

**BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION ) CASE NO. PAC-E-20-02**  
**OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER )**  
**REQUESTING APPROVAL OF \$21.2 ) DIRECT TESTIMONY OF**  
**MILLON NET POWER COST DEFERRAL ) DAVID G. WEBB**

**ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER**

---

**CASE NO. PAC-E-20-02**

**April 2020**

1 **Q. Please state your name, business address, and present position with PacifiCorp**  
2 **d/b/a Rocky Mountain Power (“Rocky Mountain Power” or the “Company”).**

3 A. My name is David G. Webb and my business address is 825 NE Multnomah Street,  
4 Suite 600, Portland, Oregon 97232. My title is Manager, Net Power Costs.

5 **QUALIFICATIONS**

6 **Q. Please describe your education and professional experience.**

7 A. I received a Master of Accountancy degree from Southern Utah University in 1999 and  
8 a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Management from Brigham Young  
9 University in 1994. I am a Certified Public Accountant licensed in the state of Nevada.

10 I have been employed by PacifiCorp since 2005 and have held various positions in the  
11 regulation, finance, fuels, and mining departments. I assumed my current role  
12 managing the regulatory net power cost group in 2019.

13 **Q. Have you testified in previous regulatory proceedings?**

14 A. Yes. I have previously provided testimony to the public utility commissions in Utah,  
15 Wyoming, and Oregon.

16 **PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

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

18 A. My testimony presents and supports the Company’s calculation of the Energy Cost  
19 Adjustment Mechanism (“ECAM”) balancing account for the 12-month period of  
20 January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019 (“Deferral Period”). More specifically, I  
21 provide the following:

- 22 • A summary of the ECAM calculation, including changes made to comply with  
23 Commission orders;

- 1 • Details supporting the addition of approximately \$21.6 million to the deferral  
2 balance, including \$11.5 million customers' share of excess ECAM-related  
3 costs, \$4.5 million Lake Side 2 Resource Adder, a \$4.7 million reduction in  
4 renewable energy production tax credits ("PTCs"), \$0.5 million resource  
5 tracking mechanism ("RTM") deferral, \$32 thousand renewable energy credit  
6 ("REC") revenue differential, and \$0.5 million interest accrued;
- 7 • Discussion of the main differences between adjusted actual net power costs  
8 ("Actual NPC") and net power costs in rates ("Base NPC"); and,
- 9 • Discussion about the Company's participation in the energy imbalance market  
10 ("EIM") with the California Independent System Operator ("CAISO") and the  
11 benefits from EIM that are passed through to customers.

12 **Q. What other witnesses present testimony for the ECAM and Tariff Schedule 94 in**  
13 **this case?**

14 A. Mr. Robert M. Meredith, Director, Pricing and Cost of Service, provides testimony on  
15 the proposed rates in Electric Service Schedule No. 94, Energy Cost Adjustment  
16 ("Schedule 94") and Mr. Steven R. McDougal, Director, Revenue Requirement,  
17 provides testimony on wind repowering costs as calculated and deferred through the  
18 approved RTM.

#### 19 **SUMMARY OF THE ECAM DEFERRAL CALCULATION**

20 **Q. Please briefly describe the Company's ECAM authorized by the Commission.**

21 A. In general, the ECAM tracks deviations between Actual NPC and Base NPC and defers  
22 90 percent of the difference for later recovery.<sup>1</sup> Other items, described in detail later in

---

<sup>1</sup> See Order No. 30904 in Case No. PAC-E-08-08 and Order No. 33440 in Case No. PAC-E-15-09.

1 my testimony, are also tracked in the ECAM to true-up the amount in base rates to  
2 actuals. These items include a resource adder for the Lake Side 2 gas generation plant,  
3 PTCs, RTM deferral, and revenues from the sale of RECs.<sup>2</sup> The balance that  
4 accumulates over a deferral period is then passed on to customers as a rate surcharge  
5 or credit. The Schedule 94 rate, described in Mr. Meredith's testimony appears as a  
6 separate line item on customer bills, collects from or credits to customers the balance  
7 of deferred costs. Schedule 94 is adjusted as needed in the Company's annual ECAM  
8 filings.

9 The Company is required to file an application with the Commission annually  
10 by April 1<sup>st</sup> to seek approval of the deferral amount and the new Schedule 94 rate, which  
11 becomes effective June 1<sup>st</sup>.

12 **Q. How is the ECAM deferral calculation presented in your testimony?**

13 A. The calculation of the ECAM deferral is contained in Exhibit No. 1, discussed later in  
14 my testimony. Table 1 is a summary of the major components.

15 **Q. Are there any changes to the ECAM calculation?**

16 A. Yes. As discussed in Mr. McDougal's testimony, the Company and intervening parties  
17 reached a stipulated agreement approved in Order No. 33954, that authorized the  
18 Company to use the ECAM to recover the replacement of certain assets, new  
19 investment, incremental energy production, and wind repowering project PTCs through  
20 the RTM. The RTM and ECAM will capture the costs and benefits of the repowered  
21 wind facilities until they are recovered in base rates through a general rate case.  
22 Exhibit No. 1 has been modified from previous years to include the RTM deferral.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Order No. 33440 in Case No. PAC-E-15-09 pages 5–6.

1 **ECAM DEFERRAL CALCULATION**

2 **Q. Please describe the calculation of the ECAM deferral included in this filing.**

3 A. Table 1 provides a summary of the total ECAM deferral and a breakdown of the  
4 individual components of the ECAM. Additionally, Exhibit No. 1 presents the detailed  
5 calculation of the ECAM deferral on a monthly basis.

6 **Table 1**  
**Annual ECAM Calculation**

<b>Calendar Year 2019 ECAM Deferral</b>	
NPC Differential	\$ 13,470,193
EITF 04-6 Adjustment	115,324
LCAR	(829,632)
Total Deferral Before Sharing	<u>\$ 12,755,886</u>
Sharing Band	<u>90%</u>
Customer Responsibility	<u>\$ 11,480,297</u>
Lake Side 2 Resource Adder	\$ 4,540,985
Production Tax Credits	4,717,273
RTM Adjustment	452,488
REC Deferral	(31,947)
Interest on Deferral	<u>462,786</u>
<b>Annual Deferral (Jan - Dec 2019)</b>	<u><u>\$ 21,621,882</u></u>

7 Table 1 summarizes the components of the ECAM balance. The first section  
8 summarizes the Idaho-allocated share of those items for which Idaho customers and  
9 the Company share responsibility, including: NPC differential, EITF 04-6 adjustment,  
10 and load change adjustment revenue (“LCAR”) costs. The next section calculates the  
11 90 percent customers’ share of the items above and adds the following items which are  
12 refunded or collected in full (i.e., 100 percent): the Lake Side 2 resource adder, PTCs,  
13 RTM deferral and REC revenues. The total of these items equal the ECAM deferral.

1 **Q. Please explain how the depreciation regulatory asset has been included in the**  
2 **ECAM calculation.**

3 A. In Case No. PAC-E-18-01, the Commission ordered the Company to include the  
4 depreciation regulatory asset created in Case No. PAC-E-13-02 in future Idaho ECAM  
5 filings. As seen in Exhibit No. 1, the beginning balance, monthly deferral, and monthly  
6 amortization are included as part of the ECAM deferral balance.

