BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

)

)

)

IN THE MATTER OF AVISTA CORPORATION'S APPLICATION TO UPDATE ELECTRIC LINE EXTENSION SCHEDULE 51 AND ALLOWANCES.

CASE NO. AVU-E-14-02 ORDER NO. 33031

On March 14, 2014, Avista Corporation filed a tariff advice to revise the Company's Electric Line Extension Schedule 51. The Company proposes to update both its line extension costs and the developer/builder allowances that apply to new residential, commercial, and industrial customers' services. The proposed changes would take effect on May 1, 2014.

Although the Company initially filed a tariff advice, the Company and Commission Staff later agreed that the tariff advice—that proposes to update electric line extension allowances that were last set in 2001—should be processed as an application so interested persons could file comments under the Commission's Modified Procedure rules.

On April 1, 2014, the Commission issued a Notice of Application and Notice of Modified Procedure setting an April 22, 2014 comment deadline. *See* Order no. 33003. Staff filed the only comments and the Company concurred with them. *See* Comments of the Commission Staff; Concurrence in Staff's Comments.

Having reviewed the record, we issue this Order approving an updated Schedule 51 based on new line extension costs and allowances as follows.

THE APPLICATION

With its Application, the Company proposes to revise Schedule 51 by updating the costs it incurs to extend electric lines to new customers. It also proposes to update its allowance to developers and builders against those costs. By way of background, the Company annually updates the cost of line extensions (e.g., the cost of transformers and lines) to new customers that are recovered through base rates. Developers and builders who request the line extension must pay for any costs above the Company's line extension allowance. But, while the Company has annually updated its line extension costs, it has not updated the line extension allowance since 2001. The Company now seeks to update both the line extension costs and allowances. The Company's proposed updates and how the Company expects them to impact residential developments are summarized below.

A. Proposed Line Extension Costs

The Company proposes to revise its Schedule 51 line extension costs to reflect its new Construction & Material Standards and the actual costs for materials and labor used to extend lines in 2013. The Company updated its Construction & Material Standards to meet heightened standards contained in the 2012 National Electric Safety Code (NESC). For example, the 2012 NESC sets higher strength standards for guy-supported wood poles and requires upgrades to guy wire insulation. The Company's proposed cost updates also reflect that transformer costs have significantly increased. *See* Application at 1-2.

B. Proposed Line Extension Allowances

The Company also proposes to increase the developer/builder allowances that were last set in 2001. *See* Order No. 28562. The allowances vary by customer class. The Company's current and proposed allowances are:

Service Schedule	Current Allowance	Proposed Allowance
Schedule 1 Individual Customer (per unit)	\$1,000	\$1,600
Schedule 1 Duplex (per unit)	\$800	\$1,275
Schedule 1 Multiplex (per unit)	\$600	\$975
Schedule 11/12 (per kWh)	\$0.10703	\$0.13766
Schedule 21/11 (per kWh)	\$0.06000	\$0.11657
Schedule 31/32 (per kWh)	\$0.6000	\$0.19689

The Company explains that it calculated the proposed allowances using an embedded-cost methodology. The Company believes this methodology ensures that the Company's investment in distribution/terminal facilities for each new customer will equal the embedded costs of the same facilities that were used to calculate base rates. Any costs exceeding the allowance will be paid by the developer/builder as a contribution in aid of construction (CIAC). The Company says that it calculated embedded costs based on the cost-of-service study from its last general rate case (AVU-E-12-01) as updated to account for the settlement agreement in that case. *Id.* at 2.

C. Impact to Residential Developments

The Company claims its proposed changes would lower developer/builder payments for line extensions in residential developments as follows:

Residential Developments		
Filing – Development Summary	<u>2013</u>	<u>2014</u>
Total Cost per Lot	\$1,716	\$1,598
Less: Service Cost	<u>\$469</u>	\$485
Developer Responsibility	<u>\$1,247</u>	<u>\$1,113</u>
Developer Non-refundable Payment	\$247	-
Developer Refundable Payment	\$1,000	\$1,113
Builder Payment	\$469	\$ 0

Id. at 3.

