BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF)	
PACIFICORP DBA ROCKY MOUNTAIN)	CASE NO. PAC-E-11-07
POWER FOR AUTHORITY TO INCREASE)	
RATES BY \$11.0 MILLION TO RECOVER)	
DEFERRED NET POWER COSTS THROUGH)	ORDER NO. 32216
THE ENERGY COST ADJUSTMENT)	
MECHANISM (ECAM)	_)	

On February 1, 2011, PacifiCorp dba Rocky Mountain Power filed an Application for authority to recover its deferred net power costs pursuant to the Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism (ECAM) approved in Order No. 30904 (Sept. 2009). The ECAM is designed to annually adjust Rocky Mountain's rates upward or downward to reflect the difference between the Company's actual power supply costs and those power costs embedded in base rates. Rocky Mountain's actual costs of providing electric service (its "power supply costs") vary from year to year depending on the Company's fuel (gas and coal) costs, the amount of surplus power sales, the amount of power purchases, and the market price of power. In this Application, the Company is proposing to recover an additional \$11 million in deferred net power costs starting April 1, 2011, and ending March 31, 2012. The energy cost adjustment rates are contained in service Schedule No. 94. Rocky Mountain filed supporting testimony and requested that its Application be processed by Modified Procedure.

On February 17, 2011, the Commission issued Order No. 32187 seeking public comment on Rocky Mountain's ECAM Application. In Order No. 32187, the Commission set a comment deadline of March 16, 2011, and reply comments (if any) deadline of March 23, 2011. In response to the Commission's Order, comments were filed by approximately 20 customers as well as the Commission Staff. Rocky Mountain filed reply comments.

BACKGROUND

A. The ECAM

The ECAM is designed to recover all components of net power costs as traditionally defined in the Company's general rate cases and modeled in its production dispatch model: GRID. The ECAM is calculated to collect or credit the accumulated difference between total Company base net power costs ("Base NPC") and the total Company actual net power costs

("Actual NPC") incurred to serve customers in Idaho calculated on a cents-per-kilowatt-hour basis. In this case the Company requests authority to recover its net power costs for the 12-month deferred period December 1, 2009 to November 30, 2010. Application at 1. The annual ECAM surcharge or credit is combined with the Company's base rates to produce a customer's overall energy rate. The ECAM rate adjustment is applicable to all customer classes excluding tariff contract customers.¹

The ECAM rate component is in effect for one year, usually from April 1 through March 31 of the following calendar year. The mechanism addresses only power cost expenses. Specifically, base and actual NPC will include costs typically booked to the following Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) accounts:

Account 447 – Sales for resale, excluding on-system wholesale sales and other revenues that are not modeled in GRID.

Account 501 – Fuel, steam generation, excluding fuel handling, start-up fuel/gas,² diesel fuel, residual disposal and other costs that are not modeled in GRID.

Account 503 – Steam from other sources.

Account 547 – Fuel, other generation.

Account 555 – Purchased power, excluding BPA residential exchange credit pass-through, if applicable.

Account 565 – Transmission of electricity by others (wheeling).

In addition to the comparison between actual NPC to base NPC, the ECAM includes four additional components: (1) the load growth adjustment rate (LGAR); (2) a credit for the sale of SO2 emission credits; (3) an adjustment for coal stripping costs; and (4) a renewable resource adder for renewable resources not yet in rate base.

Under the ECAM, the Company and its ratepayers "share" the differences between the actual NPC and base NPC, SO2 sales, and LGAR revenues. The sharing percentage is 90% for ratepayers and 10% for the Company. In good years, Rocky Mountain's Idaho customers are

¹ Monsanto and Agrium are not subject to any ECAM surcharges/credits until after January 1, 2011. Order No. 30482 (Case No. PAC-E-07-05).