7 **Q. Based on your calculations, what is the balance expected to be in the ECAM**  
8 **deferral account as of June 1, 2020?**

9 A. The projected balance in the ECAM deferral account as of June 1, 2020 is  
10 approximately \$22.3 million. Table 2 summarizes the ECAM balancing account  
11 activity starting with the calendar year 2018 ECAM deferral balance of \$17.4 million  
12 approved in Case No. PAC-E-19-04. Approximately \$21.6 million is added to the  
13 balance from the annual deferral and interest during the Deferral Period, offset by \$11.7  
14 million of ECAM revenue collections. Table 2 then summarizes the depreciation  
15 regulatory asset balance activity; the sum of the two is the balance for collection as of  
16 December 31, 2019.

1

**Table 2  
Balancing Account Activity**

<b>ECAM Deferral Balance</b>	
Prior Deferral	\$ 17,365,652
Annual Deferral (Jan - Dec 2019)	21,159,096
Interest	462,786
ECAM Revenue Collection - Schedule 94	<u>(11,701,152)</u>
<b>Activity Through December 31, 2019</b>	<b>\$ 27,286,382</b>
<b>Depreciation Regulatory Asset Balance</b>	
Beginning Balance	\$ (86,905)
Annual Deferral (Jan - Dec 2019)	1,914,765
ECAM Revenue Collection - Schedule 94	<u>(1,904,737)</u>
<b>Activity Through December 31, 2019</b>	<b>\$ (76,878)</b>
<b>December 31, 2019 Balance For Collection</b>	<b><u>\$ 27,209,505</u></b>
Schedule 94 Collection - Jan - May 2020	\$ (5,100,346)
Interest	206,406
<b>Expected Balance as of June 1, 2020</b>	<b><u>\$ 22,315,564</u></b>

2 **Q. Please describe the ECAM calculations in Exhibit No. 1.**

3 A. The ECAM deferral is calculated by comparing Idaho-allocated Actual NPC to the  
4 NPC collected in rates on a monthly basis and deferring the differences into an ECAM  
5 balancing account. Exhibit No. 1 includes details of the ECAM calculation. I have also  
6 provided confidential work papers supporting this exhibit.

7 **Q. How are the Base NPC and Actual NPC calculated?**

8 A. The monthly Base NPC collected in rates, as set forth in Exhibit No. 1 line 6, is  
9 calculated by taking the dollar-per-megawatt-hour Base NPC rate multiplied by the  
10 actual Idaho retail sales. The Actual Idaho NPC, as set forth in Exhibit No. 1 line 15, is  
11 calculated by dividing the monthly total Company Actual NPC in the Deferral Period  
12 by the actual monthly system megawatt-hours (“MWh”) in the Deferral Period. The  
13 total Company Actual NPC dollar-per-megawatt-hour basis is then multiplied by Idaho  
14 actual monthly MWh to calculate Actual Idaho NPC.

1 **Q. Please describe how the NPC deferral is calculated.**

2 A. The deferral is calculated on a monthly basis by subtracting the Base NPC collected in  
3 rates from the Actual Idaho NPC. For the Deferral Period, the NPC differential was  
4 \$13.5 million before applying the 90 / 10 percent sharing.

5 **Q. What costs are included in the NPC differential for deferral?**

6 A. The NPC differential for deferral captures all components of NPC as defined in the  
7 Company's general rate case proceedings and modeled by the Company's production  
8 dispatch model the Generation and Regulation Initiative Decision Tool ("GRID").  
9 Specifically, Base NPC and Actual NPC include amounts booked to the following  
10 FERC accounts:

11 Account 447 – Sales for resale; excluding on-system wholesale sales and other  
12 revenues that are not modeled in GRID

13 Account 501 – Fuel, steam generation; excluding fuel handling, start-up fuel  
14 (gas and diesel fuel, residual disposal), and other costs that are  
15 not modeled in GRID

16 Account 503 – Steam from other sources

17 Account 547 – Fuel, other generation

18 Account 555 – Purchased power; excluding the Bonneville Power  
19 Administration ("BPA") residential exchange credit pass-  
20 through if applicable

21 Account 565 – Transmission of electricity by others

22 **Q. Are adjustments made to the Actual NPC before comparing them to Base NPC?**

23 A. Yes. The Company adjusts Actual NPC to reflect the ratemaking treatment of several



1 items, including:

- 2 • out of period accounting entries booked in the Deferral Period that relate to
- 3 operations before implementation of the ECAM on July 1, 2009;
- 4 • buy-through of economic curtailment by interruptible industrial customers;
- 5 • revenue from a contract related to the Leaning Juniper wind resource;
- 6 • situs assignment of the generation from Oregon solar resources procured to
- 7 satisfy Oregon Revised Statute (“ORS”) 757.370 solar capacity standard;
- 8 • situs assignment of Oregon allocated excess amortization related to a
- 9 prepaid wheeling expense;
- 10 • situs assignment of certain Utah solar resources and Schedule 32 contract
- 11 costs;
- 12 • coal inventory adjustments to reflect coal costs in the correct period;
- 13 • legal fees related to fines and citations included in the cost of coal; and,
- 14 • adjustments related to liquidated damages that occurred outside the Deferral
- 15 Period (all liquidated damage fees per a coal supply agreement are booked
- 16 in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles).

17 **Q. Why is the July 1, 2009 cutoff used to determine out of period entries?**

18 A. Since the ECAM took effect, customers’ rates have been adjusted to recover essentially  
19 all of the Company’s actual net power costs, excluding any differences due to the 90 /  
20 10 percent sharing band. Consequently, any accounting entries made during the current  
21 Deferral Period that relate to any operating period since the ECAM took effect, should  
22 also be reflected in customer rates, whether they increase or decrease Actual NPC.  
23 Accounting entries related to operating periods before the inception of the ECAM

1 should not impact the ECAM deferral.

2 **Q. In addition to comparing Actual NPC to Base NPC, what other components are**  
3 **included in the ECAM?**

4 A. Six additional components are included in the ECAM calculations: (i) an adjustment  
5 for deferred costs associated with coal mine stripping activities recorded under the  
6 Financial Accounting Standards Board (“FASB”) EITF 04-6; (ii) the LCAR  
7 adjustment; (iii) a resource adder to collect the investment in the Lake Side 2 natural  
8 gas generation facility; (iv) a true-up of PTCs; (v) the resource tracking mechanism  
9 deferral; and (vi) a true-up of REC revenues as authorized in Order No. 32196.

10 **Q. How is the adjustment for accounting pronouncement EITF 04-6 included in the**  
11 **ECAM?**

12 A. The calculation of coal stripping costs on Line 17 of Exhibit No. 1 reflects Idaho’s  
13 allocated differences between the coal stripping costs incurred by the Company during  
14 excavation and recorded on the Company’s books pursuant to the guidance of the  
15 accounting pronouncement EITF 04-6, and the amortization of the coal stripping costs  
16 as approved by the Commission in Case No. PAC-E-09-08, Order No. 30987. For the  
17 Deferral Period, the total EITF 04-6 coal stripping deferral adjustment is a \$0.1 million  
18 increase to the ECAM deferral balance before the 90 / 10 percent sharing.

