

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

Introduction

**Q: PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, PARTY YOU REPRESENT AND BUSINESS ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.**

A: My name is Daniel E. Gimble. I am a Special Projects Manager for the Committee of Consumer Services (Committee). My business address is 160 E. 300 S., Heber Wells Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

**Q: ON BEHALF OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONSUMER SERVICES (COMMITTEE OR CCS) HAVE YOU TESTIFIED BEFORE THE UTAH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION (COMMISSION OR PSC) IN PRIOR ENERGY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS CASES?**

A: Yes. Since 1991, I have testified in numerous cases before the Commission.

**Q: WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

A: My testimony provides the Committee's overall recommendation regarding Rocky Mountain Power's (Company or RMP) proposal to decrease its composite depreciation rate from 2.91 percent to 2.69 percent (decrease of 0.22 percent) based on depreciable plant balances as of December 31, 2006. I also provide the Committee's perspective on various policy issues related to this depreciation case.

**Q: HAS THE COMMITTEE RETAINED AN EXPERT THAT ALSO PREPARED AND FILED TESTIMONY IN CONNECTION WITH THIS DEPRECIATION DOCKET?**

A: Yes. The Committee retained Jacob Pous of Diversified Utility Consulting, Inc. to provide expert assistance in analyzing the reasonableness of both the Company's new depreciation study and the depreciation rates proposed by the Company. My overall recommendation is supported by

31 Mr. Pous' specific recommendations in the production and mass property  
32 (transmission, distribution, general and mining plant) areas.

33

34 Summary of Committee Position

35 Q: **PLEASE PROVIDE THE COMMITTEE'S OVERALL RECOMMENDED**  
36 **CHANGE TO DEPRECIATION EXPENSE IN THIS CASE.**

37 A: CCS Exhibit 2.1, page 1 of 7, is a summary exhibit prepared by Mr. Pous  
38 showing the Committee's overall recommendation and the specific  
39 proposals by functional plant category. Applying the Committee's  
40 proposed depreciation rates to depreciable plant balances as of  
41 December 31, 2006 results in a recommended decrease to existing  
42 depreciation expense of approximately \$37 million on a Utah basis. Thus,  
43 the Committee recommends a decrease to depreciation expense that  
44 exceeds the Company's proposed decrease by about \$27.3 million on a  
45 Utah basis.

46

47 Q: **HOW DOES THIS COMPARE TO THE RESPECTIVE POSITIONS OF**  
48 **THE COMPANY AND THE COMMITTEE IN PAST DEPRECIATION**  
49 **CASES?**

50 A: The Company's initial filings were excessive relative to the Committee's  
51 recommendations in past cases, and for that matter, the two depreciation  
52 settlements approved by the Commission. In Docket No. 98-2035-03, the  
53 Company proposed to increase depreciation rates in Utah by about \$23.6  
54 million. A settlement approved by the Commission resulted in an increase  
55 in depreciation rates of approximately \$3.1 million. However, due to  
56 previous amortization of plant at unapproved depreciation rates, the \$3.1  
57 million was offset by a \$3.55 million time-limited "accounting adjustment,"  
58 which resulted in a small net decrease of about \$0.45 million to  
59 depreciation expense for a period of two years. In Docket No. 02-035-12,  
60 the Company proposed to increase depreciation rates in Utah by about  
61 \$3.75 million. A settlement approved by the Commission resulted in a

62 decrease of approximately \$6 million to depreciation expense. While the  
63 Company requested depreciation rate increases in each of the last two  
64 depreciation cases, each settlement approved by the Commission  
65 resulted in an overall net decrease in depreciation expense. I have  
66 attached the Commission's Orders in these two dockets as CCS Exhibits  
67 1.1 and 1.2.

68

69 Q: **PLEASE BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE COMMITTEE'S**  
70 **RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE MAJOR ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH**  
71 **THIS CASE.**

72 A: The Committee's recommendations are as follows:

73 (1) The Committee supports the Company's proposal to increase the life  
74 span of the majority of its coal units to an average of 64 years.

75 Further, the Committee recommends the life spans for simple-cycle  
76 combustion turbine and combined-cycle combustion turbine gas plants  
77 be increased from 25 to 30 years and 35 to 40 years, respectively.

78 (2) The Committee opposes the Company's proposal to double the  
79 negative net salvage value of steam production facilities from \$25/kW  
80 to \$50/kW. The Committee recommends leaving the negative net  
81 salvage value at the existing \$25/kW.

82 (3) The Committee opposes the Company's proposal to recognize and  
83 include interim additions in its depreciation rates based on a five-year  
84 forecast.

85 (4) The Committee supports the Company's proposal to establish a hydro  
86 plant decommissioning reserve as set forth in its testimony.

87 (5) The Committee opposes the Company's proposals relating to 11 mass  
88 property accounts. Some of these proposals involve substantial  
89 increases to the negative net salvage values associated with certain  
90 mass property accounts.

91

92

93 Policy Issues

94 Q: **WHAT POLICY ISSUES DO YOU ADDRESS IN YOUR TESTIMONY?**

95 A: I address the Company's proposals to: increase the life span for the  
96 majority of its coal units to 64 years; include forecasted interim additions  
97 associated with production plant in depreciation rates; and establish a  
98 hydro plant decommissioning reserve. I also discuss when the  
99 depreciation rate changes ordered in this docket should become effective  
100 and when the Company should be required to file its next depreciation  
101 case.

