- 1 Q. Please state your name, business address and present position with Rocky
- 2 Mountain Power (the Company), a division of PacifiCorp.
- 3 A. My name is A. Richard Walje. My business address is 201 South Main, Suite
- 4 2300, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111. I am the President of Rocky Mountain Power.

#### 5 Qualifications

- 6 Q. Briefly describe your educational and professional background.
- 7 A. I have worked in the electric utility industry since 1972. My experience includes
- 8 working as a journeyman lineman, field service engineer with General Electric
- 9 and as a substation design engineer for Rocky Mountain Power. At Rocky
- Mountain Power I have held numerous management and executive positions with
- increasing levels of responsibility in the areas of engineering, construction,
- transmission and distribution operations, customer service, procurement,
- information technology and community affairs. I have served on PacifiCorp's
- Board of the Directors since 2000 and I am also currently the Chairman of the
- Board of the PacifiCorp Foundation. I have a Bachelor of Science in Electrical
- Engineering degree (1984) and a Master of Business Administration degree
- 17 (1991), both from the University of Utah. I have received additional executive
- 18 level instruction from the University of Michigan and management and electrical
- 19 engineering theory from General Electric's Crotonville education center.
- 20 O. What are your responsibilities as President of Rocky Mountain Power?
- 21 A. My responsibilities, as President of Rocky Mountain Power, cover all of the
- Company's affairs in the states of Utah, Idaho and Wyoming. These
- responsibilities include helping to ensure that the Company's strategy,

investments and operations result in the delivery of safe, reliable and affordable electric energy to the Company's customers.

### **Purpose and Summary of Testimony**

26

# 27 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

- 28 The purpose of my testimony is to introduce our case requesting an increase in A. 29 base electric rates in Utah. Based on testimony of Company witness Mr. Steven 30 R. McDougal, Rocky Mountain Power is currently forecast to earn a return on 31 equity ("ROE") in Utah of 5.5 percent for the test period. This filing supports an 32 overall price increase of \$232.4 million, as adjusted by the Rate Mitigation 33 Premium (defined in Mr. McDougal's testimony), or 13.7 percent, required to 34 produce the 10.5 percent ROE requested by the Company, and is necessary to 35 support the financial integrity of the Company. The requested 10.5 percent ROE 36 is lower than the 10.6 percent last authorized by the Commission and is below the 37 top of the range of the current cost of common equity for the Company as 38 demonstrated in evidence proffered by cost of equity expert, Dr. Samuel C. 39 Hadaway.
- 40 Q. Upon what test year is the rate increase request based?
- A. As described in the testimony of Mr. McDougal, the rate increase request is based on a test year that covers the period of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.
- 43 Q. What are the major components contributing to the request for this 44 increase?
- 45 A. The major factor outside of capital projects and creating the need for the requested revenue increase is the increase in net power costs which represents 64

17		percent of the requested increase. Total Company net power costs have increased
18		\$527.1 million above the costs currently included in customers' rates. As
19		described in Witnesses Mr. Gregory N. Duvall's and Ms. Cindy A. Crane's
50		testimony, the primary contributors to the increase are
51		Item a – load growth
52		Item b – increases in coal costs
53		Item c – reduction in wholesale sales revenue
54		In addition to power costs, the cost of capital additions are a significant
55		driver in the need for this case and represents 21 percent of the increase. The
56		details of items included in the request are presented by Mr. Chad A. Teply, Mr.
57		Douglas N. Bennion and Mr. Darrell T. Gerrard. Mr. McDougal's testimony also
58		supports the cost of capital additions.
59	Q.	What actions has the Company taken to mitigate the magnitude of the new
50		power cost increase?
		•
51	A.	As described in the testimony of Company witnesses the Company has taken the
51 52	A.	As described in the testimony of Company witnesses the Company has taken the following actions to mitigate the increases in net power costs:
	A.	
52	A.	following actions to mitigate the increases in net power costs:
52 53	A.	following actions to mitigate the increases in net power costs:  • Pursued a diversified coal supply strategy, relying on fixed contracts,
52 53 54	A.	following actions to mitigate the increases in net power costs:  • Pursued a diversified coal supply strategy, relying on fixed contracts, indexed contracts and affiliate-owned coal mines to meet the fuel needs of
<ul><li>52</li><li>53</li><li>54</li><li>55</li></ul>	A.	following actions to mitigate the increases in net power costs:  • Pursued a diversified coal supply strategy, relying on fixed contracts, indexed contracts and affiliate-owned coal mines to meet the fuel needs of its coal fired power plants.
<ul><li>62</li><li>63</li><li>64</li><li>65</li><li>66</li></ul>	A.	<ul> <li>Pursued a diversified coal supply strategy, relying on fixed contracts, indexed contracts and affiliate-owned coal mines to meet the fuel needs of its coal fired power plants.</li> <li>Aggressively negotiated with Chevron Mining to limit the price increase</li> </ul>