19 **Q. Please describe the LCAR adjustment.**

20 A. The calculation of the LCAR adjustment is a symmetrical adjustment for over- or  
21 under-collection of the energy-related portion of the Company’s embedded revenue  
22 requirement for production facilities as specified in Case No. GNR-E-10-03, Order No.  
23 32206. The LCAR accounts for variances in Idaho load that cause the Company to

1 collect more or less of these production-related costs. The LCAR rate of \$5.54 per  
2 MWh is used for the Deferral Period.

3 **Q. How is the LCAR adjustment calculated and what impact does it have on the**  
4 **Deferral Period?**

5 A. The LCAR adjustment assumes that the actual production-related costs of the LCAR  
6 are equal to base, Exhibit No. 1 line 18. The actual production-related costs are then  
7 compared to the LCAR revenue collection in rates, calculated by multiplying the LCAR  
8 rate by the actual Idaho retail sales, Exhibit No. 1 line 21. The LCAR adjustment is the  
9 difference between the actual production-related costs and the LCAR revenue, line 22  
10 of Exhibit No. 1, and is a \$0.8 million decrease to the ECAM deferral balance before  
11 the 90 / 10 percent sharing.

12 **Q. Please explain the sharing ratio between the Company and customers in the**  
13 **ECAM.**

14 A. The ECAM includes a symmetrical sharing ratio in which customers either pay or  
15 receive 90 percent of the ECAM deferral balance, and the Company is responsible for  
16 the remaining 10 percent. Line 24 of Exhibit No. 1 represents the customers' 90 percent  
17 share of the monthly deferral shown on line 23 of Exhibit No. 1. For the Deferral  
18 Period, the customers' share of the deferred balance is \$11.5 million. The remaining  
19 balance of \$1.3 million associated with the Company's 10 percent share is not included  
20 in the deferral balance as it is not recoverable from customers.

21 **Q. What is the amount of the Lake Side 2 resource adder in the current filing?**

22 A. Pursuant to the stipulation in Case No. PAC-E-13-04, approved by the Commission in  
23 Order No. 32910, the Company included a resource adder to recover the investment in

1 the Lake Side 2 generation plant which is not yet included in base rates. The resource  
2 adder amounts to \$1.99/MWh of the Lake Side 2 generation capped at 2,729,500 MWh  
3 or \$5.4 million for the calendar year. The total Lake Side 2 resource adder for the  
4 Deferral Period was \$4.5 million based on 2,281,902 MWh of generation, line 27 of  
5 Exhibit No. 1.

6 **Q. What is the amount of the PTC true-up in the current filing?**

7 A. The PTC Deferral, on line 32 of Exhibit No. 1, is calculated by comparing the actual  
8 Idaho-allocated PTC to the PTC customers receive through base rates. The PTC credit  
9 in base rates is calculated by multiplying the approved PTC rate of \$1.99/MWh by  
10 Idaho retail sales. The difference is a \$4.7 million increase to the ECAM deferral.

11 **Q. Please explain the RTM deferral.**

12 A. The RTM deferral, on line 33 of Exhibit No. 1, is calculated per Exhibit No. 4 described  
13 in Mr. McDougal's testimony. The RTM deferral during calendar year 2019 is \$0.5  
14 million.

15 **Q. What is the amount of REC revenue adjustment in the current filing?**

16 A. The REC revenue adjustment, on line 38 of Exhibit No. 1, is calculated by comparing  
17 the actual Idaho-allocated REC revenue to the REC revenue credit customers receive  
18 through base rates. The REC revenue credit in base rates is calculated by multiplying  
19 the approved REC revenue rate of \$0.09/MWh by Idaho retail sales. The difference is  
20 a \$32 thousand decrease to the ECAM deferral.

21 **Q. What is the total ECAM deferred balance calculated in Exhibit No. 1?**

22 A. The total ECAM deferred balance as of December 31, 2019 is \$21.2 million, shown on  
23 line 39 plus \$463 thousand of interest on line 48 of Exhibit No. 1, for a total deferral

1 of \$21.6 million.

2 **Q. Does the calculation of the ECAM deferral in this application comply with the**  
3 **parameters of the Idaho ECAM as approved by the Commission?**

4 A. Yes. Therefore, the Company recommends the Commission approve the ECAM  
5 application for recovery of the \$21.6 million prudently incurred ECAM costs.

6 **DIFFERENCES IN NPC**

7 **Q. On a total-Company basis, what was the difference between Actual NPC and Base**  
8 **NPC for the Deferral Period?**

9 A. On a total-Company basis, Actual NPC for the Deferral Period were \$1,653 million,  
10 exceeding Base NPC for the Deferral Period by \$167 million. Table 3 provides a high  
11 level summary of the difference between Base NPC and Actual NPC by category on a  
12 total-Company basis.

13

**Table 3**  
**Net Power Cost Reconciliation (\$ millions)**

	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Base NPC</b>	\$ 1,485
Increase/(Decrease) to NPC:	
Wholesale Sales Revenue	157
Purchased Power Expense	91
Coal Fuel Expense	(83)
Natural Gas Expense	2
Wheeling and Other Expense	0
<b>Total Increase/(Decrease)</b>	<b>\$ 167</b>
<b>Adjusted Actual NPC</b>	<b>\$ 1,653</b>

1 **Q. Please describe the Base NPC the Company used to calculate the NPC component**  
2 **of the ECAM deferral.**

3 A. The Base NPC were set in Case No. PAC-E-16-12 and became effective January 1,  
4 2017. Base NPC used the 12 month test period of January 2016 through  
5 December 2016 and set total-Company Base NPC at \$1,485 million.

6 **Q. Please describe the primary differences between Actual NPC and Base NPC.**

7 A. From an accounting perspective, and as shown in Table 3, Actual NPC were higher than  
8 Base NPC due to a \$157 million reduction in wholesale sales, a \$91 million increase in  
9 purchased power expense, a \$2 million increase in natural gas expense, and a  
10 \$0.2 million increase in wheeling and other expenses. The items were partially offset  
11 by an \$83 million reduction in coal fuel expense.

12 **Q. Please explain the changes in wholesale sales revenue.**

13 A. Wholesale sales revenue declined relative to Base NPC due to higher market prices and  
14 a reduction in the wholesale sales volume of market transactions (represented in GRID  
15 as short-term firm and system balancing sales).

16 Revenue from market transactions is \$141 million lower than Base NPC due to  
17 higher market prices and lower volume of market sales transactions. The average price  
18 of actual market sales transactions was \$9.94/MWh, or 42 percent, higher than the  
19 average price in Base NPC. Actual wholesale market volumes were 8,148 GWh, or  
20 62 percent, lower than the Base NPC. In addition, an expired contract accounted for  
21 \$9 million of the decrease in wholesale sales revenue.

22 **Q. Please explain the changes in purchased power expense.**

23 A. Purchased power expense increased due to a \$104 million increase (49 percent) in

1 qualifying facility (“QF”) transactions, partially offset by the expiration of a long-term  
2 purchase power contract. Actual QF transaction volumes were 1,690 GWh (47 percent)  
3 higher than Base NPC. The expiration of the Hermiston purchase power agreement  
4 (“PPA”) resulted in lower purchased power costs of \$31.3 million.