² Start-up fuel is accounted for separately from the primary fuel for steam-powered generation plants. Start-up costs are not accounted for separately for natural gas plants, and therefore all fuel for natural gas plants is included in the determination of both base NPC and actual NPC.

credited with 90% of the below-normal cost savings. In high-cost years, Idaho customers pay 90% of the Company's abnormal power supply costs. In last year's ECAM case, the Commission approved recovery of approximately \$2.0 million in deferred net power costs for the first ECAM deferral period from July 1, 2009 to November 30, 2009. Order No. 31033.

B. The Current Application

The current Application represents an increase of \$11.0 million over the Schedule 94 ECAM rates currently in effect. Application at 2. The current Application would recover the deferred power supply costs for the 12-month period ending November 30, 2010. Application at ¶ 12. As shown in the table below, the Company is requesting authority to recover a total of \$12.8 million (existing \$1.8 million + \$11 million proposed increase).

The ECAM includes a deferral for renewable resources that recognizes the Company's investments in renewable generation projects that are not yet being recovered in Idaho rates, even though these projects provide significant benefits to customers. Specifically, the adjustment recognizes that actual NPC were reduced by power generated from these renewable generation projects.³ Pursuant to Commission Order No. 30904, the Commission approved a renewable resource adjustment of \$55 per megawatt-hour (MWh) multiplied by the actual MWh output generated by the renewable resources that were not included in rate base in Case No. PAC-E-08-07. *Id.* at ¶ 20.

The components making up the deferred ECAM balance are reflected in the following table:

NPC Differential for Deferral	\$ 6,073,522
LGAR	5,286,046
SO2 Credit	(93,906)
EITF 04-6 Adjustment	(108,588)
Total	\$11,157,074
	90%
Customer Responsibility	\$10,041,366
Renewable Resource Adder	2,696,763
Unamortized Previous Balance	760,036
Interest	61,885
November 2010 Deferral Balance	\$13,560,051
Less ECAM Balance	(760,036)
Proposed ECAM Recovery	\$12,800,015

Source: Dir. Testimony at 10.

³ The renewable wind resources included in this Application are: Glenrock; Glenrock II; Seven Mile; Seven Mile II; Rolling Hills; High Plains; McFadden Ridge; and Dunlap. Dir. Testimony at 8.

The Company calculates that the change in ECAM rates in Schedule 94, if approved, will result in an overall increase of 7.4% or \$11 million for the ECAM year (April 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012). As proposed, the ECAM will increase the following rates schedules:

Residential Customers (Schedule 1) - a 6.1% increase, i.e., approximately \$5.00 per month for the average residential home using 839 kWh per month.

Residential Time-of-Day (Schedule 36): 7.5%

Irrigation Customers (Schedule 10): 7.9%

General Service

Schedule 23/23A: 7.1%
Schedule 6/6A: 8.6%
Time-of-Day (Schedule 35): 11.2%
High Voltage (Schedule 9): 10.9%
Commercial/Industrial (Schedule 19): 8.2%

Public Street Lighting (Schedules 7/7A, 11, 12): 2.8%

COMMENTS

A. Customer Comments

The Commission received comments from approximately 20 customers. The customer comments uniformly opposed the Company's rate increase. In opposing the Company's ECAM rate increase, most customers noted that the Company had just received an increase in its base rates about three months ago. Other low-income and fixed-income customers argued that the Company should reduce its expenses thereby mitigating the need for any rate increase.

B. Staff Comments

After auditing Rocky Mountain's Application and workpapers, Staff agreed with the Company's calculation regarding the various ECAM accounts. However, Staff recommended one adjustment to the proposed recovery mechanism. More specifically, Staff recommended that the Commission amortize the recovery of the load growth adjustment amount of \$5.286 million over a two-year period instead of recovering this amount in one year. Staff's proposal, in essence, would defer recovery of about \$2.64 million until 2012.

