BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Application) of Rocky Mountain Power for) Docket No. Authority to Increase Its Retail) 07-035-93 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.)

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING PROCEEDINGS

TAKEN AT: Public Service Commission

160 East 300 South, Room 403

Salt Lake City, Utah

DATE: May 20, 2008

TIME: 9:05 a.m.

REPORTED BY: Kelly L. Wilburn, CSR, RPR

```
1
                           APPEARANCES
 2
     Commissioners:
     Ted Boyer (Chairman)
     Ric Campbell
     Ron Allen
 5
                               -000-
     For Rocky Mountain Power:
 6
 7
     KATHERINE A. McDOWELL, ESQ.
     McDOWELL & RACKNER, PC
 8
         520 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 830
         Portland, Oregon 97204
 9
         (503) 595-3922
         (503) 595-3928 (fax)
10
     MARK C. MOENCH, ESQ.
     ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER
11
         201 South Main Street, Suite 2400
         Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
12
         (801) 220-4459
         (801) 220-4804 (fax)
13
14
     For the Division of Public Utilities:
15
     PATRICIA E. SCHMID, ESQ.
     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
         160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor
16
         Post Office Box 140857
         Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0857
17
         (801) 366-0353
         (801) 366-0352 (fax)
18
19
     For the Utah Committee of Consumer Services:
20
     PAUL H. PROCTOR, ESQ.
     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
21
         160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor
         Post Office Box 140857
22
         Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0857
         (801) 366-0353
         (801) 366-0352 (fax)
23
24
                               -000-
```

1	APPEARANCES, CONTINUED
2	For the UIEC:
3	F. ROBERT REEDER, ESQ. PARSONS, BEHLE & LATIMER
4	One Utah Center 201 South Main Street, Suite 1800
5	Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 (801) 532-1234
6	(801) 536-6111 (fax)
7	For the UAE Intervention Group:
8	GARY A. DODGE, ESQ. HATCH, JAMES & DODGE, PC
9	10 West Broadway, Suite 400 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
10	(801) 363-6363 (801) 363-6666 (fax)
11	Appearing Pro Se:
12	ROGER J. BALL
13	1375 Vintry Lane Salt Lake City, Utah 84121
14	(801) 277-1375
15	-000-
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	WITNESSES		
2	DANIEL LAWTON	Page	
3	Direct by Mr. Proctor Further Direct by Mr. Proctor	17 114	
4	Cross by Ms. McDowell Redirect by Mr. Proctor	122 141	
5	BRUCE WILLIAMS		
6	Direct by Ms. McDowell	23	
7	Cross by Ms. Schmid Cross by Mr. Proctor	28 29	
8	SAMUEL C. HADAWAY		
9	Direct by Ms. McDowell	31	
10	Cross by Ms. Schmid Cross by Mr. Proctor	46 51	
11	Redirect by Ms. McDowell Recross by Ms. Schmid	58 61	
12	CHARLES E. PETERSON		
13 14 15 16	Direct by Ms. Schmid Cross by Ms. McDowell Cross by Mr. Proctor Cross by Mr. Ball Redirect by Ms. Schmid	63 70 94 98 112	
17	ROGER BALL		
18	Testimony by Mr. Ball	145	
19	RICH WALJE		
20	Direct by Ms. McDowell Cross by Mr. Dodge	152 156	
21	-000-		
22			
23			
24			
25			

1		EXHIBITS			
2	No.	Description	Page		
3	BNW-1 to 14	Bruce Williams exhibits	13		
4	BNW-1-S and BNW-2-S	Bruce Williams exhibits	13		
5 6	SCH-1 to SCH-7	Samuel Hadaway exhibits	14		
7	SCH-1-R to SCH-8-R	Samuel Hadaway exhibits	14		
9	ARW-1-R and ARW-2-R	Rich Walje exhibits	15		
10 11	DPU 2.0 and DPU 2.1 to 2.16	Charles E. Peterson exhibits (includes confidential version of DPU 2.0)	16		
12	DPU 2.0-SR	Charles E. Peterson exhibits	16		
14	CCS-3.1 to 3.10	Daniel J. Lawton exhibits	19		
15 16	3.1-SR to 3.3	Daniel J. Lawton exhibits	19		
17	RJB 3.0, 5.0, and 6.0	Roger Ball Testimony	22		
18		-000-			
19	(The provi		onir		
20	(The previous exhibits and related testimony were prefiled and are part of the PSC record and filed at the Commission.)				
21		-000-			
22		-000-			
23					
24					
25					

1		ADDITIONAL EXHIBITS	
2	No.	Description	Page
3	RMP-1-(RoR)	Updated Table 1	45
4	DPU 2.7(a)	Corrected exhibit	69
5	RMP Cross 1	Cross to Charles Peterson testimony - portions of testimony in the concurrent Questar general rate case	93
7 8 9	RMP Cross 2	Cross to Charles Peterson testimony - First page of the Commission's order approving stipulation in the 2006 Rocky Mountain rate case	93
10 11 12 13	RMP Cross 3	Cross to Charles Peterson testimony - PacifiCorp Single-Stage Discounted Cash Flow Models March 17, 2008, and Corrected	93
14 15	UA Cross 1(RoR)	Cross to Rich Walje Testimony - Results of Operations	164
16		-000-	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

- 1 MAY 20, 2008 9:05 A.M.
- 2 PROCEEDINGS
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: This is the time and
- 4 place duly noticed for the Rate of Return portion of
- 5 the case hearing in the Docket No. 0703593, in the
- 6 matter of the application of Rocky Mountain Power for
- 7 authority to increase its retail electric utility
- 8 service rates in Utah, and for approval of it's
- 9 proposed electric service schedule and electric
- 10 service regulations, consisting of a general rate
- 11 increase of approximately 161.2 million per year, and
- 12 for approval of a new large load surcharge.
- 13 And we know that that -- the amount of the
- 14 request has now been reduced because of the test year
- 15 change. You've all received -- hopefully have all
- 16 received a letter we issued last week to explain how
- 17 we wish to proceed.
- 18 We're trying to, trying to manage our
- 19 schedule as best we can with two simultaneous rate
- 20 cases, another one threatened, three resource cases, a
- 21 transmission line, and then the regular daily workload
- 22 that we have.
- 23 And our expectation is that we will complete
- 24 the Rate of Return portion of the Rocky Mountain case
- 25 today. We'll do the same with Questar tomorrow.

- 1 We've -- I don't know how you want to call the two
- 2 categories of witnesses. In my own mind I'm calling
- 3 them "technical" witnesses and "policy" witnesses.
- 4 But we thought we would hear the technical
- 5 witnesses first, and then the policy or opinion
- 6 witnesses later in the day. I thought we would begin
- 7 by putting all of the written prefiled testimony on
- 8 record now. That would give everyone an opportunity
- 9 to make any corrections they need to make, objections
- 10 to the admissibility of the, the testimony.
- 11 We'll rule on the motion to strike Mr. Ball's
- 12 testimony also at the outset. And I guess is there
- 13 any confusion about which witnesses we consider to be
- 14 which category? In this case essentially Mr. Walje
- 15 and Mr. Ball will be heard later in the day is our
- 16 expectation, anyway. We're calling them the policy
- 17 witnesses or opinion witnesses.
- 18 The order of witnesses will be we'll let the
- 19 Company go first. Put on a witness. There will be
- 20 cross examination and then redirect. Go to the next
- 21 witness, and so on. Then we'll go to the Company
- 22 (sic.) Following the Company witness, the committee.
- 23 And then Mr. Ball and Mr. Walje will be heard this
- 24 afternoon.
- MS. SCHMID: Pardon me. Would the Division

- 1 go after the Company?
- 2 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Yes.
- 3 MS. SCHMID: Okay, thank you.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: They're supposed to go
- 5 first, Ms. Schmid. It's their case.
- 6 MS. SCHMID: Certainly.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: If you're going -- if
- 8 your witnesses are going to give summaries we would
- 9 hope that those summaries would be very brief. We
- 10 state this in every hearing, but we have read all the
- 11 testimony.
- I myself stayed up into the wee hours
- 13 rereading the testimony last night. And I know my two
- 14 colleagues have written it -- have read it as well and
- 15 understand it more clearly even than I do. So we
- 16 don't need a lot in the way of summery; we know what
- 17 the testimony is.
- The purpose of this hearing is to have an
- 19 opportunity to cross examination witnesses under the
- 20 hot lights. And we think that that's gonna be the
- 21 most fruitful and the best use of time today.
- 22 As always, we discourage trying to prove your
- 23 case through cross examination. It's largely in
- 24 effectual, and a huge waste of time for everyone else
- 25 as you try to do that.

- 1 We don't anticipate issuing an order -- a
- 2 separate order on Rate of Return, but rather we'll
- 3 issue an order in the case in chief later in the
- 4 summer as we go forward. Have I missed anything or
- 5 are there any questions about what I've said so far?
- No? Well, okay. We don't know if this
- 7 format is going to work, but we're hoping that it
- 8 does. Our anticipation is that we can go through the
- 9 technical witnesses this morning, and perhaps into the
- 10 early afternoon. And then have an opportunity to hear
- 11 from the policy witnesses. We would hope to conclude
- 12 the hearing by 5:00, if possible.
- 13 We'll take regular breaks to give our
- 14 reporter a rest and us an opportunity to regroup and
- 15 rethink. Okay. With that, then, let's take
- 16 appearances first. And we'll begin with the Company.
- 17 MS. McDOWELL: Katherine McDowell from the
- 18 law firm of McDowell & Rackner here on behalf of Rocky
- 19 Mountain Power.
- MR. MOENCH: Mark Moench, general counsel for
- 21 Rocky Mountain Power, on behalf of Rocky Mountain
- 22 Power.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Welcome. And welcome
- 24 Ms. McDowell. Is this the first time you've testified
- 25 in our -- or rather participated in a hearing in Utah?

- 1 Ms. McDowell: Yes it is, Commissioner, and
- 2 I'm honored to be here.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, we're glad to
- 4 have you.
- 5 Ms. Schmid?
- 6 MS. SCHMID: Patricia E. Schmid from the
- 7 Attorney General's Office representing the Division of
- 8 Public Utilities.
- 9 MR. PROCTOR: Paul Proctor on behalf of the
- 10 Utah Committee of Consumer Services.
- 11 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. Mr. Reeder?
- MR. REEDER: Good morning. I'm Robert
- 13 Reeder, on behalf of a group of industrial customers
- 14 whose names appear and are identified as the UIEC.
- I would note that I would ask to be excused
- 16 from this hearing at the conclusion of my appearance.
- 17 I have no witnesses. And to facilitate your
- 18 expedition -- expeditiously disposing of this matter,
- 19 I'll waive cross examination.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well Mr. Reeder,
- 21 thank you. You may well be back in my will.
- Mr. Dodge?
- MR. DODGE: Gary Dodge on behalf of the UAE
- 24 Intervention Group.
- 25 MR. BALL: Roger Ball, on my own behalf.

- 1 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay, thank you
- 2 Mr. Ball. With that why don't we -- let's try to get
- 3 the prefiled written testimony into the record at this
- 4 point, and then we'll begin with the witnesses.
- 5 Ms. McDowell?
- 6 Ms. McDowell: Yes, Commissioner. So would
- 7 it be helpful to just read through what the testimony
- 8 is and what the exhibits are?
- 9 COMMISSIONER BOYER: That would be very
- 10 helpful.
- 11 Ms. McDowell: Okay. We have the witness
- 12 Mr. Williams. We have his direct testimony. And that
- 13 direct testimony is accompanied by 14 witnesses -- or
- 14 excuse me.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Exhibits?
- Ms. McDowell: Fourteen exhibits, BNW-1
- 17 through 14. Then we have Mr. Williams' supplemental
- 18 direct testimony which is accompanied by two exhibits,
- 19 BNW-1-S and BNW-2-S. Then Mr. Williams has rebuttal
- 20 testimony. No exhibits with that testimony.
- 21 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well.
- Ms. McDowell: So shall I proceed to
- 23 Mr. Hadaway and Mr. Walje as well?
- 24 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Why don't we go one by
- 25 one. Let's get Mr. Williams' testimony into the

- 1 record if it's admissible.
- 2 Ms. McDowell: Very good. So we would offer
- 3 Mr. Williams' testimony.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Are there any objections
- 5 to Mr. Williams' testimony?
- 6 MS. SCHMID: None.
- 7 MR. PROCTOR: No objection.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. Mr. Williams'
- 9 direct testimony, his supplemental testimony, both
- 10 with exhibits, and his rebuttal testimony are admitted
- 11 into evidence.
- 12 Ms. McDowell: Thank you, Commissioner.
- 13 Would you like me to proceed?
- 14 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Please, if you would.
- 15 Ms. McDowell: Our next witness this morning
- 16 will be Dr. Hadaway. He has prepared direct
- 17 testimony, which is accompanied by Exhibits SCH-1
- 18 through SCH-7. Mr. Hadaway has also prepared rebuttal
- 19 testimony, and that testimony is accompanied by
- 20 Rebuttal Exhibits SCH-1-R through SCH-8-R. We would
- 21 offer Mr. Hadaway's testimony and exhibits.
- 22 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Are there objections
- 23 on -- to Mr. Had -- Dr. Hadaway's testimony?
- MS. SCHMID: None.
- 25 COMMISSIONER BOYER: None? Okay, then the --

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 both the direct and rebuttal testimony of Mr. --
- 2 Dr. Hadaway, together with exhibits, are admitted into
- 3 evidence.
- 4 Ms. McDowell: And Commissioner, our final
- 5 witness will be Mr. Rich Walje. Mr. Walje submitted
- 6 specific testimony for this phase of the proceedings
- 7 but also has aspects of his direct and rebuttal
- 8 testimony from the Revenue Requirement proceedings
- 9 which are relevant to the Rate of Return testimony.
- 10 So we could go ahead and offer those for the
- 11 limited purpose of their applicability to this
- 12 hearing, and then go ahead and offer the specific
- 13 rebuttal for Rate of Return if that would be
- 14 acceptable.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Let's do that.
- Ms. McDowell: So in that case we have the
- 17 direct policy testimony of Rich Walje. We have his
- 18 rebuttal testimony in the Rate of Return hearing. And
- 19 then we have his rebuttal testimony in the Revenue
- 20 Requirement phase. And that's accompanied by two
- 21 exhibits, ARW-1-R and ARW-2-R. We would offer
- 22 Mr. Walje's testimony.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Are there objections to
- 24 Mr. Walje's testimony?
- MS. SCHMID: None.

- 1 MR. PROCTOR: None.
- 2 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. Mr. Walje's
- direct policy testimony, his rebuttal testimony, and
- 4 the Rate of Return portion of this proceeding and his
- 5 rebuttal testimony in the Revenue Requirement, with
- 6 the two exhibits, are admitted into evidence.
- 7 Ms. McDowell: Thank you, Commissioner.
- 8 That's all of the testimony that we -- prefiled
- 9 testimony we intend to offer today.
- 10 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Ms. McDowell.
- 11 Ms. Schmid?
- MS. SCHMID: Good morning. The Division
- 13 would like to offer DPU Exhibit No. 2.0. And there's
- 14 also a confidential version of that testimony. And
- 15 DPU Exhibits No. 2.1 through 2.16. This is the
- 16 prefiled direct Rate of Return exhibit -- testimony of
- 17 Charles E. Peterson and the associated exhibits.
- 18 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. Are there
- 19 objections to Mr. Peterson's testimony, prefiled
- 20 written testimony?
- MS. SCHMID: We also have a surrebuttal. I
- 22 didn't know if you wanted to do them together or
- 23 separate.
- 24 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Please.
- 25 MS. SCHMID: Okay. We'd also like to offer

- 1 DPU Exhibit No. 2.0-SR which is the prefiled
- 2 surrebuttal Rate of Return testimony of Charles
- 3 Peterson.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. I ask the
- 5 question again, are there objections to Mr. Peterson's
- 6 testimony, prefiled? Very well. The testimony of
- 7 Mr. Peterson, together with exhibits, are admitted.
- 8 Mr. Proctor?
- 9 MR. PROCTOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The,
- 10 the Committee has previously filed with the Commission
- 11 two sets of testimony by Daniel J. Lawton, both direct
- 12 and surrebuttal. The direct has been marked as
- 13 CCS-3-D, and it consists of 31 pages.
- 14 In addition, there are ten exhibits marked
- 15 CCS-3.1 through and including 3.10. In addition,
- 16 there is testimony -- surrebuttal testimony marked
- 17 CCS-3-SR, consisting of seven pages. And three
- 18 exhibits that have been marked 3.1-SR through and
- 19 including 3.3.
- 20 Upon Mr. Lawton being sworn appropriately, of
- 21 course, and with three corrections that need to be
- 22 made -- two to the direct, two to the surrebuttal --
- 23 they're not consequential but nevertheless need to be
- 24 made --
- 25 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Would you like to take

- 1 care of that at this moment? We could swear
- 2 Mr. Lawton.
- 3 MR. PROCTOR: If I could, yes.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: We could swear
- 5 Mr. Lawton.
- 6 MR. PROCTOR: Would you, please?
- 7 (Mr. Lawton was duly sworn.)
- 8 DANIEL LAWTON,
- 9 called as a witness, having been duly sworn,
- 10 was examined and testified as follows:
- 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 12 BY MR. PROCTOR:
- 13 Q. Mr. Lawton, if I could ask you just very
- 14 quickly, are there changes that you wish to make to
- 15 your direct testimony, in particular page 2, lines 45
- 16 and 46?
- 17 A. Yes. On page 2 of my direct testimony at the
- 18 end of line 44, the 985 percent -- 9.85 percent should
- 19 be 9.65 percent. Then if you go down to line 46, at
- 20 the start of the first sentence, the 9.65 percent
- 21 should be 9.85 percent. For some reason those two
- 22 numbers were inverted. With that change, the
- 23 testimony is correct.
- 24 Q. Is there a change that you would like to make
- 25 to Exhibit 3.7 to your direct testimony?

- 1 A. Yes. Exhibit 3 -- CCS-3.7, if I can -- no.
- 2 I think that was my direct, wasn't it?
- 3 Q. Yeah, in your direct testimony.
- 4 A. Yeah. Exhibit CCS-3.7, I incorrectly
- 5 misspelled the name of the Company, and I wanted to
- 6 correct the name. The word "Mountain," there's a "u"
- 7 missing.
- 8 Q. And finally Mr. Lawton to your surrebuttal,
- 9 Exhibit 3.3-SR, is there a change that needs to be
- 10 made on page 2 of this three-page document?
- 11 A. Yes. On page 2 in the upper right-hand
- 12 corner of the Exhibit CCS-3.3 should be SR, not R,
- 13 signifying this is surrebuttal testimony.
- Q. Mr. Lawton, if I were to ask you the
- 15 questions today that have -- you have responded to in
- 16 your prefiled written testimony would your answers
- 17 remain the same?
- 18 A. Yes they would, sir.
- 19 MR. PROCTOR: With that, Mr. Chairman, the
- 20 Committee would offer into evidence the direct and
- 21 surrebuttal testimony of Daniel Lawton as we have
- 22 earlier identified it.
- COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Proctor.
- 24 Are there any objections to the admission of the
- 25 prefiled testimony of Mr. Lawton?

- 1 MS. SCHMID: None.
- Ms. McDowell: No.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Seeing none, then the
- 4 prefiled testimony of Mr. Lawton together with
- 5 exhibits, and as corrected today, are admitted into
- 6 evidence.
- 7 And that does raise the question that with --
- 8 were there corrections to any of the written testimony
- 9 previously submitted into evidence?
- 10 Ms. McDowell: No.
- 11 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you.
- 12 MS. SCHMID: And sorry Mr. Chairman, the
- 13 Division has one question with respect to an exhibit,
- 14 but we will check on that. It may have gone in with
- 15 zeroes instead of numbers. But we will check.
- 16 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. If you would
- 17 check and let us know that.
- 18 Let's see. Mr. Dodge, you have no witnesses
- 19 but you're gonna participate today?
- 20 MR. DODGE: Yes, in a limited role.
- 21 COMMISSIONER BOYER: And Mr. Ball, there has
- 22 been a motion to strike your testimony. You've
- 23 responded to that. I suppose we should let
- 24 Ms. McDowell have an opportunity to argue that, and
- 25 then you to respond. And we'll rule here from the

- 1 bench before we proceed.
- 2 Ms. McDowell?
- 3 Ms. McDowell: Thank you, Commissioner. The
- 4 motion basically tried to set out in advance of the
- 5 hearing our concerns about this testimony before it
- 6 was offered so that all parties had advance notice of
- 7 our concerns about the relevance of this testimony to
- 8 this hearing.
- 9 It's our view that the testimony essentially
- 10 reargues points that were handled and resolved in the
- 11 test year hearing. We have enough issues to address
- 12 here without going back and rearguing those issues.
- 13 So it was our opinion that this testimony was
- 14 irrelevant to the issues that are before the
- 15 Commission today, and should not be received.
- 16 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Ms. McDowell.
- Mr. Ball, response?
- 18 MR. BALL: Responding to Ms. McDowell's
- 19 remarks here, I really don't think the -- those
- 20 issue -- the issues that I've raised in my Rate of
- 21 Return testimony were addressed in the test year
- 22 hearing. Certainly they were raised.
- 23 I did testify regarding the financial impact
- 24 of a projected test year back then, but the Commission
- 25 really didn't rule on that. And so it's entirely

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 appropriate that they should consider it now. Perhaps
- 2 more appropriate.
- 3 But I would point out that by bringing it
- 4 forward during the test year proceeding I gave
- 5 everybody plenty of opportunity to understand what my
- 6 position was. And I find it, I find it interesting
- 7 that no party, including the Company, filed any
- 8 contravening testimony. Thank you Chairman.
- 9 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Does anyone else wish to
- 10 speak to the motion to strike, and then we'll give
- 11 Ms. McDowell the last word? No? Ms. McDowell,
- 12 anything further?
- Ms. McDowell: No, thank you.
- 14 (Pause.)
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: All right. We share
- 16 some of the concerns of the Company regarding
- 17 relevance and materiality, whether it's probative and
- 18 so on and so forth, but we're going to admit
- 19 Mr. Ball's testimony. We'll give it appropriate
- 20 weight during our deliberate process.
- 21 Do you wish to submit your written prefiled
- 22 testimony into evidence, Mr. Ball?
- MR. BALL: Thank you Chairman.
- 24 (Pause.)
- 25 MR. BALL: First of all, Chairman, I have one

- 1 correction to make. Would remind everyone that I've
- 2 already been sworn in this proceeding. The correction
- 3 is to the cover sheet of my rebuttal testimony. I'm
- 4 grateful to PacifiCorp for pointing out that I had
- 5 shown in the middle of the page the wrong date.
- I show the 31st of March, 2008. It should be
- 7 corrected, please, to the 28th of April, 2008. Which
- 8 is the same date shown in the footer of each page and
- 9 in the service certificate. That's the only
- 10 correction of which I am aware.
- 11 And I'd like to offer my Rate of Return
- 12 direct testimony, marked as Exhibit RJB-3.0, Rate of
- 13 Return rebuttal testimony marked as RJB Exhibit 5.0,
- 14 and Rate of Return surrebuttal testimony marked as RJB
- 15 Exhibit 6.0 and ask that it be admitted into evidence,
- 16 please.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. I think we've
- 18 already argued the admissibility issues. So then the
- 19 Rate of Return direct testimony of Mr. Ball, his
- 20 rebuttal testimony, and surrebuttal testimony will be
- 21 admitted into the -- into evidence in this proceeding.
- MR. BALL: Thank you.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. I think that
- 24 brings us to the case in chief now. And we'll proceed
- 25 with alacrity, won't we? And we'll turn the time over