STAFF COMMENTS

Commission Staff reviewed the Company's Application and recommended some adjustments to the Company's proposed costs and allowances. The Company concurs with Staff's recommendations. The recommendations are summarized below.

A. Recommended Line Extension Costs

Staff recommended some adjustments to the Company's proposed line extension costs. As an initial matter, Staff notes that the Company changed how it calculates construction costs and cost reduction credits after 2013. For example, in 2013 the Company included trenching costs in the Company's construction costs and cost reduction credits. But the Company's proposed costs and credits omit these costs because developers have always provided their own trenching.¹ In addition, the Company's proposed tariff accounts for the costs of complying with the updated 2012 NESC standards. Furthermore, the Company moved some cost components from 2013 categories to new cost categories. For example, while 2013 transformer cost category includes only transformer equipment costs, the Company's proposed transformer cost category also includes transformer installation costs. Although these above changes made it difficult for Staff to compare the Company's existing and proposed construction costs and credits, Staff believes the changes were reasonable.

Because the Company changed how it calculates construction costs and cost reduction credits after 2013, Staff compared the Company's proposed, individual construction cost components to similar cost components from the prior year. Staff reports that the

¹ As the cost reduction credits for developer-provided trenching are not needed, Staff removed \$546 in trenching credits from the Company's average underground primary and secondary distribution costs (although the cost to inspect the trench remains). Staff's adjustment reduces the total weighted average cost while increasing the underground primary and secondary credits by \$0.13 and \$0.21 per lot.

Company's average transformer installation cost per lot changed the most and increased by 51% because: (1) each transformer's cost increased; (2) the Company moved fixed costs from primary distribution costs to transformer costs; and (3) the Company incurred greater costs to satisfy the more rigorous NESC standards. Staff opines that these changes and increases are reasonable. Staff also reports that the Company's distribution and service costs per lot increased or decreased with the average length of an installation. For example, the cost to install underground primary distribution facilities decreased because the average installation length decreased. On the other hand, the cost to install underground secondary distribution and service lines increased because the average installation length decreased because the average installation and service lines increased because the average installation length decreased because the average installation and service lines increased because the average installation length decreased because the average installation and service lines increased because the average installation and service lines increased because the average installation length decreased because the average installation and service lines increased because the average installation length decreased because the average install

Based on its analysis, Staff recommended some adjustments to the Company's proposed line extension costs. Staff's recommended adjustments combine with the Company's proposal to decrease total line extension costs by 7%, from \$1,716 per lot to \$1,596 per lot. This decrease mainly occurs because primary distribution costs are 73% less than they were in 2013 (although the costs of secondary distribution, transformers, and service drops have increased). The table below summarizes the Company's approved costs, the Company's proposed costs, and Staff's recommended adjustments:

				2013 to 201	4 Revised
		2014	2014		
Per Lot Cost (\$)	2013	Company Filing	Revised (No Trenching)	\$ Difference	% Difference
Primary Distribution Cost	1,227	511	333	(894)	-73%
Secondary Distribution Cost	255	424	308	53	21%
Transformer	311	470	470	159	51%
Total Weighted Avg Cost (Trenching by Developer)	1,793	1,405	1,111	(682)	-38%
Trenching Credit	(546)	(292)	0	546	-100%
Total Developer Cost	1,247	1,113	1,111	(136)	-11%
Service Drop Cost	469	485	485	16	3%
Total Builder/Developer Cost	1,716	1,598	1,596	(120)	-7%

Change in Developer and Builder Cost

Staff's adjustments to the Company's proposed construction costs and cost reduction credits are further detailed in Attachment A to this Order. Staff opines that the adjusted costs and credits are reasonable and should be approved by the Commission.