102

103 *64-Year Life Span for Coal Units*

104 Q: **WHAT IS THE COMMITTEE'S POSITION ON THE COMPANY'S**  
105 **PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE LIFE SPAN OF THE MAJORITY OF**  
106 **ITS COAL UNITS TO 64 YEARS?**

107 A: At the September 12, 2007 Committee meeting, the Committee was  
108 briefed on the salient issues attendant to this depreciation case, including  
109 the Company's 64-year life span proposal for coal units. At that meeting,  
110 the Committee voted 4-2 to support the 64-year life span proposal. The  
111 Committee determined that the "accounting lives" of coal units should  
112 more closely match the expected "engineering lives" so current ratepayers  
113 are not overcharged for the Company's coal plant investments. The  
114 Committee made this assessment based on information that the industry  
115 trend is to recognize longer life spans for coal units and that the  
116 Committee's depreciation expert has provided testimony recommending  
117 longer life spans for coal units in recent cases.

118

119 Q: **HAVE OTHER STATES RECENTLY APPROVED EXTENDING COAL**  
120 **UNIT LIFE SPANS?**

121 A: Yes. Commissions in Oklahoma and Colorado have recently approved  
122 extending life spans for coal units to approximately 60 years. Mr. Pous  
123 addresses these cases in his testimony.

124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152

*Interim Additions*

**Q: BRIEFLY EXPLAIN THE COMPANY’S PROPOSAL REGARDING INTERIM ADDITIONS?**

A: For the first time the Company proposes to recognize and include nominal interim additions in its depreciation rates for steam and other production plant.<sup>1</sup> According to RMP, the recommended interim addition amount is based on a five-year forecast and is limited to existing equipment.

**Q: WHAT ARE THE COMMITTEE’S CONCERNS RELATING TO INTERIM ADDITIONS?**

A: The Committee has two primary concerns. First, it allows RMP to begin depreciating plant before it actually provides “used and useful” service to customers. This is contrary to a long history of sound regulatory principles followed by the Commission that in the rate effective period costs charged to customers should match the associated benefits received. Second, the costs are based on a five-year forecast, which means the costs are highly speculative and uncertain. The Committee’s expert, Mr. Pous, discusses these and other concerns in greater detail in his direct testimony.

**Q: WHAT IS THE COMMITTEE’S POSITION ON THE COMPANY’S INTERIM ADDITION PROPOSAL?**

A: The Committee’s recommendation is that the Commission should reject the Company’s proposal.

---

<sup>1</sup> On page 9 of his direct testimony, Mr. Lay notes that the Company has not adjusted its five-year forecast for inflation and that they are simply proposing a nominal level of interim additions.

153 *Hydro Plant Decommissioning Reserve*

154 Q: **BRIEFLY EXPLAIN THE COMPANY'S HYDRO PLANT**  
155 **DECOMMISSIONING RESERVE PROPOSAL.**

156 A: The Company proposes a policy change to recognize the increased  
157 probability that some of its smaller hydro plants will face future  
158 environmental challenges that will affect the future operations of those  
159 facilities. Specifically, the Company proposes to establish a hydro plant  
160 decommissioning reserve for facilities that have a specific  
161 decommissioning agreement and small hydro plants where the Company  
162 has estimated a probability of decommissioning occurring within the next  
163 ten years.

164

165 Q: **WHAT IS THE COMMITTEE'S POSITION ON RMP'S PROPOSAL TO**  
166 **CREATE A HYDRO DECOMMISSIONING RESERVE?**

167 A: The Committee supports the Company's proposal. It appears reasonable  
168 to set up a decommissioning reserve if there is an agreement to remove  
169 certain hydro facilities and to reflect the probability that other small hydro  
170 resources may be removed due to economic, environmental or political  
171 reasons.

172

173 Q: **DOES THE CREATION OF A HYDRO DECOMMISSIONING RESERVE**  
174 **OBLIGATE UTAH RATEPAYERS IN ANY WAY TO COVER COSTS**  
175 **RESULTING FROM HYDRO DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES?**

176 A: No. A hydro reserve simply allows RMP to reflect expected  
177 decommissioning costs on its books. Whether any requested future cost  
178 recovery is afforded to the Company will chiefly be determined by the  
179 prevailing inter-jurisdictional cost allocation method as it relates to hydro  
180 facilities and the prudence of the costs incurred by the Company to  
181 remove facilities.

182

183

184 *January 1, 2008 Implementation Date*

185 Q: **WHEN DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE THAT THE NEW**  
186 **DEPRECIATION RATES BE IMPLEMENTED?**

187 A: RMP proposes that new depreciation rates be effective on January 1,  
188 2008.

189

190 Q: **WHAT IS THE COMMITTEE'S POSITION RELATING TO THE**  
191 **PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE?**

192 A: The Committee's position is that new depreciation rates approved by the  
193 Commission should be fully reflected in the test year used in RMP's next  
194 Utah rate case.

195

196 Q: **WHAT IS THE COMMITTEE'S POSITION REGARDING WHEN RMP**  
197 **SHOULD PREPARE AND FILE ITS NEXT DEPRECIATION CASE?**

198 A: The Committee believes that depreciation rates should be reviewed within  
199 a three-to-five year period. Given the frequency with which RMP has  
200 been filing general rate cases and the fact that depreciation is a major  
201 expense item, it may make sense for the Commission to file its next  
202 depreciation case sooner rather than later.

203

204 Q: **DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

205 A: Yes.

206

207

208