- 1 to Ms. McDowell for your first witness.
- 2 MS. MCDOWELL: Thank you, Commissioner. We
- 3 call Bruce Williams.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Williams, have you
- 5 been sworn in this proceeding?
- 6 THE WITNESS: No, I have not.
- 7 (Mr. Williams was duly sworn.)
- 8 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you. Please be
- 9 seated.
- 10 BRUCE WILLIAMS,
- 11 called as a witness, having been duly sworn,
- 12 was examined and testified as follows:
- 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 14 BY MS. McDOWELL:
- 15 Q. Mr. Williams, can you state your full name
- 16 and spell it for the record?
- 17 A. Bruce Williams. B-r-u-c-e, W-i-l-l-i-a-m-s.
- 18 Q. How are you employed, Mr. Williams?
- 19 A. I am the vice president and treasurer of
- 20 PacifiCorp.
- 21 Q. In that capacity have you prepared testimony
- 22 and exhibits for this proceeding?
- 23 A. Yes, I have.
- Q. And have those exhibits -- excuse me,
- 25 testimony and exhibits been previously filed and

- 1 offered and admitted in this proceeding?
- 2 A. Yes, they have been.
- 3 Q. Have you prepared a summary of your prefiled
- 4 testimony?
- 5 A. Yes, I have.
- 6 Q. Mindful of Commissioner Boyer's admonition to
- 7 make summaries brief, can you please provide that
- 8 summary of your testimony now?
- 9 A. Yes, I will.
- 10 And I also did hear your comments about being
- 11 brief and I'll try my best to comply with those.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BOYER: I'd like to characterize
- 13 it as a suggestion, but admonition has a nice ring to
- 14 it as well. Thank you, Mr. Williams.
- MS. McDOWELL: I'm gonna err on the side of
- 16 deference this morning.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you.
- 18 THE WITNESS: Well, first of all good
- 19 morning. Thank you for the opportunity to be here
- 20 with you again. There are three main parts to my
- 21 testimony. The first concerns the Company's capital
- 22 structure. Cost of debt and preferred are the other
- 23 two pieces.
- 24 Dr. Hadaway will testify concerning the cost
- 25 of common equity, which is a final component necessary

- 1 to determine the overall cost of capital for Rocky
- 2 Mountain Power. In my updated testimony, as directed
- 3 by the Commission in its order concerning the test
- 4 period, the Company utilized the 12 months ending
- 5 December 31, 2008, as the test period to determine the
- 6 capital structure and cost of capital in this matter.
- 7 My testimony demonstrates that the Company's
- 8 capital structure will be 49.2 percent debt, .4
- 9 percent preferred stock, and 50.4 percent common
- 10 equity. No party in this case has raised objections
- 11 or proposed a different capital structure.
- 12 My testimony further describes how the cost
- 13 of debt is determined, including the cost of
- 14 700 million of new long-term debt which is to be
- 15 issued during the test period. This is a significant
- 16 amount of new debt for the Company. And it's
- 17 necessary to fund the investments that we're making in
- 18 new generation, transmission, environmental resources,
- 19 and local distribution facilities.
- 20 It's important that the cost of this debt be
- 21 determined appropriately, as the Company will be a
- 22 regular ongoing issuer of long-term debt going
- 23 forward. The cost of this debt is really composed of
- 24 two pieces:
- 25 The first is the underlying treasury bond

- 1 rate. Then in addition to that treasury bond rate
- 2 there is the credit spread or premium that investors
- 3 require because of the greater risk of the Company
- 4 compared to U.S. Treasury securities.
- 5 This is the same method that the Company has
- 6 utilized previously here in Utah and in the other
- 7 states that regulate Rocky Mountain Power or Pacific
- 8 Power. My testimony demonstrates that the cost of
- 9 debt is 6.30 percent for the test period.
- 10 My testimony also describes a methodology for
- 11 determining the cost of preferred stock, and that cost
- 12 is 5.41 percent. Again, this methodology is also
- 13 consistent with past practices of this Commission and
- 14 the other states that regulate Rocky Mountain Power or
- 15 Pacific Power.
- 16 Again, no parties have raised any objections
- 17 to the cost of preferred stock or proposed an
- 18 alternative. You will hear later from Dr. Hadaway as
- 19 to the cost of common equity and why it is
- 20 10.75 percent. This capital structure and the costs
- 21 then produce a weighted average cost of capital of
- 22 8.54 percent for Rocky Mountain Power.
- 23 My rebuttal testimony responds to several
- 24 issues raised by Mr. Lawton and Mr. Peterson. Most
- 25 significantly we disagree about one item, and that is

- 1 the cost of the new debt to be issued during the test
- 2 period.
- 3 Mr. Lawton and Mr. Peterson propose a
- 4 reduction in the cost of this new debt, citing a
- 5 general decline in yields or interest rates on U.S.
- 6 Treasury bonds since my direct testimony was prepared.
- 7 However, they admit a corresponding and offsetting
- 8 increase in the credit spreads that investors
- 9 currently require for corporate bonds, including those
- 10 of the Company.
- 11 They are correct that treasury bonds have
- 12 declined. But importantly, the credit spreads
- 13 required of Single-A rated public utility companies
- 14 like Rocky Mountain Power has widened significantly,
- 15 resulting in borrowing costs that are higher than when
- 16 the direct testimony was prepared.
- 17 My rebuttal testimony demonstrates that the
- 18 6.30 percent continues to be appropriate overall cost
- 19 of debt. Finally I'd like to comment on the
- 20 surrebuttal testimony of Mr. Lawton and Mr. Peterson.
- 21 Both gentlemen have expressed concerns that
- 22 Dr. Hadaway and I have made contradictory statements
- 23 concerning interest rates. I'd like to be clear that
- 24 this is not the case.
- 25 Dr. Hadaway and I have correctly utilized

- 1 rates that are appropriate for different borrowers at
- 2 different periods in time. Dr. Hadaway will further
- 3 elaborate on his interest rate selections during his
- 4 testimony.
- 5 Finally in closing I'd like to say the
- 6 Company's provided clear testimony as to the capital
- 7 structure during the test period and the cost of
- 8 capital. There's really only one important item of
- 9 disagreement, and that's the cost of this new debt
- 10 that will be issued.
- 11 On that point, Rocky Mountain Power has
- 12 demonstrated the costs in the direct testimony are the
- 13 most appropriate. That concludes my opening
- 14 statement.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you Mr. Williams.
- Ms. Schmid, cross examination?
- 17 MS. SCHMID: Thank you. Very few questions.
- 18 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MS. SCHMID:
- Q. Mr. Williams, is it correct that the Company,
- 21 in approximately November of 2008, plans to issue
- 22 about a \$700 million debt issuance?
- 23 A. I'd say that's approximately correct, though
- 24 the time could move. But that's the size we have
- 25 targeted, yes.

- 1 Q. Has the Company hedged the future interest
- 2 rate for this?
- 3 A. No, we have not.
- 4 MS. SCHMID: Thank you, that's all.
- 5 COMMISSIONER BOYER: You are parsimonious
- 6 today, Ms. Schmid, thank you.
- 7 Mr. Proctor, cross examination for
- 8 Mr. Williams?
- 9 MR. PROCTOR: Could I just have one moment?
- 10 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Surely.
- 11 (Pause.)
- 12 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 13 BY MR. PROCTOR:
- 14 Q. Mr. Williams, prior to coming here today did
- 15 you review Dr. Hadaway's surrebuttal -- or excuse me,
- 16 rebuttal testimony, and in particular that part where
- 17 he describes the cost of new debt for companies such
- 18 as PacifiCorp?
- 19 A. I believe so. But if you could refer to a
- 20 specific section, that would be helpful.
- Q. It would be Table 1, page 5, of his rebuttal
- 22 testimony.
- 23 A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that?
- Q. Table 1, page 5, to Dr. Hadaway's rebuttal
- 25 testimony. Long-term interest rate trends. Do you

- 1 see that?
- 2 A. Well, I think I'm looking at the same thing
- 3 you are, but I'm not certain. Do you have --
- 4 Q. Well, what -- doesn't that table reflect that
- 5 as of March 2008 the Single-A utility long-term
- 6 interest rate was 6.21 percent?
- 7 A. I think you are looking at the column that's
- 8 labelled monthly average for March 2008?
- 9 Q. Yes.
- 10 A. That 6.2? And yes, that is correct.
- 11 Q. Okay. And that is different than the all-in
- 12 cost that you describe on page 2 of your rebuttal
- 13 testimony, is it not?
- 14 A. It's different because they're different
- 15 points in time. This is March. My testimony is
- 16 looking at costs in December.
- 17 O. December of 2007?
- 18 A. No, December 2008.
- 19 Q. Thank you, sir.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Is that all,
- 21 Mr. Proctor?
- MR. PROCTOR: That's all.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay, very well.
- Mr. Dodge?
- MR. DODGE: No questions.

- 1 COMMISSIONER BOYER: No questions?
- 2 Mr. Ball?
- 3 MR. BALL: No, thank you.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Ms. McDowell, anything
- 5 further?
- 6 MS. McDOWELL: No, your Honor.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you Mr. Williams,
- 8 you may be excused. Or step down, anyway.
- 9 I guess that brings to us Dr. Hadaway?
- MS. McDOWELL: That's correct.
- 11 (Dr. Hadaway was duly sworn.)
- 12 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you. You may be
- 13 seated.
- 14 SAMUEL C. HADAWAY,
- 15 called as a witness, having been duly sworn,
- 16 was examined and testified as follows:
- 17 EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MS. McDOWELL:
- 19 Q. Good morning Dr. Hadaway.
- A. Good morning.
- 21 Q. Can you please state your full name and spell
- 22 it for the record?
- A. My name is Samuel C. Hadaway. S-a-m-u-e-l,
- 24 middle initial C. Hadaway, H-a-d-a-w-a-y.
- Q. Mr. Hadaway, how are you employed?

- 1 A. I'm a principal and co-owner in a financial
- 2 consulting firm, Financo, Inc., of Austin, Texas.
- 3 Q. And in that capacity have you been employed
- 4 by the Company to prepare expert testimony in this
- 5 proceeding?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Have you prepared direct and rebuttal
- 8 testimony in this proceeding that has been offered and
- 9 admitted already?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Dr. Hadaway, have you prepared a summary of
- 12 your direct and rebuttal testimony?
- 13 A. Yes, I have.
- 14 Q. Can you please provide that summary?
- 15 A. Yes, thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman,
- 16 Commissioners, thank you for being here again.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Welcome Dr. Hadaway.
- 18 THE WITNESS: My testimony covers the
- 19 Company's requested Rate of Return on equity. As
- 20 Mr. Williams just covered with you, he uses the cost
- 21 of debt, preferred stock, and capital structure, along
- 22 with my estimate of ROE, to calculate the overall Rate
- of Return, which is then applied to the rate base.
- 24 Rate of Return, as you well know, is often
- 25 controversial, for at least two very important

- 1 reasons: One, the dollars are large. When one
- 2 applies the Rate of Return to the rate base, the
- 3 amount of money involved is a lot. But ROE is also
- 4 controversial because it's quite subjective.
- 5 There's no book or other publication to tell
- 6 us what ROE is. For this reason, economists usually
- 7 rely on two categories of information to estimate ROE:
- 8 They rely on financial models, and they rely on
- 9 financial market data.
- 10 While there is not a data source that tells
- 11 us what ROE is, such things as interest rates, rates
- 12 of return allowed by other regulators, and other
- 13 economic data are often used. With respect to
- 14 financial models there's several different categories,
- 15 but most regulators use the discounted cash flow
- 16 model, or DCF model. And many use some form of risk
- 17 premium analysis, at least as a check of
- 18 reasonableness.
- 19 In my direct and rebuttal testimony I present
- 20 results from three forms of the DCF model, as well as
- 21 various risk premium methods. My updated DCF results,
- 22 with data through March of 2008, are summarized in my
- 23 rebuttal testimony in Exhibit SCH-R-7.
- 24 Those results from the DCF model indicate a
- 25 range of 10.4 percent to 11.3 percent. If we might --

- 1 and I am going recall the Chairman's admonition. If
- 2 we might, I think we would expedite things if we
- 3 looked at that exhibit very briefly.
- 4 It's exhibit -- it's under the tab Exhibit
- 5 SCH-R-7 -- or 7-R. That exhibit consists of 5 pages.
- 6 But I'd like to just start with the first page, which
- 7 is a summary of the results from the three DCF models.
- 8 There should be a tab that says Exhibit RMP-SCH-7-R.
- 9 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Seven-R?
- 10 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
- 11 COMMISSIONER BOYER: That's my problem. I'm
- 12 now with you, Mr. Hadaway.
- 13 THE WITNESS: Okay. If you look at that
- 14 first page of 7-R there are four columns. The first
- 15 column is just the name of the companies, the
- 16 comparable companies that we used in our estimation
- 17 process. The other three columns show the results
- 18 from, from the various versions of the DCF model.
- 19 In the DCF model, as you know, ROE is just
- 20 the sum of the expected yield -- the dividend yield --
- 21 that investors, expect plus the growth rate that they
- 22 expect. In, in the first column of numbers there,
- 23 this is strictly the traditional constant growth DCF
- 24 model.
- 25 And in that model I used only analyst

- 1 estimates of earnings growth to estimate the growth
- 2 rate. Later we're gonna talk about gross domestic
- 3 product and some other ways of doing that. But that
- 4 first column is about as traditional as you can get in
- 5 terms of the DCF model. The range from that model is
- 6 10.4 to 10.8 percent, as you see down there in the
- 7 average median at the bottom.
- 8 If you want to flip over to the second page.
- 9 This sort of makes how the DCF model work -- works
- 10 pretty clear. Again, it's just the dividend yield
- 11 plus the growth rate. And if you look in column 3 you
- 12 see that the dividend yield that we use is next year's
- 13 projected dividend from column 2, divided by the
- 14 recent price in column 1.
- Down at the bottom of column 3 you see that
- 16 the average median is 4.7 to 4.8 percent, about. So
- 17 that's the first part of the constant growth DCF
- 18 model. If you look over in columns 4 through 7,
- 19 that's where I calculate the growth rate that's used
- 20 in that first model.
- 21 Columns 4, 5, and 6 are simply surveys done
- $22\,$ by Zack's, Reuters, and Thompson financial, where they
- 23 ask security analysts on Wall Street and elsewhere
- 24 what they project the earnings growth rate to be for
- 25 these companies for the next five years.

- 1 These are traditionally used by Rate of
- 2 Return analysts. I've criticized them in some cases
- 3 because they're quite volatile. Sometimes they change
- 4 more than the constant growth DCF model would -- you
- 5 would expect for them to. But that's what they are.
- 6 We averaged those together in column 7. And
- 7 then you see, you see that over in column 8 we add
- 8 together 7 and 3, and that's where you get the DCF
- 9 range of 10.4 to 10.8. That's the first model, and
- 10 that's the one that people typically argue about.
- If we flip back to the first page, the
- 12 summary page, I'll very briefly talk about the other
- 13 two models. The column of numbers in the middle is
- 14 the same in terms of form as the constant growth DCF
- 15 model, but in that I use a growth rate based on the
- 16 overall growth in the U.S. economy as proxied by the
- 17 nominal gross domestic product growth rate.
- 18 In my direct testimony and rebuttal I provide
- 19 forecasts of what that GDP growth rate is. That
- 20 number has been updated in my rebuttal and it is
- 21 6.5 percent. In this version of the model the
- 22 analysts' growth rates at the present time are just a
- 23 little bit lower than 6.5 percent. So you can see
- 24 that the GDP model produces numbers of 11.2 to
- 25 11.3 percent.

- 1 That's not my final recommendation. My final
- 2 recommendation is 10.75. But that's the most
- 3 aggressive of the three models. The third model, in
- 4 the far right-hand column of the summary page, is sort
- 5 of a compromise.
- 6 It uses dividends from Value Line for the
- 7 first five years, and then it switches to the
- 8 long-term GDP growth rate in years five out to the
- 9 future. This is a model that has been used,
- 10 particularly in the state of Oregon it is the one that
- 11 is required to be used.
- 12 It is not -- I don't want to say that they
- 13 use the DCF growth rate as the growth rate in it, but
- 14 it's the form of the model that they use. And many
- 15 commissions use two-stage models. You can see that
- 16 because it is a combination of dividends and other
- 17 growth rates, it's sort of in between the other two.
- 18 At any rate, based on all these three models,
- 19 the DCF range is 10.4 to 11.3, quantitatively from all
- 20 of those. My final recommendation, as I said, is
- 21 10.75 percent. I also update my risk premium analysis
- 22 in Exhibit SCH-8-R.
- In that analysis I used, at the time, a
- 24 forecasted Single-A utility interest rate. And that
- 25 interest rate in Exhibit 8-R is 6.36 percent. That

- 1 results in a risk premium estimate of ROE of
- 2 10.73 percent.
- 3 However, you've read the surrebuttal
- 4 testimony and other testimony and know that there is
- 5 controversy about interest rate forecasts in this
- 6 case. So I have also rerun that model with just the
- 7 current interest rate.
- 8 I'll show you an update to my Table 1 in a
- 9 few minutes. But through April the Single-A interest
- 10 rate is 6.29 percent. About the same -- last one that
- 11 was discussed earlier here for March, but it's up just
- 12 a little bit in April.
- For the month of April it was 6.29 percent.
- 14 I looked on Moody's website yesterday, it was
- 15 6.27 percent as of Friday. So that rate has been
- 16 pretty constant the last 30 days or so in that 6 1/4,
- 17 6.3 range.
- 18 The three of us who estimated ROE used
- 19 various models. We used all -- all of us used the DCF
- 20 model. And based on that model alone, if it was just
- 21 DCF, our ROE estimates are not as far apart as our ROE
- 22 recommendations are.
- For example, Mr. Peterson recommends a
- 24 10.1 percent ROE, but his DCF analysis based on his
- 25 earnings growth rates indicates an ROE range of 10.37

- 1 to 10.69. That's on page 26 of his direct testimony.
- 2 Mr. Lawton recommends an ROE of only
- 3 9.85 percent, but his primary DCF analysis based on
- 4 his actual DCF work, not his critiques of mine,
- 5 produces about a 10 percent ROE.
- 6 While I continue to disagree with the other
- 7 witnesses' growth rate inputs, if this Commission
- 8 relies strictly on the DCF model, even with their
- 9 growth rates, that model indicates ROEs between 10 and
- 10 10.7 percent.
- 11 If some weight is also given to my slightly
- 12 higher long-term growth rates, the range is between
- 13 10 1/2 and 11 percent. In addition to the DCF models,
- 14 we all also offered various risk premium results.
- 15 As I indicated in my rebuttal, I disagree
- 16 with Mr. Peterson's CAPM results because under current
- 17 market condition the CAPM, using the government bond
- 18 interest rate and historical market risk premiums,
- 19 cannot reflect the current market turmoil or the
- 20 higher current corporate interest rates that companies
- 21 like Rocky Mountain Power are having to pay.
- 22 I've been criticized by the other parties
- 23 because I used CAPM in my direct testimony. And that
- 24 result was 9.8 percent to 10.6 percent when I prepared
- 25 my direct testimony. But I have excluded the updated

- 1 results from the CAPM in my rebuttal testimony. I
- 2 didn't include the CAPM in my rebuttal because
- 3 government policy has pushed down government interest
- 4 rates to artificially low levels.
- 5 The short-term Treasury Bill rate that's
- 6 sometimes used -- and that I used in one version of
- 7 the CAPM -- dropped to as low as 1 percent a few weeks
- 8 back. It's about 1.8 percent now.
- 9 Other government interest rates, because of
- 10 the "Flight to Safety" as it's called -- that is,
- 11 investors being afraid of the market turmoil and
- 12 moving their money into Treasury bonds -- has also
- 13 pushed down even the long-term Treasury bond rate.
- I did rerun CAPM, doing it the same way I did
- in my direct testimony, and the result was about
- 16 8 percent to 9.5 percent ROE. Those results indicate
- 17 declining capital costs when, in fact, corporate costs
- 18 have gone up. For that reason I rely on the updated
- 19 DCF and corporate bond risk premium methods, and not
- 20 the CAPM, to support my final 10.75 percent ROE
- 21 recommendation.
- I also disagree with Mr. Lawton's risk
- 23 premium analysis because he uses a base interest rate
- 24 in that analysis of only 5 1/2 percent. That number
- 25 is simply wrong. Current Single-A utility interest

- 1 rates, as I've said, are about 6.3 percent. They
- 2 haven't been as low as 5.5 percent since 2005.
- 3 Mr. Lawton and the other parties here agreed to a
- 4 settlement at 10 1/4 percent ROE. Interest rates have
- 5 gone up almost a hundred basis points since then.
- To make sure that everything is clear about
- 7 these interest rate issues I've prepared an update of
- 8 the Table 1 interest rate data that appeared in my
- 9 direct and rebuttal testimony. Table 1 lists the
- 10 average Single-A utility interest rates for each
- 11 month, along with government bond interest rates for
- 12 each month, January 2005 through April 2008.
- 13 Now, I believe we have copies of that updated
- 14 table. It's exactly the same as in my two pieces of
- 15 testimony, with just one more month added to it.
- 16 (Pause.)
- 17 THE WITNESS: I hope that this exhibit will
- 18 help to clarify some of the confusion about
- 19 difficulties in interest rate forecasts, about where
- 20 government bond rates have gone, but also make quite
- 21 clear where corporate borrowing costs and corporate
- 22 capital costs have gone.
- 23 As I also said a few minutes ago, I looked in
- 24 Moody's website yesterday. And the number for
- 25 April -- I'm sorry. The number for May the 16th,

- 1 Friday's interest rate, the Single-A interest rate was
- 2 6.27 percent.
- 3 Last week it went up as high as 6.32 percent.
- 4 It fluctuates a few basis points each day. But there
- 5 is no material change that has occurred since this
- 6 exhibit -- since the data was available for this
- 7 exhibit.
- 8 The first column of numbers in Table 1 shows,
- 9 about as clearly as possible, that utility interest
- 10 rates have not declined to but in fact increased
- 11 almost a full percentage point since their lows in
- 12 2005. I hope that the Commission will not be
- 13 distracted by Mr. Peterson, and particularly
- 14 Mr. Lawton's discussion of interest rate forecasts and
- 15 government rate policies.
- 16 Table 1 also shows government interest rates
- 17 that have occurred, but in the right hand two columns
- 18 the much wider interest rate spreads that utilities
- 19 like Rocky Mountain Power and other corporations have
- 20 had to pay.
- 21 Those spreads have almost doubled from the
- 22 levels that existed you can see back early, if you
- 23 look in the last two columns of the exhibit. The
- 24 spread is simply the Single-A interest rate in the
- 25 20 year column, minus the 20 year Treasury bond rate.