B. Recommended Line Extension Allowances

Staff also analyzed the Company's proposed line extension allowance. Staff explains that the Company uses the allowance to credit developers and builders for the upfront distribution and terminal facility line extension costs that the Company recovers through base rates. The Commission set the current allowance in 2001. *See* Case No. AVU-E-00-01. Staff notes that in the present case, the Company updates its allowances using the same method that Staff used to calculate the allowances in Case No. AVU-E-00-01. Applying this calculation method here, the Company proposes increasing all allowances—except Schedule 31/32—from 29% (Schedule 11/12) to 94% (Schedule 21/22) above 2001 levels. Staff finds the updated allowances to be about equal to the fully embedded cost of the same facilities used to calculate base rates for each customer class. Because of this, and because 12 years of growth and inflation have affected the total embedded cost, Staff believes the Company's proposed increases are reasonable.

However, while Staff agrees with the Company's calculation method, Staff believes the Company incorrectly applied that method in one respect. Specifically, Staff says the Company's proposed allowance includes certain service meter costs even though Schedule 51 excludes all meter costs. Staff thus recommended removing all meter costs from the proposed line extension allowance to ensure the allowance is consistent with Schedule 51. The currently approved allowance, Company's proposed allowance, and Staff's proposed adjusted allowance are shown below:

Service Schedule	Company's Current Allowance	Company's Proposed Allowance	Staff's Proposed Allowance
Schedule 1 Individual Customer (per unit)	\$1,000	\$1,600	\$1,550
Schedule 1 Duplex (per unit)	\$800	\$1,275	\$1,240
Schedule 1 Multiplex (per unit)	\$600	\$975	\$930
Schedule 11/12 (per kWh)	\$0.10703	\$0.13766	\$0.12868
Schedule 21/22 (per kWh)	\$0.06000	\$0.11657	\$0.11874
Schedule 31/32 (per kWh)	\$0.6000	\$0.19689	\$0.19279

Staff's proposed, adjusted line extension allowances are further described in Attachments B through E to this Order.

Staff says the adjusted \$1,550 per lot allowance would apply to residential developments as follows. The first \$1,111 of the allowance would eliminate the total developer cost and reduce current rates by that amount. The remaining \$439 of the allowance would be credited to builders against the \$485 cost of a service drop for each lot, which decreases the

builder's remaining cost to \$46 per lot for a 90% decrease from current rates. The following table summarizes these impacts:

		r		2013 to 2014	4 Revised
		2014	2014		
Per Lot Cost (\$)	2013	Company Filing	Revised (No Trenching)	\$ Difference	% Difference
Total Developer Cost	1,247	1,113	1,111	(136)	-11%
Allowance (not to exceed cost)	1,000	1,113	1,111	111	11%
Remaining Developer Cost	247	0	0	(247)	-100%
Total Builder Cost	469	485	485	16	3%
Left-over allowance	0	485	439	439 *	n/a
Remaining Builder Cost	469	0	46	(423)	-90%
Total Allowance	1,000	1,600	1,550	550	55%
Total Allowance Used	1,000	1,598	1,550	550	55%
Unused Allowance	0	2	0	0	n/a

Developer and Builder Cost Impact

Besides adjusting the proposed allowance in this case, Staff also recommended the Company regularly seek to update those allowances to ensure any changes are gradual and better represent the costs embedded in base rates. Because the Company would calculate the allowance based on input from the Company's last general rate case, Staff recommended that the Company seek to update the allowances whenever a new general rate case concludes. The Company could apply to update the allowances when it files its annual Schedule 51 Line Extension Cost updates.

