BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for	Docket No 07-035-93
Authority to Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in	
Utah and for Approval of its Proposed 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	

REVENUE REQUIREMENT DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

ROGER J BALL

7 APRIL 2008

REVENUE REQUIREMENT TESTIMONY

Q Are you the same Roger J Ball who filed Test Year Direct Testimony in this Docket on 25
 January 2008?

A Yes. It was admitted into evidence during the 7 February Test Year hearing as Exhibit
RJB 1.0, together with a statement of my academic and professional qualifications and
professional experience as Exhibit RJB 1.1, and my 4 February Test Year Rebuttal
Testimony as Exhibit RJB 2.0. On 7 February I appeared and testified during the Test
Year hearing, and on 13 February I filed Test Year Closing Argument. Most recently, on
31 March, I filed my Rate of Return Direct Testimony as Exhibit RJB 3.0.

9 Q What is the purpose of your Revenue Requirement Testimony?

10 A To comply with the requirement in the Commission's 27 December 2007 Scheduling 11 Order in this proceeding that non-Company parties file direct testimony regarding rate of 12 return by 7 April 2008, and to address the recovery of regulatory expenses in rates.

Q What regulatory expenses has Rocky Mountain Power (RMP, or PacifiCorp, or Company,
 or utility) included in its Supplemental Direct Testimony in this Docket?

15 A RMP witness and Director of Revenue Requirements McDougal presents Exhibit RMP

16 SRM-1S which shows a total of \$3,483,200 (Line 876, Page 2.14, of Section 2 "Results of

17 Operations") for Regulatory Commission Expense.

18 Q Is this an appropriate expense to be passed on to ratepayers?

A Absolutely not. It is not a cost that benefits ratepayers in any way. In fact, a large portion

20 of it is spent to their detriment when the Company argues for increased rates.

21 Q Is there a parallel in a below-the-line item?

Rocky Mountain Power Rate Case

Roger J Ball

REVENUE REQUIREMENT TESTIMONY

Page 2 of 6

A Yes. PacifiCorp spends considerable sums each year on lobbying that is not allowed as a
 regulatory expense but that has much the same purpose, to benefit the Company's
 managers and owners.

Q FERC regulation is not subject to this Commission's jurisdiction. Do you make an
 exception from your recommendations with regard to those expenses?

27 A No. FERC regulation has no beneficial effect for ratepayers, either.

28 Q But wouldn't ratepayers be worse off without regulation?

A I don't mean to imply that ratepayers would be better off with an unregulated monopoly
 supplier. If there is a monopoly, there must be regulation, and it must be effective, and it
 must be focused on protecting ratepayers. There are great benefits for utility owners and
 managers in being granted a monopoly, and it is only reasonable that they should bear
 the costs of regulation.

34 Q What benefits?

A They have no competition, no-one to look over their shoulders at. Every entrepreneur dreams of carving out a market niche where he will have no competition. Bill Gates and his colleagues who created MicroSoft come forcibly to mind. But most business owners struggle for years without achieving monopoly. When a state grants monopoly rights to a utility, it confers enormous cost-saving advantages upon it.

40 Q Are there no benefits to ratepayers?

A Perhaps during the early years, if the grant of a monopoly persuades owners to invest in
 infrastructure where none previously existed. But those days are long gone. Nowadays,
 PacifiCorp owners and managers have licence to milk a \$1½B a year cash cow. During
 the decade of the 1990s, that enabled the Company to take its Utah earnings and spend

Rocky Mountain Power Rate Case Roger J Ball

RATE OF RETURN TESTIMONY

Docket No 07-035-93 31 March 2008 45 them on vanity projects on four continents. There followed huge losses of value for 46 owners, and the takeover of PacifiCorp by ScottishPower. Ratepayers lost out because 47 investment in infrastructure to serve Utah's growth was simply sidelined for years. 48 Subsequently, instead of a prudent strategy, we have seen only tactical proposals 49 designed to rescue the Company from desperate shortages of generation, transmission 50 and distribution facilities at the eleventh hour, sometimes after midnight. This has last-51 minute approach has resulted in expensive measures that have contributed heavily to 52 rapidly increasing rates.

