

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

---

In the Matter of the Application of	)	Docket No. 19-057-03
Dominion Energy Utah for Authority to	)	
Change its Depreciation Rates	)	Direct Testimony
	)	of Donna Ramas
	)	For the Office of
	)	Consumer Services

---

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

Donna Ramas

FOR THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES

May 21, 2019

## Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
IMPACT OF COMPANY PROPOSED CHANGE.....	3
TRANSPONDER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM AND TRANSPONDER LIVES ...	4
RECOMMENDATION .....	8

1           **INTRODUCTION**

2   **Q.   WHAT IS YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?**

3   A.   My name is Donna Ramas. I am a Certified Public Accountant licensed in  
4       the State of Michigan and Principal at Ramas Regulatory Consulting, LLC,  
5       with offices at 4654 Driftwood Drive, Commerce Township, Michigan  
6       48382.

7   **Q.   HAVE YOU PREPARED A SUMMARY OF YOUR QUALIFICATIONS  
8       AND EXPERIENCE?**

9   A.   Yes. I have attached Appendix I, which is a summary of my regulatory  
10      experience and qualifications.

11   **Q.   ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU APPEARING?**

12   A.   I was asked by the Utah Office of Consumer Services (OCS) to review the  
13      Application filed by Dominion Energy Utah (DEU or Company) seeking  
14      authority to change its depreciation rates, with a focus on the impact of the  
15      requested changes on the revenue requirements of DEU. Accordingly, I  
16      am appearing on behalf of the OCS.

17   **Q.   WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

18   A.   My testimony focuses on the depreciation rate requested by DEU for  
19      Account 381.21 – Meters – Transponders. DEU is seeking to increase the  
20      depreciation rate applied to this account from 6.67% to 8.23%. The  
21      increase in the depreciation rate to be applied to transponders is based  
22      largely on a proposal to reduce the estimated service life used in the  
23      depreciation calculation from 15 years to 13 years. I recommend that the

24 depreciation rate to be applied to this account be no greater than 6.48%  
25 based on an estimated service life of the underlying assets of no less than  
26 17 years.

27 **Q. COULD YOU PLEASE BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE REASON WHY**  
28 **YOU ARE RECOMMENDING A DEPRECIATION RATE OF NO MORE**  
29 **THAN 6.48% FOR ACCOUNT 381.21 – METERS – TRANSPONDERS?**

30 A. Yes. The Company requests that the proposed new depreciation rates at  
31 issue in this case be reflected in its accounting system beginning on the  
32 tariff rate effective date resulting from its next general rate case  
33 proceeding, which DEU currently anticipates will be on or near March 1,  
34 2020. It is my opinion that an estimated average service life of at least 17  
35 years, or possibly even longer, will be more reflective of the life of the  
36 transponders that will be used and useful in providing service to DEU's  
37 customers at the time the new depreciation rates proposed in this case  
38 take effect. My testimony provides background information on the  
39 transponders and addresses why an estimated service life of 17 years or  
40 longer for transponders is reasonable and appropriate.

41 **Q. ARE YOU ADDRESSING THE DEPRECIATION STUDY IN ITS**  
42 **ENTIRETY AND WHETHER THE DEPRECIATION RATES**  
43 **REQUESTED BY DEU, BASED ON THE DEPRECIATION STUDY, ARE**  
44 **REASONABLE?**

45 A. No. My recommendations are focused on the appropriate depreciation  
46 rate to apply to Account 381.21 – Meters – Transponders. I am not taking

47 a position on the appropriateness of the remaining depreciation rates  
48 proposed by DEU in its application.

49 **Q. HAVE YOU PROVIDED ANY EXHIBITS WITH YOUR TESTIMONY?**

50 A. Yes. For ease of reference, Exhibit OCS 1.1D consists of DEU data  
51 responses referenced in this testimony. This includes the responses to  
52 OCS Data Requests 2.01, 2.02, 2.04, 2.05 and 2.06. Also included in  
53 Exhibit OCS 1.1D is the response to DPU 1.10 and select pages from  
54 DPU 1.10 Attachment 3<sup>1</sup>.

55 **IMPACT OF COMPANY PROPOSED CHANGE**

56 **Q. DOES THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE ESTIMATED**  
57 **SERVICE LIFE OF TRANSPONDERS HAVE A SUBSTANTIAL IMPACT**  
58 **ON DEPRECIATION EXPENSE?**

59 A. Yes. The direct testimony of DEU witness Jordan K. Stephenson  
60 indicates that the overall impact of the Company's proposed depreciation  
61 rates increases the annual depreciation accrual, or depreciation expense,  
62 by \$9,079,901.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Stephenson's testimony identifies the decrease in  
63 the service life used for transponders from 15 years to 13 years as one of  
64 the major changes causing an overall increase in depreciation expense.<sup>3</sup>  
65 The depreciation study prepared by Gannett Fleming (hereinafter referred  
66 to as "depreciation study"), filed as DEU Exhibit 1.2, similarly describes

---

<sup>1</sup> Since DPU 1.10 Attachment 3 consists of multiple pages, only the first page and the page addressing transponders is being provided in the exhibit.