C. Summary of Staff Recommendations

In summary, Staff recommended the Commission approve the revised 2014 Schedule 51 Tariff Construction Costs and Cost Reduction Credits contained in the Attachment to this Order, and the following allowances, effective May 1, 2014:

Service Schedule	<u>Allowance</u>
Schedule 1 Individual Customer (per unit)	\$1,550
Schedule 1 Duplex (per unit)	\$1,240
Schedule 1 Multiplex (per unit)	\$930
Schedule 11/12 (per kWh)	\$0.12868
Schedule 21/22 (per kWh)	\$0.11874
Schedule 31/32 (per kWh)	\$0.19279

Staff also recommended the Commission direct the Company to seek allowance updates (using the method applied in this case) when the Company files its annual update of Schedule 51 line extension costs after each general rate case.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

We have reviewed the record, including the Application, Staff's comments, and Avista's concurrence in Staff's comments. We find that Avista is an electrical and gas corporation, and that we have jurisdiction and authority over Avista and the issues in this case under Title 61 of the Idaho Code and the Commission's Rules of Procedure, IDAPA 31.01.01.000, *et seq.*

We also find the Company's proposed changes to Schedule 51, as adjusted by Staff, are fair, just, and reasonable and we approve those changes with a May 1, 2014 effective date. In making this finding, we specifically approve of the method that the parties used to calculate the updated allowances in this case. That method ensures the allowances will roughly equal the fully embedded facilities cost used to calculate base rates for each customer class. This, in turn, ensures that new customer-related distribution costs will not drive revenue requirement and base rate increases, and that new customers will pay the cost of new distribution facilities that benefit them. We further find that removing service meter costs from the Company's proposed line extension allowances is reasonable and consistent with Schedule 51's exclusion of meter costs.

Lastly, we find it is reasonable, and we direct the Company, to seek allowance updates (using the methodology used for this case) with the annual update of Schedule 51 line extension costs after each general rate case. Updating the line extension allowances in this manner will ensure that any changes are gradual and are informed by input obtained during the general rate case.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Company shall update Schedule 51 to reflect updated line extension costs and allowances as described in this Order. These changes and the new Schedule 51 shall take effect May 1, 2014. The Company shall promptly file conforming tariffs, and shall take such other action as directed above.

THIS IS A FINAL ORDER. Any person interested in this Order may petition for reconsideration within twenty-one (21) days of the service date of this Order. Within seven (7) days after any person has petitioned for reconsideration, any other person may cross-petition for reconsideration. *See Idaho Code* § 61-626.

7

DONE by Order of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission at Boise, Idaho this 30^{th} day of April 2014.

PAUL KJELLANDER, PRESIDENT

MACK A. REDFORD, COMMISSIONER

MARSHA H. SMITH, COMMISSIONER

ATTEST:

