Docket No. 07-035-93 DPU Exhibit No. 4.0 David T. Thomson April 7, 2008

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

:

In the Matter of the Application of Rocky
Mountain Power for Authority To Increase
Its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in
Utah and for Approval of Its Proposed
:

Utah and for Approval of Its Proposed : Docket No. 07-035-93 Electric Service Schedules and Electric :

Service Regulations, Consisting of a
General Rate Increase of Approximately
\$161.2 Million Per Year, and for Approval
of a New Large Load Surcharge

:

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

DAVID T. THOMSON STATE OF UTAH DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

APRIL 7, 2008

- 1 Q. Please state your name and business address for the record.
- 2 A. David T. Thomson. My business address is Heber M. Wells Building 4th Floor,
- 3 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-6751.
- 4 Q. For which party will you be offering testimony in this case?
- 5 A. I will be offering testimony on behalf of the Utah Division of Public Utilities
- 6 ("Division").
- 7 Q. Please describe your position and duties with the Division of Public Utilities?
- 8 A. I am a Technical Consultant. Among other things, I serve as an in-house
- 9 consultant on issues concerning the terms, conditions and prices of utility service;
- industry and utility trends and issues; and regulatory form, compliance and
- practice relating to public utilities. I examine public utility financial data for
- determination of rates; review applications for rate increases; research, examine,
- analyze, organize, document and establish regulatory positions on a variety of
- 14 regulatory matters; review operations reports and ensure compliance with laws
- and regulations, etc.; testify in hearings before the Utah Public Service
- 16 Commission ("Commission"); assist in analysis of testimony and case
- preparation; and in the past I have participated in settlement conferences.
- 18 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?
- 19 A. The purpose of my testimony is to put forth adjustments to various account
- balances as provided by Rocky Mountain Power (the "Company") in its filing
- 21 used to determine its proposed revised overall revenue increase request of \$99.8
- 22 million, as set forth in the testimony of Steven R. McDougal (Exhibit SRM-1S).

23	Q.	What areas in the filing where you assigned to review as part of your
24		examination and what other work did you do relating to the Company's
25		filing?
26	A.	I was assigned to review Taxes other than Income Taxes; Property Taxes; Outside
27		Services expense (FERC Account #923); Rent expense (FERC Account #923);
28		Maintenance and General expense (FERC Account #935); Advertising expense
29		(FERC Accounts #909 and #930); Airplane expense; the Operation and
30		Maintenance expense related to Customer Accounting, and Customer Service and
31		Information.
32		I also teamed with the Division consultants on a limited review of Income
33		Taxes. I performed a limited review of detailed Executive expenses. I was
34		involved with reviewing external and internal auditor workpapers and reports in
35		conjunction with my areas of assignment. I reviewed Company accounting
36		records and documentation directly related to the assigned areas of my review. I
37		attended meetings with Company personnel where DSM accounting and
38		expenses, secondary labor adjustments, non-utility and capitalized labor, and
39		Forecasting Methodology were reviewed and discussed.
40		I made inquiries as to the effect of new accounting reporting requirements
41		and regulation on costs in the filing. The regulation was Sarbanes-Oxley and the
42		new reporting requirement was FIN 48. I also did a limited review of
43		PacifiCorp's 10-year financial plan. I reviewed General Rate Case testimony from
44		Idaho and its related Stipulation and the Wyoming Stipulation concerning matters

45		of adjustment and settlement in those filings that would or would not relate to the
46		Utah filing.
47	Q.	How will you present your adjustments?
48	A.	I have six adjustments and I will discuss them in the order of my attached DPU
49		Exhibits 4.1 to 4.6. These adjustments reduce expenses and costs to Property
50		taxes, Rents, Outside Services, Airplane costs, Advertising expense, and
51		Customer Accounting.
52	Q.	Will you please describe your first adjustment as set forth in DPU Exhibit
53		4.1?
54	A.	Yes. This adjustment takes the revised projected 2008 Property tax expense as
55		provided by the Company in response to the Division's Data Request number
56		21.1, and computes the revised incremental Property Tax amount for 2008. Since
57		this revised incremental amount is less than the amount for the Property Tax
58		expense as filed in the 2008 Test Period by Company witness Steven R.
59		McDougal (SRM-S1; page 7.4 & 7.4.1), this adjustment corrects the Property Tax
60		amount to the proper revised incremental amount. The Company should have
61		updated its property tax projection for 2008 for this revised estimate, as provided
62		by its own property tax department in its SRM-S1 filing, but did not.
63		In response to the Division's Data request 21.1, the Company explains this
64		revision to 2007 and 2008 property taxes as follows:
65 66 67		Note that estimates of calendar year 2008 and 2009 property tax expense were prepared prior to the receipt of tax bills for certain states, including Utah. Receipt of 2007 Utah tax bills
68		revealed an unanticipated 6% decline in overall Utah property