53 Q Are Utah ratepayers supposed to be paying Rocky Mountain Power's regulatory costs?

54 А No. Utah Code Annotated (UCA) §54-5-1.5(1)(a) says:

- 55 A special fee to defray the cost of regulation is imposed upon all public utilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission. (Emphasis added.) 56
- 57 UCA §54-5-1.5(4)(a) goes on to say:
- 58 It is the intent of the Legislature that the public utilities provide all of the funds for 59 the administration, support, and maintenance of: 60
 - (i) the Public Service Commission:
 - state agencies within the Department of Commerce involved in the regulation (ii) of public utilities: and
 - (iii) expenditure by the attorney general for utility regulation. (Emphasis added.)
- 64 The plain language of these statutory provisions state that Utah's Legislature has
- 65 imposed all the costs of regulating Rocky Mountain Power upon the Company; no-one
- 66 else; certainly not its ratepayers.
- 67 Q The opening phrase of UCA §54-5-1.5(4)(a) is: "It is the intent of the Legislature". Don't
- 68 the courts attach less weight to Legislative intent language than to statutory provisions?
- 69 А When that intent language is recorded in Legislative journals, that is the case. However,
- 70 in this instance, the intent is part of the statute and therefore carries the weight of law.

Rocky Mountain Power Rate Case

Docket No 07-035-93 31 March 2008

61

62

63

Although Utah utilities' rates have been set based upon revenue requirements including regulatory costs for several years, it is illegal, and the Commission will act *ultra vires* if it chooses to do so in this proceeding.

Q UCA §54-5-1.5(4) speaks to the costs of Utah's state regulatory agencies. How should
 that guide the Commission with regard to Rocky Mountain Power's own regulatory
 expenses?

A Given that the provisions of this sub-section require that public utilities, rather than ratepayers, bear all the costs of the regulatory agencies, whose primary purpose is to protect captive customers with no alternative suppliers, it clearly makes no sense that ratepayers should be saddled with the costs incurred by those utilities advocating higher rates or other burdens for consumers in regulatory proceedings.

Even if the Commission is unpersuaded that it is unlawful for it to exclude the public utility regulatory fee from RMP's revenue requirement on this occasion, it would be entirely inequitable for it to impose the cost of the Company's expenses in advancing its managers' and owners' interests on ratepayers.

86 Q Does that conclude your Revenue Requirement Direct Testimony?

87 A Yes, thank you.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Revenue Requirement Testimony of Roger J Ball in Docket 07-035-93 was served upon the following by electronic mail on 7 April 2008:

PacifiCorp:

Jeff Larsen jeff.larsen@pacificorp.com Dave Taylor dave.taylor@pacificorp.com Justin Lee Brown (8685) justin.brown@pacificorp.com Daniel Solander (11467) daniel.solander@pacificorp.com Data Request Response Center datarequest@pacificorp.com

Utah Division of Public Utilities:

Phil Powlick, Director philippowlick@utah.gov William Powell wpowell@utah.gov Dennis Miller dennismiller@utah.gov Michael Ginsberg (4516) mginsberg@utah.gov Patricia E Schmid (4908) pschmid@utah.gov

Utah Committee of Consumer Services:

Michele Beck, Director mbeck@utah.gov Dan Gimble dgimble@utah.gov Cheryl Murray cmurray@utah.gov Paul Proctor (2657) pproctor@utah.gov

UAE:

Gary A. Dodge (0897) gdodge@hjdlaw.com Kevin Higgins khiggins@energystrat.com Neal Townsend ntownsend@energystrat.com

USMagnesium:

Roger Swenson Roger.swenson@prodigy.net

UIEC

F Robert Reeder bobreeder@parsonsbehle.com William J Evans bevans@parsonsbehle.com Vicki M Baldwin vbaldwin@parsonsbehle.com

IBEW

Arthur F Sandack asandack@msn.com

CVWRF:

Ronald J Day dayr@cvwrf.org

Kroger:

Michael L Kurtz mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com Kurt J Boehm kboehm@bkllawfirm.com

Nucor Steel:

Peter J Mattheis pjm@bbrslaw.com Eric J Lacey elacey@bbrslaw.com Gerald H Kinghorn ghk@pkhlawyers.com Jeremy R Cook jrc@pkhlawyers.com

WRA & UCE

Steven S Michel smichel@westernresources.org Mike Mendelsohn mmendelsohn@westernresourc es.org Sarah Wright sarah@utahcleanenergy.org

SLCAP & Crossroads

Betsy Wolf bwolf@slcap.org

AARP

Dale F Gardiner dgardiner@vancott.com Janee Briesemeister jbriesemeister@aarp.org

Interwest

Stephen F Mecham sfmecham@cnmlaw.com Craig Cox cox@interwest.org

Wal-Mart

Holly Rachel Smith holly@raysmithlaw.com Ryan L Kelly ryan@kellybramwell.com Steve W Chriss stephen.chris@wal-mart.com

Utah Farm Bureau

Stephen R Randle s.randall@yahoo Todd Bingham toddrbingham@gmail.com

/s/

Roger J Ball

Rocky Mountain Power Rate Case

Roger J Ball

REVENUE REQUIREMENT TESTIMONY

Docket No 07-035-93 7 April 2008