Jean D. Jewell

Commission Secretary

O:AVU-E-14-02_kk2

	41.2%	-28.5%	38.5%	-35.5%	61 1%	-10.0%	6.2%	217%	6 2%	21 1%	23.5%	-100 0%	-17%	75.2%	levised		% Difference	21.1%	-39.9%	-22.6%	-15.4%	4.7%	-	V Disc	21 Dol	0/017	%0 FE-	3.5%
2013 vs. 2014 Revised <u> 5 Difference</u> (500 54)	(Jag 34) 2.31	(2, 180 36)	3.03	(1 62)	943.47	(184, 16)	0.56	624.94	1 10	50.69	1 66	(239 98)	(0.12)	1,281 39	2013 vs. 2014 Revised		-	19.34	(36.14)	(0.88)	(0.71)	(90.06)		C DIMARANCE CUTA REVISED	Q	01-31- 07 7A	94 14	16.55
2014 Revised 4 215 86	7 92	5,468.41	10.91	2.94	2,487.43	1,656.76	9.58	3,509 24	18.76	290.67	8 71		6.93	2,984 94			2014 KEVISED		54.46	3.02	391	1.23		2014 Bavierd	244 38	07.67	143.05	485.1
2014 Company Filing 4 215 86	7.92	5,468.41	10.01	2.94	2,487 43	1,656.76	9.58	3,509.24	18.76	290.67	8.71		6.93	2,984,94		2014 Company Elline	DU EA		54 33	3 02	3.91	1.23		2014 Company Filing	244.38	97.67	143.05	485.1
<u>2013</u> 4,814 40	5.61	7,648.77	7.88	4.56	1,543.96	1, 840.92	9 02	2,884.30	17,66	239.98	7 05	239 98	7 05	1,703 55	ers	2013	71 41		no na	3.90	4.62	1.29		2013	201.98	50.19	216,38	468.55
<u>Unit</u> per fool	per foot	per foot	per foot	per foot	per unit	per foot	per foot	per foot	per foot	per foot	per foot	per foot	per foot	per unit	Individual Customers	Ibrit	per lot		het IOI	per tool	per foot	per foot		Unit	per lot	per lot		
<u>Cost Type</u> Fixed		Fixed		Valiable	rixea	rixed				Fixed	Vanable	Fixed	Vanable	Fixed	pu	Cost Description	Conduit for Development	Conduit for Development			Utton (Individual Customer)	Conduit (Individual Customer)		Cost Description	Ditch (Indivdual Customer)	Conduit (Individual Customer)	Cable, Etc. (Individual Customer)	
Tariff Construction Cost <u>Type</u> <u>Facility</u> Overhead Primary	Pnmary	3 phase Primary	Sphase Filmary	Jende	Damos	Primary	Pnmary	3-phase Primary	Second Se	secondary	secondary	Service	Service	lranstormer	tion Credits for	Facility	Secondary	Pamary	Sanra		Pumary 10	rumary/servce	it Per Lot	Facility	Service	Service	Service	. Lot
Tariff Const <u>Type</u> Overhead	Overhead	Overnead	Overhead	Overhead	Indominad	Underground 1	nuclean	Ciuciground	Underground	nuceigiound	nucedionuc	nuaerground	nnderground	Underground	Cost Reduc	Type	Underground	Underground	t Indemnund	puncification (niveryiound	Service Cost Per Lot	Type	Underground	Underground	Underground	lotal Cost per Lot

Attachment A Order No. 33031 Case No. AVU-E-14-02

Attachment B Order No. 33031 Case No. AVU-E-14-02

Residentia	Residential (Schedule 1)	0	
# Customers Baio of Bourno	100,853		
	4.000 m		
	Distribution	Terminal	
AVU-E-12-08 Cost of Service Study	Plant	Facilities	Total
Net Plant	98,707,458	41, 191,860	139,899,318
Return on Net Plant	10,557,730	4,405,873	14,963,602
Depreciation Expense	4,536,270	1.721.649	6,257,919
Total	15,094,000	6,127,522	21,221,521
	Distribution	Terminal	
Per Customer Expenses	Plant	Facilities	Total
Net Plant	978 73	408 43	1387 16
Rotum on Nat Plant	104 68	43 69	148.37
Depreciation Expense	44 98	17 07	62 05
Total	149 66	60 76	210.42
Allowable Investment	\$1,104.74	\$448.48	\$1,663.22
Less Meter Cost	\$0.00	20 00	\$0.00
Allowable Investment	\$1,104.74	\$448.48	\$1,553.22

Calculation of Allowance - Schedule Schedule 001	ule 51		
<u>Summary</u> Total Cost per Customer (C18) Return on Common Equity (C4*C27) Debt Costs (C4*E22)	\$\$ \$\$ \$\$	1,387 16 106 69 41.68	
ouvora Depreciation Expense Total Revenue Requirement	ນູທ ທ	148.37 62.05 210.42	
Revenue Requirement Factor Allowable Investment Less Meter Cost	. vs v	13.55% 1,553.22	
TOTAL ALLOWANCE	~ ~	1,553.22	1ndui
<u>Cast per Customer</u> Number of Customers Total Net Plant Distribution Total Net Plant Terminal Facilities Total per Customer	ጥ የኦ የኦ	100,853 98,707,458 41,191,860 1,387.16	input Input
Rate of Return/Capital Structure Long Term Debt Common Equity Long Term Deht Cost	Capit	Capital Structure 50% 50%	
common Equity Return Weighted Debt Cost Weighted Equity Rate of Return before Gross Up		9.01% 9.80% 3.005% 4.9000%	Indu
Gross Up Factor Return on Equity after Gross Up Rate of Return after Gross Up		1.57 7.69% 10.696%	Input
<u>Degreciation</u> Rate for Clistribution Rate for Terminal Facilities Distribution Depreciation Expense Terminal Fac. Depreciation Total Annual Depreciation Weighted Average Depreciation Rate	vs vs	3.05% 2.48% 44.98 17.07 62.05 2.8514%	tindu
Apartments Current Schedule 1 Allowance Current Schedule 1 Allowance Current Multiplex Allowance Ratio of Duplex Lo Residence New Duplex Allowance Ratio of Multiplex to Residence New Multiplex Allowance	v v	1000 800 600 0.8 1,242.58 1,242.58 0.6	1000 Schedule 51 800 Schedule 51 800 Schedule 51 600 Schedule 51 0.8 0.6 1.58