5 Additionally, expenses from market transactions (represented in GRID as short-  
6 term firm and system balancing purchases) increased by \$37.0 million compared to  
7 Base NPC. Actual market purchases were 2,714 GWh (38 percent) lower than Base  
8 NPC, but the average price of actual market purchases transactions was \$23.51/MWh  
9 (94 percent) higher than Base NPC.

10 **Q. Please explain the changes in wheeling expenses.**

11 A. Actual long-term wheeling expenses decreased by \$1.4 million when compared to Base  
12 NPC due to expired wheeling contracts. This was offset by an increase of \$6.8 million  
13 of short-term wheeling expenses.

14 **Q. Please explain the changes in coal fuel expense.**

15 A. Coal fuel expense decreased because coal generation volume decreased 4,587 GWh  
16 (12 percent) compared to Base NPC. The average cost of coal generation increased  
17 from \$19.96/MWh in Base NPC to \$20.22/MWh in the Deferral Period, but the lower  
18 generation volume results in an overall decrease of \$83 million in coal fuel expense.

19 **Q. Please explain the changes in natural gas fuel expense.**

20 A. The total natural gas fuel expense in Actual NPC increased by \$2 million compared to  
21 Base NPC mainly due to an increase in average cost of natural gas generation from  
22 \$23.06/MWh in Base NPC to \$23.79/MWh in the Deferral Period. This was partially  
23 offset by a decrease in gas generation volumes of 291 GWh (2 percent).

1 **Q. Please provide an update of the Enbridge natural gas pipeline rupture and its**  
2 **impact on Company operations and costs.**

3 A. On October 9, 2018, the Enbridge natural gas pipeline that transports natural gas  
4 produced in the Western Canadian Sedimentary Basin to consumers in British  
5 Columbia (“B.C.”) and, through interconnecting pipelines, the Northwestern United  
6 States (“U.S.”), experienced a massive rupture. The pipeline was brought back into  
7 service in late October 2018, however, at a reduced capacity until testing of the many  
8 segments of the pipeline were completed. Spot natural gas prices at the Sumas B.C.-  
9 U.S. border trading point traded as high as \$159 per million British thermal units on  
10 days of intense demand due to cold weather and reduced natural gas supply in the first  
11 quarter of 2019.

12 The pipeline rupture and reduced operating capacity impacted electricity prices  
13 primarily at the Mid-Columbia power market hub, but also increased electricity prices  
14 at other trading points where PacifiCorp transacts. Because of PacifiCorp’s  
15 geographical and resource diversity, the impact to the Company was not as severe as  
16 other utilities and power producers that have a high reliance on Sumas natural gas  
17 supplies. PacifiCorp has one natural gas-fired generator—the Chehalis plant—that is  
18 sourced from the Sumas natural gas hub. Due to the pipeline rupture, there were times  
19 of limited availability of natural gas flowing to the Sumas gas hub and limited ability  
20 to withdraw out of storage facilities at Jackson Prairie. With the inability to run  
21 Chehalis due to limited gas availability and supplies, plus the impact of uneconomical  
22 market conditions, the result contributed to higher prices at Mid-Columbia ultimately  
23 increasing net power costs.



1 **IMPACT OF PARTICIPATING IN THE EIM**

2 **Q. Are the actual benefits from participating in the EIM with CAISO included in the**  
3 **ECAM deferral?**

4 A. Yes. Participation in the EIM provides benefits to customers in the form of reduced  
5 Actual NPC. The EIM benefits are embedded in Actual NPC through lower fuel and  
6 purchased power costs. The Company is able to calculate the margin realized on its  
7 EIM imports and exports, the inter-regional benefit. The Company's EIM inter-regional  
8 benefit for the deferral period was \$57.2 million.

9 **Q. How does the Company calculate its actual EIM benefits?**

10 A. Using actual information from the EIM, including five- and 15-minute pricing, the  
11 Company identifies the incremental resource that could have facilitated the transfer to  
12 an adjacent EIM area or the CAISO in each five-minute interval. The benefit is then  
13 calculated as the difference between the revenue received less the expense of generation  
14 assumed to supply the transfer. In the event of an import, the benefit is equal to the cost  
15 of the import minus the avoided expense of the generation that would have otherwise  
16 been dispatched.

17 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

18 A. The ECAM deferral of \$21.6 million, including interest, for the Deferral Period, was  
19 accurately calculated in compliance with previous Commission orders and  
20 Exhibit No. 1 was updated to include the RTM deferral. Therefore, I respectfully  
21 request that the Commission approve this application as filed with rates effective  
22 June 1, 2020.

1 Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?

2 A. Yes.

Case No. PAC-E-20-02  
Exhibit No. 1  
Witness: David G. Webb

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

---

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of David G. Webb

April 2020



**BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION ) CASE NO. PAC-E-20-02  
OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER )  
REQUESTING APPROVAL OF \$21.2 ) DIRECT TESTIMONY OF  
MILLON NET POWER COST DEFERRAL ) ROBERT M. MEREDITH**

**ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER**

---

**CASE NO. PAC-E-20-02**

**April 2020**

1 **Q. Please state your name, business address and present position with PacifiCorp,**  
2 **dba Rocky Mountain Power (“the Company”).**

3 A. My name is Robert M. Meredith. My business address is 825 NE Multnomah Street,  
4 Suite 2000, Portland, Oregon 97232. My present position is Director, Pricing and Cost  
5 of Service.

### 6 **QUALIFICATIONS**

7 **Q. Briefly describe your educational and professional background.**

8 A. I graduated from Oregon State University in 2004 with a Bachelor of Science degree  
9 in Business Administration and a minor in Economics. In addition to my formal  
10 education, I have attended various industry-related seminars. I have worked for the  
11 Company for 15 years in various roles of increasing responsibility in the Customer  
12 Service, Regulation, and Integrated Resource Planning departments. I have over nine  
13 years of experience preparing cost of service and pricing related analyses for all of the  
14 six states that PacifiCorp serves. In March 2016, I became Manager, Pricing and Cost  
15 of Service. In June 2019, I was promoted to my current position.

16 **Q. Have you testified in previous regulatory proceedings?**

17 A. Yes. I have previously filed testimony on behalf of the Company in regulatory  
18 proceedings in Idaho, Utah, Wyoming, Oregon, Washington, and California.

19 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?**

20 A. My testimony presents and supports the Company’s proposed rates to recover the 2019  
21 Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism (“ECAM”) deferral balances through Electric  
22 Service Schedule No. 94, Energy Cost Adjustment (“Schedule 94”).

1 **BACKGROUND**

2 **Q. What level of revenues is Schedule 94 currently designed to collect?**

3 A. Schedule 94 is currently designed to collect approximately \$10.6 million—\$4.2 million  
4 for Tariff Contract 400, \$0.3 million for Tariff Contract 401, and \$6.1 million for the  
5 standard tariff customers—based on Idaho loads from Case No. PAC-E-15-09.

