| 1 | Q. | Are you the same William R. Griffith who has previously testified in this |
|----|-------|--|
| 2 | | proceeding? |
| 3 | A. | Yes, I am. |
| 4 | Purpo | ose of Testimony |
| 5 | Q. | What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony? |
| 6 | A. | My rebuttal testimony addresses two issues that have been raised in this docket |
| 7 | | relating to the implementation of the revenue requirement change in this proceeding. |
| 8 | | The first issue is the proposed implementation of a revenue requirement change in |
| 9 | | Phase I of this proceeding prior to a Commission decision in Phase II on cost of |
| 10 | | service, rate spread and rate design. The second issue is the treatment of special |
| 11 | | contract customer revenues at the time that the commission orders the revenue |
| 12 | | requirement change in this case. |
| 13 | Phase | e I Rate Change |
| 14 | Q. | Please discuss the Company's proposed implementation of a revenue |
| 15 | | requirement change in customers' rates prior to the Commission's decision on |
| 16 | | cost of service, rate spread and rate design in Phase II of this docket. |
| 17 | A. | The Company proposes that the revenue requirement change ordered in Phase I of |
| 18 | | this docket be applied through a uniform percentage Tariff Rider Rate applied to all |
| 19 | | tariff customers' bills prior to the Commission's determination of cost of service, rate |
| 20 | | spread and rate design in Phase II of this docket. This Tariff Rider Rate would be |
| 21 | | similar to the Schedule 95 Credit that was applied in Docket No. 06-035-21 and that |
| 22 | | expired on May 31, 2007. In the absence of any determination on cost of service, we |
| 23 | | believe that this is the most appropriate way to reflect the Commission's ordered |

Page 1 – Rebuttal Testimony of William R. Griffith

| 24 | | revenue requirement in Phase I prior to the Phase II determination of cost of service. |
|--|-----------------|---|
| 25 | Q. | How does the Company propose that the Tariff Rider Rate be treated? |
| 26 | A. | The Company proposes that the Tariff Rider Rate ordered in Phase I be treated no |
| 27 | | differently than any of the Company's other rates in effect at that time. The Tariff |
| 28 | | Rider Rate would be applied to customer's bills as a line item for service on and after |
| 29 | | the effective date of the Phase I order through the effective date of the Phase II order. |
| 30 | | Following the conclusion of Phase II, a new tariff book (P.S.C.U. No. 48) with new |
| 31 | | rates would go into effect, and the Tariff Rider Rate and all other previous tariffs |
| 32 | | would be cancelled. Prospectively, customers would be billed for usage on and after |
| 33 | | the effective date of the new tariffs ordered in Phase II in the same manner as occurs |
| 34 | | for any other rate change ordered by the Commission. |
| | | |
| 35 | Q. | If the Commission ordered rate spread and rate design changes in its Phase II |
| 35 36 | Q. | If the Commission ordered rate spread and rate design changes in its Phase II order that differed from the equal percentage rate spread being proposed |
| | Q. | |
| 36 | Q. | order that differed from the equal percentage rate spread being proposed |
| 36 37 | Q. A. | order that differed from the equal percentage rate spread being proposed through the Phase I Tariff Rider Rate, should the Commission true up the |
| 36 37 38 | - | order that differed from the equal percentage rate spread being proposed through the Phase I Tariff Rider Rate, should the Commission true up the differences following its Phase II order? |
| 36 37 38 39 | - | order that differed from the equal percentage rate spread being proposed through the Phase I Tariff Rider Rate, should the Commission true up the differences following its Phase II order? No. There should be no change to the rates in effect prior the Phase II order. The |
| 36 37 38 39 40 | - | order that differed from the equal percentage rate spread being proposed through the Phase I Tariff Rider Rate, should the Commission true up the differences following its Phase II order? No. There should be no change to the rates in effect prior the Phase II order. The rates ordered in Phase II are to be applied on and after the effective date of the Phase |
| 36 37 38 39 40 41 | - | order that differed from the equal percentage rate spread being proposed through the Phase I Tariff Rider Rate, should the Commission true up the differences following its Phase II order? No. There should be no change to the rates in effect prior the Phase II order. The rates ordered in Phase II are to be applied on and after the effective date of the Phase II order, and they should not impact previous periods. Since the revenue requirement |
| 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 | - | order that differed from the equal percentage rate spread being proposed through the Phase I Tariff Rider Rate, should the Commission true up the differences following its Phase II order? No. There should be no change to the rates in effect prior the Phase II order. The rates ordered in Phase II are to be applied on and after the effective date of the Phase II order, and they should not impact previous periods. Since the revenue requirement would be unchanged following the Phase I order, any rate adjustment of the Phase I |