Calculation of Allowance - Schedule 51 Schedule 011/012

Cents Per kWh	\$ 0.1149 \$ 0.0088 \$ 0.0035 \$ 0.0123 \$ 0.0051	\$ 0.0174 13.55% \$ 0.1287 \$ 0.1287 \$ 0.12868	331,376 input \$ 28,362,255 input \$ 9,699,864 input \$ 114.86	Capital Structure 50% Input 50% Input 9.80% Input 3.005% 7.91% 7.51% 1.57 Input 7.69%	3.05% 3.05% \$ 2.42% \$ 1.21 5.15 2.85% Input
Summary	Total Cost per Customer (C18) Return on Common Equity (C4*C27) Debt Costs (C4*E22) Subtotal Depreciation Expense	Total Revenue Requirement Revenue Requirement Factor Allowable Investment Less Meter Cost TOTAL ALLOWANCE	<u>Cost per Customer</u> Annual MWhs Total Net Plant Distribution Total Net Plant Terminal Facilities Total per Customer	Rate of Return/Capital Structure Long Term Debt Common Equity Long Term Debt Cost Common Equity Return Weighted Debt Cost Weighted Equity Rate of Return before Gross Up Gross Up Factor Return on Equity after Gross Up Rate of Return after Gross Up	wate for Distribution Rate for Terminal Facilities Distribution Depreciation Expense Terminal Fac. Depreciation Total Annual Depreciation Weighted Average Depreciation Rate