6 **PROPOSED RATE CHANGE FOR SCHEDULE 94**

7 **Q. Please describe the Company’s proposed rate change in this case.**

8 A. The 2020 ECAM application proposes to increase Schedule 94 rates to recover  
9 approximately \$22.3 million from June 1, 2020 to May 31, 2021. The \$22.3 million  
10 includes \$21.6 million for the 2019 ECAM Deferral, plus approximately \$5.7 million  
11 remaining from the 2018 ECAM balance, for a total balance of \$27.3 million as of  
12 December 31, 2019. This is offset by a net credit of \$76,878 in the depreciation  
13 regulatory asset balance and \$4.9 million Schedule 94 forecasted revenue collection  
14 from January 1, 2020 through May 31, 2020, as shown in Table 2 of Mr. David G.  
15 Webb’s testimony. Mr. Webb explains in his testimony the components of the  
16 2019 ECAM deferred balance. The \$22.3 million balance summarized in Table 2 is  
17 also partially offset by a \$3.1 million amortization of the amount representing the  
18 savings from federal tax reform resulting from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, enacted in  
19 December 2017 (“ECAM Tax Reform Credit”), as further discussed in the testimony  
20 of Mr. Steven R. McDougal.

21 **Q. Please explain the proposed rate change for Tariff Contracts 400 and 401.**

22 A. The proposed rate for Tariff Contracts 400 and 401 is the same as for standard tariff  
23 customers with transmission delivery service voltage.

1 **Q. What is the impact of the proposed ECAM rates?**

2 A. As summarized in my Exhibit No. 2, these rate change proposals result in an increase  
3 of 3.8 percent for Tariff Contract 400, and an increase of 3.9 percent for Tariff Contract  
4 401. Standard tariff customers will also see an average increase of 2.6 percent, or  
5 \$4.9 million.

6 **CALCULATION OF PROPOSED RATES FOR SCHEDULE 94**

7 **Q. How were the proposed Schedule 94 rates developed for all customers?**

8 A. The proposed rates for all customers were developed in four steps. First, I developed  
9 their kilowatt-hour (“kWh”) consumption at the generation level by multiplying their  
10 retail loads at the delivery service voltage level with the corresponding line loss factors.  
11 Next, an overall average rate at the generation level was developed by dividing their  
12 total collection target identified above with their kWh consumption at the generation  
13 level. Finally, rates by delivery voltage level were developed by multiplying the above  
14 overall average rate at the generation level with the corresponding line loss factors. As  
15 a result, the Company proposes Schedule 94 rates of 0.571, 0.549 and 0.532 cents per  
16 kWh for secondary, primary and transmission delivery service voltages, respectively,  
17 for all customers.

18 **Q. Please describe Exhibit No. 2.**

19 A. Exhibit No. 2 shows the 2014 loads used to develop rates, the line loss adjusted loads,  
20 the allocation of the ECAM price change including the ECAM Tax Reform Credit, and  
21 the percentage change by rate schedule.

22 **Q. Please describe Exhibit No. 3.**

23 A. Exhibit No. 3 contains clean and legislative copies of the proposed Electric Service



1 Schedule No. 94, Energy Cost Adjustment. The Company requests that the proposed  
2 Schedule 94 rates become effective on June 1, 2020.

3 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

4 **A. Yes.**

Case No. PAC-E-20-02  
Exhibit No. 2  
Witness: Robert M. Meredith

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

---

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Robert M. Meredith

April 2020

**EXHIBIT NO. 2**  
**ESTIMATED IMPACT OF PROPOSED ECAM ADJUSTMENT**  
**FROM ELECTRIC SALES TO ULTIMATE CONSUMERS**  
**DISTRIBUTED BY RATE SCHEDULES IN IDAHO**  
**HISTORIC 12 MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 2014**

Line No.	Description	Sch.	Average Cust	MWH	Present Rev (\$000)	At Meter			At Generation	Tax Rev (\$000)	Rev (\$000)	ECAM Proposal			Present ECAM Rev (\$000)	Net Change (\$000)	%
						S	P	T				S	P	T			
1	Residential Sales																
1	Residential Service	1	46,059	442,589	\$49,602	442,589	44,534	487,503	(\$394)	\$2,920	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$1,399	\$1,127	2.2%	
2	Residential Optional TOD	36	13,484	235,152	\$22,484	235,152		259,016	(\$209)	\$1,551	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$743	\$599	2.6%	
3	AGA Revenue				\$3												
4	Total Residential		59,543	677,741	\$72,090	677,741	0	746,519	(\$603)	\$4,471				\$2,142	\$1,726	2.3%	
5	<b>Commercial &amp; Industrial</b>																
6	General Service - Large Power	6	1,036	303,011	\$23,667	258,477	44,534	332,125	(\$270)	\$1,989	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$951	\$768	3.1%	
7	General Svc. - Lg. Power (R&F)	6A	214	30,600	\$2,616	30,600		33,705	(\$27)	\$202	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$97	\$78	2.9%	
8	Subtotal-Schedule 6		1,250	333,611	\$26,283	289,077	44,534	365,830	(\$297)	\$2,191				\$1,048	\$846	3.1%	
9	General Service - High Voltage	9	17	121,001	\$7,626			125,363	(\$108)	\$751	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$353	\$290	3.6%	
10	Irrigation	10	4,969	602,488	\$54,316			663,629	(\$536)	\$3,975	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$1,904	\$1,535	2.7%	
11	Comm. & Ind. Space Heating	19	103	5,151	\$438			5,674	(\$5)	\$34	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$16	\$13	2.9%	
12	General Service	23	6,634	153,848	\$14,913	152,484	1,364	169,411	(\$137)	\$1,015	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$486	\$392	2.5%	
13	General Service (R&F)	23A	2,314	33,450	\$3,376		611	36,822	(\$30)	\$221	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$106	\$85	2.4%	
14	Subtotal-Schedule 23		8,948	187,299	\$18,289	185,323	1,975	206,233	(\$167)	\$1,235				\$592	\$477	2.5%	
15	General Service Optional TOD	35	3	1,893	\$123			2,085	(\$2)	\$12	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$6	\$5	3.7%	
16	Special Contract 1	400	1	1,443,926	\$86,967		1,443,926	1,495,980	(\$1,285)	\$8,960				\$4,216	\$3,459	3.8%	
17	Special Contract 2	401	1	107,486	\$6,264		107,486	111,361	(\$96)	\$667				\$314	\$257	3.9%	
18	AGA Revenue				\$478												
19	Total Commercial & Industrial		15,293	2,802,855	\$200,786	1,083,932	46,510	2,976,154	(\$2,495)	\$17,825				\$8,449	\$6,882	3.3%	
20	<b>Public Street Lighting</b>																
21	Security Area Lighting	7	193	267	\$102	267		294	(\$0)	\$2	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$1	\$1	0.7%	
22	Security Area Lighting (R&F)	7A	136	107	\$44			117	(\$0)	\$1	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$0	\$0	0.6%	
23	Street Lighting - Company	11	37	87	\$40			95	(\$0)	\$1	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$0	\$0	0.6%	
24	Street Lighting - Customer	12	234	2,424	\$436	2,424		2,670	(\$2)	\$16	0.571	0.549	0.532	\$8	\$6	1.4%	
25	AGA Revenue				\$0												
26	Total Public Street Lighting		600	2,884	\$621	2,884	0	3,177	(\$3)	\$19				\$9	\$7	1.2%	
27	<b>Total Sales to Ultimate Customers</b>		75,435	3,483,480	\$273,497	1,764,558	46,510	3,725,850	(\$3,100)	\$22,316				\$10,600	\$8,615	3.0%	
28	<b>Total (w/o Sch 400, 401)</b>		75,433	1,932,068	\$180,265	1,764,558	46,510	2,118,509	(\$1,720)	\$12,689				\$6,070	\$4,899	2.6%	
29	Voltage Line Loss Factors applied to rates:				Unallocated	Allocated											
30	Total Company Current Deferral Rate (cents/kWh):				1.06475	1.03605											
31	ECAM deferral			\$22,316	0.599	0.638	0.621	Total Tariff Customer Rate							0.316	0.302	
32	Tax Offset			(\$3,100)	-0.089	-0.089	-0.089	Total Schedule 400 Rate							0.532	0.292	
33	% of Tax Offset				0.571	0.549	0.532	Total Schedule 401 Rate							0.532	0.292	