- 1 And the last column is the Single-A utility rate minus
- 2 the 10 year utility rate.
- 3 The market turmoil that has occurred has
- 4 caused corporate interest rates to go up. These facts
- 5 show that Mr. Peterson and Mr. Lawton are simply
- 6 incorrect in their statements that rates have
- 7 declined.
- 8 In this context, their estimates of ROE are
- 9 too low. They do not reflect the increased borrowing
- 10 costs that Rocky Mountain is required to pay. The
- 11 Company's requested an ROE of 10.75 is the most
- 12 reasonable reflection of these costs.
- 13 Thank you for your attention. I'll be happy
- 14 to answer any questions.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Dr. Hadaway.
- Ms. McDowell: Commissioner Boyer, if I
- 17 might, can I ask a couple of questions to lay the
- 18 foundation for this exhibit?
- 19 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Please, if you would.
- Ms. McDowell: Thank you.
- Q. (By Ms. McDowell) Dr. Hadaway, have you
- 22 previously provided versions of Table 1 in your direct
- 23 and rebuttal testimony?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. What is the change that you have made to

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 Updated Table 1 for purposes of this morning's
- 2 hearing?
- 3 A. The data on this table are published in
- 4 what's called Moody's Bond Record. Moody's has been
- 5 bought by Emergent, so sometimes it's called Emergent
- 6 Bond Record now as well. But these come out each
- 7 month, with the average of the daily interest rates.
- 8 So all that I've done is add the month of
- 9 April to these dates. For the data in the 20 year and
- 10 10 year Treasury bond columns I looked on the Federal
- 11 Reserve website, that economists like me typically
- 12 use. They're the official interest rates that are
- 13 published on the Federal Reserve website.
- 14 Q. All right Dr. Hadaway. I think you were --
- 15 you indicated that the data through March of '08 had
- been provided in your rebuttal testimony?
- 17 A. Yes, that's right.
- 18 Q. So the only addition is the last line on the
- 19 table?
- 20 A. That's right.
- 21 Ms. McDowell: We would offer Updated
- 22 Table 1. And I'm not sure what the next exhibit in
- 23 sequence is.
- 24 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Nor am I.
- 25 Ms. McDowell: So who might be able to inform

- 1 us of that?
- 2 COMMISSIONER BOYER: According to my records
- 3 the last exhibit is SCH-8R.
- 4 Ms. McDowell: So would it be appropriate to
- 5 make this hearing Exhibit No. 1-ROR-1? Is that per
- 6 your numbering purposes?
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Whatever your -- it just
- 8 needs to be identified separate from the other
- 9 exhibits.
- 10 Ms. McDowell: Okay. So if we do Exhibit
- 11 RMP-1(RoR), that's how we would mark this exhibit.
- 12 And we would offer it now into the record.
- 13 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Any objections to
- 14 Updated Table 1, referred to as Exhibit RMP-1-(RoR)?
- MS. SCHMID: None.
- MR. PROCTOR: No objections, thank you.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Seeing none, it will be
- 18 admitted into evidence. Thank you.
- 19 Ms. McDowell: Thank you. And I just had one
- 20 point of clarification for Dr. Hadaway.
- 21 Q. (By Ms. McDowell) I believe you misspoke,
- 22 Dr. Hadaway, when you indicated that the agreement on
- 23 ROE in 2005 was 10.25. Did you mean to say 10.5?
- A. Yes. The later one was 10.25, sorry.
- 25 Q. Thank you, Dr. Hadaway.

- 1 Ms. McDowell: With that, I have nothing
- 2 further. And witness is available for cross
- 3 examination.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. Let's turn
- 5 to Ms. Schmid.
- 6 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 7 BY MS. SCHMID:
- 8 Q. Good morning, Dr. Hadaway. How are you?
- 9 A. Good morning, Ms. Schmid. Thank you.
- 10 Q. Dr. Hadaway, if we turn to the exhibit you
- 11 referenced a little earlier, which is in your rebuttal
- 12 testimony marked as SCH-7-R, the first page?
- 13 A. I have that.
- 14 Q. If we look at your column entitled "Constant
- 15 Growth DCF Model Analyst Growth Rates," we see numbers
- 16 most generally in the 10, 11, or 9 percent range; is
- 17 that correct? And I'll eliminate the decimal points,
- 18 after the decimal points.
- 19 A. Yes, that's right.
- 20 Q. But we do see one 16.8 reference; is that
- 21 correct?
- 22 A. Yes, for PPL Corporation.
- Q. If we delete the PPL Corporation at 16.8, as
- 24 it is much higher than the others, would you accept
- 25 subject to check that the group average is

- 1 10.2 percent?
- 2 A. I'll accept that subject to check.
- 3 Q. Thank you. Dr. Hadaway -- it's always
- 4 frightening when a lawyer tries to ask economic
- 5 questions, but here I go. What is a rate of return?
- 6 A. It's the expected rate that equity investors
- 7 wish to receive on their equity investment.
- 8 Q. And what is a market, please?
- 9 A. A market is a place where securities, in this
- 10 case, are traded.
- 11 Q. So it's true that a rate of return is not
- 12 necessarily the same thing as a market; is that
- 13 correct?
- 14 A. It's certainly not the same as a market, but
- 15 the estimate of the rate of return is derived from
- 16 market data.
- 17 Q. Okay. Did you read the Commission's 2002
- 18 Questar Gas order, insofar as it addressed rate of
- 19 return and a weighted dividends earnings formula in
- 20 preparation for this case?
- 21 A. I did not. I have discussed it with
- 22 Counsel -- and I don't know if it's the 2002 case, but
- 23 I have discussed Questar cases with Counsel about that
- 24 issue.
- 25 Q. Okay. Are you familiar that the Commission

- 1 did a 75/25 equation in that case?
- 2 A. It's my understanding that that was the low
- 3 end of the Commission's range. And that they used
- 4 earnings only as the upper end of the DCF range.
- 5 Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the recent Rocky
- 6 Mountain Power rate case in Wyoming, which is Docket
- 7 No. 20000-277-ER-07?
- 8 A. I am. I was a witness in that case.
- 9 Q. Thank you. Are you also familiar with the
- 10 recent Rocky Mountain Power rate case in Idaho, Docket
- 11 PAC-E-07-05?
- 12 A. Yes. I was also a witness in that case.
- 13 Q. Thank you. Didn't you originally recommend a
- 14 10.75 rate for each of those cases?
- 15 A. I did.
- 16 Q. And then didn't you say, at least in Wyoming
- 17 and I believe in Idaho as well, that a 10.25 wasn't --
- 18 rate was in a range of reasonableness?
- 19 A. We didn't have a hearing and I didn't say
- 20 anything in Idaho, but I did testify about the
- 21 settlement in Wyoming. I don't remember the exact
- 22 words. But in the context of the settlement I
- 23 certainly would agree with that.
- Q. Okay. And so the decision in Wyoming was a
- 25 result of a settlement, but the decision in Idaho was

- 1 a result of litigation?
- 2 A. No, they were both settlements.
- 3 Q. They were both settlements? Okay. Isn't
- 4 10.25 much closer to the 10.1 that the Division is
- 5 recommending here than 10.25 is to 10.75?
- 6 A. Mathematically, perhaps so.
- 7 Q. Um --
- 8 A. Interest rates have gone up since those
- 9 settlements that you asked me about.
- 10 Q. Is it true that you were involved, on behalf
- 11 of the Public Service Commission of New Mexico, in a
- 12 gas case, Docket No. 06-00210-UT, and an electric
- 13 case, Docket No. 07-00077-UT, before the New Mexico
- 14 Public Regulation Commission?
- 15 A. Yes. I testified for the company there, not,
- 16 not for the Commission.
- 17 Q. And isn't it true that you used a GDP
- 18 component in your calculations there?
- 19 A. I did.
- 20 Q. And isn't it true that the New Mexico Public
- 21 Regulation Commission rejected the use of GDP in that
- 22 case?
- 23 A. That Commission has done a lot of things.
- 24 Company stock price has fallen in half since the
- 25 decisions that were made there. But they did indeed

- 1 impose, to my knowledge, the most hash decision in a
- 2 gas case that's been made in the country.
- 3 Q. Isn't it true, however, that they did reject
- 4 your use of the GDP?
- 5 A. Actually they didn't, Ms. Schmid. The
- 6 examiner did. And then the Commission came back and,
- 7 in their modifications to the proposal for decision,
- 8 said that they did include some consideration of it in
- 9 one of the averages.
- 10 Q. When I look at that -- let's see.
- MS. SCHMID: One moment, please.
- 12 (Pause.)
- 13 Q. (By Ms. Schmid) Okay. And isn't it true
- 14 that if we delete the GDP component from your
- 15 calculations here, then your rate is not very far from
- 16 Mr. Peterson and Mr. Lawton?
- 17 A. Yes. That's why I talked about that first
- 18 column of my exhibit. That one and retal --
- 19 re -- that one uses only analyst growth rates. The
- 20 10.4 to 10.8 percent.
- 21 MS. SCHMID: Thank you very much. Those are
- 22 all my questions.
- THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 24 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Ms. Schmid.
- 25 Mr. Proctor, questions for Dr. Hadaway?

- 1 MR. PROCTOR: Yes.
- 2 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 3 BY MR. PROCTOR:
- 4 Q. Dr. Hadaway, in your direct testimony I
- 5 understand that you did, in fact, use the CAPM model
- 6 to estimate a rate of return; is that correct?
- 7 A. Yes, I did.
- 8 Q. And what was the outcome of your analysis
- 9 using that model in your direct?
- 10 A. I gave that in my summary. Let me look here
- 11 just for a second. At that time government interest
- 12 rates indicated, let's see, 9.8 to 10.6 percent.
- 13 Q. Now, in your surrebuttal you abandoned that
- 14 model. And I don't mean to misstate, so you can
- 15 correct me. But it's because of the turmoil that you
- 16 saw in the markets that had occurred since the time
- 17 you prepared that testimony until the time you filed
- 18 your surrebuttal. Is that a fair statement?
- 19 A. It's a little more than that. It's the
- 20 inconsistency between rising corporate borrowing costs
- 21 and government policies that have pushed down the
- 22 federal funds rate to a low of 2 percent, the
- 23 short-term Treasury Bill rate to 1 percent.
- 24 Q. Okay.
- 25 A. Which the one year Treasury also went down to

- 1 1 percent. It happens that those indexes are what
- 2 banks borrow overnight for on the federal funds rate.
- 3 And the one year Treasury Bill rate is the basis for
- 4 the adjustable rate mortgage that many, many people
- 5 have.
- 6 So to avoid upward movements in that mortgage
- 7 rate, the government has had a policy of driving down
- 8 particularly the one year Treasury Bill rate. Those
- 9 rates figure directly into the CAPM. And I explained
- 10 why I didn't think it was appropriate to use them now
- 11 to estimate the corporate cost of capital.
- 12 Q. Did you ever use the term "market turmoil" in
- 13 your surrebuttal test -- or your rebuttal testimony?
- 14 A. I'm sure that I did, yes.
- 15 Q. Yes. In fact, on page 6 is the first time it
- 16 appears, market turmoil, along with your Flight to
- 17 Safety reference; is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. So in fact weren't you referencing -- in
- 20 abandoning your CAPM model weren't you referencing the
- 21 same economic conditions and uncertainty that this
- 22 Commission referenced when it determined that 2008 was
- 23 in fact the test period to be utilized in this case?
- 24 A. I'm not sure I understand where you're going,
- 25 Mr. Proctor.

- 1 Q. It's not a matter of where I'm going, sir.
- 2 It's a question that I've asked you, and I would like
- 3 an answer to the question.
- 4 A. I don't know what the Commission referenced.
- 5 Q. Didn't they use similar terms to "economic
- 6 uncertainty"?
- 7 A. I don't know.
- 8 Q. Have you read that order?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 MR. PROCTOR: Thank you very much. No more
- 11 questions.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Proctor.
- Mr. Dodge?
- MR. DODGE: No questions.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: No questions?
- 16 Mr. Ball?
- MR. BALL: Nothing, thank you.
- 18 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. Redirect,
- 19 Ms. McDowell -- oh, we might have questions ourselves.
- 20 Commissioner Allen?
- 21 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- In your testimony you've indicated,
- 23 Dr. Hadaway, that you used GDP. And I'm just assuming
- 24 that gross domestic product helps you get a handle on
- 25 whether we have an expanding or contracting economy as

- 1 you do your model; is that correct?
- THE WITNESS: Yes, sir that's right.
- 3 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: In the process of doing
- 4 that do you ever take into account regional
- 5 differences in the potentials of --
- 6 THE WITNESS: I don't. And the reason why is
- 7 because the capital markets really are nation wide,
- 8 and even really global now.
- 9 Once in a while, when there's certain issues
- 10 like the Western energy crisis, you know, major, major
- 11 things like that, then certainly economists take that
- 12 into account. But in a routine circumstance, where
- 13 we're just looking at national markets and what the
- 14 costs are, then we don't do that.
- 15 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Do you think that even
- 16 if you were, do you think it would be material --
- 17 we've see some spreads now recently, I'm just
- 18 wondering what you think about the materiality if you
- 19 did do that.
- THE WITNESS: Well they would be much higher,
- 21 obviously, but I haven't tried to incorporate that.
- 22 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Commissioner Campbell?
- 24 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Just out of
- 25 curiosity, are you aware of what's going on with PPL

- 1 that is causing analysts to estimate such a high
- 2 growth rate?
- 3 THE WITNESS: They have had a restructuring
- 4 of that entire company, and I don't know exactly what
- 5 it is that's happened. Sometimes in these data you'll
- 6 see a company that has probably gone through a low
- 7 point and is expected to make a tremendous recovery.
- 8 That will cause a higher number like that. But I
- 9 don't know about PPL.
- 10 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Dr. Hadaway, I just have
- 11 a couple of questions relating to your Exhibit
- 12 SCH-7-R. In the first column you list a number of
- 13 comparable companies, 14 of them to be exact. How did
- 14 you go about selecting those? What kind of variables
- 15 do you look at?
- 16 THE WITNESS: That's very important. We
- 17 start with the company -- the subject company's bond
- 18 rate. PacifiCorp and Rocky Mountain Power are rated
- 19 Single-A minus. So we require that at least one of
- 20 the bond rating agencies rate companies at least
- 21 Single-A to be included in our group.
- 22 We also then -- a lot of companies have such
- 23 diversification efforts going on that it causes their
- 24 data to be influenced by things other than regulation.
- 25 So we require that at least 70 percent of the revenues

- 1 be from regulated activities.
- We also look and require that they haven't
- 3 cut their dividends in the past two years, because the
- 4 dividend is so important in the DCF model. And we
- 5 make sure that they're not currently engaged in merger
- 6 activities, because there's been so much of that.
- 7 Between the direct and rebuttal testimony,
- 8 for example, Energy East has become subject of a
- 9 merger. And so it has been removed from the group.
- 10 The group, as you can see here, is 14 companies, and
- 11 it was previously 15.
- 12 But those are the most general kinds of
- 13 screens. There are others. In my long experience in
- 14 this business I've found that economists are
- 15 criticized more for picking and choosing if they get
- 16 too careful about the companies that they pick, so we
- 17 have stuck with a very broad base like this.
- 18 I think 15 companies, 14 companies is okay as
- 19 a sample size. If it gets too much smaller than that,
- 20 then sometimes one has to try to look at other
- 21 factors. But here I think we're okay with this
- 22 sample.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Do -- does capital
- 24 structure play any role in this?
- THE WITNESS: It does not, except indirectly,

- 1 as it certainly affects the bond rating. You're not
- 2 gonna find a Single-A rated company that's got 70
- 3 percent debt or something like that.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: And on this list
- 5 Ms. Schmid pointed out PPL, and Commissioner Campbell,
- 6 would you consider that to be an outlier?
- 7 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Just because of
- 9 various -- okay.
- 10 Commissioner Allen has one additional
- 11 question.
- 12 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- I almost forgot to ask -- it's kind of
- 14 related to my previous question -- when you talk about
- 15 the inputs to your analysis and where that comes from.
- 16 I'm just curious, when you look at company --
- 17 comparable companies, I think the Value Line analysis
- 18 is where you looking at that.
- 19 I'm curious, is that pretty much strictly a
- 20 financial analysis? Or does that include other
- 21 factors, such as similar companies, whether they're
- 22 fully regulated, partially deregulated?
- 23 THE WITNESS: We do use the screen that says
- 24 they have to be -- 70 percent of the revenues have to
- 25 come from regulated activities. So that, that helps

- 1 to at least mitigate -- it doesn't entirely eliminate
- 2 the effect -- but it helps to mitigate the
- 3 non-regulated activities.
- 4 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you.
- 5 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Back to you,
- 6 Ms. McDowell. Anything further for Dr. Hadaway?
- 7 Ms. McDowell: Thank you, Commissioner Boyer.
- 8 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 9 BY MS. McDOWELL:
- 10 Q. I have a couple of questions for you,
- 11 Dr. Hadaway. The first pertains to Ms. Schmid's
- 12 questions about the settlements in Wyoming and Idaho
- 13 and the ROE numbers that came out of those
- 14 settlements.
- 15 Dr. Hadaway, were those settlements all-issue
- 16 settlements?
- 17 A. As far as I know, they were, yes.
- 18 Q. They were not ROE-only settlements?
- 19 A. No, absolutely not.
- 20 Q. So you were testifying as to the
- 21 reasonableness of ROE in the context of an overall
- 22 revenue requirements settlement?
- 23 A. There was no testimony in Idaho. That
- 24 settlement was accepted. There was testimony in
- 25 Wyoming. And I was asked, because there was concern,

- 1 that the Commission might reduce the ROE or change it
- 2 somehow. I presented this same data to say why that
- 3 that was the minimum ROE that I thought the company
- 4 should settle for.
- 5 Q. Dr. Hadaway, you were asked about your
- 6 testimony in New Mexico, and the New Mexico
- 7 Commission's reactions to your GDP proposal. Have you
- 8 presented that proposal to other State Commissions?
- 9 A. Yes, I have.
- 10 Q. And has it been received by other State
- 11 Commissions and approved?
- 12 A. Yes. There, there have only been about three
- 13 cases in my long history where the Company's requested
- 14 ROE was accepted. Once in Wyoming. And most recently
- 15 in Missouri, where the Missouri Commission looked
- 16 directly at the GDP growth rate. They looked at the
- other witnesses' analyses.
- I had recommended an 11 1/4 percent based
- 19 RO -- or 11 percent based ROE, and they accepted it.
- 20 They added 25 basis points to that for a construction
- 21 program as well.
- 22 But the FERC has used GDP growth in their gas
- 23 pipeline cases for a long, long time. Other
- 24 commissions -- I testified recently in Massachusetts,
- 25 where I was criticized for using GDP in a

- 1 distribution-only case out there.
- 2 Fully litigated. That Commission found that
- 3 GDP did not reflect the ROE as far as they were
- 4 concerned. They requested 10.75. And they granted,
- 5 after full litigation and delivery on the case,
- 6 10 1/4.
- 7 So, you know, those are sort of the
- 8 directions that things are going. The problem with
- 9 the analyst growth rates by themselves is that they
- 10 have been as low as 3 1/2 percent. And now they're
- 11 back up, they are as high as 6 1/2 percent. At least
- 12 equal to the GDP growth rate that I used.
- But the constant growth DCF model is not
- 14 supposed to bounce around like that. And that's why I
- 15 think the FERC and others have started to use GDP as
- 16 least as part of what they're doing.
- MS. McDOWELL: That's all I have,
- 18 Commissioner.
- 19 MS. SCHMID: Chairman? If I might.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Yes, you may.
- 21 MS. SCHMID: I have very, very limited
- 22 recross. Limited to the subjects on redirect.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: That's slightly unusual,
- 24 but you -- for Dr. Hadaway?
- MS. SCHMID: Yes.

- 1 COMMISSIONER BOYER: All right, let's hear
- 2 them.
- 3 MS. SCHMID: Okay.
- 4 RECROSS EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MS. SCHMID:
- 6 Q. Dr. Hadaway, would it surprise you that the
- 7 Wyoming Commission's order at paragraph 97
- 8 characterized your testimony and position as:
- 9 "Dr. Hadaway also addressed the
- 10 stipulation, stating that although the
- 11 agreed upon ROE of 10.25 percent was
- 12 50 basis points lower than his
- 13 recommended ROE, he believed the
- stipulated 10.25 was within a range of
- 15 reasonableness.
- 16 "Dr. Hadaway recommended the
- 17 stipulation as it relates to the agreed
- upon ROE at 10.25 be accepted by the
- 19 Commission, transcript pages 346-347."
- 20 A. I think you read it right.
- Q. Okay. Would you also accept that the New
- 22 Mexico final electric order -- the final Commission
- 23 order in the docket number referenced earlier
- 24 beginning with 07 states that --
- 25 MS. McDOWELL: You know, I'm gonna object to

- 1 this, because I didn't ask about New Mexico. I
- 2 asked -- I accepted New Mexico and asked about other
- 3 commissions.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: I think that goes beyond
- 5 the scope of direct, thank you.
- 6 MS. SCHMID: Okay. My apologies.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: And I think you
- 8 already -- that other question was already asked and
- 9 answered, Dr. Hadaway. Very well. Thank you,
- 10 Dr. Hadaway. Thank you for being here. You may step
- 11 down.
- 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 13 COMMISSIONER BOYER: I think that brings us
- 14 to the next policy witness, which will be Mr. Peterson
- 15 of the Division of Public Utilities.
- 16 Let's check with our reporter and see how
- 17 you're doing.
- 18 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm fine.
- 19 COMMISSIONER BOYLE: Are you okay? All
- 20 right.
- Our intention will be to go to till about
- 22 10:30, take a short break so that our reporter can
- 23 rest, and then we'll reconvene in 10 or 15 minutes.
- Ms. Schmid?
- MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

- 1 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Have you been -- you
- 2 have not?
- 3 THE WITNESS: I have not been.
- 4 (Mr. Peterson was duly sworn.)
- 5 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Peterson.
- 6 Please be seated.
- 7 CHARLES E. PETERSON,
- 8 called as a witness, having been duly sworn,
- 9 was examined and testified as follows:
- 10 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 11 BY MS. SCHMID:
- 12 Q. Good morning Mr. Peterson.
- 13 A. Hello.
- Q. Could you please state your name and business
- 15 address for the record?
- 16 A. My name is Charles E. Peterson. My business
- 17 address is here in this building.
- 18 Q. And --
- 19 A. I don't know the -- Heber Wells Building,
- 20 Salt Lake City, Utah.
- 21 Q. And by whom are you employed, and in what
- 22 capacity?
- 23 A. The Division of Public Utilities. And I am a
- 24 technical consultant within the Division.
- 25 Q. And are you the same Charles E. Peterson that

- 1 filed DPU Exhibit No. 2.0, in both confidential and
- 2 non-confidential forms, as your direct, with
- 3 associated exhibits, and DPU Exhibit No. 2.R --
- 4 2.0-SR?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. And isn't it true that we do need to check on
- 7 one exhibit just to make sure that one of the columns
- 8 was transmitted properly, and we'll get back to the
- 9 Commission on that?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Do you have a brief summary of your testimony
- 12 that you would like to give today?
- 13 A. Yes. I hope it will be brief enough.
- 14 Q. Thank you. Please proceed.
- 15 A. In my direct testimony I asserted a midpoint
- 16 cost of equity of 10.1 percent. That is surrounded by
- 17 what I consider to be a reasonable range of
- 18 approximately 8.65 to 10.45 percent.
- 19 In arriving at this conclusion I considered a
- 20 number of options in the Discounted Cash Flow, or DCF
- 21 model, and the Capital Asset Pricing Model, usually
- 22 referred to as CAPM. I also developed a Risk Premium
- 23 Model based upon Value Line financial strength
- 24 ratings, which I used as a check on the other models.
- 25 In developing the DCF models I applied