Annual MWhs 331,376 Rate of Return 10 696% Rate of Return 10 506% AVU-E-12-08 Cosl of Service Study Distribution Net Plant 28,362,255 9,699 Net Plant 3,033,621 1,037 Depreciation Expense 1,303,435 402 Total 1,303,435 1,439 Per Customer Expenses 1,303,435 1,439 Net Plant 0,0856 1,439 Return on Net Plant 1,303,435 402 Total 1,303,435 402 Return on Net Plant 0,0856 0,0 Return on Net Plant 0,0856 0,0 Return on Net Plant 0,0032 0,0 Return on Net Plant 0,0032 0,0 Return on Net Plant 0,0032 0,0	321 976		
of Return 10 696% E-12-08 Cost of Service Study Distribution Plant 28,362,255 Plant 3,033,621 m on Net Plant 3,033,621 eciation Expense 1,303,435 eciation Expenses 1,303,435 Distribution 9,033,635 Customer Expenses 9,033,635 Plant 0 0856 m on Net Plant 0 0032 Customer Expense 0 0032	0/0'100		
E-12-08 Cosl of Service Study Distribution Plant 28,362,255 Plant 3,033,621 m on Net Plant 3,033,621 m on Net Plant 3,033,621 eciation Expense 1,303,435 eciation Expense 1,303,435 Distribution 20,056 Plant 0.0856 Outloner Expenses Plant Distribution 0.0032 Plant 0.0032 Cation Expense 0.0033	10 696%		
E-12-08 Cosl of Service Study Plant Plant 28,362,255 m on Net Plant 3,033,621 m on Net Plant 3,033,621 eciation Expense 1,303,435 existion Expenses 1,303,435 Distribution 9,0356 Plant 0 0856 non Net Plant 0 0032 castion Expense 0 0032	Ĺ	Terminal	
Plant 28,362,255 mon Net Plant 28,362,255 1,303,621 eciation Expense 1,303,435 4,337,056 4,337,056 1,303,435 2,030 1,303,435 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,303,455 1,305 1,303,455 1,305	Plan	Facilities	Total
m on Net Plant 3,033,621 eciation Expense 1,303,435 4,337,056 4,337,056 2.051 Distribution Plant 0 0056 m on Net Plant 0 0002 m on Net Plant 0 0003 eciation Expense 0 0039		9,699,864	38,062,119
eciation Expense 1,303,435 1, 4,337,056 1, 2.0stomer Expenses Plant Fa Plant 0 0856 m on Net Plant 0 0039 m on Net Plant 0 0039 eciation Expense 0 00131		1,037,495	4,071,116
4,337,056 4,337,056 Customer Expenses Distribution Plant Plant 0 0856 m on Net Plant m on Net Plant m on Net Plant ciation Expense 0 0039 eciation Expense 0 0131	1,303,435	402,253	1.705,688
Construction Term Customer Expenses Distribution Clant Plant Plant 0 M 0 M 0 M 0 M 0 M 0 M 0 M 0 M 0		1,439,748	5,776,804
Distribution Termination Customer Expenses Plant Plant 0.0856 Plant 0.0856 m on Net Plant 0.0032 m on Net Plant 0.0033			
Customer Expenses Plant Fac Plant 0 0856 0 Plant 0 0035 0 m on Net Plant 0 0039 0 eciation Expense 0 00131 0	<u> </u>	Terminal	
Plant 0 0856 m on Net Plant 0 0032 eciation Expense 0 0039 0 0131	Plant	Facilities	Total
m on Net Plant 0 0092 eciation Expense 0 0131	0 0856	0 0293	0 1149
eciation Expense 0 0039 0 0131	0.0092	0 0031	0 0123
0 0131	0 0039	0 0012	0 0051
-	0 0131	0 0043	0.0174
Allowable Investment \$0.0966 \$0.0	\$0.0966	\$0.0321	\$0.1287
Less Meter Cast 0 00000 0 00	0 00000	0 0000 0	0.00000
Allowable Investment \$0.09661 \$0.03		\$0.03207	\$0.12868

Calculation of Allowance - Schedule 51 Schedule 021/022

Cents Per kWh	\$ 0.1059	\$ 0.0081	\$ 0.0032	\$ 0.0113	\$ 0.0048	\$ 0.0161	13.55%	\$ 0.1187	S - Innut	\$ 0.11874		676.398 Innut	\$ 61.588.043 Innut			98.cut ¢	Capital Structure
(Zummary Total Cost per Customer (C18)	Return on Common Equity (C4*C27)	Debt Costs (C4*E22)	Subtotal	Depreciation Expense	Total Revenue Requirement	Revenue Requirement Factor	Allowable Investment	Less Meter Cost	TOTAL ALLOWANCE	Cast per Customer	Annual MWhs	Total Net Plant Distribution	Total Net Plant Terminal Facilities	Total per Customer		<u>Rate of Return/Capital Structure</u>

3,222 003 10.880,961

1,071,514 399,589 1,471,103

6,587,445 2,822,414 9,409,859

Depreciation Expense Total

Return on Net Plant

7,658,958

61,588,043 10,017,911 71,605,954

Total

Terminal Facilities

Distribution

Plant

AVU-E-12-08 Cost of Ser Net Plant

Large General (Schedule 21/22)