Page 2 – Rebuttal Testimony of William R. Griffith

| 46 | Q. | If the Commission should ultimately rule against Rocky Mountain Power's |
|--|------|---|
| 47 | | recommendation and decide to revise Phase I rates at the end of Phase II, does |
| 48 | | Rocky Mountain Power have a methodology it would recommend to the |
| 49 | | Commission to accomplish this? |
| 50 | A. | Yes. Under those circumstances, Rocky Mountain Power would recommend that a |
| 51 | | Phase II Tariff Rider Rate be applied prospectively to each customer class in order to |
| 52 | | implement the total dollar reallocation over a short period of time (perhaps four |
| 53 | | months). The Phase II Tariff Rider Rate would be designed to credit or charge each |
| 54 | | rate schedule class the estimated dollars on a percentage basis of the bill that were |
| 55 | | over or under collected from that rate schedule (compared to the final Phase II order) |
| 56 | | during the Phase I rate effective period. Undertaking any more detailed rate |
| 57 | | adjustment (at each schedule's rate design level or at the customer bill level) would |
| 58 | | be administratively complex, costly and most likely confusing to customers while |
| 59 | | producing minuscule benefit. |
| 60 | Trea | tment of Special Contract Revenues |
| 61 | Q. | Please describe the Company's proposal for the treatment of special contract |
| 62 | | revenues. |
| 63 | A. | In my direct testimony (page 5) I state, |
| 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 | | For present revenues in this case, the Company has assumed that the rate changes expected to become effective in 2008 will occur in line with each special contract's terms. For the proposed revenues in this case, the Company has made a conservative assumption that the 2008 special contract rates are unchanged. Because special contract rates are in some instances linked to tariff changes, some special contract rates will change depending on the outcome of this case. At the conclusion of this case, the Company proposes to reflect the final ordered tariff changes in special contract rates as appropriate. Including these changes will affect the final rate spread which may reduce the |

| 73 74 | | impacts on tariff customers when the final revenue requirement is implemented. |
|----------|----|---|
| 75 | Q. | Would Rocky Mountain Power like to clarify its proposal for the treatment of |
| 76 | | special contract revenues? |
| 77 | A. | Yes. Any changes in special contract prices due to the rate change during the rate |
| 78 | | effective period (approximately August 13, 2008 to August 13, 2009) should be |
| 79 | | applied to modify the rate change collected from tariff customers. |
| 80 | Q. | Please explain. |
| 81 | A. | The August 2008 rate change will impact the rates of three special contract customers |
| 82 | | on January 1, 2009. For the fourth special contract customer, there will be no price |
| 83 | | change during the rate effective period. |
| 84 | | At the time of the Phase II order, Rocky Mountain Power proposes to |
| 85 | | calculate the effect of the January 1 price change on the three special contract |
| 86 | | customers. It will also calculate the revenue effect of the special contract price |
| 87 | | change for the three customers for the period January 1, 2009 through August 13, |
| 88 | | 2009. It will then subtract the calculated revenue effect of the special contract price |
| 89 | | change from the ordered revenue requirement amount and apply the net rate change |
| 90 | | to the tariff customers through the final rate spread ordered by the Commission in |
| 91 | | Phase II. Assuming that a rate increase is ordered, this will reduce the rate increase to |
| 92 | | tariff customers. |
| 93 | Q. | Does this conclude your supplemental testimony? |
| 94 | A. | Yes. |

Page 4 – Rebuttal Testimony of William R. Griffith