Gary A. Dodge, #0897 Hatch, James & Dodge 10 West Broadway, Suite 400 Salt Lake City, UT 84101 Telephone: 801-363-6363 Facsimile: 801-363-6666 Email: gdodge@hjdlaw.com

Attorneys for UAE Intervention Group

Holly Rachel Smith Russell W. Ray, PLLC 6212-A Old Franconia Road Alexandria, VA 22310 Telephone: (703) 313-9401 Email: holly@raysmithlaw.com

Ryan W. Kelly, #9455 Kelly & Bramwell, P.C. 11576 South State Street Bldg. 204 Draper, UT 84020 Telephone: (801) 495-2559 Email: ryan@kellybramwell.com

Attorneys for Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

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

Docket No. 07-035-93

PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF STEVE W. CHRISS

[COST OF SERVICE / RATE DESIGN]

The UAE Intervention Group (UAE) and Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. ("Wal-Mart") hereby submit the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Steve W. Chriss on cost of service/rate design issues.

DATED this 21st day of July, 2008.

Com A Dodge

Gary A. Dodge, Attorneys for UAE

Holly Rachel Smith, Ryan W. Kelly Attorneys for Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by email this

21st day of July, 2008, on the following:

Mark C. Moench Daniel Solander, Rocky Mountain Power 201 South Main Street, Suite 2300 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 mark.moench@pacificorp.com daniel.solander@pacificorp.com

Ted D. Smith Stoel Rives LLP 201 South Main St., Suite 1100 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 tsmith@stoel.com

Michael Ginsberg
Patricia Schmid
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
500 Heber M. Wells Building
160 East 300 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
mginsberg@utah.gov
pschmid@utah.gov

Paul Proctor ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 160 East 300 South, 5th Floor Salt Lake City, UT 84111 pproctor@utah.gov

F. Robert Reeder
William J. Evans
Vicki M. Baldwin
PARSONS BEHLE & LATIMER
One Utah Center, Suite 1800
201 S Main St.
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
BobReeder@pblutah.com
BEvans@pblutah.com
VBaldwin@pblutah.com

Roger J. Ball 1375 Vintry Lane Salt Lake City, Utah 84121 Ball.roger@gmail.com

Lee R. Brown US Magnesium LLC 238 N. 2200 W Salt Lake City, UT 84116 Lbrown@usmagnesium.com

ARTHUR F. SANDACK 8 East Broadway, Ste 510 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 asandack@msn.com

Peter J. Mattheis Eric J. Lacey BRICKFIELD, BURCHETTE, RITTS & STONE, P.C. 1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W. 800 West Tower Washington, D.C. 20007 pjm@bbrslaw.com elacey@bbrslaw.com

Gerald H. Kinghorn PARSONS KINGHORN HARRIS, P.C. 111 East Broadway, 11th Floor Salt Lake City, UT 84111 ghk@pkhlawyers.com

Steven S. Michel Western Resource Advocates 2025 Senda de Andres Santa Fe, NM 87501 smichel@wcstcrnresources.org

Michael L. Kurtz Kurt J. Boehm BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com kboehm@bkllawfirm.com

| s/ | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

Direct Testimony of Steve W. Chriss

on behalf of

UAE and Wal-Mart

[Cost of Service / Rate Design]

July 21, 2008

| 1 | Q. | PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | OCCUPATION. |
| 3 | A. | My name is Steve W. Chriss. My business address is 2001 SE 10th St., |
| 4 | | Bentonville, AR 72716-0550. I am Manager, State Rate Proceedings, for Wal- |
| 5 | | Mart Stores, Inc. |
| 6 | Q. | ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS DOCKET? |
| 7 | A. | I am testifying on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. and the Utah Association of |
| 8 | | Energy Users ("UAE and Wal-Mart"). |
| 9 | Q. | ARE UAE AND WAL-MART SPONSORING THE TESTIMONY OF ANY |
| 10 | | OTHER WITNESSES IN THIS PHASE OF THE PROCEEDING? |
| 1 | A. | Yes. They are also co-sponsoring the testimony of Kevin Higgins. |
| 12 | Q. | PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE. |
| 13 | A. | In 2001, I completed a Masters of Science in Agricultural Economics at Louisiana |
| 14 | | State University. From 2001 to 2003, I was an Analyst and later a Senior Analyst |
| 15 | | at the Houston office of Econ One Research, Inc., a Los Angeles-based consulting |
| 16 | | firm. My duties included research and analysis on domestic and international |
| 17 | | energy and regulatory issues. From 2003 to 2007, I was an Economist and later a |
| 18 | | Senior Utility Analyst at the Public Utility Commission of Oregon in Salem, |
| 19 | | Oregon. My duties included appearing as a witness for PUC Staff in electric, |

