Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Revise Rates in Tariff Schedule 98, Renewable Energy Credits Balancing Account

DOCKET NO. 19-035-11

ORDER

ISSUED: May 24, 2019

BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 15, 2019, PacifiCorp dba Rocky Mountain Power (“RMP”) filed an application (“Application”) requesting approval to revise the collection rates for the Renewable Energy Credits (“REC”) Balancing Account (“RBA”) in its Electric Service Schedule No. 98, “REC Revenue Adjustment” (“Schedule 98”). RMP’s Application seeks an increase of approximately $0.3 million, or 0.02 percent, which is the difference between the current Schedule 98 RBA collection level of approximately $0.5 million and the Application’s proposed collection level of approximately $0.8 million. RMP requests an effective date of June 1, 2019 for the change. RMP’s Application includes proposed modifications to Schedule 98, Sheet No. 98.

Pursuant to the Public Service Commission’s (“PSC”) March 29, 2019 Scheduling Order, Notice of Hearings, and Tariff Status (“Scheduling Order”), the Division of Public Utilities (“DPU”) filed comments on April 25, 2019. No other party filed comments in this docket.

On May 16, 2019, the PSC’s designated Presiding Officer conducted a hearing to consider the Application. RMP and the DPU participated and testified. The Application and supporting evidence are uncontested and briefly summarized below.
RMP’s proposed modification to Schedule 98 rates allocates the RBA revenue requirement variance to the various rate schedules over a one-year period, beginning June 1, 2019. RMP determined the proposed 2019 RBA revenue requirement of $0.836 million owed to RMP by adjusting the year end 2017 REC revenue deferral balance of $0.062 million owed to RMP by the following items: 2018 Actual REC Revenue ($1.28 million); 10 percent retention incentive on incremental REC sales (-$0.128 million); 2018 Leaning Juniper Contract Revenue ($0.003 million); 2018 REC Revenues in base rates (-$2.0 million); 2017 REC revenue surcredit (-$0.105 million); estimated Schedule 98 surcharge – January 2019 through May 2019 ($0.225 million); carrying charges for 2018 deferral period (-$0.033 million); and carrying charges for the interim period of January 2019 through May 2019 (-$0.017 million). RMP’s testimony in support of its Application presents the actual 2018 REC revenues used to set rates in this docket, the calculation of the RBA balance for the various deferral periods, the proposed rate spread for the various deferral periods, and the final rate design.

With the exceptions noted below, RMP proposes to allocate the 2019 RBA deferral revenue to be collected from customers consistent with the Step 2 base RBA revenues the PSC approved in Docket No. 13-035-184, RMP’s 2014 general rate case (“2014 General Rate Case”).

Consistent with past RBA filings, RMP proposes certain modifications to rate spread. First, RMP calculated the share of the deferred RBA balance for Schedule Nos. 7 (Security Area Lighting

---

1 See Exhibit RMP (THS-1) included with the Direct Testimony of Terrell H. Spackman, filed March 15, 2019.

Closed to New Service), 11 (Street Lighting Company-Owned System), 12 (Street Lighting Customer-Owned System), and 15 (Outdoor Nighttime Lighting Service, Traffic and Other Signal System Service Customer-Owned System) by multiplying the total deferred RBA revenue by the percentage of REC revenue allocation the PSC approved for these schedules in Docket No. 12-035-68.\(^3\) RMP asserts this is appropriate because the approved rate spread for these schedules in RMP’s 2014 General Rate Case was zero. Second, the REC revenue allocation for a contract customer, whose contract the PSC approved in Docket No. 17-035-72,\(^4\) is based on the overall 2019 RBA percentage applicable to tariff customers in Utah. Third, consistent with the terms of the contract the PSC approved in Docket No. 16-035-33,\(^5\) Contract Customer 3 is no longer subject to the RBA and therefore RMP does not allocate RBA costs to this customer. RMP then allocates the remaining REC revenue to the other customer classes consistent with the approved rate spread in the corresponding general rate case.