Case No. PAC-E-20-02  
Exhibit No. 3  
Witness: Robert M. Meredith

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

---

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Robert M. Meredith

April 2020



I.P.U.C. No. 1

~~Ninth-Tenth~~ Revision of Sheet No. 94.1  
 Canceling ~~Eighth-Ninth~~ Revision of Sheet No. 94.1

**ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER**

**ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULE NO. 94**

**STATE OF IDAHO**

**Energy Cost Adjustment**

**AVAILABILITY:** At any point on the Company's interconnected system.

**APPLICATION:** This Schedule shall be applicable to all retail tariff Customers taking service under the Company's electric service schedules.

**ENERGY COST ADJUSTMENT:** The Energy Cost Adjustment is calculated to collect the accumulated difference between total Company Base Net Power Cost and total Company Actual Net Power Cost calculated on a cents per kWh basis.

**MONTHLY BILL:** In addition to the Monthly Charges contained in the Customer's applicable schedule, all monthly bills shall have applied the following cents per kilowatt-hour rate by delivery voltage.

		Delivery Voltage		
		Secondary	Primary	Transmission
Schedule	1	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh		
Schedule	6	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh	0. <del>549302</del> ¢ per kWh	
Schedule	6A	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh	0. <del>549302</del> ¢ per kWh	
Schedule	7	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh		
Schedule	7A	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh		
Schedule	9			0. <del>532292</del> ¢ per kWh
Schedule	10	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh		
Schedule	11	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh		
Schedule	12	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh		
Schedule	19	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh		
Schedule	23	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh	0. <del>549302</del> ¢ per kWh	
Schedule	23A	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh	0. <del>549302</del> ¢ per kWh	
Schedule	24	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh	0. <del>549302</del> ¢ per kWh	
Schedule	35	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh	0. <del>549302</del> ¢ per kWh	
Schedule	35A	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh	0. <del>549302</del> ¢ per kWh	
Schedule	36	0. <del>571316</del> ¢ per kWh		
Schedule	400			0. <del>532292</del> ¢ per kWh
Schedule	401			0. <del>532292</del> ¢ per kWh

Submitted Under Case No. PAC-E-~~20-0219-04~~

**ISSUED:** April ~~13~~, 20~~2019~~

**EFFECTIVE:** June 1, 20~~2019~~



I.P.U.C. No. 1

Tenth Revision of Sheet No. 94.1  
 Canceling Ninth Revision of Sheet No. 94.1

**ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER**

**ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULE NO. 94**

**STATE OF IDAHO**

**Energy Cost Adjustment**

**AVAILABILITY:** At any point on the Company's interconnected system.

**APPLICATION:** This Schedule shall be applicable to all retail tariff Customers taking service under the Company's electric service schedules.

**ENERGY COST ADJUSTMENT:** The Energy Cost Adjustment is calculated to collect the accumulated difference between total Company Base Net Power Cost and total Company Actual Net Power Cost calculated on a cents per kWh basis.

**MONTHLY BILL:** In addition to the Monthly Charges contained in the Customer's applicable schedule, all monthly bills shall have applied the following cents per kilowatt-hour rate by delivery voltage.

		Delivery Voltage		
		<u>Secondary</u>	<u>Primary</u>	<u>Transmission</u>
Schedule	1	0.571¢ per kWh		
Schedule	6	0.571¢ per kWh	0.549¢ per kWh	
Schedule	6A	0.571¢ per kWh	0.549¢ per kWh	
Schedule	7	0.571¢ per kWh		
Schedule	7A	0.571¢ per kWh		
Schedule	9			0.532¢ per kWh
Schedule	10	0.571¢ per kWh		
Schedule	11	0.571¢ per kWh		
Schedule	12	0.571¢ per kWh		
Schedule	19	0.571¢ per kWh		
Schedule	23	0.571¢ per kWh	0.549¢ per kWh	
Schedule	23A	0.571¢ per kWh	0.549¢ per kWh	
Schedule	24	0.571¢ per kWh	0.549¢ per kWh	
Schedule	35	0.571¢ per kWh	0.549¢ per kWh	
Schedule	35A	0.571¢ per kWh	0.549¢ per kWh	
Schedule	36	0.571¢ per kWh		
Schedule	400			0.532¢ per kWh
Schedule	401			0.532¢ per kWh

Submitted Under Case No. PAC-E-20-02

**ISSUED:** April 1, 2020

**EFFECTIVE:** June 1, 2020

**BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION ) CASE NO. PAC-E-20-02  
OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER )  
REQUESTING APPROVAL OF \$21.2 ) DIRECT TESTIMONY OF  
MILLON NET POWER COST DEFERRAL ) STEVEN R. MCDOUGAL**

**ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER**

---

**CASE NO. PAC-E-20-02**

**April 2020**

1 **Q. Please state your name and business address with PacifiCorp dba Rocky**  
2 **Mountain Power (“Company”).**

3 A. My name is Steven R. McDougal, and my business address is 1407 W. North Temple,  
4 Suite 330, Salt Lake City, Utah 84116.

5 **QUALIFICATIONS**

6 **Q. Please describe your education and professional background.**

7 A. I received a Master of Accountancy from Brigham Young University with an emphasis  
8 in Management Advisory Services and a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting  
9 from Brigham Young University. In addition to my formal education, I have also  
10 attended various educational, professional, and electric industry-related seminars. I  
11 have been employed with PacifiCorp and its predecessor, Utah Power and Light  
12 Company (the “Company”), since 1983. My experience includes various positions with  
13 regulation, finance, resource planning, and internal audit. My current position is the  
14 Director of Revenue Requirements.

15 **Q. What are your current responsibilities with the Company?**

16 A. My primary responsibilities include overseeing the calculation and reporting of the  
17 Company’s regulated earnings and revenue requirement, assuring that the  
18 interjurisdictional cost allocation methodology is correctly applied, and explaining  
19 those calculations to regulators in the jurisdictions in which the Company operates.