natural gas, and telecommunications dockets. I joined the energy department at

20

| 2 | | UAE-WM Exhibit COS/RD 2.1 attached hereto. |
|----|----|--|
| 3 | Q. | HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE |
| 4 | | UTAH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION? |
| 5 | A. | No, this is my first time submitting testimony before the Utah Public Service |
| 6 | | Commission. |
| 7 | Q. | HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE |
| 8 | | OTHER STATE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS? |
| 9 | A. | Yes. I have submitted testimony before the utility regulatory commissions in |
| 10 | | Colorado, Louisiana, Nevada, Indiana, and Oregon on dockets regarding cost of |
| 11 | | service and rate spread, qualifying facility rates, telecommunications deregulation, |
| 12 | | resource certification, demand side management, and the collection of cash |
| 13 | | earnings on construction work in progress. |
| 14 | Q. | HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY IN A |
| 15 | | PACIFICORP RATE CASE? |
| 16 | A. | Yes. I submitted testimony in Oregon docket UE 179, PacifiCorp's 2006 general |
| 17 | | rate case in that jurisdiction. |
| 18 | Q. | HAVE YOU PREPARED EXHIBITS? |
| 19 | A. | Yes, I have prepared UAE-WM Exhibit COS/RD 2.1, consisting of three (3) |
| 20 | | pages and UAE-WM Exhibit COS/RD 2.2, consisting of fourteen (14) pages. |
| 21 | | |

Wal-Mart in July 2007. My Witness Qualifications Statement is found at

1

| 1 | Q. | WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY? |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | A. | I address an issue with Rocky Mountain Power's ("RMP") Schedule 115 |
| 3 | | Commercial and Industrial Energy Efficiency Incentives, Optional for Qualifying |
| 4 | | Customers, Schedule 125, Commercial & Industrial Energy Services, Optional for |
| 5 | | Qualifying Customers, and Schedule 192, Self-Direction Credit, and the contracts |
| 6 | | used by RMP to implement these schedules. |
| 7 | Q. | WHAT CHANGES DO UAE AND WAL-MART PROPOSE TO THESE |
| 8 | | SCHEDULES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION? |
| 9 | A. | UAE and Wal-Mart propose to delete some language contained in the standard |
| 10 | | contracts used by RMP when it enters into an agreement with a customer under a |
| 11 | | demand side management program. |
| 12 | Q. | WHAT IS THE LANGUAGE OF CONCERN? |
| 13 | A. | As I understand it, the standard contracts currently used by RMP contain language |
| 14 | | identical or similar to the following: |
| 15 | | "Customer hereby transfers to Rocky Mountain Power all "Environmenta |
| 16 | | Attributes" attributable to the Energy Efficiency Project or its operation |
| 17 | | Environmental Attributes include any and all credits, benefits, emissions |
| 18 | | reductions, offsets and allowances, howsoever entitled, resulting from the |
| 19 | | avoidance of the emission of any substance to the air, soil or water at or by |
| 20 | | PacifiCorp generating facilities through reduced generation of energy or other |

savings or offsets on account of the Energy Efficiency Project. Customer will

21

not claim ownership of any Environmental Attributes. As long as Customer at the same time states the Energy Efficiency Project was made possible with funding from Rocky Mountain Power, Customer may claim that it is facilitating the production of the Environmental Attributes attributable to the Energy Efficiency Project." *See* UAE-WM Exhibit COS/RD 2.2, pages 3 and 10 (Section 2.5). It is my understanding that the contract used to implement Schedule 192 contains this or similar language.

Q. WHY IS THIS LANGUAGE PROBLEMATIC?

A.

This language is problematic for several reasons. First, it is an impediment to broader participation in energy efficiency and demand reduction programs because it effectively conditions a customer's decision to participate in such a program with RMP on transferring ownership of the related environmental attributes to RMP. This transfer is required under the current contractual language without any corresponding payment or consideration to the customer.

Second, it is inconsistent with my reading of recently-enacted Utah law, Utah Code Sections 54-17-601(10)(e)(i) and 54-17-603(4)(b), which provide that customers who own demand side measures have the right to any environmental credits or attributes derived from those measures. While the market for these attributes is still in its infancy, their future value is not known and customers should not be required to forego those future market opportunities.

| 1 | Q. | IS IT FAIR FOR A CUSTOMER WHO PARTICIPATES IN A DEMAND |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | SIDE PROGRAM TO RETAIN THE VALUE OF THE |
| 3 | | ENVIRONMENTAL ATTRIBUTES? |
| 4 | A. | Yes. It is the customer who implements and owns the measure, not the Company. |
| 5 | | Although implementation of these measures may utilize money collected from |
| 6 | | other customers, they defer or eliminate the need for more costly supply-side |
| 7 | | resources and are thus cost-effective and fair for all customers. Additionally, this |
| 8 | | funding does not confer ownership rights and responsibilities to any party other |
| 9 | | than the customer implementing the measure – it is the customer implementing |
| 10 | | the measure that is generally providing the bulk of the investment and who will be |
| 11 | | responsible for ongoing operation and maintenance costs. That customer should |
| 12 | | have the right to retain all of the benefits that result from its actions, as is clearly |
| 13 | | contemplated by Utah Code Sections 54-17-601(10)(e)(1) and 54-17-603(4)(b). |
| 14 | Q. | WHAT CHANGE DO YOU PROPOSE TO THE CONTRACTUAL |
| 15 | | LANGUAGE? |
| 16 | A. | To avoid these issues and to ensure consistency with the intent of the legislature, |
| 17 | | all of the language referenced above, or any similar language, should be deleted in |
| 18 | | its entirety from all demand side management contracts. |
| 19 | Q. | DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY? |
| 20 | A. | Yes. |