE 3200
DENVER CO 80202
E-MAIL: darueschhoff@hollandhart.com
tnelson@hollandhart.com
awjensen@hollandhart.com
aclee@hollandhart.com
clmoser@hollandhart.com

TOM ARKOOSH
ARKOOSH LAW OFFICES
PO BOX 2900
BOISE ID 83701
E-MAIL tom.arkoosh@arkoosh.com
erin.cecil@arkoosh.com

ED JEWELL
DARRELL EARLY
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
BOISE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
PO BOX 500
BOISE ID 83701-0500
E-MAIL: BoiseCityAttorney@cityofboise.org
ejewell@cityofboise.org
dearly@cityofboise.org

WIL GEHL
ENERGY PROGRAM MANAGER
BOISE CITY DEPT OF PUBLIC WORKS
PO BOX 500
BOISE ID 82701-0500
E-MAIL: wgehl@cityofboise.org

MATTHEW NYKIEL
ID CONSERVATION LEAGUE
710 N 6TH ST
BOISE ID 83702
E-MAIL: matthew.nykiel@gmail.com

BRAD HEUSINKVELD
ID CONSERVATION LEAGUE
710 N 6TH ST
BOISE ID 83702
E-MAIL:
bheusinkveld@idahoconservation.org

PETER MEIER
US DEPT OF ENERGY
1000 INDEPENDENCE AVE SW
WASHINGTON DC 20585
E-MAIL: peter.meier@hq.doe.gov

DWIGHT ETHERIDGE
EXETER ASSOCIATES
5565 STERRETT PLACE
STE 310
COLUMBIA MD 21044
E-MAIL: detheridge@exeterassociates.com

F. DIEGO RIVAS
NW ENERGY COALITION
1101 8TH AVE
HELENA MT 59601
E-MAIL: diego@nwenergy.org

NORMAN M SEMANKO
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
800 W MAIN ST STE 1300
BOISE ID 83702
E-MAIL: nsemanko@parsonsbehle.com

STEVE W CHRISS
DIR ENERGY SERVICES
WALMART INC
2608 SOUTHEAST J ST
BENTONVILLE AR 72716
E-MAIL: stephen.chriss@walmart.com

BENJAMIN J OTTO
1407 W COTTONWOOD CT
BOISE ID 83702
E-MAIL: ben@nwenergy.org

JUSTINA A CAVIGLIA
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
50 W LIBERTY ST STE 750
RENO NV 89502
E-MAIL: jcaviglia@parsonsbehle.com



SECRETARY