The following table provides a comparison of Schedule 98’s current and proposed RBA refund/collection rates using the above allocation proposal.

---


\(^4\) Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of [the] Electric Service Agreement between PacifiCorp and Nucor-Plymouth Bar Division, a Division of Nucor Corporation, Docket No. 17-035-72 (Order Approving Electric Service Agreement, issued March 23, 2018).

\(^5\) See In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of an Energy Service Contract between PacifiCorp and Kennecott Utah Copper, LLC, Docket No. 16-035-33 (Order, issued November 28, 2016).
During the hearing, RMP provided a summary of its written testimony. RMP represented the net revenue requirement of $0.836 million to be collected from Utah customers during the period June 1, 2019 through May 31, 2020 was calculated in a manner consistent with previous RBA filings. RMP requests the PSC approve its request to collect this amount on an interim basis, beginning June 1, 2019.
THE DPU’S COMMENTS AND TESTIMONY

The DPU recommends the PSC approve the Application and the proposed changes to Schedule 98 as filed, effective June 1, 2019, on an interim basis until it completes its final audit of the RBA as provided in the Scheduling Order.

According to the DPU, RMP indicated that it is actively marketing RECs through bilateral discussions with counterparties and brokers and plans to issue periodic reverse requests for proposal for RECs.

During the hearing, the DPU testified that RMP’s proposed allocation of the outstanding deferral balance across customer classes is consistent with the rate spread approved in the 2014 General Rate Case with certain modifications. Based on its preliminary review of the Application and its review of corresponding PSC orders, the DPU concludes that, in general, RMP has complied with the PSC’s orders pertaining to Schedule 98 and recommends the PSC approve RMP’s proposed revisions to Schedule 98 on an interim basis.

DISCUSSION, FINDINGS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on the Application, the evidence presented at hearing, and the recommendation of the DPU, we find the Application is reasonable and conclude it is consistent with our prior orders and applicable statutes. Accordingly, the requested Schedule 98 rate changes are approved, effective June 1, 2019, on an interim basis, subject to further review of the DPU’s final audit report and any associated comments.6

---

6 The Scheduling Order in this docket allows parties an opportunity to submit comments on the DPU’s audit report by August 1, 2019 and the opportunity to provide reply comments by August 14, 2019.
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ORDER

1) RMP’s Application for authority to revise Schedule 98 and implement a $0.3 million rate increase is approved as filed on an interim basis, effective June 1, 2019, subject to the PSC’s right to order a refund or surcharge following final review of the DPU’s audit and any associated comments.

2) RMP’s proposed modifications to Schedule 98, Sheet No. 98 are approved on an interim basis.

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, May 24, 2019.

/s/ Michael J. Hammer
Presiding Officer

Approved and Confirmed May 24, 2019 as the Order of the Public Service Commission of Utah.

/s/ Thad LeVar, Chair

/s/ David R. Clark, Commissioner

/s/ Jordan A. White, Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Gary L. Widerburg
PSC Secretary

DW#308431
Pursuant to §§ 63G-4-301 and 54-7-15 of the Utah Code, an aggrieved party may request agency review or rehearing of this Order by filing a written request with the PSC within 30 days after the issuance of this Order. Responses to a request for agency review or rehearing must be filed within 15 days of the filing of the request for review or rehearing. If the PSC does not grant a request for review or rehearing within 20 days after the filing of the request, it is deemed denied. Judicial review of the PSC’s final agency action may be obtained by filing a petition for review with the Utah Supreme Court within 30 days after final agency action. Any petition for review must comply with the requirements of §§ 63G-4-401 and 63G-4-403 of the Utah Code and Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure.
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Steven Snarr (stevensnarr@agutah.gov)
Assistant Utah Attorneys General
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Division of Public Utilities
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Office of Consumer Services
160 East 300 South, 2nd Floor
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
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