20 **Q. Have you testified in previous proceedings?**

21 A. Yes. I have provided testimony in regulatory proceedings in California, Idaho, Oregon,  
22 Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.



1 **PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY**

2 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

3 A. I explain and support the Company’s request, through this Energy Cost Adjustment  
4 Mechanism (ECAM), for recovery of \$452 thousand, before carrying charge,  
5 associated with the wind repowering costs as calculated and deferred through the  
6 approved Resource Tracking Mechanism (RTM). This amount is included the ECAM  
7 as shown in Mr. Dave Webb’s Testimony, Exhibit No. 1, line 33. I also summarize the  
8 2017 Tax Reform Credit and modifications to the accounting treatment of the excess  
9 deferred income tax, (“EDIT”), balances.

10 **RESOURCE TRACKING MECHANISM**

11 **Q. Please briefly describe the background and purpose of the resource tracking  
12 mechanism, (“RTM”).**

13 A. In Case No. PAC-E-17-06, filed on July 3, 2017, the Company applied for approval of  
14 the plan to upgrade (or “repower”) its existing wind resources and approval of  
15 associated ratemaking treatment. On November 21, 2017, the Company and  
16 intervening parties reached a stipulated agreement that allows the Company to use the  
17 ECAM to recover the replacement of certain assets, new investment, incremental  
18 energy production, and wind repowering project PTCs through the RTM. The RTM and  
19 ECAM will capture the costs and benefits of the repowered wind facilities until they  
20 are recovered in base rates through a general rate case. The Stipulation between the  
21 parties was approved by Commission Order No. 33954, dated December 28, 2017.

22 **Q. Which repowering projects are included in the RTM and this ECAM?**

23 A. Nine repowering projects were completed and placed in service during 2019 that

1 produced an Idaho-allocated net incremental benefit of \$529,156. These include  
2 Leaning Juniper, Glenrock I, Glenrock III, Rolling Hills, Seven Mile Hill I, Seven Mile  
3 Hill II, High Plains, McFadden Ridge and Goodnoe Hills wind facilities. Other future  
4 repowered wind projects, as they are completed and placed in service, will be included  
5 in future RTM deferrals.

6 **Q. Has the Company calculated the wind repowering deferral under the RTM**  
7 **guidelines that were agreed to in the Stipulation and approved by the**  
8 **Commission?**

9 A. Yes. The deferral calculations follow the design and operation of the RTM as submitted  
10 in the Direct Testimony of Mr. Jeffrey K. Larsen pages 6-16 and Exhibit 12 that was  
11 referenced and approved in the Stipulation and Final Order of Case No. PAC-E-17-06.  
12 The RTM, along with the ECAM, will capture and match all the costs and benefits of  
13 the repowered wind facilities until such time as they are recovered in base rates.

14 **Q. What are the costs and benefits associated with repowering that the Company has**  
15 **included in the RTM deferral?**

16 A. The Company has included the following items in the RTM on a monthly basis  
17 beginning when a repowered wind project is placed into service:

- 18 • The pre-tax return on investment;
- 19 • Operation and maintenance expense;
- 20 • Depreciation expense;
- 21 • Property taxes;
- 22 • Wind taxes, if assessed;
- 23 • NPC benefits; and

1                   • PTC benefits.

2     **Q. Has the Company prepared an exhibit showing the calculated amount of the wind**  
3     **repowering deferral under the approved RTM guidelines?**

4     A. Yes. Exhibit No. 4 shows the calculation of the December 31, 2019 RTM deferral  
5     balance which results in a \$452 thousand charge to be collected from customers through  
6     the ECAM. This exhibit is structured similar to Exhibit 12 of Mr. Larsen's Direct  
7     Testimony referenced above.

8     **Q. Line 18 of Exhibit No. 4 shows that the repowered wind projects produced a net**  
9     **revenue requirement benefit of \$(529) thousand. Why is the Company seeking**  
10    **recovery of \$452 thousand through the ECAM?**

11    A. The RTM was approved to match all of the costs and benefits associated with the  
12    repowered wind projects and pass those onto customers. Absent the RTM the ECAM  
13    only captures some of the benefits and does not included any of the costs incurred to  
14    produce those benefits. The ECAM will return to customers 100 percent of the  
15    Production Tax Credits (PTC) of \$882 thousand, and 90 percent of Net Power Cost  
16    (NPC) benefit of \$100 thousand, shown on lines 21 and 24, respectively. Combined,  
17    the ECAM would return to customers \$982 thousand, absent the RTM. Due to the  
18    sharing band in the ECAM 10 percent of the NPC benefits wouldn't be passed onto  
19    customers. However the ECAM does not capture any of the costs incurred by the  
20    Company to repower the wind facilities. The purposes of the RTM is to capture those  
21    costs and match them with the benefits. The \$529 thousand, on line 18, represents  
22    Idaho's share of the net benefit produced by the repowered wind facilities. The

1 \$452 thousand RTM deferral allows the Company to recover the net costs that are not  
2 reflected in the ECAM.

3 **Q. Has the Company included a carrying charge on the RTM deferral balance in**  
4 **Exhibit No. 4?**

5 A. No. Although the RTM deferral balance is subject to a carrying charge, the monthly  
6 RTM deferral balance is summed with the other ECAM components and receives a  
7 carrying charge as part of the overall carrying charge calculation.

8 **TAX REFORM CREDIT**

9 **Q. Was the Federal Tax Act Adjustment credit netted against the ECAM?**

10 A. Yes. The savings from federal tax reform, resulting from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act,  
11 enacted in December 2017, as prescribed in the tax stipulation among the Company  
12 and parties filed with the Commission March 5, 2019 in Case No. GNR-U-18-01  
13 (“ECAM Tax Reform Credit”) were netted against the ECAM deferral as described in  
14 Mr. Robert M. Meredith’s testimony.

15 **Q. Please summarize the ECAM Tax Reform Credit approved in Order No. 34331.**

16 A. The Order approved the \$1,141,000 deferred balance of current tax savings for the  
17 period of January 1, 2018, through May 31, 2019, that had not been returned to  
18 customers through Schedule 197. This balance was tracked and amortized over two  
19 years (\$570,500 per year), beginning June 1, 2019, through the Energy Cost  
20 Adjustment Mechanism (“ECAM”). The Tax Reform Act resulted in Idaho-allocated  
21 Excess Deferred Income Taxes (“EDIT”), composed of the following amounts,  
22 grossed-up for taxes:

- 1 • Protected property-related EDIT of \$105,924,604<sup>1</sup>, with estimated annual
- 2 amortizations through the average rate assumption method (“ARAM”) of
- 3 \$2,564,410 in 2018, \$2,352,309 in 2019, and \$2,306,632 in 2020; and
- 4 • Non-protected property and non-property EDIT of \$14,883,505.<sup>2</sup>

5 The Order also specified that as the EDIT balances amortize in rates, the amounts will  
6 include a rate base carrying charge offset to account for the corresponding increase in  
7 rate base associated with the amortized EDIT until the next Idaho general rate case.

8 **Q. What was the amount of Tax Reform Credit included in this Application?**

9 A. Table 1 summarizes the Tax Reform Credit Mr. Meredith netted against the ECAM  
10 deferral to calculate the net ECAM rates.