<sup>2</sup> DEU Exhibit 1.0, lines 42 – 45.

<sup>3</sup> DEU Exhibit 1.0, lines 57 – 61.

67 the decrease in the service life for Account 381.21 – Meters –  
68 Transponders as a significant change.<sup>4</sup>

69 The depreciation study was calculated based on December 31,  
70 2017 gas plant balances. DEU Exhibit 1.3, at page 1, shows the balance  
71 in Account 381.21 – Meters – Transponders as \$81,807,796 at December  
72 31, 2017. At the currently authorized depreciation rate for Account 381.21  
73 of 6.67% the resulting depreciation expense would be \$5,456,580<sup>5</sup>  
74 (\$81,807,796 x 6.67%). At DEU's proposed depreciation rate for the  
75 account of 8.23%, the annual depreciation expense would be \$6,732,782  
76 (\$81,807,796 x 8.23%). Thus, the Company's proposal to reduce the  
77 estimated service life of transponders from 15 years to 13 years and  
78 increase the resulting depreciation rate from 6.67% to 8.23% would  
79 increase the annual depreciation expense, based on December 31, 2017  
80 transponder plant balances, by \$1,276,202 (\$6,732,782 - \$5,456,580).

81 **TRANSPONDER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM AND TRANSPONDER LIVES**

82 **Q. WHAT IS DRIVING THE PROPOSED CHANGE IN THE ESTIMATED**  
83 **SERVICE LIFE FOR TRANSPONDERS?**

84 **A.** The Company experienced multiple problems with transponders  
85 manufactured by Elster, causing the Company to decide to undergo a  
86 replacement program, replacing the Elster transponders with transponders

---

<sup>4</sup> DEU Exhibit 1.2, p. iv.

<sup>5</sup> This excludes the impact of the existing reserve variance amortization being applied to the account.

87 manufactured by Itron. The Elster transponders are being replaced earlier  
88 than the estimated service lives anticipated in the prior depreciation study.  
89 The depreciation study submitted by the Company in this case was  
90 conducted based on 2017 accounting data. As of December 31, 2017, the  
91 Company was in the midst of the transponder replacement program  
92 resulting in the service life of the transponders proposed by the Company  
93 being based on both the remaining Elster transponders not yet replaced  
94 during the study period and the new replacement transponders. The  
95 shortened life of the remaining Elster transponders has a significant  
96 impact on the depreciation rate proposed by the Company in this case.

97 **Q. CAN YOU PLEASE ELABORATE ON THE TRANSPONDER**  
98 **REPLACEMENT PROGRAM AND THE SERVICE LIVES OF THE**  
99 **TRANSPONDERS?**

100 A. Yes. The transponders are discussed at several places in the  
101 depreciation study. From 2015 to present, DEU has been replacing  
102 transponders manufactured by Elster with transponders manufactured by  
103 Itron. This is described in the depreciation study as a “major transponder  
104 replacement program” with over one million transponders manufactured  
105 by Elster being replaced. The depreciation study, at page iv, describes  
106 the reason for the major replacement program as follows:

107 ... The Elster transponders have been problematic in recent years  
108 with an unusually high percentage of meter misreads or no reads.  
109 After a couple of failed attempts to read the meter automatically via  
110 the transponder, the Company typically will perform a manual read  
111 of the problematic meter or will estimate the consumption based on  
112 historic consumption patterns if the existing transponder has failed

113 to perform properly. The reduction in service life from 15 years to 13  
114 years is based primarily on company plans to replace a significant  
115 portion of their transponders that comprise their network.  
116 Approximately 600,000 of the 1,000,000 transponders will be  
117 replaced during the years 2018 and 2019. 400,000 transponders  
118 were replaced during years 2015-2017.

119  
120 Similarly, the depreciation study, at pages III-5 and III-6 states that  
121 there has been an increasing level of transponder failures causing nearly  
122 10% of customer consumption data to need to be obtained through  
123 manual meter reads or estimates. Page III-6 of the depreciation study  
124 indicates as follows regarding the expected service life of the problematic  
125 Elster transponders that are being replaced, and the replacement  
126 transponders manufactured by Itron:

127 ... The Elster transponders are expected to have a 10 to 11-year  
128 service life while the Itron transponders are expected to have an  
129 average service life of approximately 15 to 20 years. The survivor  
130 curve estimate for Account 381.21 is 13-S3. The previous estimate  
131 was the Iowa 15-S4. The service life estimated for Account 381.21,  
132 Meters – Transponders is largely based on the service life  
133 expectation of the battery powering the transponder. A 17 to 20-year  
134 battery life is expected for the newer transponders based on  
135 statements issued by the manufacturer, i.e., Itron. The actual overall  
136 average service life is expected to be slightly less than the 17-20  
137 years due to retirement caused by equipment failure, storm damage,  
138 third-party damage, etc.”