Deer Creek rather than acquisition of a new longwall system.
 Investment in wind projects which are projected to generate over three

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

A.

- million MWh in the test period with no fuel costs, while providing millions of dollars in Renewable Energy Credit revenues.
- Generation plant turbine upgrades at the Huntington, Hunter, and Jim Bridger plants allow more efficient turbine performance without increasing emissions while increasing the Company's overall generation capacity by over 50 MW when aggregated with the Company's pollution control investments.

However, despite these efforts net power costs are primarily outside of the Company's control and that is why the Company has asked for an energy cost adjustment mechanism in Docket No. 09-035-15.

## 82 Q. What has led to the Company's capital investments included in the case?

This case includes investments in all facets of the system, including required pollution control equipment which is essential to ensure the continued operation of our low cost generation fleet, as well as local transmission and distribution investments, and transmission grid investments. All of these capital investments help to improve reliability, support power delivery and help to assure safe operations. As mentioned above, the details of these investments are presented in the testimony of witnesses Mr. Teply, Mr. Gerrard and Mr. Bennion.

# Q. Has the Company adjusted its investment plans based on current economic conditions?

92 A. Yes. The Company biennially undertakes a rigorous and extensive capital and

93		resource planning process that results in its integrated resource plan. This plan
94		provides the basis for making both near term and long term investment decisions.
95		The plan takes into account the expected load increases and resources necessary
96		to meet customer needs. Those projects that can be delayed, primarily local
97		transmission and distribution projects, have been delayed to reflect current
98		economic conditions and temporarily suppressed electricity consumption. The
99		Commission acknowledged the 2008 IRP in Docket No. 09-2035-01 on April 1,
100		2010.
101	Q.	What has created the need for the increase in operations and maintenance
102		expenses ("O&M") in this case?
103	A.	As described in Mr. Teply's testimony, the Company has added generation and
104		environmental facilities that require an incremental increase in O&M to assure
105		proper plant operations. However, even with these increases the Company's
106		OMAG (as defined below) costs per kWh generated have essentially stayed flat
107		over the past five years.
108	Q.	What steps has the Company taken to mitigate the cost increases affecting
109		customers?
110	A.	The Company has been able to keep overall expenses low by aggressively
111		pursuing efficiency gains that have allowed the Company to largely offset the
112		O&M expense for new generation. The Company continues to proactively and
113		aggressively control O&M and administrative and general expenses (together,
114		"OMAG"). As a result of the Company's cost-control efforts, the Utah-allocated
115		OMAG costs, while higher on a total dollars basis than the costs included in the

last rate case, have actually slightly declined on a cost per kWh from the level currently included in customer rates.

Contributing to this on-going low level of OMAG expense is the Company's decision to hold flat the number of full-time equivalent employees ("FTEs") since 2009, with the exception of a small number of FTEs related to new generation facilities. In addition, as discussed in the testimony of Mr. Erich D. Wilson, the Company has followed the market practice of keeping wage increases at historically low levels and made adjustments to the health care benefits plan design and to employee cost sharing to reduce costs.