Docket No. 07-035-93 DPU Exhibit 4.0 David T. Thomson April 7, 2008

tax rates. This resulted in a \$1,731,401 decline in actual 2007 Utah property tax expense to \$31,081,518. Once changes in tax rates for Utah and certain other states were taken into account in late 2007, final calendar year 2007 property tax expense was \$69,102,427 or \$2,242,816 less than the original 2007 estimate of \$71,352,243.

Also, on page 14 of the attachment is a worksheet titled "Revised 2008 and 2009 Estimated Tax Assessment and Operating Tax Expenses." This revised worksheet contains updated estimates of 2008 and 2009 property tax expense which rely upon the 2007 property tax expense of \$69,102,427. The revised estimate for calendar year 2008 and 2009 property tax expense was \$79,665,746 and \$89,505,746 respectively. Revised schedules 7.4 and 7.4.1 are also included in the attachment.

A.

DPU Exhibit 4.1.1 shows how the adjustment was computed and is based on the above mentioned revised schedules 7.4 and 7.4.1. The adjustment results in a Utah allocated decrease in Test Period Property Tax expense of \$1,154,129 for FERC account 408 – Taxes Other Than Income. My computations for this adjustment are found in DPU Exhibit 4.1.

Q. Will you explain your second adjustment as set forth in DPU Exhibit 4.2?

This adjustment removes from rent expense the operational expenses for closed facilities, vacant space, under utilized space, or space in the base period that will not be used during the future test period per my analysis of information on leased or rental assets as provided by the Company in Division Data Requests numbers 16.1 and 37.1 – 37.12. Per those data requests, some of the leased or rental space was either unoccupied or under utilized or was being subleased for amounts less than what the Company was paying for the leased space. Also, some of the leases

with rent expense in the Base Period will be terminated prior to December 31, 2008 and should not be in the Future Test Period rent expense. The total dollar amount for these types of leases or rentals was computed using lease or rental information provide by the Company. Rental space that is not used and useful as described above and as outlined in detail in DPU Exhibit 4.2.1 was adjusted out of rent expense.

A.

However, the adjustment I have made for the 1033 Building 6th Street – Portland is subject to withdrawal if the Company can clear up my questions as to this lease being used and useful. My footnote (4) to DPU Exhibit 4.2.1 explains in detail why I made the adjustment to the above lease and what conditions need to be met to have this part of my overall adjustment withdrawn. The adjustment amount results in a reduction of Utah Base Period allocated rental expense of \$415,918 for FERC account 931 - Rents. DPU Exhibit 4.2 outlines my computations for this adjustment. The above \$415,918 amount would be reduced by \$102,505 if I withdraw my Portland Building component as explained above and in my DPU Exhibit 4.2.1.

Q. What is your Third Adjustment as set forth in DPU Exhibit 4.3?

This adjustment removes from the Base Period for FERC Account 923 - Outside Services, certain out-of period costs, and non-recurring costs and reduces certain costs that should be amortized. It also removes certain below the line costs that are recorded as Base Period operating expense. These costs are removed from the

Base Period results of operations to normalize the Test Period Results. The total of all the adjustments reduces Base Period Outside Services expense, resulting in a reduced Utah allocated amount of \$553,990. Of this amount \$175,613 is out of period and \$378,377 is non-recurring. My computations for this adjustment are found in DPU Exhibit 4.3. The various adjustments and the explanations for the adjustments are outlined in detail in my DPU Exhibit 4.3.1. The amounts used are from those recorded in the Company's accounting records for FERC Account 923 for the Base Period.

A.

Q. Will you please explain your fourth adjustment as set forth in DPU Exhibit 4.4?

This adjustment removes from operating expenses non-utility use of the Company airplane. Some portions of this adjustment are subject to withdrawal based on the resolution of certain comments, questions and concerns that I have put forth to the Company. These are described in detail in my Division Exhibits 4.4.1 and 4.4.2.

In Division Data Request 41.1, I asked the Company to provide a list of trips taken in Company owned or leased aircraft during the Base Year with the following information for each trip by utility and non-utility personnel or individuals: first, the date of the trip; second, the point where the trip began; third, the destination; fourth, the purpose of the trip; and fifth, the identity of each person on the aircraft, excluding the flight crew, and each person's title or position with the Company. I also asked the Company to provide the alternative cost of coach class airfare to the destination or closest destination airport as

serviced by commercial aircraft including commercial commuter aircraft for the trips for each identified person on the aircraft.