Staff noted that during the 12-month deferral period ending November 30, 2010, actual Idaho load decreased 12.52% from the 2007 normalized 12-month period. Given this

unique situation of loads decreasing while power costs increase, Staff proposed that the load growth adjustment be amortized over two years for the following reasons. First, Rocky Mountain recently received a general rate increase of approximately 6.78%. Amortizing the load growth adjustment over two years would decrease the average increase in this case from about 7.4% to 5.8%. Even with these adjustments the accumulation of the two increases is significant.

Second, the Commission recently issued an Order changing the Company's load growth adjustment rate (LGAR) mechanism. The affect of this change reduces the LGAR by about 75% (Case No. GNR-E-10-03, Order No. 32206). The lower LGAR will result in a smaller deferral amount for next year's load growth adjustment even if loads decline again this year. Third, Staff also proposed that the second year's amortization be carried in the deferral balance with interest for future recovery. Finally, because the two tariff contract customers are not subject to the ECAM rate adjustments that accumulated prior to January 1, 2011, Staff recommended these customers should not be assessed any of the amortized portion of the load growth adjustment for the 24-month amortization period.

Based upon Staff's proposal regarding the load growth adjustment, the ECAM recovery for the first year would be reduced by about \$2.39 million or approximately 18.58%. Attachment B to Staff's comments shows the Staff rate calculations for the adjustment described above. Staff proposed the following ECAM rates:

Secondary Distribution Rate

Primary Distribution Rate

0.569¢/kWh

0.550¢/kWh

Transmission Rate

0.535¢/kWh

C. Company Reply

The Company filed reply comments on March 23, 2011.⁴ In its reply comments, the Company stated that it does not object to Staff's recommendation to amortize the recovery of the LGAR component over a two-year period. Reply at 2. The Company agreed with Staff's first two observations regarding the reduction in the LGAR amount for next year and acknowledged that the renewable resource adder "will not be included in the ECAM in the future." *Id*.

While the Company appreciated Staff's efforts to mitigate the price increases, the Company expressed some concern that pushing additional costs into future years "runs the risk of only compounding similar increases next year." *Id.* Based upon the Company's recently filed

⁴ On March 24, 2011, the Company filed an erratum to page 3 of its reply comments.

general rate case in Wyoming, Rocky Mountain expects that the net power costs attributable to Idaho may increase by approximately \$19 million above base rates next year. *Id.* at 3. This would result in an ECAM increase for next year of more than \$9 million, plus the \$2 million deferral of the load growth adjustment amount plus the associated interest. The Company also noted that it does not expect to match the level of credit flowing from the sale of renewable energy credits for next year. *Id.* at 3.

The Company also noted that Staff's proposed adjustment did "not specify what interest rate should be applied." The Company assumes and agrees that interest to the LGAR deferral amount should be set at the customer deposit rate.

	RMP	STAFF
ITEM	PROPOSAL	PROPOSAL
NPC Differential for Deferral	\$ 6,073,522	\$ 6,073,522
LGAR	5,286,046	2,643,023
SO2 Credit	(93,906)	(93,906)
EITF 04-6 Adjustment	(108,588)	(108,588)
Total	\$11,157,074	\$ 8,514,051
	90%	90%
Customer Responsibility	\$10,041,366	\$ 7,662,646
Renewable Resource Adder	2,696,763	2,696,763
Unamortized Previous Balance	760,036	760,036
Interest	<u>61,885</u>	61,885
November 2010 Deferral Balance	\$13,560,051	\$11,181,330
Less ECAM Balance	(760,036)	(760,036)
Proposed ECAM Recovery	\$12,800,015	\$10,421,294

Source: Dir. Testimony at 10.