#### **Introduction of Witnesses**

- Q. Please identify the witnesses that the Company will offer to support the application and the subject of their testimony.
- 128 A. The Company witnesses that have filed direct testimony in support of the application and the subjects of their testimony are:
  - **Steven R. McDougal**, Director, Revenue Requirement, will explain why the forecast test year that begins on July 1, 2011 and ends on June 30, 2012 best reflects the conditions that the Company expects to experience in the rate-effective period. In addition, Mr. McDougal will present the Company's overall revenue requirement based on the forecasted results of operations for the test year.
  - **Bruce N. Williams**, Vice President and Treasurer, will testify concerning the Company's cost of debt, preferred stock and capital structure.
    - **Dr. Samuel C. Hadaway**, FINANCO, Inc. will testify concerning the market required rate of return on equity capital (ROE) for Rocky Mountain Power.

139	Peter C. Eelkema, Lead/Senior Consultant, Load and Revenue Forecasting, will
140	present the load forecast for the case. He describes how the Company developed
141	the forecasts of the number of customers, kilowatt-hour sales at the meter, and
142	system loads and system peak loads at the system input level, and number of bills
143	for the test period.
144	Gregory N. Duvall, Director, Long Range Planning and Net Power Costs, will
145	present the Company's proposed net power costs ("NPC") for the test period. He
146	describes the major cost drivers in the test period NPC and addresses the specific
147	issues related to the GRID model described in the Commission order in the
148	Company's 2009 general rate case.
149	Cindy A. Crane, Vice President, Interwest Mining Company and Fuel Resources
150	for PacifiCorp Energy, will explain the Company's overall approach to providing
151	the coal supply for the Company's coal plants and support the level of coal costs
152	included in fuel expense in this case.
153	Stefan A. Bird, Senior Vice President, Commercial and Trading, for PacifiCorp
154	Energy, will support the test period REC revenue forecast and explain the basis
155	for that forecast. He will also demonstrate the prudence of the Top of the World
156	Wind Energy, LLC power purchase agreement, for which the Company is seeking
157	cost recovery in this proceeding.
158	Chad A. Teply, Vice President of Resource Development and Construction for
159	PacifiCorp Energy, will support the prudence of capital investments in pollution
160	control equipment, generation plant, and hydro projects being placed in service
161	during the test period. His testimony also supports the prudence of incremental

162	generation operations and maintenance costs associated with certain new
163	resources, new pollution control equipment, and other generation fleet operational
164	changes impacting this case.
165	Darrell T. Gerrard, Vice President of Transmission System Planning, will
166	explain and support the major capital investments in the Company's main
167	transmission grid. He explains the primary driver(s) creating the need for these
168	projects, and describes the benefits to customers and the electrical system overall.
169	Douglas N. Bennion, Vice President of Engineering Services and Capital
170	Investment, will explain and support the Company's local T&D capital
171	investment plan and plant additions.
172	Dean S. Brockbank, Vice President and General Counsel of PacifiCorp Energy,
173	explains the process that has been followed for relicensing the Klamath
174	Hydroelectric Project ("Project") and settlement of issues related to the
175	relicensing proceeding. He also explains how the expenses and costs for
176	relicensing and settlement for the Project are prudent expenditures that have been
177	incurred in the best interest of Rocky Mountain Power's customers.
178	Erich D. Wilson, Director, Human Resources, will provide an overview of the
179	compensation and benefit plans provided to employees at the Company and
180	support the costs related to these areas included in the test period.
181	Scott D. Thornton, Manager, Metered Data Management, will give an overview
182	of load research and the processes surrounding the development of load estimates
183	used in the Company's rate filing.
184	C. Craig Paice, Regulatory Consultant in Pricing and Cost of Service, will

185	present the Company's class cost of service study.
186	William R. Griffith, Director of Pricing and Cost of Service, will present the
187	Company's rate spread and rate design proposals.
188	Jeffrey M. Kent, Director Distribution, will propose changes to the Company's
189	pole attachment rate to reflect the administrative support cost for managing the
190	joint use of the Company's poles and to include a fee schedule of non-recurring
191	charges as part of Schedule 4.
192 <b>Q.</b>	Does this conclude your direct testimony?
193 A.	Yes.