- 1 earnings-only growth rates, dividend-only growth
- 2 rates, and the 75/25 percent weighted average of
- 3 forecast earnings and dividend growth rates that the
- 4 Commission used in its order in the 2002 Questar Gas
- 5 general rate case.
- I support this weighting as a reasonable
- 7 compromise between the arguments for earnings-only
- 8 growth rates and dividend growth rates, or sometimes
- 9 there are other growth rates that are offered to be
- 10 included in the DCF model.
- 11 The single-stage or one-step DCF model ranged
- 12 from 8.63 to 10.69 percent. I also estimated
- 13 two-stage DCF models that gave a range from
- 14 9.76 percent to 10.32 percent. I also compiled
- 15 estimates based upon 10 year historical growth rates.
- 16 These growth -- these historical growth rates
- 17 typically gave very low results after some
- 18 adjustments, 7 percent range, but before adjustments
- 19 as low as 4 percent. I considered these to be
- 20 unreasonably low.
- 21 I've applied several variations of the CAPM,
- 22 including a version similar to the CAPM model that
- 23 PacifiCorp witness Dr. Hadaway originally used and
- 24 later abandoned. Except I -- that I did update the
- 25 risk free rates to the time period that I prepared my

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 direct testimony.
- 2 Dr. Hadaway talked about using Treasury Bill
- 3 rates or short-term Treasury rates. I have included
- 4 in my models the Treasury rates, but do not recommend
- 5 their application in this case. I rely on 20 year
- 6 Treasury bond rates in developing the CAPM model as
- 7 the risk free rate.
- 8 Twenty -- the CAPM model ranged from about
- 9 8.6 percent to a little over 9.9 percent. My risk
- 10 free -- or my Risk Premium Model ranged from 8.8 to
- 11 10.3 percent. In these ranges I've concluded that
- 12 10.1 percent is a reasonable point estimate.
- 13 As testified earlier, we have no -- the
- 14 Division has and I have no problems with the capping
- 15 structure recommended by the Company, nor the cost of
- 16 preferred stock. There is an issue about using the
- 17 forecast forward interest rate curve for the
- 18 \$700 million debt offering that the company
- 19 anticipates making toward the end of the year.
- 20 The Company is late -- lately discussing that
- 21 interest rates have gone -- or that the long-term
- 22 interest rates have gone down and the credit spread
- 23 has widened between corporate debt and the government
- 24 bond interest rates.
- 25 While this may be true, Dr. Hadaway also

- 1 mentioned in his rebuttal testimony that these credit
- 2 spreads are narrowing. And I would expect them to
- 3 continue to narrow back to a more typical range.
- 4 Therefore, at this point in time I'm still standing by
- 5 my 2 percentage point -- or 2 basis point, rather --
- 6 there's a big difference -- 2 basis point reduction in
- 7 the cost of debt for long-term debt.
- 8 Dr. Hadaway did a pretty good job of
- 9 discussing some of our differences. I do not agree
- 10 with his GDP growth rate. And certainly if it -- if
- 11 GDP growth is appropriate, it should be a
- 12 forward-looking GDP growth rate. And not one based
- 13 upon the historical averages that Mr. -- or excuse me,
- 14 Dr. Hadaway testified to.
- There are forecasts of long-term GDP growth
- 16 rate. I highlighted two of the sources of government
- 17 estimates in my testimony, both of which conclude that
- 18 a growth -- a long-term GDP growth rate of around
- 19 4 1/2 percent is currently expected. And I explained
- 20 why I believe that is reasonable, given current
- 21 economic conditions worldwide.
- Well, to make this quicker, I just would
- 23 conclude by saying that, despite the criticisms
- offered by the Company's witnesses, I stand by my
- 25 original direct testimony. And suggest a recommended

- 1 point estimate of 10.1 percent for the return on
- 2 equity portion, and an overall cost of capital of
- 3 8.2 percent. Thank you, that concludes my summary.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Any questions for
- 5 Mr. Peterson?
- 6 MS. SCHMID: No. Mr. Peterson is now
- 7 available for cross examination.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BOYER: All right. Let's start
- 9 with Ms. McDowell, with the Company, and then with
- 10 Mr. Proctor, and around the room. Are you -- do you
- 11 anticipate lots of questions for Mr. Peterson?
- 12 MS. McDOWELL: More than seven minutes. So I
- 13 don't know if --
- 14 COMMISSIONER BOYER: All right, let's --
- 15 MS. McDOWELL: I'm happy to commence, but I'm
- 16 also happy to --
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: No, let's -- rather than
- 18 interrupt your cross examination let's take a
- 19 13 minute break. And we'll come back here about 25 to
- the hour.
- 21 (A recess was taken from 10:23 to 10:38 a.m.)
- 22 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Ms. Schmid would like to
- 23 introduce a corrected exhibit to Mr. Peterson's
- 24 testimony at this time, and she's distributing it at
- 25 this moment.

- 1 Q. (By Ms. Schmid) Mr. Peterson, do you have
- 2 before you a document entitled DPU Exhibit 7 --
- $3 \quad 2.7(a)$?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Is this the same as the previous exhibit,
- 6 except that the column there that had zeroes has been
- 7 corrected and it now has numbers?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. The -- do you recall which column that was
- 10 that had the zeroes?
- 11 A. It was the projected three to five year EPS
- 12 growth.
- 13 Q. Thank you.
- 14 MS. SCHMID: The division would like to move
- 15 and request that this page be substituted for the
- 16 deficient previous DPU Exhibit 2.7(a.) And the
- 17 Division believes also that the electronic copy
- 18 contained -- submitted to the Commission contained the
- 19 same defect of zeroes.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Any objection to the
- 21 admission of this corrected exhibit?
- MS. McDOWELL: No.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. It is
- 24 admitted into evidence. Thank you Ms. Schmid.
- 25 Ms. McDowell, you may proceed with your cross

- 1 examination of Mr. Peterson.
- MS. McDOWELL: Thank you, Commissioner Boyer.
- 3 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 4 BY MS. McDOWELL:
- 5 Q. Good morning Mr. Peterson.
- 6 A. Hello.
- 7 Q. So, I was struck by one comment you made in
- 8 your summary, and I wanted to begin with that. You
- 9 indicated that in Mr. Hadaway's rebuttal testimony he
- 10 indicated that spreads are starting to narrow?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Can you please direct me to the point in
- 13 Mr. Hadaway's testimony that your comment is based on?
- 14 A. I hope I can. Yes, it's on page 4. The
- 15 broader context is lines 80 through 88. Starting with
- 16 line 83: "Corporate interest rate spreads" -- no,
- 17 wait a minute. That's the wrong one.
- 18 Q. In fact, that reference states that corporate
- 19 interest spreads are currently the highest level seen
- in many years.
- 21 A. Right.
- Q. Do you see that?
- 23 A. That's, that's correct. I went to that one
- 24 because that was part of my surrebuttal testimony, so.
- 25 Q. Well, we could go through the pages where he

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 talks about spreads, if that would be helpful.
- 2 A. Um.
- Q. Page 1, lines 11 through 12, is the first
- 4 reference.
- 5 A. Well, I will either find it because I've
- 6 highlighted it, or I will not be able to find it.
- 7 Q. Well, let's go back to the beginning of the
- 8 testimony, page 1.
- 9 A. Okay.
- 10 Q. Lines 11 and 12. Do you see that
- 11 testimony --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- there pertaining to spreads? And now
- 14 there that testimony says that your recommendation and
- 15 Mr. Lawton's are not consistent with much wider
- 16 interest rate spreads. Do you see that?
- 17 A. I see that, yes.
- 18 Q. So that's, that's certainly not the reference
- 19 to narrowing spreads?
- 20 A. No.
- Q. How about page 2, lines 35 and 36? That's a
- 22 similar reference, isn't it --
- 23 A. Yes.
- Q. -- to widening spreads?
- 25 (Pause.)

- 1 THE WITNESS: Well, I have to confess that I
- 2 have not been able to find where I got that notion
- 3 from. I with -- I apologize. I withdraw the comment.
- Q. (By Ms. McDowell) Thank you Mr. Peterson.
- 5 Can you please turn to page 10 of your surrebuttal?
- 6 Do you have that?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. I'd like to basically direct your attention
- 9 to the far -- that Q&A that begins on line 175. Do
- 10 you have that?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And there you testify that the turmoil in the
- 13 credit markets is not significant to cost of equity
- 14 for utilities. Is that a fair summary?
- 15 A. It hasn't been -- it has not significantly
- 16 affected stock prices.
- 17 Q. But it -- cost of capital is certainly more
- 18 than just stock prices, wouldn't you agree?
- 19 A. Well, depending on which model you use. It
- 20 can be more. But that -- but stock prices are the
- 21 basis for cost of equity in every model that I'm aware
- 22 of. And stock prices have shown very -- especially
- 23 utility stock prices have shown very little reaction
- 24 to the --
- 25 Q. So --

- 1 A. -- to the credit prices.
- Q. So Mr. Peterson, do you agree that the
- 3 turmoil in the credit markets would impact utilities
- 4 if they could not access financing at market rates?
- 5 A. Well, as a broad statement, if they couldn't
- 6 access financing then I guess I would have to agree
- 7 with that. But there's no evidence that they are not
- 8 able to access financing.
- 9 Q. So in that Q&A at the bottom of the page
- 10 there you reference the Questar Gas general rate case,
- 11 correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. And you've filed testimony in that case as
- 14 well?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. I'm going to hand you a cross examination
- 17 exhibit which I'll mark as RMP Cross Examination
- 18 Exhibit 1.
- 19 MS. McDOWELL: That was a direct exhibit.
- 20 This is our first cross examination exhibit, so I
- 21 began the sequence again.
- 22 MR. BALL: Beg your pardon. Trying to be
- 23 helpful.
- MS. McDOWELL: Thank you.
- 25 Q. (By Ms. McDowell) So Mr. Peterson, do you

- 1 recognize this as portions of your testimony in the
- 2 concurrent Questar general rate case?
- 3 A. Yes, appears to be.
- 4 Q. Can you please turn to page 9 of that
- 5 testimony?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Now, in that testimony it appears that market
- 8 turmoil, according to your testimony, resulted in a
- 9 rate of 7.20 for Questar's March 2008 debt offering;
- 10 is that correct?
- 11 A. Yes. That's my understanding from Questar.
- 12 Q. And then on page 10, top of page 10, you
- 13 testified that that rate was reasonable, given -- and
- 14 this is lines 202 to 203 -- the current difficulties
- in the credit market. Do you see that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Now, this testimony was filed on March 31st,
- 18 wasn't it?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And on that same date you filed testimony in
- 21 this case, correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Now, can you turn to page 6 of your direct
- 24 testimony?
- 25 A. In this same exhibit?

- 1 Q. No, that would be in Rocky Mountain's case.
- 2 Your direct testimony in this case, page 6, lines 132
- 3 to 133.
- 4 A. Okay.
- 5 Q. Now, in this case you propose lowering the
- 6 cost of debt to -- and this begins on line 132 -- to
- 7 reflect the current environment. Do you see that?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Now, don't you agree that the current
- 10 environment, informed by the recent experience that
- 11 Questar Gas has had in the market, suggests that
- 12 interest rates could actually be much higher than the
- 13 published average rates?
- 14 A. For Questar that's possibly correct, given
- 15 the, what I understand about the Questar case. We're
- 16 talking about PacifiCorp.
- 17 Q. Now, both Questar and PacifiCorp have the
- 18 same debt ratings, don't they?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Can you turn to your direct testimony at
- 21 page 4?
- 22 A. In, in this case?
- 23 Q. Yes. And I'm --
- 24 A. Okay.
- 25 Q. -- just to avoid confusion, I won't be

- 1 referring again to that cross examination exhibit in
- 2 the Questar case.
- 3 A. Okay.
- 4 Q. So any further references to your testimony
- 5 are to your testimony in this case.
- 6 A. Okay, thank you. Page 4 you said?
- 7 Q. Yes, page 4. And I believe the line
- 8 reference is line -- well it's basically lines 1 --
- 9 lines 75 to 77. And there you're testifying about the
- 10 CAPM model, or the C-A-P-M model? How do you prefer
- 11 to reference this? I want to make sure I'm.
- 12 A. CAP-M is fine. However you want to.
- Q. Okay, all right.
- 14 A. I understand C-A-P-M too.
- 15 Q. Now, there you note that the Commission has
- 16 "Expressed justified skepticism about the CAPM model."
- 17 Do you see that?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Now, notwithstanding this precedent, your
- 20 testimony asks the commission to consider the CAPM in
- 21 this case, correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. But your testimony does not present evidence
- 24 directed at the concerns and issues the Commission has
- 25 previously found with the CAPM, does it?

- 1 A. I believe it does, in fact, discuss those
- 2 various issues. At least some of them.
- 3 Q. Well now, in the Questar case that you cited
- 4 before I believe the Commission had concerns about the
- 5 statistical validity of the beta estimate. Do you
- 6 remember that?
- 7 A. I believe that was in the context of, of I
- 8 think the Questar's home witness bringing a concern
- 9 about statistical validity. But --
- 10 Q. But you haven't addressed that issue?
- 11 A. I haven't, I haven't addressed that -- well,
- in a sense I have too, but I'm not sure what the
- 13 statistical validity problem was exactly in that
- 14 matter.
- 15 Q. Can you turn to page 20 of your testimony?
- 16 Again, your direct testimony.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Here, lines 447 through 448? So you
- 19 acknowledge, don't you, that the implementation of the
- 20 CAPM model has created controversy and consternation;
- 21 is that correct?
- 22 A. Which line are you reading from?
- 23 Q. Page 20, lines 447 to 448. Bottom of the
- 24 page. Are you with me?
- 25 A. Well, I don't see where "consternation" is

- 1 mention there.
- 2 Q. "Practical implementation of the model
- 3 has resulted in much controversy and
- 4 consternation."
- 5 A. I guess I have a different line numbering.
- 6 Q. So page 20, DPU Exhibit 2.0, lines 447 to
- 7 448?
- 8 MS. SCHMID: May I approach the witness? I
- 9 believe that opposing counsel and I have the same
- 10 pages and lines. And I could give --
- MS. McDOWELL: Yeah, let's just make sure
- 12 we're literally all on the same page.
- 13 THE WITNESS: The copy that I have is -- does
- 14 not refer to what you're saying on lines 447 and 448
- on page 20. They relate to my Risk Premium Model.
- 16 I'm not sure why there would be a difference, but --
- 17 okay.
- MS. SCHMID: Occa -- if I may note.
- 19 Occasionally when pages are printed from an online
- 20 reference, page number -- line numbers occasionally
- 21 change.
- 22 THE WITNESS: Okay. I, I see it. It's
- 23 actually, on the copy I had what you are referencing
- 24 is 422 on page 19. But in any case.
- Q. (By Ms. McDowell) So you certainly

- 1 acknowledge concerns about application of the model?
- 2 A. There has been much controversy, yes.
- 3 Q. So, now can you turn to page 31 of your
- 4 testimony, lines 680 through 681?
- 5 A. Okay, which, which line numbers?
- 6 Q. Basically I'm gonna ask you about your
- 7 results -- the testimony on your results from CAPM.
- 8 It's the Q beginning on 679. It goes to 687, but I
- 9 specifically was gonna ask you about the testimony at
- 10 the beginning of that, of that Q. Are you with me
- 11 there?
- 12 A. Yes, I believe so.
- 13 Q. Okay, great. Now, in your application of the
- 14 CAPM you rejected the results using T-bills because
- 15 they were, I think your words were "unreasonably low"?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Is that correct? And then going down to
- 18 lines 685 to 686. It appears that you also threw out
- 19 the lower half of your CAPM results because they were
- 20 outside the reasonable range; is that correct?
- 21 A. Yes.
- Q. So it's fair to say that the difference
- 23 between you and Mr. Hadaway in this case is that you
- 24 threw out some of your CAPM results and Dr. Hadaway
- 25 just simply ceased using the model; is that correct?

- 1 A. I suppose that would be one way of looking at
- 2 it.
- Q. And it's fair to say, isn't it, that the
- 4 Commission thus far has followed Dr. Hadaway's
- 5 approach and not yours?
- 6 A. They have not been favorable towards CAPM,
- 7 that's true.
- 8 Q. I'm gonna hand you an exhibit that I'm gonna
- 9 mark as Cross Exhibit RMP-2(RoR.)
- 10 (Pause.)
- 11 Q. (By Ms. McDowell) Mr. Peterson, you
- 12 testified in support of the stipulation in the 2006
- 13 Rocky Mountain rate case; is that correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Now, I've handed you the first page of the
- 16 Commission's order approving that stipulation, marked
- 17 as RMP Cross Exhibit 2. Do you have that in front of
- 18 you?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell me what the date of the order
- 21 approving the stipulation in the 2006 Utah rate case
- 22 was?
- 23 A. It says it was issued December 1st --
- 24 December 1, 2006.
- 25 Q. Now, do you have in front of you a copy of

- 1 Dr. Hadaway's Exhibit 1, his Updated Table 1? It's
- 2 actually RMP Exhibit 1(RoR.) It's the Updated
- 3 Table 1.
- 4 A. I don't believe I have -- the one that was
- 5 handed out today?
- 6 Q. That's correct.
- 7 A. I don't have a copy of that.
- 8 Q. Well, we'll get you a copy. Now, I think you
- 9 had just identified the date of the Commission order
- 10 approving the '06 stipulation as December '06; is that
- 11 correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. Can you tell me, what was the Single-A
- 14 corporate rate in December '06, according to Table 1?
- 15 A. Five point eight one percent.
- 16 Q. Now, looking down to the bottom of the table,
- 17 the current rate for April '08 is 6.29 percent,
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. That's what it shows, yes.
- 20 Q. So the current rate is approximately 48 basis
- 21 points higher than the rate at the time of the
- 22 approval of the stipulation in the 2006 case; is that
- 23 correct?
- A. As of April average, yes.
- 25 Q. Now, the stipulation in that case approved a

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 10.25 percent ROE, correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Now, if you subtract 10.25 -- or excuse me.
- 4 If you subtract the 5.81 interest rate you identified
- 5 from the 10.25 ROE you just discussed, that would
- 6 produce a 4.4 percent difference, wouldn't it?
- 7 A. Approximately.
- 8 MR. PROCTOR: Excuse me Mr. Chairman, I --
- 9 this is not my witness and so I'm very uncomfortable
- 10 objecting. But I think in the interest of my own
- 11 client, who was a party to the stipulation, I think I
- 12 have to.
- I don't believe that I'm misspeaking when I
- 14 say that referencing that it was a settlement and the
- 15 outcome is one thing. But I believe there are bars in
- 16 the stipulation to citing to the foundations -- the
- 17 information upon which a settlement was based in a
- 18 subsequent proceeding as substantive evidence on the
- 19 merits of a party's position taken later.
- 20 Such a thing would also be contrary to this
- 21 Commission's own authority, as determined by the
- 22 Supreme Court of Utah, with respect to the extent to
- 23 which one rate case is res judicata, or collaterally
- 24 estops in evidence is a subsequent one.
- 25 Again, this is not my witness. And if I'm

- 1 out of place, please tell me, and I will withdraw this
- 2 objection. But I believe we're getting into an
- 3 objectionable area with this line of questions.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Ms. McDowell?
- 5 MS. McDOWELL: Well, I -- that was the last
- 6 question I was gonna ask specifically about the
- 7 stipulation, so. And I was not going to ask any
- 8 questions about the foundation for the stipulation or
- 9 Mr. Peterson's opinion about the stipulation. I was
- 10 simply asking about the interest rates at the time of
- 11 the stipulation.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BOYER: All right. Well, I
- 13 think Mr. Proctor is right as to the specific terms or
- 14 the negotiation of the terms of the settlement. But
- 15 at this point your question relates to a portion of
- 16 the order which does reflect a 10.25 percent return on
- 17 equity, so we'll let Mr. Peterson answer that
- 18 question.
- 19 MS. McDOWELL: I was actually careful to only
- 20 use the face page, because I didn't want to violate
- 21 anybody's sensibilities around the settlement. Thank
- 22 you.
- Q. (By Ms. McDowell) So can you turn to
- 24 Dr. Hadaway's Exhibit 8-R, please? This is his -- the
- 25 last exhibit in his rebuttal testimony.

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. So this is Dr. Hadaway's risk premium
- 3 analysis, correct?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Now, what risk premium does Dr. Hadaway
- 6 identify on Exhibit 8-R?
- 7 A. It appears he identifies 4.37 percent.
- 8 Q. So that number is close to the 4.4 percent
- 9 number we just identified with respect to the 2006
- 10 stipulation, correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Now, Dr. Hadaway produces a number of 10.73
- 13 in his risk premium analysis. Do you see that?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Now, would you accept, subject to check, that
- 16 if you add the 4.4 percent number we just identified
- 17 to the current 6.29 percent rate in Table 1, it would
- 18 produce the same number, 10.73 percent?
- 19 A. Well, it would produce 10.69 percent, I
- 20 think.
- 21 Q. Close?
- 22 A. All right.
- 23 Q. Can you turn to your direct at page 14,
- 24 please?
- 25 A. I believe I have it.