FINDINGS

Based upon our review of the Application and the comments, we first find that there is agreement between the Company and Staff regarding the ECAM accounts. Although the public comments urged us to reject the Company's Application, the Commission instituted the ECAM in 2009 to allow the variations in power supply costs to be recognized on an annual basis. We affirm the adoption of this process as the preferred way to address these cost variations. However, we find it reasonable to mitigate this year's proposed increase by adopting Staff's recommendation to amortize the recovery of the load growth adjustment amount over two years instead of recovering this amount in one year. Deferring half of the load growth amount will postpone recovery of about \$2.64 million until the next year. Adopting this adjustment decreases the average increase in this case from 7.4% to 5.8%. We understand and appreciate the

Company's concern regarding deferral of additional costs into future years. We believe that it is appropriate in this case to mitigate this rate increase for Rocky Mountain customers. Consequently, Rocky Mountain may recover \$10,421,294 in deferred net power supply costs during the 12-month period beginning April 1, 2011.

We further find that it is reasonable that the deferred LGAR amount (\$2,643,023) accrue interest at the customer deposit rate set out in Utility Customer Relations Rule 106, IDAPA 31.21.01.106. We also find that the two tariff customers (Monsanto and Agrium) are not subject to the ECAM rate adjustments for this year or the LGAR deferral amount carried over to the second year of the two-year period (April 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013).

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that PacifiCorp dba Rocky Mountain Power's Application for authority to recover its deferred net power costs through the ECAM is approved as modified above. The LGAR component of the ECAM shall be recovered over a two-year period.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Rocky Mountain defer \$2,643,023 of the load growth adjustment amount to the next ECAM deferral period. This LGAR deferral amount will accrue interest at the customer deposit rate set out in Utility Customer Relations Rule 106, IDAPA 31.21.01.106. In addition, the recovery of this deferred amount shall not apply to Monsanto and Agrium.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Rocky Mountain file a new Schedule 94 conforming to the rates set out on page 5 of this Order and on line 30 of Appendix A. The revised Schedule 94 shall be filed with the Commission within seven days of this Order. The revised Schedule 94 rates shall become effective for service rendered on and after April 1, 2011.

THIS IS A FINAL ORDER. Any person interested in this Order (or in issues finally decided by this Order) or in interlocutory Orders previously issued in this Case No. PAC-E-11-07 may petition for reconsideration within twenty-one (21) days of the service date of this Order with regard to any matter decided in this Order or in interlocutory Orders previously issued in this case. Within seven (7) days after any person has petitioned for reconsideration, any other person may cross-petition for reconsideration. See *Idaho Code* § 61-626.

DONE by Order of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission at Boise, Idaho this $3/\sqrt{3}$ day of March 2011.

JIM D. KEMPTON, PRESIDENT

MARSHA H. SMITH, COMMISSIONER

MACK A. REDFORD, COMMISSIONER

ATTEST:

Commission Secretary

bls/O:PAC-E-11-07_dh2

COMMISSION STAFF - ATTACHMENT B ESTIMATED IMPACT OF PROPOSED ECAM ADJUSTMENT FROM ELECTRIC SALES TO ULTIMATE CONSUMERS DISTRIBUTED BY RATE SCHEDULES IN IDAHO 12 MONTHS ENDING DECEMBER 2010

