

1407 W North Temple, Suite 310 Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

March 28, 2017

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Utah Public Service Commission Heber M. Wells Building, 4th Floor 160 East 300 South Salt Lake City, UT 84114

- Attention: Gary Widerburg Commission Secretary
- RE: Docket No. 16-035-36 In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power to Implement Programs Authorized by the Sustainable Transportation and Energy Plan Act

Pursuant to the Commission's Phase Two Scheduling Order dated October 21, 2016, in the above referenced matter, Rocky Mountain Power hereby submits for filing the Phase Two rebuttal testimony of Mr. Steven R. McDougal.

Rocky Mountain Power respectfully requests that all formal correspondence and requests for additional information regarding this filing be addressed to the following:

By E-mail (preferred):	<u>datarequest@pacificorp.com</u> <u>bob.lively@pacificorp.com</u> <u>daniel.solander@pacificorp.com</u>
By regular mail:	Data Request Response Center

Data Request Response Center PacifiCorp 825 NE Multnomah, Suite 2000 Portland, OR 97232

Informal inquiries may be directed to Bob Lively at (801) 220-4052.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey K. Larsen Vice President, Regulation

CC: Service List

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 28th day of March 2017, a true and correct copy of Rocky Mountain Power's STEP Rebuttal Testimony was served by email on the following:

WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES	
Jennifer E. Gardner - jennifer.gardner@westernresources	s.org
Nancy Kelly - <u>nkelly@westernresources.org</u>	
Penny Anderson - penny.anderson@westernresources.or	g
Ken Wilson - <u>ken.wilson@westernresources.org</u>	
Dave Effross - <u>dave.effross@westernresources.org</u>	
UTAH CLEAN ENERGY	
Sophie Hayes - sophie@utahcleanenergy.org	
Mitalee Gupta - mgupta@utahcleanenergy.org	
SIERRA CLUB	
Gloria Smith - gloria.smith@sierraclub.org	
Travis Ritchie - travis.ritchie@sierraclub.org	
Joseph Halso - joe.halso@gmail.com	
OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES	
Michele Beck - mbeck@utah.gov	
UTAH DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES	
Erika Tedder - etedder@utah.gov	
ASSISTANT UTAH ATTORNEYS GENERAL	
Patricia Schmid - pschmid@utah.gov	
Justin Jetter - jjetter@utah.gov	
Robert Moore - <u>rmoore@utah.gov</u>	
UTAH ASSOCIATION OF ENERGY USERS	
Gary A. Dodge - gdodge@hjdlaw.com	
Phillip J. Russell - prussell@hjdlaw.com	
Kevin Higgins - <u>khiggins@energystrat.com</u>	
Neal Townsend - <u>ntownsend@energystrat.com</u>	
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION	
Megan J. DePaulis – megan.depaulis@slcgov.com	
Tyler Poulson – <u>tyler.poulson@slcgov.com</u>	

Katie Savarin Coordinator, Regulatory Operations

Rocky Mountain Power Docket No. 16-035-36 Witness: Steven R. McDougal

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF UTAH

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

Rebuttal Testimony of Steven R. McDougal

March 2017

Q. Please state your name, business address and present position with PacifiCorp dba
 Rocky Mountain Power (the "Company").

A. My name is Steven R. McDougal. My business address is 1407 West North Temple,
Suite 330, Salt Lake City, Utah 84116. My present position is Director of Revenue
Requirement for PacifiCorp.

6 Q. Have you previously filed testimony in this proceeding?

7 A. Yes, I filed both supplemental and rebuttal testimony in Phase One of this proceeding.

8 PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

9 Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?

10 A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to and/or rebut issues raised by the 11 Division of Public Utilities ("DPU") witnesses Mr. Robert A. Davis and Ms. Myunghee 12 Sim Tuttle, Utah Office of Consumer Services ("OCS") witness Mr. Danny A.C. 13 Martinez, and Utah Clean Energy ("UCE") witness Ms. Kate Bowman. Specifically, my 14 testimony will address STEP funding limits and approval issues raised by Mr. Davis, 15 reporting recommendations from Mr. Martinez, issues regarding the commercial line 16 extension program raised by Mr. Martinez and Ms. Tuttle, and one issue regarding 17 confidential customer information raised by Ms. Bowman.

18

STEP FUNDING LIMITS AND APPROVALS

19Q.Mr. Davis recommends that the Commission specify in its STEP Order that the20Company should bear the risk for any funds spent over and above the statutorily21authorized STEP collection levels. Does the Company agree with this22recommendation?

A. Yes. The Company will commit to not charge more to the STEP project than authorized
 in the legislation. To be clear, ongoing O&M occurring after the conclusion of the STEP
 surcharge will be included in a future rate case and the Company will justify the ongoing
 level.

27 CLEAN COAL PROJECTS

Q. Mr. Davis recommends that the Company report at the end of the first phase of the
 CO₂ Cryogenic Carbon Capture ("CCC") program, before seeking approval of
 funding for the second phase of the program. Does the Company agree with this
 recommendation?