- 1 O. Now, there you, on lines 310 through 313 in
- 2 the question, make a reference to the 2002 Questar Gas
- 3 case. Do you see that?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Now it's true, isn't it, that that case
- 6 accepted a weighted average of earnings and dividends
- 7 for purposes of setting the bottom of the range; isn't
- 8 that correct?
- 9 A. I don't recall that.
- 10 Q. And it also accepted a 100 percent earnings
- 11 growth as the other end of the range, the high end of
- 12 the range. Are you familiar with that part of the
- 13 order?
- 14 A. I don't specifically recall that, no.
- 15 Q. Now, I'd like to turn to your exhibits on
- 16 your Discounted Cash Flow analysis. And that
- 17 includes, I think, your corrected Exhibit 2.7. I
- 18 believe those exhibits, your summary exhibit is
- 19 DPU 2.5?
- 20 A. Yes. Did you want to look at 2.5?
- 21 Q. I do. I just need to get it and --
- 22 A. Okay.
- 23 Q. -- keep my papers organized. So just for a
- 24 point of clarification, these -- the summary of model
- 25 results includes ten-year historical growth rates. Do

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 you see that?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Now, in your testimony you stated that they
- 4 do not warrant consideration in the final estimate of
- 5 cost of equity; is that correct?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. So we just want to focus on the top two lines
- 8 of your summary, correct? Not the, the third line
- 9 under each column, correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Now, if, if the weighted average were to set
- 12 the bottom of the range and the EPS growth rate were
- 13 to set the top of the range, it would produce a range
- 14 from 10.03 to 10.69; is that correct?
- 15 A. Yes, looking at the individual calculations.
- 16 Q. And that produces a midpoint approximately of
- 17 10.36; does that sound right?
- 18 A. Approximately.
- 19 Q. Now, you use two different estimates, one
- 20 based on spot prices and one based on one month
- 21 prices; is that correct?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And your spot prices were derived from
- 24 Exhibit 2.7(a); is that right?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. That's the exhibit you corrected today?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Now, the exhibit that we have has all zeroes
- 4 in the EPS growth column. And that's the change
- 5 you've corrected; is that right?
- 6 A. Well, yes.
- 7 Q. Did -- I just want to verify. Did that
- 8 correction change any of the other data points on this
- 9 exhibit?
- 10 A. I don't believe it should have. I believe I
- 11 tried to check those before, but I don't believe
- 12 there's any further changes.
- 13 Q. Well, I guess it does -- you know, just
- 14 looking at it and doing this on the fly -- it does
- 15 change all of the results, because if you have a zero
- 16 column for earnings the input of zero is going to skew
- 17 the results, correct?
- 18 A. On, on that schedule. If you look back on
- 19 Exhibit 2.5, the correct numbers were there.
- 20 Q. So those correct numbers, just so the record
- 21 is clear, in your corrected 2.7(a) your range is
- 22 10.69 -- 10.13 to 10.169; is that correct?
- 23 A. Well, excluding the dividend only, that would
- 24 be correct.
- 25 Q. Well, the Commission has never acknowledged

- 1 just a dividend only result, have they?
- 2 A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. Okay. So then can you turn to your next
- 4 page, which is where you derive your one month prices?
- 5 A. Okay.
- 6 Q. So that's Exhibit 7 -- DPU Exhibit 2.7(b); is
- 7 that -- does that sound right?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Okay. I'm gonna hand you one more cross
- 10 examination exhibit. And in your --
- 11 MS. McDOWELL: Commissioner Boyer, while
- 12 Mr. Moench is distributing those is it good practice
- 13 to accept all the -- to offer the cross exhibits at
- 14 the end of the cross examination, or shall I offer
- 15 them as I go?
- 16 COMMISSIONER BOYER: It's really your
- 17 preference.
- MS. McDOWELL: Okay.
- 19 COMMISSIONER BOYER: I was going to remind
- 20 you at the end of your cross examination if you
- 21 haven't done so.
- 22 MS. McDOWELL: All right. Well, I have at
- 23 this point I think we're on Cross Examination
- 24 Exhibit RMP-3.
- 25 Q. (By Ms. McDowell) So Mr. Peterson, I've

- 1 handed you an exhibit which works off of your
- 2 Exhibit 2.7(b.) And before we go through that I just
- 3 want to talk with you a little bit about what
- 4 Exhibit 7. -- 2.7(b) purports to show.
- 5 So you use, it's basically a similar
- 6 spreadsheet to your 2.7(a), but instead of using spot
- 7 prices this has monthly prices; is that correct?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Now, it appears from your testimony that
- 10 you're -- you emphasize your weighted results more
- 11 than your earnings only results. Is that a fair
- 12 summary?
- 13 A. I considered both of them in the, in the
- 14 final analysis. So I, I would say that I considered
- 15 both of them.
- 16 Q. Okay. So the weighted growth numbers are
- 17 from the third column from the right on
- 18 Exhibit 2.7(b); is that correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. And can you tell me what the calculation is
- 21 that you used to derive the estimated weighted growth
- 22 numbers, EPS growth numbers, and dividend growth
- 23 numbers? I guess first of all, was it the same
- 24 calculation for all three?
- 25 A. It should be, yes, the same formula. Do you

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 want me to go ahead and explain now, or?
- 2 Q. Please.
- 3 A. On the estimated cost of equity using
- 4 weighted growth, first of all the weighted growth
- 5 figure was calculated, which is the next column to the
- 6 left, which says 75.25 weighted growth. I took
- 7 25 percent of the 3 to 5 year EPS growth rate, and
- 8 25 percent of the projected 3 to 5 year dividend
- 9 growth rate, to arrive in the -- for Alliant Energy,
- 10 for example, of 6.12 percent.
- 11 The current dividend yield was increased by
- 12 that growth rate to get an adjusted dividend yield
- 13 figure, which is not shown explicitly here. And then
- 14 that would -- and then to that was added the
- 15 6.12 percent.
- 16 Q. So now, you do a, a basic calculation of
- 17 dividend and growth rates to get your final numbers;
- 18 is that correct?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. So you would basically multiply your dividend
- 21 yield times one plus your projected growth rate plus
- 22 your growth rate. Is that a fair calculation?
- 23 A. Actually, I'm -- I'm thinking that I probably
- 24 actually used the, just the dividend growth of
- 25 5. -- in the -- for Alliant Energy it would be 3.96

- 1 percent increase by 5.5 percent. And that would be
- 2 the adjusted dividend. And then I added to that the
- 3 weighted average growth.
- 4 Q. So are you saying you did a different
- 5 calculation for your weighted growth estimates than
- 6 for your EPS growth estimates?
- 7 A. I believe that's -- subject to
- 8 double-checking, I believe that's the case.
- 9 Q. And would you accept that, subject to check,
- 10 that if you use that cal -- that same calculation that
- 11 you used for calculating your EPS growth and dividend
- 12 growth columns with your weighted growth columns, your
- 13 weighted growth numbers are understated?
- 14 A. Would you rephrase -- repeat that, please? I
- 15 couldn't quite follow you.
- 16 Q. Well, let's start with the assumption that
- 17 you're using the same calculation for all three
- 18 results. For all three estimates.
- 19 A. Okay.
- 20 Q. The same DCF calculation. And would you
- 21 accept, subject to check, that if you apply that same
- 22 calculation that you used for EPS growth and dividend
- 23 growth to your weighted growth, that the numbers you
- 24 have on Exhibit 2.7 are all incorrect?
- 25 A. Well, that presumes that the same -- that the

- 1 EPS growth and dividend growth columns are correct,
- 2 so.
- 3 Q. It's your exhibit.
- 4 MS. SCHMID: Objection to the form of the
- 5 question. It seems quite circular.
- 6 THE WITNESS: Um, well, if there's a
- 7 calculation error somewhere in it that I haven't been
- 8 able to discuss, then certainly something is mistaken.
- 9 Q. (By Ms. McDowell) Well, just assume, subject
- 10 to check, that that's the result. I've handed you
- 11 what's been marked as RMP Exhibit 3. Do you see that?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. And there the column we've been discussing is
- 14 boxed in and demonstrates the application of your
- 15 formula in a consistent manner to all three columns.
- 16 Do you see that?
- 17 A. Well, I'll accept your representation that
- 18 it's consistent, but --
- 19 Q. Subject to check?
- 20 A. Subject to check. But I see what you're
- 21 talking about.
- 22 Q. And the effect of applying that consistent
- 23 calculation throughout would be to raise the weighted
- 24 growth average from 10.03 to 10.10. Do you see that?
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. So then going back to your summary page.
- 2 Basically that would revise the range we previously
- 3 talked about from 10.03 to 10.69 to now 10.10 to
- 4 10.69; is that correct?
- 5 A. Assuming everything else is correct, then
- 6 that would be -- would flow through, yes.
- 7 Q. And that, in turn, would produce a revised
- 8 midpoint of approximately 10.40. Does that sound
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. Ten point four oh relative to what? I'm
- 11 sorry.
- 12 Q. Between the bottom of the range,
- 13 10.10 percent, and the top of the range,
- 14 10.69 percent.
- 15 A. Yes, approximately 10.4.
- MS. McDOWELL: That's all I have, thank you.
- 17 And before I stop I'd like to offer the Cross Exhibits
- 18 1 through -- RMP 1 through 3.
- 19 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Any objection to the
- 20 admission of the Cross Examination Exhibits 1 through
- 21 3?
- MS. SCHMID: None.
- MR. PROCTOR: None.
- 24 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Seeing none, they are
- 25 admitted into evidence. Thank you. Let's move now to

- 1 Mr. Proctor.
- 2 MR. PROCTOR: Thank you Mr. Chairman.
- 3 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 4 BY MR. PROCTOR:
- 5 Q. Mr. Peterson, would you turn to page 15 of
- 6 your surrebuttal, please.
- 7 A. Page 15?
- 8 Q. Page 15, yes. Do you have it?
- 9 A. I believe so, yes.
- 10 Q. Line 280 -- actually 279, at the end of the
- 11 line, begins the sentence:
- 12 "Dr. Hadaway, by contrast, uses a
- forecast long-term government rate of 5
- 14 percent."
- Do you see that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you know whether or not Dr. Hadaway was
- 18 using an estimated 2008 or an estimated 2009 long-term
- 19 government interest rate?
- 20 A. Well, without looking at, I -- looking at it,
- 21 I'm not sure.
- Q. Would the place that you would look be
- 23 Dr. Hadaway's Exhibit 2-R? Do you have that?
- 24 A. I have 2-R. That's where he gets his
- 25 estimate from, yes.

- 1 Q. Now, on the left-hand column it has an E 2008
- 2 for 30 year bonds. That's in the lower part of the
- 3 page. Do you see that?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And what is that estimate for 30 year bond
- 6 rates for 2008?
- 7 A. Four point three.
- Q. And to the right of that is the estimate for
- 9 2009; is that correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And that is 5.0?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. So from that would you conclude that
- 14 Dr. Hadaway was using a 2009 estimate when he
- 15 calculated the borrowing cost of 6.36 percent?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Now, if you were to apply the same 1. -- or
- 18 136 basis points addition to the estimated 2008
- 19 number, what then would be the interest rate?
- 20 A. It would be approximately 6.66.
- 21 Q. Six six?
- 22 A. Or 5.66 rather, sorry.
- Q. Okay. Now, as you went on in that top
- 24 paragraph on page 15 you discussed the fact that
- 25 interest yields -- or excuse me, that corporate

- 1 interest rate spreads were converging. Do you see
- 2 that?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. And at the very beginning of your testimony
- 5 in your summary you did mention that in your judgment
- 6 Dr. Hadaway had acknowledged that spreads were
- 7 narrowing. And you subsequently withdrew that
- 8 reference to Dr. Hadaway.
- 9 But is this the particular part where you
- 10 drew your conclusion that indeed, under the
- 11 circumstances, that spread was in fact narrowing?
- 12 A. Well, that -- the difference between
- 13 forecasted -- the actual reference is the current and
- 14 forecasted Single-A utility interest rates are
- 15 converging.
- 16 Q. In the last sentence beginning on page 289
- 17 you make a statement with respect to rate spreads and
- 18 a correction to them; do you see that?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. Is that the basis for your reference that,
- 21 indeed, the rate spreads would be narrowing?
- MS. McDOWELL: I'm gonna object to this line
- 23 of questioning. It doesn't sound like cross
- 24 examination to me. It sounds like friendly cross.
- 25 And I heard your directions at the beginning of this

- 1 hearing, which were that you wanted to see cross
- 2 examination conducted as cross examination.
- 3 MR. PROCTOR: I being my best to be
- 4 unfriendly.
- 5 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Well, I believe it's in
- 6 the context of Mr. Peterson's testimony regarding
- 7 Mr. Lawton's testimony, so I'd like to hear it.
- 8 Q. (By Mr. Proctor) Is, is those -- are those
- 9 calculations from the basis upon your conclusion -- or
- 10 for your conclusion that rate spreads are narrowing?
- 11 A. Well, the -- yes. That we have a very high
- 12 rate spread right at the moment, as highlighted by
- 13 Dr. Hadaway. I do not necessarily believe that that
- 14 rate spread is going to persist. We have several
- 15 months for things to change before the company
- 16 contemplates issuing debt.
- 17 Q. And that would be the latter part of this
- 18 year?
- 19 A. Yes.
- Q. On that same Exhibit 2-R from Dr. Hadaway, on
- 21 the -- on that exhibit there is a fourth quarter
- 22 estimate for 2008 long-term corporate -- or excuse me,
- 23 long-term Treasury bonds?
- 24 A. One moment, I've lost my place. Okay. Where
- 25 are you looking, sir?

- 1 Q. Again, it's Hadaway Exhibit 2-R.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. And on the right-hand side there's a
- 4 per-quarter estimate 2008, 30 year bond rate?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. So what is the estimate from Dr. Hadaway's
- 7 exhibit for the fourth quarter of 2008?
- 8 A. Four point four percent.
- 9 Q. Thank you, Mr. Peterson. Thank you.
- 10 MR. PROCTOR: I have no further questions.
- 11 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Proctor.
- Mr. Dodge?
- MR. DODGE: No questions, thank you.
- 14 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Ball, have you
- 15 questions of Mr. Peterson?
- 16 MR. BALL: Yes. Just a little bit, please,
- 17 Chairman.
- 18 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MR. BALL:
- Q. Morning Mr. Peterson.
- 21 A. Hello.
- 22 Q. I'd like to refer you back to Rocky Mountain
- 23 Power's Cross Exhibit 2 Rate of Return, the cover
- 24 sheet from The Commission's Report and Order in Docket
- 25 06-035-21 issued on December 1, 2006. Do you have

- 1 that in front of you?
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. Do you happen to recall, Mr. Peterson, when
- 4 the stipulation referred to in the synopsis of the
- 5 order was filed and when PacifiCorp petitioned the
- 6 Commission to approve it?
- 7 A. Offhand, I don't remember the specific date.
- 8 Q. Subject to your check would you accept that
- 9 it was filed and the motion filed on the 26th of July,
- 10 2006?
- 11 A. That would sound consistent with when we were
- 12 having settlement discussions, so that isn't --
- 13 wouldn't surprise me.
- Q. Referring now to PacifiCorp's exhibit -- or
- 15 rather Rocky Mountain Power's Exhibit 1 Rate of
- 16 Return, the Updated Table 1, Long-Term Interest Rate
- 17 Trends?
- 18 A. I have it.
- 19 Q. Looking at the December '06 line, the
- 20 5.81 percent in the Single-A utility rates. On the
- 21 26th of July, 2006, would anybody have known about
- 22 that 5.81 percent?
- 23 A. No.
- Q. What do you -- what rate do you suppose they
- 25 would have had as the most recent available rate when

- 1 that stipulation was being drafted, just before it was
- 2 filed?
- 3 A. The June or July rates.
- 4 Q. So 6.42 or 6.4?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. So running through the same calculation that
- 7 Ms. McDowell took you through. If you take 6.4 away
- 8 from 10.25 would you agree, subject to check, that the
- 9 answer is 3.85?
- 10 A. Sounds approximately correct.
- 11 Q. If you then add 3.85 to the 6.29 percent for
- 12 April '08 would you agree, again subject to check,
- 13 that the answer is 10.14?
- 14 A. Again, that sounds approximately correct.
- 15 MR. BALL: Thank you very much, Mr. Peterson.
- 16 Thank you, Chairman. I'm done.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Ms. Schmid?
- MS. SCHMID: Yes.
- 19 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Let's see if the
- 20 Commissioners have questions of Mr. Peterson and then
- 21 we'll let do you your redirect. Commissioner Allen?
- 22 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I
- 23 just have a couple of questions following on the
- length, excuse me, backing up and looking at the
- 25 inputs on our assumptions. As we do the analysis I'm

- 1 curious, on your list of comparable companies for your
- 2 cash flow models, did you just use strictly financial
- 3 information?
- 4 Did you try to come up with a list that was
- 5 more specifically applicable to our company in other
- 6 areas? How did you, how did you develop your comps?
- 7 THE WITNESS: Well, in general I started off
- 8 similarly to Dr. Hadaway. And we do have overlap, to
- 9 some extent, between our comparables. However, as I
- 10 was looking at it I discovered that there were items
- 11 that caused me concern that are of a non-financial
- 12 nature.
- 13 For example PPL, that we previously were
- 14 discussing, has a substantial investment in utilities
- in the United Kingdom, which are subject to different
- 16 forms of regulation or -- than we have in this -- than
- 17 is typical in this country, from what I understand.
- 18 And I thought that was a significant
- 19 difference from what PacifiCorp, as it exists today,
- 20 is like. It does not hold foreign assets to a -- to
- 21 any noticeable degree. I also compared -- or one of
- 22 the things I was interested in was whether the
- 23 company, the proxy company had thermal generation.
- 24 Had its own generation. Which PacifiCorp has
- 25 substantial amounts of.

- 1 And I discovered that several of
- 2 Dr. Hadaway's companies are strictly distribution
- 3 companies. They do not have their own generation but
- 4 purchase most, if not all of it. And so I eliminated
- 5 those on the basis of lack of similarity to PacifiCorp
- 6 in terms of generation.
- 7 And if you were to look at my Exhibit 2.4 you
- 8 will see some notes on those companies that
- 9 Dr. Hadaway used that I elected not to use. So
- 10 those -- I don't know. Does that give you some answer
- 11 to your question, or?
- 12 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: That helps, I guess. If
- 13 I were to just add to that I would just ask how you --
- 14 if you feel comfortable that your, your inputs reflect
- 15 fully-integrated fully-regulated company in terms
- 16 of -- like you mentioned one of the possible outliers
- 17 there.
- 18 But are you comfortable with the model in
- 19 terms of how it reflects, and did you, did you
- 20 consider that? When you were creating these inputs
- 21 did you consider the differences in our -- the company
- 22 before us versus those on the sheet? That's what I'm
- 23 really interested in.
- 24 THE WITNESS: Well that, of course, is the
- 25 goal. You're trying to find comparable companies or

- 1 proxy companies that are as close to the subject
- 2 company as you reasonably can find. And I think an
- 3 additional item that differs somewhat between me and
- 4 Dr. Hadaway is Dr. Hadaway apparently only looked at
- 5 electric utility revenues.
- 6 I also looked at the relative earnings of the
- 7 electric utilities to the holding -- the parent
- 8 holding company. And again referencing PPL
- 9 Corporation as an example, only 16 percent of the
- 10 income to the parent corporation comes from domestic
- 11 electric utilities.
- 12 So I was looking for the companies that, at
- 13 least to the extent possible, maximized both revenues
- 14 and income to the parent companies. It's the nature
- 15 of things right now that there are relatively few pure
- 16 electric companies that are publicly traded. So you
- 17 do the best you can.
- 18 And Dr. Hadaway had different criterias than
- 19 I did, apparently, which gave different results. And
- 20 I've compared the companies that I included with the
- 21 ones I -- that Dr. Hadaway had that I did not include,
- 22 again on page 2.4.
- Both of us used bond ratings as a, as an
- 24 initial screening, I guess you could say. We wanted
- 25 to have bond ratings that were at least close to

- 1 PacifiCorp's A-minus rating. I also had a size
- 2 factor. I didn't want companies to be a whole lot
- 3 larger than PacifiCorp, or very tiny.
- 4 Again, thinking that there's, there's going
- 5 to be a size issue at some point of companies too
- 6 small to be comparable. And specifically I used the
- 7 plus or minus 5 times revenues or 5 times net plan as
- 8 a size factor.
- 9 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Great, thank you.
- 10 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Commissioner Campbell,
- 11 please.
- 12 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Mr. Peterson, if you
- 13 would turn to Exhibit 2.3 of your direct testimony?
- 14 I'm just gonna ask you a question or two about capital
- 15 structure.
- 16 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 17 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: You made the
- 18 statement that you have no problem with the capital
- 19 structure proposed by the company. Could you
- 20 elaborate on that, please? Based on what, what your
- 21 comparable group of companies shows.
- 22 THE WITNESS: Yes. The comparable group of
- 23 companies taken as a whole have an equity capital
- 24 structure on average two or three percentage points
- 25 below PacifiCorp's. There are also companies that

- 1 have similar equity capital structures.
- 2 In particular I considered that DPL Energy
- 3 and American Electric Power. Although they, they had
- 4 comparable bond ratings, they had noticeably lower
- 5 equity capital structure than the other companies. So
- 6 when I took those out, then there was a capital
- 7 structure from 2007 that I considered to be fairly
- 8 similar, as an average of the others, to the
- 9 50.8 percent that PacifiCorp is -- currently has.
- 10 The other aspect of this is that the capital
- 11 structure at PacifiCorp, while it's fluctuated around
- 12 from year to year, even from quarter to quarter, it
- 13 has held fairly constant in the approximate 50 to
- 14 51 percent range. Which is what we were looking at in
- 15 previous rate -- what we, meaning the Division, was
- 16 looking at in previous rate cases and also during the
- 17 acquisition.
- 18 As I concluded in my testimony, I believe,
- 19 the slightly higher than average capital structure, in
- 20 my view, is justified in the -- because -- in part
- 21 because PacifiCorp is engaged in a fairly large
- 22 capital expenditure program. And the capital
- 23 structure here will help support its bond rating and
- 24 its financing.
- 25 So those were the thoughts that I had in

- 1 evaluating capital structure.
- 2 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: And have you -- or
- 3 has the Division changed at all its policy as it
- 4 relates to actual versus hypothetical capital
- 5 structures?
- 6 THE WITNESS: I know that in past matters the
- 7 Division I think has advocated a hypothetical. But
- 8 I'm not sure of the details there.
- 9 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Final question, and
- 10 it has to do with the comparison of the debt, the debt
- 11 that -- interest rate that Questar issued debt at
- 12 versus in this hearing. Are there other factors
- 13 besides debt ratings that affect the interest rates
- 14 that the companies get when they issue debt?
- 15 THE WITNESS: Yes. The -- referencing the
- 16 Questar debt issuance, they issued it in two parts.
- 17 One of it was actual -- one part actually was below
- 18 their forecasted amount that they originally filed.
- 19 Their forecasted cost of debt when they initially
- 20 filed their direct testimony.
- 21 The other part was the 7.2 percent figure,
- 22 which apparently -- well, it surprised me and it also
- 23 apparently surprised Questar, in a conversation I had
- 24 with them. Part of the problem appears to be that, in
- 25 the markets at the time, the size of the debt issue

- 1 was a problem.
- 2 It was too small to find buyers for a
- 3 relatively small issuance. And that apparently
- 4 contributed to the higher than expected debt rate. So
- 5 as I indicated, or started to indicate in my testimony
- 6 being crossed by Mrs. -- Ms. McDowell, PacifiCorp
- 7 should not be faced with that circumstance with their
- 8 debt offering that's coming up. Even assuming the
- 9 market conditions are exactly the same as they were
- 10 when Questar issued its debt.
- 11 So that's why I believe that it's an apples
- 12 and orange comparison.
- 13 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Thank you.
- 14 COMMISSIONER BOYER: I also have a couple of
- 15 questions, Mr. Peterson, on the, the capital
- 16 structure. And I appreciate your clarification here
- in response to Commissioner Campbell.
- 18 At what level would red flags be raised if,
- 19 for example, equity to cap -- equity to debt increased
- 20 to 52, or 55, or 60, or 80? Any rules of thumb, or
- 21 how would you determine whether or not that was
- 22 problematic.
- 23 THE WITNESS: I think that if, if the -- it
- 24 would start to become clearly problematic if the
- 25 rate -- the equity percentage started to be at or even