After providing the above information the Company has agreed to remove from revenue certain non-utility flights. Its list of the flights to be removed has been reproduced from Division Data Request 41.1 and is found in Exhibit 4.4.1. The Company referenced the list as Attachment DPU 41.1-2. I quote from its response to Division Data Request 41.1 as follows:

In compiling this response, the Company identified costs for certain trips or passengers that served a purpose not directly related to PacifiCorp or Rocky Mountain Power utility business. Provided as Attachment DPU 41.1-2 is a list of these items along with the cost of each, which the Company would agree to remove from the revenue increase requested in its general rate case (\$41,659 on a total company basis, or \$17,584 allocated to Utah)¹.

I have included these amounts as part of my adjustment along with other amounts that are subject to withdrawal as explained above. This adjustment results in a decrease to Base Period operating cost for the Utah allocated portion in the amount of \$72,044. My computations for this adjustment are found in DPU Exhibit 4.4.1 and 4.4.2. All Information for this adjustment was provided by the Company in Division Data Requests Numbers 41.1.

.

¹ In response to Division Data Request 47.1 in Attachment DPU 47.1c the Utah allocated percentage is shown as 42.38% for FERC Account #557, this is the percentage I used for my adjustments subject to withdrawal. In actuality, the airplane O&M costs are allocated to numerous accounts with different allocation percentages. For ease of computation, I have used one of the accounts where most of the airplane costs are allocated to in the Company records (FERC Account #557). This produces a Utah allocated amount that would be different than if I allocated total amounts to applicable FERC accounts and then used the Utah allocation factors for those accounts. My amounts are an approximation and could be slightly higher or lower than the proper allocation. Due to the size of this adjustment it was felt that the approximate Utah amount would have a minuscule effect on the overall change in revenue requirement and thus was used. However, for the non-utility travel amount agreed to by the Company, I have used its Utah allocated amount as provided by it in its response to Division Data Request 41.1.

Would you now please explain your fifth adjustment as set forth in DPU

Exhibit 4.5?

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

A.

Yes. I am reducing through an adjustment FERC Account 930 – Miscellaneous General Expenses in the Base Period Utah allocated amount of \$1,324,171. My computations for this adjustment are found in DPU Exhibit 4.5. The adjustment is for advertising expenses that are not recoverable under Public Service Commission R746-406 as detailed in my DPU Exhibits 4.5.1 and 4.5.2. explained in my footnote (1) in DPU Exhibit 4.5.2, for some of my adjustment amounts I am reducing advertising costs due to a lack of substantiation for such costs (DPU Exhibit 4.5.2 note (1) quotes the FERC substantiation rules.) For purposes of those adjustments, I have treated unsubstantiated costs as unrecoverable until or when (1) such costs are substantiated with regard to the messages advertised as required by FERC rules and (2) that such substantiation makes it clear that the costs adhere to R746-406. Documentation was requested in a Division Data Request 6.2-1 2nd supplement to support certain advertising payments in the Company's advertising accounts. However, the Company's response did not substantiate the message of the advertising as per FERC rules. Again, I am referring to the requirement as to advertising message documentation indicating that such costs adherence to FERC rules and State rules for recoverability. Also, some of the adjustments in DPU Exhibit 4.5.1 on their face do not appear to meet the recoverability requirements of Rule R746-406 and thus have been treated as not recoverable. Some of these costs may be subject to 186 recoverability if proper support, as discussed above and in DPU Exhibits 4.5.1 187 and 4.5.2, is provided. The basis of the adjustment is from information provided by the Company in its response to Division Data Request 6.2-1 2nd supplement. 188 189 What is your sixth and last adjustment as set forth in DPU Exhibit 4.6? Q. 190 My last adjustment removes out-of-period and non-recurring costs from FERC A. 191 Accounts 901 and 903 - Customer O&M Expenses for the base period. These 192 transactions are removed from Base Period results of operations to normalize the 193 Base Period results. The adjustment results in a reduction on a Utah allocated 194 basis in the Base Period Customer O&M expenses in the amount of \$48,605. My 195 computations for this adjustment are found in DPU Exhibit 4.6. DPU Exhibit 196 4.6.1 provides the details to my adjustment and the explanation for the 197 adjustments. The amounts used are from those recorded in the Company's 198 accounting records for FERC Accounts 901 and 903 for the Base Period. 199 Q. **Does this conclude your Testimony?**

200

A.

Yes.