676,398 10 696%

Rate of Return Annual MWhs

0 0097 0.0042

0.0161

0 0022

0 0139

Depreciation Expense Total

Return on Net Plant

\$0.1187

\$0.0161

\$0.1027

Allowable investment

Less Meter Cost

Altowable investment

0 1059

0.0148

0.0911

Total

Terminal Facilities

Distribution

Per Customer Expenses

Net Plant

<u>Rate of Return/Capital Structure</u>	Capital Structure
Long Term Debt	50% Input
Common Equity	50% Input
Long Term Debt Cost	6.01% Input
Common Equity Return	9.80% Innut
Weighted Debt Cost	3.005%
Weighted Equity	4.9000%
Rate of Return before Gross Up	7.91%
Gross Up Factor	1.57 Input
Return on Equity after Gross Up	7.69%
Rate of Return after Gross Up	10.696%
<u>Depreciation</u> Rate for Distribution Rate for Terminal Facilitues Distribution Depreciation Expense Terminal Fac. Depreciation Total Annual Depreciation Weighted Average Depreciation Rate	3.04% 3.04% \$ 2.17% \$ 4.17 \$ 0.59 4.76 2.85% Input

<u>Depreciation</u> Rate for Distribution	
Rate for Terminal Facilities	
Distribution Depreciation Expense \$	
Terminal Fac. Depreciation Expense \$	
Total Annual Depreciation	
Weighted Average Depreciation Rate	

8	4	٦	
0.0000	\$0.11874		
0.00000	\$0.01605		
0.0000	\$0.10269		

Attachment D	Order No. 33031	Case No. AVU-E-14-02
--------------	-----------------	----------------------

Calculation of Allowance - Schedule 51 Schedule 031/032

Cents Per kWh \$ 0.1719 \$ 0.0032 \$ 0.0052 \$ 0.0052	s 0.0261 13.55% 5 0.1928 5 0.1928	56,445 Input \$7,971,221 Input \$1,732,224 Input \$171.91	Capital Structure 50% Input 50% Input 6.01% Input	9.80% Input 3.005% 4.9000% 7.91% 1.57 Input 7.69% 10.696%
<u>Summary</u> Total Cost per Customer (C18) Return on Common Equity (C4*C27) Debt Costs (C4*E22) Subtotal Depreciation Expense	Total Revenue Requirement Revenue Requirement Factor Allowable Investment Less Meter Cost TOTAL ALLOWANCE	<u>Cost per Customer</u> Annual MWhs Total Net Plant Distribution Total Net Plant Terminal Facilities Total per Customer	<u>Rate of Return/Capital Structure</u> Long Term Debt Common Equity Long Term Debt Cost	Common Equity Return Weighted Debt Cost Weighted Equity Rate of Return before Gross Up Gross Up Factor Return on Equity after Gross Up Rate of Return after Gross Up

3.05%	2.25%	6.49	1.24	7.73	2.85% Input
		s	Ś		
<u>Depreciation</u> Rate for Distribution	Rate for Terminal Facilities	Terminal Factor Sector	Total Annual Fact Depreciation Expense		weighted Average Depreciation Rate

0.0184	0.0261	\$0.1928	0.00000	\$0.19279
0.0033	0.0045	\$0.0334	0.00000	\$0.03339
0.0151	0,0216	\$0.1594	0.0000	\$0.15940

Pumping (Schedule 31/32)	hedule 31/3	12)	
Annual MWhs Rate of Return	56,445 10.696%		
AVU-E-12-08 Cosl of Service Study	Distribution	Terminal Facilities	Total
Net Plant	7.971,221	1,732,224	9,703,445
Return on Net Plant	852,600	185.278	1,037,878
Uepreciation Expense	366,330	70 040	436,370
łotal	1.218,930	255,318	1,474,248
	DisInbution	Terminal	
rei customer Expenses	Plant	Facilities	Total
Net Plani	0.1412	0.0307	0.1719
Relurn on Net Plant	0.0151	0.0033	0.0184
Uepreciation Expense	0.0065	0 0012	0.0077
0131	0,0216	0.0045	0.0261
Allowable Investment	\$0.1594	\$0.0334	\$0.1928
ess: Meter Cosi	0, 00000	0.0000	0.00000
Allowable Investment	\$0.15940	\$0.03339	\$0.19279