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 above the high end of the range of the comparable
- 2 companies.
- 3 On my schedule 2.3 that you have a high of
- 4 Alliant Energy of around 65 percent, I think that
- 5 would be a red flag if they came in there. You have a
- 6 couple of others that are in the 50 to 54 percent
- 7 range, which is where PacifiCorp sits. Actually
- 8 closer to the 50 percent, 51.
- 9 Then you have a couple that are -- well, at
- 10 least one that's just slightly under 50 percent. So
- 11 PacifiCorp is clearly in the upper half of, of these
- 12 comparable companies. But at this point they're not
- 13 really far out in that sense. If that makes any
- 14 sense.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Yes, thank you. Does
- 16 capital structure, in your opinion, have anything to
- 17 do with allocating or balancing costs for risk sharing
- 18 between customers and shareholders?
- 19 THE WITNESS: It can. Again, it, it's I
- 20 suppose a policy decision as much as anything else.
- 21 But clearly a -- the higher the equity capital
- 22 structure, the, the higher the overall cost of capital
- 23 would be. Which would increase rates to ratepayers.
- 24 And the opposite would be true if you had a
- 25 low capital equity capital structure, then

- 1 theoretically at least you have lower cost of capital.
- 2 But there of course would be offsetting considerations
- 3 in both instances.
- 4 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Moving now to selection
- 5 of comparables. You heard my question to Dr. Hadaway
- 6 about what variables -- he called them screens -- but
- 7 what variables he used in selecting comparable
- 8 companies. You've given us some testimony on that as
- 9 well.
- 10 Would it be useful at all to evaluate other
- 11 kinds of variables? For example, the regulatory
- 12 environment in which those companies operate. For
- 13 example, do they -- do those compan -- do those
- 14 regulatory environments permit weather normalization?
- Or other kinds of things, like weather
- 16 patterns, or age of facilities, age of generation, age
- of transmission, whether or not there's a fuel pass
- 18 through, those kinds of things. Would that be useful
- in selecting comparables?
- THE WITNESS: Well, it could be useful.
- 21 The -- to look at other things. Whether they're
- 22 deregulated or, or not would be a useful criteria.
- 23 The problem is, you start -- if you start to
- 24 become too restrictive on what you're going to accept,
- 25 then quickly you run the risk of only ending up with a

- 1 very few comparable companies. Or maybe even none at
- 2 all if you make it too stringent as to what sort of
- 3 hurdle a company has to cross in order to become a
- 4 proxy company.
- 5 And usually I consider having eight or ten
- 6 proxy companies as kind of a minimum number, so.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Assuming that you have a
- 8 cross-section of --
- 9 THE WITNESS: Assuming you have --
- 10 COMMISSIONER BOYER: -- different kinds of
- 11 variables.
- 12 THE WITNESS: Right.
- 13 COMMISSIONER BOYER: If you have a large
- 14 enough sample.
- 15 THE WITNESS: I think the sam -- you're
- 16 right. You could look -- ideally you would have a
- 17 collection of companies that were identical to
- 18 PacifiCorp, if such a thing were possible. But since
- 19 that isn't possible, you have to make some selection.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BOYER: It doesn't appear, at
- 21 least from my reading of the prefiled written
- 22 testimony, that anyone did that sort of analysis.
- 23 Maybe they did it offline or something, but it wasn't
- 24 expressed in the testimony in this case.
- 25 THE WITNESS: In my instance I do remember

- 1 looking at issues of whether a company was in a
- 2 deregulated state or not. But that was the only other
- 3 issue that I -- or the only other criterion that I
- 4 looked at as a possible screen.
- 5 But as you can see from Exhibit 2.4, I
- 6 haven't detailed that out. So in the end I did not
- 7 elect to use it as a significant screening tool.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Peterson.
- 9 Regarding rate spread, you've heard Dr. Hadaway
- 10 testify that the spread seems to be increasing. And
- 11 he's provided some exhibits that seem to demonstrate
- 12 that.
- 13 You've testified that you think that that
- 14 increase is gonna diminish, or that the spread is
- 15 going to narrow. What are the variables causing this?
- 16 Is it the Fed tinkering with interest rates that
- 17 control inflation? What do you think?
- 18 THE WITNESS: Well, there's a lot of things.
- 19 First of all, the Federal Reserve actions are only
- 20 directly effective on short-term interest rates. And
- 21 what we're really looking at, in my opinion should be
- 22 looking at, are the longer-term interest rates. The
- 23 20, 30 year Treasury bonds and similarly-maturing
- 24 corporate bonds.
- 25 Those are certainly less directly affected by

- 1 and influenced by Federal Reserve tinkering, although
- 2 I wouldn't say that they have -- that there's no
- 3 influence on them. Now they're -- the problems that
- 4 affect longer-term rates are perceptions of long-term
- 5 inflation and credit quality would be the primary
- 6 things that would drive those.
- 7 And we have been in an environment lately
- 8 where there are concerns of higher inflation, although
- 9 they haven't specifically manifest themselves in the
- 10 broad index. So, at least not to an extreme degree.
- 11 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. Thank you,
- 12 Mr. Peterson.
- 13 Ms. Schmid, have you any further questions of
- 14 Mr. Peterson?
- MS. SCHMID: Very limited.
- 16 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay.
- 17 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MS. SCHMID:
- 19 Q. Mr. Peterson, Rocky Mountain Power asked you
- 20 questions about CAPM. Was CAPM the only mechanism
- 21 that you presented to the Commission for its
- 22 consideration in your evidence concerning ROE?
- 23 A. No.
- Q. Did you offer any sort of qualification or
- 25 caveat on CAPM to the Commission in your testimony?

- 1 A. I presented I think a fairly lengthy
- 2 discussion of issues surrounding the Capital Asset
- 3 Pricing Model for the Commission's consideration.
- 4 There are a lot of -- there are a number of issues. I
- 5 think they can be reasonably resolved. Which I've
- 6 attempted to point directions where those could be
- 7 resolved.
- 8 My primary concern about using the CAPM is
- 9 that analysts or rate of return experts should use the
- 10 commonly used models. And CAPM is certainly a
- 11 commonly used model. The Commission needs to
- 12 understand that there are difficulties with it.
- 13 There's also difficulties with the DCF model
- 14 that can be raised. Dr. Hadaway, for example,
- 15 complains that -- or has complained that analysts
- 16 forecasts fluctuate around. Which is true. And there
- 17 is, in fact, no one universally accepted long-term
- 18 growth rate that someone can come up with for a DCF
- 19 model, just as an example.
- These are all tools that we all have to
- 21 judiciously look at and apply. So I just offer that
- 22 the Commission should at least consider a judicious
- 23 application of CAPM as one of the tools the analysts
- 24 use.
- MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

- 1 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Peterson.
- 2 You may step down.
- 3 Mr. Proctor, do you think there would be any
- 4 possibility of getting Mr. Lawton's summary in before
- 5 we break for lunch?
- 6 MR. PROCTOR: Absolutely.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay, let's hear it.
- 8 THE WITNESS: I've already been sworn,
- 9 Mr. Chairman. May I take the seat?
- 10 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Lawton,
- 11 please be seated.
- 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- DANIEL J. LAWTON,
- 14 called as a witness, having been duly sworn,
- 15 was examined and testified as follows:
- 16 FURTHER DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 17 BY MR. PROCTOR:
- 18 Q. For the record, sir, could you state your
- 19 name and business address and on whose behalf you are
- 20 appearing here today?
- 21 A. Yes, sir. My name is Daniel J. Lawton.
- 22 D-a-n-i-e-l, middle initial J., L-a-w-t-o-n. My
- 23 business address is 816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1120,
- 24 Austin, Texas. And I'm appearing today on behalf of
- 25 the CCS, or Committee.

- 1 Q. Mr. Lawton, what is your profession?
- 2 A. I am an economist. And I've been providing
- 3 cost of capital in all sorts of regulatory consulting
- 4 since the early 1980s. I'm also an attorney. And I
- 5 advise and represent municipalities throughout Texas
- 6 in regulatory proceedings such as this as their
- 7 counsel.
- 8 Q. Mr. Lawton, your testimony, direct and
- 9 surrebuttal, has already been admitted. Do you have a
- 10 summary of your testimony in this matter?
- 11 A. Yes, I do. And, and in keeping with the
- 12 Chairman's admonition, I will be short. And the lunch
- 13 hour coming about as well. Certainly you
- 14 Commissioners have been asking questions and have read
- 15 all the testimony. That's clear, clear from your
- 16 questions.
- 17 And I'm not gonna go through the details.
- 18 I've laid it out in the testimony. And I invite you
- 19 to ask me questions about my testimony when that time
- 20 comes. But I provided you an analysis. And I've
- 21 tried to provide you a backup document for all my
- 22 analyses and numbers.
- It's not just Mr. Lawton coming in saying,
- 24 Here's the number, or here's the way to go. I tried
- 25 to provide you a source reference. But basically the

- 1 case right now has been down to three issues presented
- 2 to the Commission:
- 3 What's the overall rate of return we have to
- 4 grant this company, or should grant this company, for
- 5 its invested capital? And you're gonna decide
- 6 invested capital, I understand, later in these
- 7 proceedings.
- 8 And the Company's requested 8.54. I've
- 9 recommended 8.07 percent. And I think Mr. Peterson's
- 10 recommended a slightly different number than mine, but
- 11 they're relatively close.
- 12 Another issue is, what is the cost of debt
- 13 associated with the debt issue the company has to
- 14 issue or projects to issue in December of 2008? As we
- 15 all know, they've been building plant. They're gonna
- 16 issue a debt issue, a pro forma issue, for the end of
- 17 the projected test year that this Commission recently
- 18 decided.
- 19 The Company -- Mr. Williams was here on the
- 20 stand for us this morning -- recommended 6.52 percent.
- 21 I'm recommending that the cost of that debt ought to
- 22 be around 6.07 percent.
- 23 The third and final issue that, that you're
- 24 facing is what cost of equity should you include in
- 25 the overall cost of capital. The Company's at 10.75.

- 1 My testimony recommends 9.85 percent. Now, I think
- 2 you can look at these issues and, and decide them.
- 3 And my testimony tries to address that, both in direct
- 4 and surrebuttal.
- 5 There's not much difference between the
- 6 approach that Dr. Hadaway took in this case and the
- 7 approach I took. We use the same models all the time.
- 8 And what I did is I updated Dr. Hadaway's models. His
- 9 data was outdated, that's clear. I think he's
- 10 admitted that on the stand, in terms of he had to
- 11 update interest rates because of the interest rate
- 12 changes and so forth.
- But Dr. Hadaway also uses forecasted data.
- 14 Forecasted data well beyond the end of the test year.
- 15 And I invite you to, in your deliberations, to examine
- 16 Dr. Hadaway's forecast sheet. And I talk about it.
- 17 And I think it's at his -- his exhibit is Rebuttal
- 18 Exhibit SCH-2-R. It's a one-page sheet.
- 19 And I talk quite a bit about it in those
- 20 forecasts in my testimony, and I won't elaborate on
- 21 that again here. But I would point out, this
- 22 Commission has given all the analysts in this case
- 23 some guidance.
- 24 That guidance from your test year decision
- 25 where you, in fact, stated that the -- it may be

- 1 because of the economic problems and turmoil -- I
- 2 think it was caused -- talked about this morning --
- 3 that more frequent rate cases may be necessary.
- 4 And you shortened the test year and didn't go
- 5 out to the '09 period. Well, the company has heeded
- 6 that, that statement. And it's my understanding
- 7 they've announced they're gonna file another case here
- 8 shortly.
- 9 Well, that tells me that we should stay in
- 10 the '08 time period, not stray too far beyond that.
- 11 And that's what I've done in my testimony. It also
- 12 tells me that if you're going to err -- and there's,
- 13 you know, different opinions. You see it all the
- 14 time.
- 15 Err on the side of the consumer in this case,
- 16 for the following reason: Any error that is
- 17 corrected, if there is one -- an underestimate, an
- 18 overestimate -- can quickly be corrected in a rate
- 19 case that's filing -- being filed soon.
- The last major difference between me and
- 21 Dr. Hadaway has to do with growth rates. And you
- 22 heard about the GDP growth rate and that sort of
- 23 stuff. And I actually use the GDP growth rate in this
- 24 case. But I don't recommend that you use
- 25 Dr. Hadaway's 6.6 or 6.5 percent growth as an expected

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 growth for -- that investors are expecting in the
- 2 future.
- 3 Instead, his own documents show that if you
- 4 rely upon a 20 year GDP growth rate, gross domestic
- 5 product growth rate, you'll be at 5.5 percent.
- 6 Dr. Hadaway used to use a 20 year forecast. Only in
- 7 recent years has he switched to employing -- and if he
- 8 stuck to what he was doing before, he would have a
- 9 5.5 percent growth rate.
- 10 Only in recent years has he changed to using
- 11 a GDP growth rate that's based upon averaging 10
- 12 years, then averaging 20 years, then averaging 30
- 13 years, 40 years, 50 years, and 60 years, and dividing
- 14 all those averages by 6 and coming up with a number.
- 15 He claims that the -- he's trying to
- 16 weight -- give more weight to more recent times.
- 17 Well, if you want to use and give more weight to
- 18 recent times you would use a 10 year or 20 year
- 19 forecast, which comes out 5.5 percent.
- 20 So his analysis has no mathematical basis, no
- 21 financial basis, it just kind of ups the number. Now
- 22 when, when I take all these things into consideration
- 23 and I run Dr. Hadaway's models it comes out
- 24 9.85 percent.
- 25 Well, how -- and I know there's been some

- 1 confusion here in terms of the conflicts and the
- 2 testimony given orally and passed in, in the direct as
- 3 well as the sur -- the rebuttal. How does Dr. Hadaway
- 4 change it? How does he still end up at 10.75?
- Well, if you look closely at his testimony
- 6 you'll see that he picks and chooses the models he's
- 7 going to use. The first thing he did this morning was
- 8 to present you a table in his testimony and said
- 9 there's the constant growth DCF. I used analyst
- 10 estimates.
- 11 Well, when he filed direct testimony he said
- 12 that model comes out 9.9 percent. It's under
- 13 10 percent, I'm gonna discard that. He didn't even
- 14 present that to you as a possible choice. In rebuttal
- 15 he comes along, the number's up, you can use that now.
- I don't believe you should pick and choose.
- 17 You should be consistent. If the numbers fall low,
- 18 they fall low. If they go high, they go high. You
- 19 ought not pick and choose based upon an end result.
- 20 And that's what I think Dr. Hadaway has done in this
- 21 case. I pointed that out in my testimony.
- 22 And I believe that it's data snooping, and
- 23 you ought not do that. And with that, I complete my
- 24 summary statement.
- 25 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Lawton.

- 1 I didn't know that one could be both an attorney and
- 2 an economist. I thought they were mutually exclusive.
- 3 THE WITNESS: I have a right side of the
- 4 brain for the economist part.
- 5 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Right side, left?
- 6 THE WITNESS: Left side, yes.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. That's exactly
- 8 what I was thinking.
- 9 All right. We'll commence with cross
- 10 examination, then, after the lunch break. And I fully
- 11 anticipate that we'll be able to hear the policy
- 12 witnesses. So, Ms. McDowell, you probably want to get
- 13 Mr. Walje over here. And hopefully Mr. Ball can be
- 14 with us. We'll recess now until 1:30. Thank you.
- 15 (A luncheon recess was taken
- 16 from 12:00 to 1:32 p.m.)
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay, we're back on the
- 18 record. As I reminded my colleagues, hard as this is
- 19 at least we're not handling child custody cases in
- 20 Texas today.
- 21 Well, let's see if we can stay apace. We've
- 22 heard Mr. Lawton's summary, so we'll proceed now to
- 23 cross examination. I think we'll start with the
- 24 Company. And then, let's see, go to Ms. Schmid. And
- 25 then around the room, as we have in the past.

- 1 The time is yours, Ms. McDowell.
- MS. McDOWELL: Thank you, Commissioner Boyer.
- 3 Make sure my mic is on. There we go.
- 4 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 5 BY MS. McDOWELL:
- 6 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Lawton.
- 7 A. Good afternoon, Ms. McDowell.
- 8 Q. So in your summary you indicated that you had
- 9 updated Mr. -- or excuse me, Dr. Hadaway's analysis;
- 10 is that correct?
- 11 A. That's what I said. Yes, that is correct.
- 12 Q. And you were specifically talking about his
- 13 DCF analysis, I think; is that right?
- 14 A. No, that's not correct.
- 15 Q. So you were talking about all of the analyses
- 16 he did?
- 17 A. That is correct.
- 18 THE COURT REPORTER: Is your microphone on,
- 19 sir?
- 20 THE WITNESS: I'm rarely accused of talking
- 21 too softly, but I'll go up a notch.
- 22 Q. (By Ms. McDowell) And I think in your
- 23 summary you said when you updated Dr. Hadaway's
- 24 analysis it produced an ROE of 9.85; is that correct?
- 25 A. Yes. It supported a result of -- actually it

- 1 was less than 9.85. And by averaging it with an
- 2 independent alternative DCF, it came out 9.85.
- 3 Dr. Hadaway's analysis I believe came out 9.75, so.
- 4 Q. Can you turn to page -- or excuse me, it's I
- 5 think schedule 3.3-SR. It's your Exhibit 3 to your
- 6 surrebuttal testimony.
- 7 A. 3.3-SR. Which page, ma'am?
- 8 Q. Page 1.
- 9 A. I'm there.
- 10 O. And is this the table where you do go ahead
- 11 and update Dr. Hadaway's analysis?
- 12 A. No. When I was talking in my summary I was
- 13 talking about my direct testimony, where I updated
- 14 Dr. Hadaway's analyses for current data. And I did my
- own other alternative DCF independent analysis.
- 16 That's what I was talking to the Commissioners about
- in my summary.
- In my surrebuttal I was responding to
- 19 Dr. Hadaway's claimed update and showing that it still
- 20 comes out well below the 10.75.
- Q. Well let's, let's go through that. So --
- 22 A. Sure.
- Q. This is an update to Dr. Hadaway's. It's
- 24 titled: "Update Hadaway Constant Growth." Do you see
- 25 that?

- 1 A. Yes. It says: "Rebuttal Update Hadaway
- 2 Constant Growth."
- Q. All right. So let's start with your update
- 4 to Hadaway's Traditional DCF ROE. Do you see that
- 5 Column E?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And that result is 10.17 percent. Do you see
- 8 that?
- 9 A. I see that.
- 10 Q. And then if you go over to Column G. And
- 11 that's a second update to a DCF result; is that
- 12 correct?
- 13 A. That is correct.
- 14 Q. And that result is 10.22, do you see that?
- 15 A. I see that.
- 16 Q. So the updates to the DCF analysis show a
- 17 range between 10.17 and 10.22, correct?
- 18 A. No, that's incorrect.
- 19 Q. These are the two updates to the DCF
- 20 analysis -- the single-stage DCF analysis you have on
- 21 this page, correct?
- 22 A. Correct. You rephrased your question to
- 23 single-stage DCF analysis --
- 24 Q. I see.
- 25 A. -- rather than the more global DCF analysis

- 1 your first question asked me.
- Q. I see. Thank you for that. So that -- so
- 3 that would be the next two columns over, H and I; is
- 4 that correct?
- 5 A. That would be Column H only.
- 6 Q. And then Column I is an average of all of
- 7 those results?
- 8 A. Column I is an average of all three of
- 9 Dr. Hadaway's analyses employing the DCF model.
- 10 Q. And that update gets you to 10.14 percent,
- 11 correct?
- 12 A. That is correct.
- Q. So it's certainly higher than the 9.85
- 14 percent you suggested in your summary?
- 15 A. The premise of your question is the 9.85 is
- 16 premised only on DCF. As you'll recall in your first
- 17 question in your cross examination, did I also include
- 18 capital as a pricing model. And I said yes. And so
- 19 when you go to the next columns you'll see how we get
- 20 to 9.85.
- Q. Okay. And we'll do that, but first let's go
- 22 to Column L, which is your risk premium update. Do
- 23 you see that?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. And that's a 10.3 percent number, correct?

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. So then back to your CAPM column. And
- 3 that's column, it's Column I and K; is that right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And so those numbers are 8 percent to 9.3
- 6 percent, correct?
- 7 A. Right. These are Dr. Hadaway's models
- 8 employing updated data.
- 9 Q. And Dr. Hadaway didn't use these models in
- 10 his rebuttal because the rates had gone so low,
- 11 correct?
- 12 A. Right. That's what I said in my opening
- 13 statement. That, that Dr. Hadaway saw the numbers
- 14 were low and he discarded or abandoned the model.
- 15 Q. And, in fact, the numbers were low because
- 16 they're premised on a 1.4 percent Treasury rate,
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. No, not correct. The numbers are low because
- 19 the inputs to the model result in a lower number than
- 20 you had prior because the interest rates have
- 21 declined.
- Q. Well, can you turn to page 3 of Exhibit 3.3?
- 23 A. I'm there.
- Q. And there you indicate that you used a
- 25 1.42 percent rate for your CAPM model?