139

140 Given the anticipated 17 to 20 year battery life for the new  
141 transponders identified in the depreciation study, the 600,000 Elster  
142 transponders not yet replaced during the time of the study clearly had a  
143 significant impact on the selection of a 13 year overall average service life  
144 for Account 381.21 – Meters – Transponders.



145 **Q. OVER WHAT TIMEFRAME ARE THE PROBLEMATIC ELSTER**  
 146 **TRANSPONDERS BEING REPLACED?**

147 A. The transponder replacement program began in November 2015.<sup>6</sup> The  
 148 table below shows the number of Elster transponders replaced from 2015  
 149 through February 2019<sup>7</sup>:

<u>Period</u>	<u>Elster Units Replaced</u>
2015	19,908
2016	100,523
2017	239,601
2018	261,643
Jan-19	16,547
Feb-19	16,808
Total	<u>655,030</u>

150

151 Based on the above table, 360,032 Elster transponders were replaced by  
 152 December 31, 2017, with another 294,998 replaced from January 1, 2018  
 153 through February 2019. There were 318,952 Elster transponders  
 154 remaining in service as of March 2019.<sup>8</sup>

155 The depreciation study indicates that the transponder replacement  
 156 program is scheduled to be complete in either 2019<sup>9</sup> or early 2020,<sup>10</sup>  
 157 depending upon the section of the depreciation study referenced.

158 However, the response to OCS Data Request 2.02 indicates that the  
 159 Company plans to replace 18,000 to 26,000 Elster transponders per

---

<sup>6</sup> DEU Exhibit 1.2, p. iii.

<sup>7</sup> Response to OCS Data Request 2.01

<sup>8</sup> Response to OCS Data Request 2.02

<sup>9</sup> DEU Exhibit 1.2, p. iv.

<sup>10</sup> DEU Exhibit 1.2, p.III-6.

160 month until completion of the replacement program, with an estimated  
161 completion date in the third quarter of 2020.

162 **RECOMMENDATION**

163 **Q. WHEN IS IT CURRENTLY ANTICIPATED THAT THE DEPRECIATION**  
164 **RATES RESULTING FROM THIS CASE WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE?**

165 A. DEU requests that the proposed new depreciation rates at issue in this  
166 case be reflected in its accounting system beginning on the rate effective  
167 date of new base rates resulting from its next general rate case  
168 proceeding. The Company has indicated that it anticipates filing its next  
169 general rate case application on or about July 1, 2019 with an anticipated  
170 rate effective date on or near March 1, 2020. Thus, depending upon the  
171 timing of the filing of DEU's next rate case, the effective date of the new  
172 depreciation rates would be March 1, 2020 or after.

173 **Q. HOW LONG WILL THE NEW DEPRECIATION RATES RESULTING**  
174 **FROM THIS CASE BE IN EFFECT?**

175 A. In a Settlement Stipulation filed in Docket No. 07-057-13 the parties  
176 agreed that the Company will perform a new depreciation study every five  
177 years. Given the agreed to five year timeframe between depreciation  
178 studies, it is likely that the new depreciation rates resulting from this case  
179 will be in effect for a number of years.

180 **Q. DO YOU AGREE THAT THE ESTIMATED AVERAGE SERVICE LIFE**  
181 **USED IN DETERMINING THE DEPRECIATION RATES FOR ACCOUNT**

182           **381.21 – METERS – TRANSPONDERS SHOULD FACTOR IN THE**  
183           **IMPACTS OF THE PROBLEMATIC ELSTER TRANSPONDERS?**

184    A.    No, I do not. During the time period used in the depreciation study, the  
185           Company was in the midst of the transponder replacement program with  
186           over 600,000 of the problematic transponders remaining to be replaced.  
187           The over 600,000 transponders awaiting replacement had a significant  
188           impact on the estimated average service life of the assets in Account  
189           381.21 – Meters – Transponders. Clearly, the anticipated average service  
190           life of transponders in service during the 2017 accounting period used in  
191           the depreciation study, consisting of over 600,000 of the problematic  
192           Elster transponders and some of the new Itron transponders, is not  
193           reflective of the anticipated average service life of the replacement  
194           transponders.

