Witness OCS – 7SR

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Application of ) **Rocky Mountain Power, for** Docket No. 10-035-124 ) Authority to Increase Its Retail Electric ) Utility Service Rates in Utah and For Surrebuttal Testimony ) Approval of Its Proposed Electric Service ) of Seth Schwartz Schedule and Electric Service On behalf of the ) Regulations **Office of Consumer Services** )

July 19, 2011

)

**NON-CONFIDENTIAL** 

| 1  |    | INTRODUCTION   |
|----|----|--|
| 2  | Q. | WHAT IS YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?                        |
| 3  | Α. | My name is Seth Schwartz. I am the President of Energy Ventures            |
| 4  |    | Analysis, Inc. ("EVA"), which is located at 1901 North Moore Street,       |
| 5  |    | Arlington, VA 22209.   |
| 6  |    |  |
| 7  | Q. | HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY FILED TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?                          |
| 8  | A. | Yes. I filed direct testimony regarding the Company's fuel supply and coal |
| 9  |    | inventory strategy and recommended a reduction in the amount of coal       |
| 10 |    | inventory which should be included in the rate base for the test year.     |
| 11 |    |  |
| 12 | Q. | PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SURREBUTTAL                            |
| 13 |    | TESTIMONY.   |
| 14 | Α. | My surrebuttal testimony is filed in response to the rebuttal testimony of |
| 15 |    | Company witness Ms. Cindy Crane, addressing the following areas:           |
| 16 |    | 1) The appropriate long-term inventory targets adopted by the              |
| 17 |    | Company for the  |
| 18 |    | 2) The amount of short-term inventory which the Company requires to        |
| 19 |    | manage potential risks and should be included in the rate base for         |
| 20 |    | the test year. My surrebuttal testimony responds to the specific           |
| 21 |    | risks and issues identified by Ms. Crane in her rebuttal testimony.        |
| 22 |    |  |
|    |    |  |

23





| OCS-7D | Schwartz |
|--------|----------|
|--------|----------|

| 67 | Α. | The of target inventories has the effect of  |
|----|----|--|
| 68 |    |  |
| 69 |    | A reduces the potential for of   |
| 70 |    | and increases the . The adopted  |
| 71 |    | by the Company would allow the   |
| 72 |    | Company to let its inventory before it took action. It   |
| 73 |    | would also allow the Company to generative management of the second |
| 74 |    | adverse financial impacts. The would spur action by the  |
| 75 |    | Company to or to ,   |
| 76 |    | once it was outside the target range.  |
| 77 |    |  |
| 78 | Q. | WHAT IS THE FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE  |
| 79 |    | ADOPTED BY THE COMPANY FOR ITS LONG-TERM   |
| 80 |    | TARGET?  |
| 81 | Α. | At an average burn of per day, the impact of of  |
| 82 |    | average burn (the difference between the <b>second</b> of my   |
| 83 |    | recommendation and the Company's target) is tons of coal. This   |
| 84 |    | difference is equal to about a second at the Company's average   |
| 85 |    | cost of inventory.   |
| 86 |    |  |
| 87 |    |  |
| 88 |    |  |
| 89 |    |  |



|     | OCS | 7D Schwartz 10-035-124 Pag                                     | e 6 of 9 |
|-----|-----|--|----------|
| 113 | A.  | No. The Company has provided no basis for selecting the number | s which  |
| 114 |     | it adopted.  |          |
| 115 |     |  |          |
| 116 | Q.  | DID YOU PROVIDE AN ANALYSIS IN SUPPORT O                       | F AN     |
| 117 |     | APPROPRIATE SHORT-TERM INVENTORY TARGET TO                     |          |
| 118 |     |  |          |
| 119 |     | ?  |          |
| 120 | A.  | Yes. My analysis included the following factors:               |          |
| 121 |     | The coal burn projected by the Company for                     | -<br>7   |
| 122 |     | The amount of coal which the Company has                       |          |
| 123 |     |  |          |
| 124 |     | • The minimum amount of inventory needed to                    |          |
| 125 |     | ; and,   |          |
| 126 |     | • The  |          |
| 127 |     |  |          |
| 128 |     |  |          |
| 129 | Q.  | BASED ON YOUR ANALYSIS, WHAT DID YOU CONCLUDE TO               | BE AN    |
| 130 |     | APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF SHORT-TERM INVENTORY N                   | EEDED    |
| 131 |     | FOR THE TEST YEAR TO   |          |
| 132 |     | ?  |          |
| 133 | A.  | Based upon the Company's                                       |          |
| 134 |     |  |          |
| 135 |     |  |          |



| 159 |    |  |
|-----|----|--|
| 160 | Q. | HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO THE COMPANY'S CRITICISMS OF                    |
| 161 |    | YOUR APPROACH?   |
| 162 | A. | The Company makes the mistake of                                     |
| 163 |    | derive a result that is unreasonable. The approach used by           |
| 164 |    | o calculate normal inventory targets was to consider                 |
| 165 |    | To consider the  |
| 166 |    | I assume   |
| 167 |    | and I assume the   |
| 168 |    | After making these , it is not reasonable to                         |
| 169 |    | then consider  |
| 170 |    | It is reasonable to assume that the other                            |
| 171 |    | . It is not reasonable to assume the                                 |
| 172 |    |  |
| 173 |    |  |
| 174 |    | Further, it is reasonable to use the minimum inventory level for the |
| 175 |    | as adequate to operate the plants, when                              |
| 176 |    | the inventory would be above this level for                          |
| 177 |    |  |
| 178 |    |  |
| 179 | Q. | ARE THER ANY OTHER FACTORS WHICH THE COMPANY DID NOT                 |
| 180 |    | CONSIDER?  |