- 1 A. Yes, I used the same method. Also, so, so
- 2 we're clear, one input was 1.42. The other input was
- 3 the 84.33 percent beta you see above it. And the
- 4 other input was the 7.6 percent long-term risk
- 5 premium. All based on Dr. Hadaway's analyses.
- 6 So it's one of more -- it's just not the only
- 7 input.
- 8 Q. So now, did you hear Mr. Peterson's testimony
- 9 this morning where he indicated that he refused to use
- 10 CAPM results between 8 and 9.1 percent because they
- 11 were just unreasonably low?
- 12 A. I, I heard what he said. He -- in the
- 13 context, as I recall, I don't think -- I think the way
- 14 you asked your question of Mr. Peterson, as I
- 15 understood his response he wouldn't use it as a final
- 16 recommendation. I don't recall him saying he wouldn't
- 17 use it as part of the overall analysis in terms of
- 18 ranges and evaluating it.
- 19 Q. So can you tell me, if you threw out the CAPM
- 20 results -- mindful of the fact that this Commission
- 21 has never used CAPM -- and simply averaged the updates
- 22 for the other columns on Dr. Hadaway's -- your update
- 23 to Dr. Hadaway's analysis on Exhibit 3.3, what would
- 24 that average be?
- 25 MR. PROCTOR: Mr. Chairman, excuse me,

- 1 objection. The question's argumentative insofar as
- 2 suggesting that this Commission has never used that
- 3 particular model. And secondly, it's without
- 4 foundation.
- 5 MS. McDOWELL: I'll rephrase.
- 6 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Please do.
- 7 Q. (By Ms. McDowell) Can you please average
- 8 Column E, Column G, Column H, and L, and give me that
- 9 result?
- 10 A. And L?
- 11 Q. Yeah. So it's traditional DCF ROE, GDP
- 12 growth ROE, two-stage DCF, and risk premium.
- 13 A. Okay. It's a meaningless result, but I'll
- 14 give it to you. I'll do the math. I mean, nobody
- 15 would do this.
- 16 (Pause.)
- 17 THE WITNESS: Ten point one seven seven.
- 18 Q. (By Ms. McDowell) And the range there is
- 19 what, 10.02 to 10.13; is that correct? Ten point
- 20 three oh -- 10.02 to 10.30, correct?
- 21 A. Your question had so many numbers in it,
- 22 could you start over for me?
- 23 Q. I'm saying that number is based on a range of
- 24 10.02, which is Column H, to Column L, which is 10.30.
- 25 A. Yes, those are the highs and the lows of the

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 exercise.
- Q. Okay, thank you. What was the Single-A
- 3 utility bond yield that you employed in your analysis?
- 4 A. Which analysis are you speaking of?
- 5 Q. Well, let's go to page 14 of your direct
- 6 testimony.
- 7 A. Do you have a line number, ma'am?
- 8 Q. Lines 3 -- line 321.
- 9 A. It says in my testimony 5.5 percent. And
- 10 that would be the Single-A rate.
- 11 Q. So can you turn to your exhibit --
- 12 Surrebuttal Exhibit 3.1?
- 13 A. I'm there.
- Q. And that exhibit is entitled: "Long-Term
- 15 Interest Rate Trends." Do you see that?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. This chart includes data back to 1993,
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. Now, there is no yield on this chart as low
- 21 as your proposed 5.5 percent Single-A rate, is there?
- 22 A. There is no annual yield as low as
- 23 5.5 percent from 1993 forward, that is correct. But
- 24 as you know, I calculated the 5.5 percent using
- 25 Dr. Hadaway's model and method. And it's supported by

- 1 his own rebuttal testimony. His own forecast.
- Q. Can you turn to Exhibit 3.10 of your
- 3 testimony?
- 4 A. We're back on direct?
- 5 Q. On your direct, sir.
- 6 A. Sure. Is that the last one?
- 7 Q. It is.
- 8 A. Okay, I'm there.
- 9 Q. It's your update to -- or your correction to
- 10 Dr. Hadaway's risk premium analysis.
- 11 A. I'm there.
- 12 Q. So in this correction you employed that same
- 13 5.5 percent rate we were just talking about?
- 14 A. Yes. The one that Dr. Hadaway's analysis and
- 15 data support.
- 16 Q. Mr. Lawton, were you here when Dr. Hadaway
- 17 testified this morning that the most recent Single-A
- 18 utility rate published is 6 -- for a monthly average
- 19 is 6.29 percent?
- 20 A. If you're asking was I here when he said the
- 21 most recent one?
- 22 Q. Yes.
- 23 A. Yes. As of April.
- Q. That's right. And do you dispute that rate?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. So can you take a look at your Exhibit 3.10?
- 2 A. I'm there.
- 3 Q. And instead of using the number 5.50 for the
- 4 Single-A rate use the number 6.30, the most recent
- 5 Single-A rate.
- 6 A. Give me a moment.
- 7 Q. Thank you.
- 8 A. For some reason the 6.30 doesn't sound right.
- 9 And I just don't have that exhibit. I think it's one
- 10 of your --
- 11 Q. Six point two nine?
- 12 A. Oh, 6 -- okay.
- 13 Q. I rounded up. Please use 6.29, if you're
- 14 more comfortable doing that analysis.
- 15 A. Either one.
- 16 Q. But the point is, can you use the most recent
- 17 rate in lieu of the -- or instead of the 5.5 percent?
- 18 A. Sure, you can do 6.3. Do you want me to do
- 19 the calculation?
- 20 Q. Just tell me the result -- yes, if you would
- 21 do the calculation and then tell me what that would
- 22 produce.
- 23 A. Okay.
- 24 (Pause.)
- 25 THE WITNESS: I'm ready. Ten point seven two

- 1 would be the number. But of course nobody would do
- 2 this.
- Q. (By Ms. McDowell) So that number, you had
- 4 some concerns that you expressed in your summary about
- 5 the use of forecast data, didn't you?
- 6 A. Yes, I did.
- 7 Q. And that number that you just quoted, 10.73,
- 8 does not rely on forecast data, does it?
- 9 A. No, it doesn't.
- 10 Q. That's the most current data available?
- 11 A. That's the most current spot month we have
- 12 available. And that is the reason you wouldn't use
- 13 it.
- MS. McDOWELL: That's all I have.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Ms. McDowell.
- 16 Let's turn to Ms. Schmid. Cross examination
- of Mr. Lawton?
- 18 MS. SCHMID: The Division has no questions
- 19 for Mr. Lawton.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. Let's move
- 21 to Mr. Dodge.
- MR. DODGE: No questions.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Ball?
- MR. BALL: No thank you, Chairman.
- 25 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. Let's turn to the

- 1 commissioners. Commissioner Allen?
- 2 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you.
- 3 Mr. Lawton, I'll just give you the same
- 4 opportunity if you want to address the nature of the
- 5 questions that I had about finding comparable
- 6 companies.
- 7 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 8 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: How difficult and
- 9 challenging it may be for our own situation. And also
- 10 if you have any distinctions to add in terms of how
- 11 you might have used some of these in your models.
- 12 THE WITNESS: Sure. In this case I employed
- 13 Dr. Hadaway's comparable companies. And he used a
- 14 screen or -- I think we've been using the word
- 15 "screen." And he used a screen of revenues, had to
- 16 have certain revenue -- level of revenues. Had to be
- 17 followed by Value Line. And had to have I think 65 or
- 18 70 percent of its revenues from regulatory operations
- 19 and things like that.
- 20 And those screens, what they do is we used to
- 21 have so many more electric utilities to pick from but
- 22 through -- over the years these mergers and
- 23 acquisitions we see out there have resulted in a
- 24 smaller and smaller group.
- 25 Now, these screens will give you a smaller

- 1 group. And what you're trying to do is get a
- 2 comparable set of companies with similar financial and
- 3 business risks that -- as your target company, in this
- 4 case Rocky Mountain Power.
- Now, as you add more screens or more criteria
- 6 to your selection process, you are gonna limit it.
- 7 And as you limit it, you get fewer and fewer
- 8 companies. And my background in economics and
- 9 statistics tells me the more I get out there in terms
- 10 of comparable companies, the more those aberrations
- 11 get ironed out.
- 12 For example, you talked about a growth rate
- 13 of 16 percent for PPL earlier in your questioning.
- 14 And by having 15 companies versus 5, a 16 percent
- 15 growth rate, that kind of aberration will be limited.
- 16 So that's why you want a -- first, a bigger group.
- 17 But second and most important in this case and I and
- 18 Dr. Hadaway used the one group.
- 19 Mr. Peterson from, from the staff used, used
- 20 a different group, with a different set of criteria.
- 21 Yet if you look at the results of Mr. Peterson and his
- 22 group, he came up with 10.1 percent. And I used
- 23 Dr. Hadaway's group, using his selection criteria. I
- 24 came up with just about the same results of
- 25 Mr. Peterson.

- 1 And so we have two different groups selected
- 2 in this case, in this very case, albeit Mr. Peterson
- 3 and I go at it and approach it a little differently
- 4 than Dr. Hadaway, but we came up with basically the
- 5 same result with different comparable groups.
- 6 I think that's something that should give the
- 7 Commission some comfort that we're, we're capturing
- 8 what the cost of capital is for this company.
- 9 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you.
- 10 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Commissioner Campbell?
- 11 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I only have one
- 12 question. It deals with your selection of 20 years
- 13 as -- for your GDP growth estimate. And I guess my
- 14 question is why 20 versus 40? Take the averaging
- 15 aside that you're critical of.
- 16 THE WITNESS: Sure.
- 17 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Does 20 years
- 18 adequately capture the business cycle? Explain 20
- 19 versus 30 or 40.
- 20 THE WITNESS: No, I understand absolutely
- 21 your concern. And probably today 10 would -- might
- 22 even be better. Because what you want to find out is,
- 23 is the history of GDP growth -- and we can go back
- 24 from 1947, the starting point, and I'll get to your
- 25 20 year in a moment.

- 1 Is, is what happened in those years
- 2 representative of what we can expect to happen in the
- 3 future, when these rates are gonna be in effect?
- 4 Well, if we think back to the '40's, probably not.
- 5 Now 20 years, I'm going back to 1988 from -- 1987,
- 6 '86.
- 7 From that time period, the end of the '80's
- 8 through the '90's, is that gonna be more
- 9 representative? Is that gonna be representative of
- 10 hopefully lower inflation and lower interest rates
- 11 than we had in the early '80's and other times before
- 12 that?
- 13 And I think 20 years, and possibly even 10 --
- 14 and it makes no difference in this case, the numbers
- 15 are the same -- is probably more representative of the
- 16 growth situation or the things we'll see in the
- 17 economy that will likely cause growth.
- 18 And I think you could expect the 5.5 percent
- 19 as more reasonable. In addition, the second check on
- 20 that is if you look at analyst growth I think you're
- 21 more in line with 5.5 percent. So it makes sense in
- 22 two ways. Sorry.
- 23 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Would you comment on
- 24 the idea that a 10 year -- a 10 year time period would
- 25 perhaps not capture a business cycle? Or --

- 1 THE WITNESS: Well --
- 2 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: -- or multitude
- 3 business cycles that would factor into the growth
- 4 rate.
- 5 THE WITNESS: A 10 year time period may, in
- 6 fact, not capture a multitude of business cycles that
- 7 would contribute to, to growth. But the 10 years
- 8 we're looking at here?
- 9 I don't see where, where the past 10 years
- 10 would be anything real different to expect -- or the
- 11 past 20 years is what I ultimately selected -- than
- 12 what we could expect for the short run future. I
- 13 think that's a good projection base. Thank you,
- 14 Commissioner.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Lawton, just a
- 16 couple of questions. You did not, as I recall, object
- 17 to the capital structure proposed by the company?
- 18 THE WITNESS: No, I did not. I accepted
- 19 their capitalization.
- 20 COMMISSIONER BOYER: How do you arrive at
- 21 that opinion?
- 22 THE WITNESS: Sure. If you look at, I think
- 23 it's my first exhibit in my direct testimony. I
- 24 compare the capitalization levels, the equity levels
- 25 of the comparable companies to that of Rocky Mountain

- 1 Power.
- 2 And they're pretty much in sync. The
- 3 50 percent level. I think the comparable group might
- 4 have been at 49 percent on average. A little less.
- 5 But that equity level, when you do that comparison
- 6 you're looking at financial risk is what you're
- 7 looking at. Because obviously utilities could issue a
- 8 lot more debt, because it's cheaper for consumers.
- 9 But if you start getting up there at very
- 10 high debt levels, well, you could run into problems.
- 11 A, borrowing, B, servicing that debt. And what I see
- 12 in regulatory commissions around the country and when
- 13 you read these decisions, this is a very reasonable
- 14 capitalization level.
- 15 And it's -- you're gonna balance consumer
- 16 interest and the company shareholder interest against
- 17 each other. And I don't see anything out of line in
- 18 this capitalization level.
- 19 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you. Now, both
- 20 Dr. Hadaway and Mr. Peterson testified about a rate
- 21 spread.
- 22 THE WITNESS: Sure.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: With Dr. Hadaway
- 24 predicting an increase in the spread. Mr. Peterson
- 25 predicting a narrowing in the future. Do you have an

- 1 opinion on that?
- THE WITNESS: Yes. And I outlined it in my
- 3 surrebuttal testimony -- I get confused, and I
- 4 apologize. Surrebuttal testimony. Where I pointed
- 5 out in my first exhibit there and the second exhibit,
- 6 I think I pointed to the years 2002 and 2003.
- 7 And I noted that, boy, the rate spreads back
- 8 then were pretty big. Looking at annual rate spreads.
- 9 And I said, What was the Federal Reserve doing then?
- 10 And I provided the Federal Reserve changes to the
- 11 discount rate.
- 12 For that -- well, I do it historically, but
- 13 for that time period we see the Federal Reserve being
- 14 very active in its monetary policy, lowering that
- 15 discount rate spreads group. Now, what do we have
- 16 today? We have a time when we all know the Federal
- 17 Reserve has been pretty active.
- 18 I mean, going in on a Sunday and cutting the
- 19 discount rate 75 basis points on a Sunday, that's
- 20 rare. And certainly the amount of times they've cut
- 21 the discount rate is comparable to that time period.
- 22 So what is happening is you'll see the government
- 23 rates responding more quickly.
- Obviously they control direct -- more
- 25 directly the short-term government rates. And -- but

- 1 the, the 2002 experience tells us, yeah, the spreads
- 2 were big. Corporate rates were higher. The spreads
- 3 were bigger. But corporate debt was declining all
- 4 that time, albeit more slowly than the, than the
- 5 government bonds.
- And that's the kind of the same thing we see
- 7 today. And the last check on Dr. Hadaway's statement
- 8 that this Commission can make to see if it's
- 9 reasonable, give it a reasonable test, is we all
- 10 agree -- and Dr. Hadaway said a number of times --
- 11 economy's in turmoil.
- 12 We all know we have problems around the
- 13 country. Some parts of the country are worse off than
- 14 others. But how do we come out of economic turmoil or
- 15 recession? Do we tell Corporate America to create
- 16 jobs by investing, and raise the cost of money?
- 17 They're not gonna do that.
- The monetary policy is to lower corporate
- 19 borrowing. Lower it and give the -- incentivize them
- 20 to invest more, to get more jobs, to get the economy
- 21 rolling forward again.
- But Dr. Hadaway's approach, if we're going to
- 23 have higher interest rates we're not gonna tell
- 24 Corporate America, We want you to invest but we're
- 25 gonna charge you a lot more for it. That just doesn't

- 1 make sense. And that's not what the Federal Reserve
- 2 is trying to do, as we see every day.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Lawton.
- 4 So my question about tinkering wasn't too far afield,
- 5 was it?
- 6 Mr. Proctor, anything further?
- 7 MR. PROCTOR: Just two questions.
- 8 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 9 BY MR. PROCTOR:
- 10 Q. Mr. Lawton, the first I have for you pertains
- 11 to the Company's examination pertaining to 3.3-SR,
- 12 page 1 of 3.
- 13 A. I'm almost there.
- 14 Q. Okay.
- 15 A. I'm there.
- 16 Q. The Company's counsel asked you to perform an
- 17 average calculation utilizing Columns E, G, H, and L,
- 18 I believe?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. And also I, pardon me. And you performed
- 21 that calculation. I believe the result was 10.177.
- 22 You also stated that one wouldn't perform that
- 23 calculation. Why would one not perform it?
- A. Well, just as far as your question goes, I
- 25 was not included in that calculation.

- 1 Q. Oh, okay. I'm sorry.
- 2 A. The Column I. I was, but the Column I
- 3 wasn't.
- 4 Q. Oh, okay.
- 5 A. But why wouldn't I perform, perform that
- 6 calculation? Well, that's just doing the same
- 7 tinkering that we, we say Dr. Hadaway should not do.
- 8 And that is selecting your results and saying, Hey,
- 9 these numbers are low. And throwing them out and
- 10 hoping for, for a best-result scenario.
- 11 That's not good. When you're -- you come up
- 12 and you do these analyses you take the high with the
- 13 low. You stay consistent. And that's the best advice
- 14 you can give to any regulatory commission. And, and I
- 15 think that's tinkering by taking it out. It's silly.
- 16 Q. Now, with respect to in your direct
- 17 testimony, Exhibit 3.10, again Ms. McDowell asked you
- 18 to perform a calculation utilizing a spot month amount
- 19 for the corporate Single-A utility bond rate. Why
- 20 would one not use that spot month?
- 21 A. Sure. Again, basically because it's a spot
- 22 month. And that is a snapshot. A moment in time.
- 23 And as you can see the other months they, they move
- 24 quickly and, and they move sometimes considerably from
- 25 month to month.

- 1 The, the other thing -- and even
- 2 Dr. Hadaway's analysis rather than using a spot month,
- 3 when he used historical data, would use a three month
- 4 average. You don't use those spot months. So that
- 5 would be more reasonable.
- 6 MR. PROCTOR: Thank you, Mr. Lawton.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay Mr. Lawton, thank
- 8 you. You may step down.
- 9 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Commissioners. And
- 10 I appreciate you inviting me out here. It's my first
- 11 trip to Utah and I'm enjoying it.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Pleasure having you. We
- 13 even ordered up some good weather for you.
- 14 I think we'll move on to the policy
- 15 witnesses. And what I've determined to do is to hear
- 16 from Mr. Ball first, inasmuch as --if we do run out of
- 17 time, it doesn't look like we will run out of time --
- 18 but if we were to have, Mr. Walje could be available
- 19 in June. Mr. Ball could not because of his travel
- 20 schedule. So we will proceed to Mr. Ball. Do you
- 21 have a brief summary, Mr. Ball?
- 22 MR. BALL: Yes. Yes Chairman, thank you.
- 23 Sorry, you took me just a little by surprise here
- 24 by --
- 25 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Do you need a moment to

- 1 collect your thoughts? We could take a short break.
- MR. BALL: No, there's no need for that. But
- 3 it will just take me a moment or two to assemble. I
- 4 was doing something else when you broke that happy
- 5 news to me. Okay, here we go then.
- 6 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Ball, why don't you
- 7 sit up here at the stand and then everyone can have a
- 8 good vantage point.
- 9 MR. BALL: Okay. That might just take a
- 10 little longer, then. If you want to take a break, go
- 11 ahead.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BOYER: I guess while we're
- 13 waiting for Mr. Ball to, to make the move over to the
- 14 witness stand I'm hoping that you're making
- 15 arrangements to get Mr. Walje here.
- MS. McDOWELL: We are.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Fantastic, thank you.
- 18 And there he is. Were your ears ringing, Mr. Walje?
- 19 We were just speaking of you.
- 20 MS. McDOWELL: Commissioner Boyer, is it, is
- 21 it all right to excuse the Company's witnesses who
- 22 have already testified?
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: It is indeed. Yeah,
- 24 thank you very much --
- 25 MS. McDOWELL: Thank you. I just wanted to

- 1 make sure that nobody else had any other questions.
- 2 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Yes. Thank you very
- 3 much to all of them. Both of them, I guess.
- 4 Mr. Ball you have been sworn in this case,
- 5 have you not?
- 6 MR. BALL: Yes, sir. Okay, I think I'm ready
- 7 if everybody else is.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. You may proceed,
- 9 Mr. Ball.
- 10 MR. BALL: Thank you. First of all let me
- 11 say I am Roger J. Ball. My address is 1375 Vintry,
- 12 V-i-n-t-r-y, Lane, Salt Lake City, Utah 84121. I'm
- 13 appearing here today on my own behalf as a residential
- 14 ratepayer of PacifiCorp, which does business in Utah
- 15 as Rocky Mountain Power.
- 16 There is no other supplier of electricity to
- 17 whom I can turn, because Rocky Mountain Power has a
- 18 monopoly where I live. To the extent that there are
- 19 other similarly-situated Rocky Mountain Power
- 20 ratepayers, their interest in these proceedings may
- 21 align with my own.
- I am the same Roger J. Ball who filed rate of
- 23 return direct testimony marked as RJB Exhibit 3,
- 24 consisting of 15 pages, including a certificate -- a
- 25 service certificate on the 31st of March 2008. I also

- 1 filed rate of return rebuttal testimony marked RJB
- 2 Exhibit 5, consisting of 6 pages, including a service
- 3 certificate on the 28th of April.
- 4 And a rate -- and rate of return surrebuttal
- 5 testimony marked RJB Exhibit 6, consisting of 6 -- of
- 6 4 pages, including a service certificate on the 12th
- 7 of March -- 12th of May, 2008.
- 8 I'd like to say that if I were asked same
- 9 questions today that are in my prefiled written
- 10 direct, rebuttal, and surrebuttal testimony my answers
- 11 would remain the same.
- 12 By way of summary of my testimony, there are
- 13 essentially three points. The Commission last heard
- 14 return on equity litigated in Docket 99-03-510 when
- 15 PacifiCorp sought 11 1/4 percent.
- 16 Eight years ago this coming Saturday the
- 17 Commission ordered 11 percent and increased rates by
- 18 \$17 million. A little over 25 percent of PacifiCorp's
- 19 requested 67 million. In the next case, 01-03-501,
- 20 PacifiCorp received \$41 million, about 29 percent of
- 21 the 141 million it requested.
- Net power costs have been hotly contested but
- 23 some 100 issues, including return on equity, were
- 24 settled. Then came Senate Bill 61 in 2003, one
- 25 provision of which encouraged settlement.

- 1 Three subsequent cases in a row were settled
- 2 with black box stipulations, as a result of which the
- 3 company received 52 percent, 46 percent, and 58
- 4 percent. An average of 54 percent of its requests, or
- 5 about twice as large a share as before Senate Bill 61.
- In the two most recent of those cases
- 7 PacifiCorp moved the Commission to approve agreements,
- 8 including stay out provisions, or periods during which
- 9 the company would make no further rate increase
- 10 applications.
- 11 The sole owner of PacifiCorp during the early
- 12 years of the period I'm talking about, Scottish Power,
- 13 clearly didn't require returns conforming with the
- 14 theoretical underpinnings of the Company's witnesses.
- 15 Berkshire Hathaway and its subsidiary, MidAmerican
- 16 Energy Holdings Company, clearly didn't when it
- 17 invested all that was needed to buy PacifiCorp, and
- 18 didn't when the last case was settled.
- 19 Rocky Mountain Power's plea of poverty in
- 20 paragraph 10 of its application that, "In recent years
- 21 it has consistently under earned the return on equity
- 22 established by the Commission," makes my point.
- Not only does PacifiCorp routinely, as it has
- over many years, asked for about twice as much as the
- 25 rate increase it is willing to accept in a settlement

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 agreement and about four times as much as it has
- 2 received in fully-litigated cases, but it has
- 3 repeatedly, four times in a row now, agreed to those
- 4 lower-than-requested increases over the past seven
- 5 years.
- 6 Any poverty is self-imposed. But the lesson
- 7 for this Commission is that PacifiCorp's corporate
- 8 owners over those years simply don't require rates of
- 9 return on their equity at the levels Dr. Hadaway
- 10 claims.
- 11 Second point: This will be the first
- 12 PacifiCorp rate case since the passage of Senate Bill
- 13 61 in which the Commission has adopted a fully
- 14 forecasted test year.
- 15 Senate Bill 61 also amended Title 54, Chapter
- 16 4, Section 4, Subsection 3 of the Utah Code
- 17 eliminating the option for the Commission to use an
- 18 entirely historic test year, and strongly encouraging
- 19 the use of a future test period. However, it was
- 20 silent on the question of the consequent shift of
- 21 financial risk from stockholders to ratepayers, such
- 22 as me, leaving the Commission to figure out how to
- 23 handle that.
- 24 PacifiCorp Exhibit Rocky Mountain --
- 25 RMP-SRM-1-5 -- sorry, 1 -S -- can't read my own

- 1 writing -- values the shift at \$27,583,763. And my
- 2 second point is that nowhere did the legislature say
- 3 that it intended, in passing Senate Bill 61, to give a
- 4 utility a windfall.
- 5 So the Commission should offset any rate
- 6 change resulting from this proceeding by deducting
- 7 that approximately \$27 1/2 million figure from the
- 8 result so that ratepayers' interests are balanced with
- 9 stockholders' and the resulting rates can be just and
- 10 reasonable.
- 11 My argument is if the Commission doesn't do
- 12 that, the resulting rates won't be just and
- 13 reasonable. The Commission will, in fact, be granting
- 14 PacifiCorp a windfall.
- Third point: In my testimony I address
- 16 PacifiCorp's approach to risk. It's 1990 strategy to
- 17 take its Utah utility revenues and invest them outside
- 18 the United States. Not just outside Utah, but outside
- 19 the United States. And how it has subjected
- 20 ratepayers like me to the risks of rapidly increasing
- 21 power costs by failing to build and acquire adequate
- 22 reasonable cost generation and long-term contracts.
- 23 PacifiCorp shouldn't be rewarded with a
- 24 higher return on equity because it's building now. It
- 25 wouldn't need all this construction now if it had done

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 what it should have done through the 1990's and the
- 2 early part of this decade.
- 3 The Commission should balance the interests
- 4 of ratepayers with the interests of stockholders by
- 5 taking account of the fact of the risks that the
- 6 company has willfully exposed Utah ratepayers,
- 7 including myself, to. And should be looking, if
- 8 anything, to reduce the rate of return, not increase
- 9 it. Thank you, sir.
- 10 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Ball.
- 11 Mr. Ball's now available for cross examination. Let's
- 12 begin with the Company, then we'll move to the
- 13 Division, the Committee, and Mr. Dodge.
- 14 Ms. McDowell, have you questions for
- 15 Mr. Ball?
- MS. McDOWELL: No, Commissioner Boyer, we do
- 17 not. We made our points about Mr. Ball's testimony in
- 18 our motion this morning.
- 19 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you.
- Ms. Schmid, any questions?
- 21 MS. SCHMID: The Division also has no
- 22 questions for Mr. Ball. And trusts that the
- 23 Commission will award it its proper weight --
- 24 Mr. Ball's testimony its proper weight.
- 25 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Proctor?