29 30 31	28	27	26	25	24	23	ß	21	20	19	1 8	17	6	15	14	13	12	11 6	; v	00	7	6	s	4	ιJ	2			Š	Line	
¹ Equal to MWh sales by voltage times the corresponding loss factors in this line: ² Total Proposed ECAM Revenue (\$000) and Rate by Voltage (cents/kWh): ³ Equal to MWh sales by voltage times the corresponding present rate in this line:	Total Sales to Ultimate Customers (excluding Contracts 1&2)	Total Sales to Ultimate Customers	Total Public Street Lighting	AGA Revenue	Street Lighting - Customer	Street Lighting - Company	Security Area Lighting (R&F)	Security Area Lighting	Public Street Lighting	Total Commercial & Industrial	AGA Revenue	Special Contract 2	Special Contract 1	General Service Optional TOD	Subtotal-Schedule 23	General Service (R&F)	General Service	Comm. & Ind. Space Heating	General Service - High Voltage	Subtotal-Schedule 6	General Svc Lg. Power (R&F)	General Service - Large Power	Commercial & Industrial	Total Residential	AGA Revenue	Residential Optional TOD	Residential Sales Residential Service	3	Description		
ecorresp and Rate corresp	%	ø		Į	12	Ξ	7 _A	7			ı			35		23A	23	19	, vo		6A	δ			ı	36	jad	2	Sch.		
onding loss far by Voltage (o onding present	72,715	72,717	710	1	323	30	153	204		14,451	I		per d	Ų,	8,186	1,494	6,692	4,810 135	12	1,302	243	1,059		57,556	1	15,050	42,506	(3)	Cust	Average	
ctors in this line: ents/kWh): rate in this line:	1,839,250	3,325,873	2,809	0	2,313	101	131	264		2,614,750	0	101,450	1,385,173	1,883	153,201	18,907	134,294	545,290 7,769	106,486	313,498	33,001	280,497		708,314	0	280,407	427,907	4	HWM		
	146,394	216,527	601	\$0	\$407	\$44	\$52	\$97		152,237	\$681	\$4,884	\$65,249	\$99	12,864	\$1,648	\$11,216	\$41,007 \$563	\$5,432	21,458	\$2,496	\$18,962		63,689	2	\$22,027	\$41,658	(5)	(\$000)	Rev	Present
1.10148 0.569 0.100	1,690,562	1,690,562	2,809		2,313	101	131	264		979,439				1,883	152,470	18,907	133,563	545,290 7,769		272,028	33,001	239,026		708,314		280,407	427,907	9	s	3	
1.06475 0.550 0.093	42,202	42,202	0							42,202					731		731			41,470		41,470		0				Э	P	MWh by Voltage	At Meter
1.03605 0.535 0.091	106,486	1,593,109	0							1,593,109		101,450	1,385,173		0				106,486	0				0				(8)	T	Pe	
0.517	2,017,380	3,557,596	3,094		2,548	111	144	291		2,774,308		105,107	1,435,109	2,074	168,721	20,826	147,895	600,626 8,557	110,325	343,788	36,350	307,438		780,193		308,862	471,331	9	MWh1	Generation	At
\$10,421	10,421	10,421	16		\$13	\$1	\$1	83		6,375				\$11	872	\$108	\$764	\$3,103 \$44	\$570	1,776	\$188	\$1,588		4,030		\$1,596	\$2,435	(10)	(\$000)	Rev	
					0.569	0.569	0.569	0.569						0.569		0.569	0.569	0.569	0.569		0.569	0.569				0.569	0.569	(11)	s		ECAM!
					0.550	0.550	0.550	0.550						0.550		0.550	0.550	0.550	0.550		0.550	0.550				0.550	0.550	(12)	P	Rate ¢/kWh²	ECAM Proposal
		The Control of the Co			0.535	0.535	0.535	0.535	:					0.535		0.535	0.535	0.535	0.535		0.535	0.535				0.535	0.535	(13)	7	1,7	
	1,827	1,827	3		\$2	\$0	\$0	\$0	į	1,116				\$2	153	\$19	\$134	\$545 \$8	\$97	311	\$33	\$278		708		\$280	\$428	(14)	(S000) ³	ECAM Rev	Present
	8,595	8,595	13		\$11	\$0	\$ 1	\$1		5,259				9	718	\$89	\$630	\$2,557 \$36	\$473	1,465	\$155	\$1,311		3,322		\$1,315	\$2,007	(15)	(\$000)	Net Change	
	5.8%	3.9%	2.2%		2.6%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%		3.4%			,	8.7%	5.5%	5.3%	5.5%	6.2% 6.4%	8.6%	6.7%	6.1%	6.8%		5.2%		5.9%	4.8%	(31)	%	ange	

Appendix A Order No. 32216 Case No. PAC-E-11-07