**Table 1**

<b>ECAM Tax Benefits</b>	<b>2020</b>
Amortization Of Current Tax Savings	\$ (570,500)
2019 Protected EDIT	\$ (2,352,309)
2019 Non-Protected EDIT (7yr Amort)	\$ (2,126,215)
2013 Depreciation Offset	\$ 1,889,100
EDIT Rate Base Offset	\$ 137,173
2019 ECAM Net Tax Savings	\$ (3,022,751)
Amount Over/(Under) Refunded	\$ (70,120)
2020 ECAM Tax Offset	\$ (3,092,871)

11 **Q. Did the Company determine a change to the accounting treatment for the EDIT**  
12 **amortization was needed?**

13 A. Yes. During December 2019, the Company determined that it was necessary to use a  
14 different method of amortizing protected EDIT balances. While the tax filing was based

<sup>1</sup> The protected property EDIT is \$79,881,345, or \$105,924,604 grossed up for taxes.

<sup>2</sup> The non-protected property EDIT is \$10,009,386, or \$13,272,689 grossed up for taxes, and non-protected non-property total EDIT is \$1,214,771, or \$1,610,816 grossed up for taxes.

1 on the ARAM the Company determined that it didn't have the necessary records to  
2 support that method and had to switch to the Reverse South Georgia Method,  
3 ("RSGM").

4 **Q. Does the RSGM change the EDIT balances?**

5 A. No, but it does modify the amortization of those balances. The RSGM method uses a  
6 shorter amortization period which increases the protected EDIT amortization in the  
7 front-end.

8 **Q. Did the Company incorporate the RSGM amortization in the 2020 ECAM?**

9 A. No. The Company used the Tax Reform Credits approved in Order 34331. The  
10 Company intends to propose treatment for the unamortized portion of the protected  
11 property, non-protected property and non-property EDIT balances in the Idaho general  
12 rate case in June 2020.

13 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

14 A. Yes.

Case No. PAC-E-20-02  
Exhibit No. 4  
Witness: Steven R. McDougal

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

---

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Steven R. McDougal

April 2020





**PacificCorp**  
**Idaho**  
 Wind Repowering - RTM Deferral Calculation  
 Revenue Requirement  
 For the Year Ending December 31, 2019

Line No.	Description	Reference	Nov-19		Dec-19	
			Total Company	Factor	Factor	Factor %
1	Plant Revenue Requirement					
2	Capital Investment	Footnote 1	419,607,677	SG 6.0136%	486,411,451	29,250,639
3	Depreciation Reserve	Footnote 1	(1,528,028)	SG 6.0136%	(2,780,520)	(167,209)
4	Accumulated DIT Balance	Footnote 1	(15,537,430)	SG 6.0136%	(19,075,692)	(1,147,311)
5	Net Rate Base (previous month)	sum of lines 1-3	402,542,219		464,552,329	27,936,319
6	Pre-Tax Rate of Return	line 36	9.234%		9.234%	9.234%
7	Pre-Tax Return on Rate Base	line 4 * line 5	3,097,559		3,574,692	214,958
8	Wholesale Wheeling Revenue	Footnote 4	-	SG 6.0136%	-	-
9	Operation & Maintenance	Footnote 3	(489,453)	SG 6.0136%	(308,811)	(18,571)
10	Depreciation	Footnotes 3 & 6	1,252,493	SG 6.0136%	1,650,219	99,238
11	Property Taxes	Footnote 3	-	GPS 5.7978%	-	-
12	Wind Tax	Footnote 3	13,995	SG 6.0136%	20,922	1,258
13	<b>Total Plant Revenue Requirement</b>	sum of lines 6-11	<b>3,864,564</b>		<b>4,937,022</b>	<b>296,893</b>
14	<b>Net Power Cost</b>					
15	NPC Incremental Savings	Footnote 3	(518,375)	SG 6.0136%	(695,979)	(41,853)
16	PTC Benefit	Footnote 3	(3,038,577)	SG 6.0136%	(4,358,277)	(262,089)
17	Gross-up for taxes	line 14 * (line 34 - 1)	(990,650)		(1,420,904)	(85,447)
18	PTC Revenue Requirement	sum of lines 14 and 15	(4,029,226)		(5,779,181)	(347,537)
19	Depreciation Expense Adjustment	Footnotes 6 & 7	(1,430,737)	SG 6.0136%	(1,934,638)	(116,341)
20	<b>Rev. Requirement</b>	sum of lines 12, 13, 16, 17	<b>(2,113,774)</b>		<b>(3,472,775)</b>	<b>(208,839)</b>
21	<b>Adjustment for ECAM Pass-through</b>					
22	PTC Revenue Requirement	line 16	(242,302)		(242,302)	(242,302)
23	Percentage included in ECAM (100%)	ID ECAM Sharing %	100%			
24	ECAM Pass-through	line 19 * line 20	(242,302)		(242,302)	(242,302)
25	NPC Incremental Savings	line 13	(31,173)		(31,173)	(31,173)
26	Percentage included in ECAM (90%)	ID ECAM Sharing %	90%			
27	ECAM Pass-through	line 22 * line 23	(28,056)		(28,056)	(28,056)
28	<b>Rev. Reqt. after ECAM Pass-through</b>	line 18 - line 21 - line 24	143,243		143,243	143,243
29	<b>Authorized Capped Recovery</b>	line 25 - line 25	-		-	-
30	<b>Total Deferral - ID Share</b>	Footnote 5	143,243		143,243	143,243
31	<b>Net Customer (Benefit)</b>	sum of lines 21, 24, 26	(127,114)		(127,114)	(127,114)
32	<b>Deferral Balance - ID Share</b>					
33	Beginning Deferral Balance	line 32 of previous year	132,879		132,879	132,879
34	Monthly Deferral	Footnote 5	143,243		143,243	143,243
35	Deferral Collection	Footnote 3	-		-	-
36	Carrying Charge	Footnote 2	-		-	-
37	<b>Ending Deferral Balance</b>	sum of lines 28-31	-		-	-
38	Federal/State Combined Tax Rate	(1/(1-tax rate))	24.5866%			
39	Net to Gross Bump up Factor	Footnote 2	1.3260			
40	Deferred Balance Carrying Charge	Case No. PAC-E-15-09	2.00%			
41	Property Tax Rate	Rate as percent of net	9.234%			
42	Idaho SG Factor	plant in PAC-E-15-09	0.78%			
43	Idaho GPS Factor	Case No. PAC-E-15-09	6.0136%			
44		Case No. PAC-E-15-09	5.7978%			

Footnotes:  
 1) Entering monthly capital balance of the previous month.  
 2) The RTM deferral balance is included in the ECAM carrying charge calculation and is therefore zero here.  
 3) Equal to the sum of all projects.  
 4) Not applicable for Recovery.  
 5) The RTM is capped until the next general rate case so that, after taking into account the wind repowering benefits that will flow through the Company's ECAM, it will not operate to surcharge customers.  
 6) Actual depreciation expense will be adjusted by the impact of the retired assets until the next depreciation study.  
 7) Depreciation Expense for the replaced equipment currently in rates is removed as an incremental revenue requirement savings.