- 1 MR. PROCTOR: No questions.
- 2 COMMISSIONER BOYER: You must have persuaded
- 3 them all, Mr. Ball.
- 4 Mr. Dodge?
- 5 MR. DODGE: No questions.
- 6 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay, let's go to the
- 7 Commission. Commissioner Allen, do you have any
- 8 questions of Mr. Ball? Well, neither do I. I've
- 9 basically read the testimony, I've heard this before.
- 10 So you may step down. Thank you so much for
- 11 participating, Mr. Ball. Do you want to say something
- 12 further? Go ahead.
- 13 THE WITNESS: Can I draw the same conclusion
- 14 that you did; that since the Commission has no
- 15 questions, I've persuaded you?
- 16 COMMISSIONER BOYER: You can draw that, but
- 17 don't bank on it you know. We haven't yet decided
- 18 where we're going on this case.
- 19 Okay. Well, we're moving right along. Let's
- 20 see, is our reporter okay? You have a lot of energy
- 21 left? Fantastic.
- 22 Let's proceed then with Mr. Walje, our last
- 23 policy witness for the day.
- MS. McDOWELL: I hope we all get a gold star
- 25 when this is over.

- 1 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Well, I was gonna take
- 2 credit for it. But you certainly do deserve all of
- 3 the credit, I must say.
- 4 Mr. Walje, have you been sworn in this
- 5 proceeding?
- 6 THE WITNESS: I have.
- 7 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Please take a seat. You
- 8 weren't here this morning, but we've asked for brief
- 9 summaries inasmuch as we've all read all of your
- 10 prefiled written testimony.
- 11 THE WITNESS: Okay. Two-thirds of a page is
- 12 all.
- 13 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Fantastic, thank you.
- 14 RICH WALJE,
- 15 called as a witness, having been duly sworn,
- 16 was examined and testified as follows:
- 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MS. McDOWELL:
- 19 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Walje.
- A. Good afternoon.
- 21 Q. Sir, this morning we admitted -- offered your
- 22 testimony, both your direct and rebuttal testimony in
- 23 the revenue requirement phase as it pertains to the
- 24 issues in this proceeding, as well as your specific
- 25 rebuttal in the rate of return -- in our rate of

- 1 return hearing.
- 2 So that has been offered and admitted into
- 3 the record. And I think that means that it's time now
- 4 for you to deliver your summary of that testimony.
- 5 A. Okay, thank you. Thank you, Chairman Boyer,
- 6 Commissioner Campbell, and Commissioner Allen for
- 7 providing me a few brief moments to provide some
- 8 qualitative support for quantitative testimony you
- 9 heard earlier today that we believe supports our
- 10 request for an 8.54 percent return -- rate of return,
- 11 based on a 10.75 percent cost of equity and a
- 12 6.30 percent cost of debt.
- One of the points I would like to make is
- 14 that Rocky Mountain Power/PacifiCorp is facing
- 15 business challenges that are much greater than the
- 16 typical utilities, primarily driven by our fast load
- 17 growth. And especially industrial loads, which
- 18 recently have started growing at a much higher rate
- 19 than they have historically, particularly in the
- 20 states of Wyoming and Utah.
- 21 This is leading us to have to make an
- 22 unprecedent -- unprecedented level of capital
- 23 investment as we respond to meeting this business --
- 24 this growing load. The result of this, if you refer
- 25 to the Standard & Poor's rating that was attached as,

- 1 as an exhibit in my most recent testimony, you'll see
- 2 that within there they're stating that our 10 year
- 3 \$20 billion capital program could have a potential
- 4 impact on the Company's financial strength.
- 5 To put this in perspective, at the end of a
- 6 ten year period we will have nearly doubled the
- 7 electric plant and service required to meet our
- 8 customers' demand for electricity. At the same time,
- 9 the company is managing other challenging business
- 10 factors.
- In summary, as I said, electric demand is
- 12 increasing dramatically. Fuel and wholesale energy
- 13 costs are increasing. And commodity costs are also
- 14 escalating. In the near and midterm there are no
- 15 signs that these factors are going to change
- 16 fundamentally as we go forward into the next few
- 17 years.
- 18 Additionally, the company is facing more
- 19 multi-state utility business risk, as each of our
- 20 states begin to chart different energy policies
- 21 related to how they want to respond to greenhouse
- 22 gases, renewable portfolio standards, and their
- 23 generation resources as they decide how to deal
- 24 primarily with climate change and environmental
- 25 policies.

- 1 And again this is, I think, further evidence
- 2 that our business risk is different than it was
- 3 several years ago when these issues weren't at the
- 4 forefront. As a result of this required level of
- 5 investment in order to meet our obligation to serve we
- 6 will not, through either our net operating income or
- 7 depreciation expense, be able to fund this capital
- 8 program.
- 9 So we will be going to the financial markets
- 10 for new financing to meet our customers' energy needs.
- 11 And if these debt markets are competitive, the credit
- 12 ratings are particularly important to us as we
- 13 undertake this multi-billion dollar investment
- 14 program. And we want to be able to make sure that we
- 15 have access to competitively priced capital because of
- 16 its direct benefit to our customers.
- 17 So in our -- in summary, we believe our
- 18 request for a 10.75 percent return on equity is
- 19 qualitatively supported by the changes in our business
- 20 that have taken place reasonably. And an outcome of
- 21 this type will allow us to continue to provide safe
- 22 and reliable electric service to our customers. That
- 23 concludes my remarks.
- 24 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Walje.
- Is he available for cross examination at this

- 1 point?
- 2 MR. JENSEN: Yes, Commissioner Boyer.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Very well. Let's start
- 4 with Ms. Schmid.
- 5 MS. SCHMID: The Division has no questions.
- 6 And trusts that the Commission will treat Mr. Walje's
- 7 testimony appropriately and give it the proper weight.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you. Let's hope
- 9 that we do that.
- 10 Mr. Proctor?
- 11 MR. PROCTOR: I have no questions.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Dodge has some
- 13 questions, I can tell.
- MR. DODGE: I actually do. Just a couple.
- 15 CROSS EXAMINATION
- 16 BY MR. DODGE:
- 17 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Walje.
- 18 A. Good afternoon, Mr. Dodge.
- 19 Q. In your direct and surrebuttal, I guess it
- 20 is, testimony you referenced -- and in your summary
- 21 this afternoon you referenced a multi-state risk.
- 22 A. Yes.
- Q. In your mind, I mean, how should this
- 24 Commission take into account a multi-state risk in
- 25 setting an ROE? I mean, is that something that Utah

- 1 ratepayers should pay more in terms of the authorized
- 2 ROE because of the multi-state risk?
- 3 A. Well, I don't -- I'm not suggesting that they
- 4 pay more than the authorized rate of return. I'm just
- 5 suggesting that because of our historical
- 6 relationships with our six commissions and how those
- 7 are changing and relating -- in relation to the
- 8 State's energy policy decisions, that our return on
- 9 equity should be at a higher level than it has been
- 10 set previously.
- 11 Q. I'm gonna hand you a document very quickly.
- MR. DODGE: May I approach?
- 13 COMMISSIONER BOYER: You may, please.
- MR. DODGE: It's actually a set of documents.
- 15 And unless someone wants me to do it otherwise, I'll
- 16 treat them as one.
- 17 Q. (By Mr. Dodge) Mr. Walje, I'll represent
- 18 that these are excerpts from a company data request.
- 19 And I, and I bring it up only in this multi-state
- 20 context. The first page of the set, do you recognize
- 21 this as unadjusted results of operation for the State
- of Utah for calendar year 2007?
- 23 A. I do not recognize this as -- this data
- 24 request. I have not personally reviewed it.
- 25 Q. Will you accept, subject to check, that at

- 1 least the first page purports to show that?
- 2 A. Yes, I will.
- 3 Q. Results of operation unadjusted for calendar
- 4 year '07?
- 5 A. I will.
- 6 Q. And near the bottom, on line 65, it
- 7 calculates a return on equity. And again, these are
- 8 unadjusted numbers, but they will be for the others.
- 9 It reflects a Utah return on equity of 10.032 percent
- 10 for calendar year '07, correct?
- 11 A. Correct.
- 12 Q. If you'll turn to the next few pages it has a
- 13 similar results of operation unadjusted calendar year
- 14 2007 for each of the states of Washington, Oregon,
- 15 Idaho, and Wyoming. And I'm not quite sure which
- 16 order yours are in.
- 17 But I guess I want to call to your attention
- 18 that the similar lines for Washington, for example,
- 19 return on equity is 2.71. For Oregon, 9.62. For
- 20 Idaho, 6.2. For Wyoming, 7.0.
- 21 I guess my question being, given those
- 22 results of operating for the last year, don't you
- 23 think it's probably other states and not Utah that's
- 24 dragging your overall return down?
- 25 A. Well, I have not prepared to defend potential

- 1 rate cases of what we might do in other states,
- 2 Mr. Dodge.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Walje, I don't think
- 4 your mic is on.
- 5 THE WITNESS: Is that better?
- 6 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Yes, it is.
- 7 THE WITNESS: I must have turned it off
- 8 bringing it nearer to me. I guess my comment is,
- 9 Mr. Dodge, that I didn't come prepared to analyze our
- 10 return on equity or un -- our unadjusted or adjusted
- 11 results in the other states.
- 12 My, my testimony is only offered to
- 13 demonstrate that the Company's facing a different
- 14 level of business uncertainty than it has in the
- 15 recent past.
- Q. (By Mr. Dodge) Sure. And again, what I'm
- 17 addressing is your suggestion that because of the
- 18 multi-state risk, your ROE in this state should be
- 19 higher. And don't you agree that Utah, at least as of
- 20 2007, actually performed better than any of your other
- 21 states?
- MS. McDOWELL: I'm gonna object to that.
- 23 Mr. Walje has just said he is not a witness to testify
- 24 on the results of operations. We have Jeff Larsen
- 25 here, who's quite familiar with how these are put

- 1 together and what they mean. We're happy to make him
- 2 available to testify to that.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: I'm gonna sustain the
- 4 objection, but let Mr. Dodge rephrase the question if
- 5 he can.
- 6 Q. (By Mr. Dodge) Well, again, my effort is not
- 7 to ask you to address the results of operation but the
- 8 comparative returns that the company sees among the
- 9 states. And it's in response to your suggestion that
- 10 Utah's ROE should go higher because of the multi-state
- 11 risk the company faces.
- 12 And my -- isn't the right answer other states
- 13 should raise their ROE so they can get up to Utah's?
- 14 A. I would agree that we face multi-state
- 15 business risks in all states and would indicate a
- 16 higher return on equity.
- MR. DODGE: Thank you. No further questions.
- 18 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Dodge,
- 19 Mr. --
- 20 MR. DODGE: I would ask that these be marked
- 21 as UAE Cross Exhibit 1(ROE) or (RoR), whichever you
- 22 are naming them, and ask that it be admitted.
- 23 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Any objection to the
- 24 admission of these documents as UAE Cross Exhibit --
- 25 Exhibit 1?

- 1 MR. PROCTOR: No objection.
- MS. SCHMID: None.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: They are admitted then.
- 4 MS. McDOWELL: I'm sorry, we do object to
- 5 this. And I was just conferring with Mr. Larsen to
- 6 understand the basis of the objection. And that is
- 7 that these are -- this is a rolled-in comparison. And
- 8 the -- it's important to understand that this case was
- 9 not filed under rolled-in allocation protocols.
- 10 So this is an illustrative document that
- 11 doesn't have anything to do with how the allocation
- 12 methodology in this case was calculated. So that's
- 13 the first point and first concern.
- 14 The second concern we have is that the
- 15 questioning was done about unadjusted results. The
- 16 unadjusted results are, again, not a regulatory
- 17 review. They don't take into account regulatory
- 18 disallowances.
- 19 So we have concerns about this document
- 20 coming in. It's the same kind of concerns we had
- 21 about Mr. Walje being questioned on it. We have no
- 22 concerns about another witness who's qualified coming
- 23 in and explaining the issues that we have with this
- 24 document. But we don't think it's appropriate to come
- 25 in in this examination.

- 1 MR. DODGE: Mr. Chairman, may I react?
- 2 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Please do, Mr. Dodge.
- 3 MR. DODGE: For the purpose offered it's
- 4 certainly appropriate. It was offered solely for the
- 5 illustrative -- for the comparative results among the
- 6 states. This was a company data response to a request
- 7 for comparative states returns. It's offered for that
- 8 simple purpose.
- 9 Now, if Ms. McDowell wants us to spend more
- 10 time this afternoon by calling Jeff Larsen to indicate
- 11 that's what it is, that's fine. But I think the
- 12 Company could stipulate, for that purpose, that's what
- 13 it reflects. That it's in response to a data request
- 14 asking for the comparative results of operation from
- 15 the various states.
- MS. McDOWELL: We don't have that data
- 17 request here. And it would have been helpful, if that
- 18 is the context in which it's being provided, to have
- 19 the cover data request so we could review that and
- 20 understand in what context we did provide these
- 21 documents. Because the cover data request is not
- 22 apparent here, and it's -- I'd like to take your word
- 23 for it, but I --
- MR. DODGE: Does the Company dispute that
- 25 this is a data request to UIEC's data request?

- 1 MS. McDOWELL: Well, you know, it depends on
- 2 what you asked precisely what we --
- 3 MR. DODGE: I'll call Mr. Larsen. I guess if
- 4 they want to play games, we'll play games.
- 5 MS. McDOWELL: It's not about that. I just
- 6 want to be clear about what the record shows. The
- 7 data request could have asked for many different
- 8 things, and we would have provided it as responsibly
- 9 as we could.
- 10 The fact that the data request is not here
- 11 explaining the context in which we provided this data
- 12 is a concern to me. As I think it should be so the
- 13 Commission will to have its record clear.
- 14 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Proctor wants to
- 15 weigh in on the debate.
- 16 MR. PROCTOR: It seems to me, if the Company
- 17 is questioning the genuineness of the document, that's
- 18 one thing. But I believe that Mr. Walje identified it
- 19 as the type of document that his company produces.
- 20 And the number is the number.
- I mean, I don't understand why we'd continue
- 22 to call -- why the Company would require this
- 23 Commission to call another witness to testify to what
- 24 Mr. Walje has already acknowledged what it is. And
- 25 for the limited purposes Mr. Dodge has defined, it's

- 1 perfectly appropriate and perfectly admissible.
- MS. SCHMID: Pardon me.
- 3 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Mr. Walje, you know, may
- 4 have not been the, you know, the best witness to bring
- 5 this in, inasmuch as he wasn't prepared on it.
- 6 Nonetheless, with the clarifications that Ms. McDowell
- 7 has made as to the fact that these are unadjusted and
- 8 so on and so forth, we're gonna let them in and give
- 9 them appropriate weight. Thank you. And that -- this
- 10 is UAE Cross Exhibit 1?
- MR. DODGE: Yes.
- 12 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. It will be
- 13 admitted.
- MR. DODGE: (RoR) or ROE, however you
- 15 designated them. I assume to keep them straight from
- 16 the others.
- 17 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Let's call it UAE
- 18 Cross 1(RoR.)
- 19 Okay. Now that brings to us Mr. Ball. Have
- 20 you questions for Mr. Walje?
- MR. BALL: No, thank you.
- 22 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. Commissioners?
- 23 Commissioner Campbell?
- 24 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: The one question I
- 25 have is, as we've sat here in the hearing room today

- 1 we typically look at ROE based on comparable
- 2 companies. And your testimony suggests that we look
- 3 at utility and then adjust that up or down, based on
- 4 history or based on where you were and where you are.
- 5 Let me ask you this. You stated a number of
- 6 risks and those risks. Do you believe those risks are
- 7 captured in bond ratings of your company?
- 8 THE WITNESS: Commissioner Campbell, I'm not,
- 9 I think, technically qualified to answer that. I've
- 10 not analyzed what our bond ratings are versus my
- 11 qualitative testimony. So I think I would have to
- 12 leave that to either Witness Hadaway or Williams. I
- 13 mean --
- 14 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I'll stop there.
- 15 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Just a couple of
- 16 questions since you walked all the way over here,
- 17 Mr. Walje. How does -- how's capital structure
- 18 determined in your company?
- 19 Does an edict come down from Omaha? Do you
- 20 have meetings on it? Does it just evolve based on the
- 21 needs of the company at a particular point in time?
- 22 How does that happen?
- THE WITNESS: Well, there are no edicts that
- 24 come down from anybody. I think the capital structure
- 25 evolves as we go through our business planning process

- 1 and we try to determine what our level of capital
- 2 investment needs to be. Also what we believe our
- 3 operating costs are going to be.
- 4 Then our financial group takes a look at what
- 5 would be an appropriate capital structure, according
- 6 to what our business plan indicates. And that's an
- 7 intricate process.
- 8 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay, thank you.
- 9 Earlier this morning I asked a couple of the witnesses
- 10 questions about capital structure. And I asked in
- 11 essence whether or not there's any relationship
- 12 between capital structure and cost allocation, risk
- 13 allocation between shareholders and customers.
- 14 THE WITNESS: I do not recall us having any
- 15 of those specific types of conversation about how
- 16 we're, how we're assigning risk within our capital
- 17 structure between either our owners, the people who
- 18 provide us debt capital, or consumers.
- 19 COMMISSIONER BOYER: How do you respond to
- 20 Mr. Ball's suggestion that the failure to build
- 21 generation in the late '90's exposed customers to
- 22 risk, which then in turn results in a lower return?
- 23 THE WITNESS: Well, I guess I would answer
- 24 that we always try to plan our investments so they are
- 25 closer to just-in-time delivery for when that asset is

```
(May 20, 2008 - Rocky Mountain Power - 07-035-93)
```

- 1 needed, whether it be distribution, transmission, or
- 2 generation.
- 3 Because I don't think it's the right decision
- 4 for our customers for us to build a significant margin
- 5 in advance. And we would be arguing about that in a
- 6 rate case as well. So we do try to plan our
- 7 investments to be contemporaneous with when we need
- 8 the asset in order to serve customers.
- 9 COMMISSIONER BOYER: You've gone on at some
- 10 length to talking about risks unique to PacifiCorp and
- 11 this current load growth, so on. The environment in
- 12 which we live. Are there ways, other than increasing
- 13 return on equity, of addressing that kind of risk?
- 14 THE WITNESS: Well, some of the things that
- 15 Mr. Ball touched on would be a, a farther-looking test
- 16 period that would better align our costs with our
- 17 revenues.
- 18 Also, most of our states who are facing this
- 19 kind of growth or uncertainty, such as Wyoming, have
- 20 some form of power cost adjustment mechanism. So
- 21 those things would be, I think, tools that we might be
- 22 able to use to manage our costs a little bit
- 23 differently and would provide us with less business
- 24 risk.
- 25 (A recess was taken from 2:30 to 2:39 p.m.)

- 1 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay, we're back on the
- 2 record. I think you had finished answering my last
- 3 question, Mr. Walje, or.
- 4 THE WITNESS: I believe so, yes.
- 5 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay, good.
- 6 Commissioner Campbell has one more question, or one
- 7 more line of questioning.
- 8 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: I'm just gonna try to
- 9 rephrase my question.
- 10 THE WITNESS: Okay.
- 11 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: And that is, you have
- 12 enumerated a number of business risks.
- 13 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 14 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: That have increased
- 15 since the last time you were granted an ROE.
- 16 THE WITNESS: (Moves head up and down.)
- 17 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: How do you factor
- 18 into your analysis general credit markets, and the
- 19 cost of capital in global credit markets going down?
- 20 THE WITNESS: I think the way we try to
- 21 address this is through looking at a range of
- 22 comparable companies. Seeing what aspects that we can
- 23 pick out there that we think are the same and things
- 24 that are different.
- 25 I think the technical question about global

- 1 prices going down is something that I'm not actually
- 2 equipped to, to answer specifically. Other than to
- 3 say that we do target a regular bond rating as we try
- 4 to analyze where we're headed to balance a little bit
- 5 of the risks associated with shareholders, and
- 6 customers, and debt holders.
- 7 But we, we do take a look at those other
- 8 companies and try to distinguish business risk or
- 9 regulatory risk that they're facing as we ask for, as
- 10 we ask for our rate of return.
- 11 COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: So your analysis was
- 12 solely to point out risks that you've seen increased
- 13 within your company, without taking into account some
- of these other factors?
- 15 THE WITNESS: That's correct. Since I've
- 16 worked around the company since 1972 I've seen a lot
- 17 of different aspects of the history. And I think
- 18 beyond Mr. Ball.
- 19 And having come -- returned to Utah four
- 20 years ago, the business environment is distinctly
- 21 different than it was when I returned. And that was
- 22 really the only point I was trying to make in my
- 23 qualitative testimony.
- 24 COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. Ms. McDowell,
- 25 anything further for Mr. Walje?

1 MS. McDOWELL: No, Commissioner Boyer. Thank

2	you.					
3	COMMISSIONER BOYER: Okay. As I indicated at					
4	the beginning of the hearing, we won't be issuing a					
5	separate order on ROE, or return. That will be part					
6	of our order in the case in chief. So that will					
7	conclude our hearing today.					
8	And I notice we have some friends in the back					
9	pew who will be here tomorrow. And take, take note of					
10	how we conducted today's hearing, because we may try					
11	the same thing tomorrow. In fact, probably will.					
12	Mr. Walje, thank you so much, you may be					
13	excused. And that will conclude this hearing.					
14	(The hearing was concluded at 2:42 p.m.)					
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

1	CERTIFICATE						
2	CTATE OF ITALL						
3	STATE OF UTAH)) ss.						
4	COUNTY OF SALT LAKE)						
5	This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings						
6	in the matter of Docket No. 07-035-93 were taken before me, KELLY L. WILBURN, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah.						
7							
8	That the proceedings were reported by me in stenotype and thereafter caused by me to be						
9	transcribed into typewriting. And that a full, true, and correct transcription of said proceedings so taken						
10	and transcribed is set forth in the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 170, inclusive. I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties to said cause of action, and that I am not interested in the event thereof.						
11							
12							
13							
14	WITNESS MY HAND AND OFFICIAL SEAL AT KEARNS, UTAH THIS 31st DAY OF May, 2008.						
15	THIS SIDE BIT OF May, 2000.						
16	Kelly L. Wilburn, CSR, RPR						
17	My Commission Expires: May 16, 2009						
18	May 10, 2009						
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							