- 32 A. While the Company agrees that it would be useful to provide an interim report to the 33 Commission, the DPU and other interested parties on the results of the first phase of the 34 program, it would not be feasible for the Company to halt work and seek additional 35 approvals before proceeding with the second phase, if the results from Phase One support 36 moving forward. The Company strongly believes that the entire project is needed to 37 determine if a larger scale CCC project is feasible, and to implement the project it needs 38 the cooperation of the Department of Energy for a future full scale deployment. 39 Conditioning moving forward with this partnership on future Commission and 40 stakeholder approval could jeopardize the entire project's viability if it led to delays or 41 doubts about the Company's ability to finance its share of the project now or in the 42 future. The Company commits to work with the regulatory agencies on an informal basis 43 to keep them updated on the program status of Phase One, and the Phase Two 44 implementation.
- 45 Q. Mr. Martinez recommends the Company be required to file reports in accordance
 46 with a STEP Reporting Plan, as outlined in your rebuttal testimony in Phase I of
 47 this proceeding. Do you agree with his recommendation?
- A. Generally, yes. As discussed further below, the Company has a few concerns specifically
 related to quantifying benefits for the Commercial Line Extension Program, but the
 Company appreciates Mr. Martinez's support for the STEP Reporting Plan as described
 in my Phase One rebuttal testimony.

Page 2 - Rebuttal Testimony of Steven R. McDougal

52 COMMERCIAL LINE EXTENSION PROGRAM

- Q. Ms. Tuttle recommends that the Company include analysis quantifying the benefits
 of the Line Extension Program in the STEP report, and provide annual reports
 showing how the incentives from Regulation 13 are being used for each year of the
 pilot program. Does the Company agree with these recommendations?
- A. Generally, yes. The Company will provide annual reports detailing how the incentives
 are being used in each year of the pilot program. The Company will also provide detail
 comparing the amount of commercial load growth before and after the pilot program was
 implemented, and also comparing Utah's commercial load growth to the other states in its
 service territory. The Company will work informally with the regulatory agencies on
 other information needs regarding the Line Extension Program.
- Q. Mr. Martinez proposes that the program report include information quantifying
 whether the Line Extension Program is providing benefits to customers, and should
 contain a number of different elements, including: (1) the development of an
 historical benchmark; (2) a cost comparison methodology; (3) program
 expenditures; (4) cost savings; (5) explanation of results; and (6) percentage of
 projects with electric vehicle infrastructure development. Does the Company agree
 to provide additional reporting on the Line Extension Program?
- A. Generally, yes. As described in my response to Ms. Tuttle's recommendations, the
 Company is willing to work informally with the parties to identify meaningful cost
 comparison data. The Company believes the program is in the interest of customers and
 is consistent with the legislation. The Company appreciates the support of the OCS and
 DPU for the program.

Page 3 - Rebuttal Testimony of Steven R. McDougal

75 Q. Does the Company support the changes to the "Provisions of Service" section in

76 **Regulation No. 13 proposed by Mr. Martinez?**

- 77 A. The Company agrees that some clarification was needed. The Company proposes to
- 78 change the Provisions of Service section as follows:

79 To be eligible for the 20 percent reduction in their advance the developer 80 must enter into a line extension contract as provided in Regulation 12. If the development is to be constructed in phases, the backbone request 81 82 must be for installation of the backbone for that phase, otherwise it must 83 be for installation of the backbone for the entire development. In either case the design will include capacity for future development. Developers 84 85 that are building on lots are may be required to install conduit from either 86 Company or Developer primary voltage power source(s) to future electric 87 vehicle charging locations on their property for not less than 2 percent of their parking spaces. 88

The Company does not believe that it is necessary to add "that include parking," as proposed by Mr. Martinez, because all commercial or industrial buildings will have parking. Further, the Company does not believe that it is necessary to add a paragraph regarding charging stations because if there is no power in the area (which is where backbone infrastructure is installed), there are no existing charging stations in the area.

94 CON

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

95 Q. Ms. Bowman makes a number of recommendations regarding allowing increased
 96 access to data to stakeholders and regulators, and that the Company prepare a
 97 report outlining key findings when the programs have been implemented. Does the
 98 Company agree with Ms. Bowman's recommendations?

A. Yes. The Company appreciates all of the stakeholder input it has received from the parties to this docket. The Company believes that sharing information from STEP programs will allow the parties to work together on future projects that support grid modernization and future innovative technology programs. The Company would also reiterate that, in this time of greatly increased cybersecurity threats and hacking attempts, it will continue to work to safeguard sensitive customer and system information from

Page 4 - Rebuttal Testimony of Steven R. McDougal

- 105 unauthorized access, and it does not support distributing confidential customer
- 106 information as a routine reporting requirement.

107 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

108 A. Yes.