195                    By the time the new depreciation rates from this case take effect,  
196           there will be very few, if any, of the Elster transponders remaining in  
197           service. DEU currently estimates that between 10,000 and 100,000 Elster  
198           transponders will remain in service as of March 2020.<sup>11</sup> Any remaining  
199           Elster transponders, if any, should be fully replaced fairly soon after the  
200           new depreciation rate effective date. With new depreciation studies being  
201           conducted on five-year intervals, it is clearly not reasonable or appropriate  
202           to include the impacts of the problematic Elster transponders in  
203           determining the appropriate depreciation rate to apply to the transponders

---

<sup>11</sup> DEU Response to OCS Data Request 2.06.

204 that will be used and useful in providing service to customers during the  
205 period the depreciation rates are in effect.

206 **Q. WHAT IS THE ANTICIPATED SERVICE LIFE OF THE REPLACEMENT**  
207 **TRANSPONDERS?**

208 A. The depreciation study, at page III-6, indicates a 17 to 20 year battery life  
209 is expected for the new transponders and that service life expectations are  
210 based largely on the battery powering the transponder. On the same  
211 page, the depreciation study states that the "...ltron transponders are  
212 expected to have an average service life of approximately 15 to 20 years"  
213 and that "The actual overall service life is likely to be slightly less than 17-  
214 20 years due to retirement caused by equipment failure, storm damage,  
215 third-party damage, etc." The notes taken during the meeting between  
216 Gannett Fleming staff and Company management, which were provided in  
217 response to DPU Data Request 1.10, Attachment 3, state, "new ITRON  
218 transponders are expected to last 20 yrs."

219 **Q. WHAT ESTIMATED AVERAGE SERVICE LIFE DO YOU RECOMMEND**  
220 **FOR USE IN CALCULATING THE APPROPRIATE DEPRECIATION**  
221 **RATE FOR ACCOUNT 381.21 – METERS – TRANSPONDERS?**

222 A. I recommend an average service life of no less than 17 years be used. A  
223 17 year life would be more reflective of the anticipated average service life  
224 of the transponders that will be used and useful in providing service to  
225 customers when the depreciation rates become effective than the 13 year  
226 service life used in the depreciation study.

227 **Q. WHAT DEPRECIATION RATE DO YOU RECOMMEND FOR ACCOUNT**  
228 **381.21?**

229 A. To ensure consistent and proper calculation of the depreciation rate, I  
230 asked the OCS to issue OCS Data Request 2.05, to DEU, asking that the  
231 Company "...provide what the depreciation rate would be for Account  
232 381.21 Meters – Transponders if recalculated based on the original cost at  
233 December 31, 2019 utilizing: a) actual amounts for 2018; b) the  
234 Company's current best estimate of the amounts for 2019; and c) an  
235 assumed transponder life of 17 years." The question also stated: "In  
236 other words, please provide an updated version of page IX-16 to be based  
237 on actual and projected balances as of December 31, 2019 and based on  
238 a 17 year estimated life instead of the 13 year life included in the current  
239 calculation." This would result in most of the Elster transponders being  
240 excluded from the calculation and in an estimated average service life of  
241 17 years for the transponders. The Company responded as follows:

242 The calculated remaining life depreciation rate using a 17-S3  
243 survivor curve, 0% net salvage, and the projected 12/31/2019 plant  
244 and reserve balances, is 6.48%. Support of the projected plant and  
245 reserve balances is included in OCS Data Request No. 2.04  
246 Attachment 1. The detailed depreciation calculation is provided in  
247 OCS Data Request No. 2.05 Attachment 1.

248  
249 The response was prepared by John F. Siedmayer, CDP of Gannett  
250 Fleming. Based on this response, I am recommending a depreciation rate  
251 for Account 381.21 – Meters – Transponders of 6.48% based on an  
252 estimated average service life of 17 years.

253 **Q. WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THE 6.48% RECOMMENDED**  
254 **DEPRECIATION RATES?**

255 A. As previously indicated in this testimony, the Company's proposed  
256 depreciation rate for Account 381.21 of 8.23% applied to the December  
257 31, 2017 balance in the account of \$81,807,796 results in depreciation  
258 expense of \$6,732,782. Application of my recommended depreciation  
259 rate of 6.48% to the December 31, 2017 account balance would result in  
260 annual depreciation expense of \$5,301,145 ( $\$81,807,796 \times 6.48\%$ ). Thus,  
261 based on the December 31, 2017 balance in Account 381.21, the resulting  
262 depreciation expense would be \$1,431,637 lower as a result of replacing  
263 the Company's proposed 8.23% depreciation rate with a rate of 6.48%.  
264 The actual impact on the depreciation expense included in rates charged  
265 to customers will be dependent on the Commission authorized plant in  
266 service balance for Account 381.21 in the upcoming rate case.

267 **Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

268 A. Yes.