



**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**  
GENERAL COUNSEL DIVISION

August 19, 2016

Public Utility Commission of Oregon  
201 High Street SE, Suite 100  
Salem, OR 97301-1166  
[PUC.FilingCenter@state.or.us](mailto:PUC.FilingCenter@state.or.us)

Attn: Filing Center

**Re: UE 307 – Errata Filing**

Commission Staff hereby submits the attached errata to Staff Witness Dr. Kaufman's Rebuttal/Cross-Answering Testimony in UE 307. This filing contains the following changes:

- The page numbers referenced in Staff/400, Kaufman/1 have been updated.
- The reference in footnote 2 on Staff/400, Kaufman/2 changed from Staff/506 to Staff/406.
- The reference in footnote 4 on Staff/400, Kaufman/3 changed from Staff/506 to Staff/406.
- Staff/400, Kaufman/42, lines 7-8 are changed to read "PacifiCorp's own fuel risk management appears to place the entire burden of minimum take requirements on flexible inventory and uneconomic dispatch."
- The confidential figures and corresponding discussion in Staff/400, Kaufman/32, line 16 have been revised due to an excel cell reference to GRID sale dollars instead of GRID sale volumes.
- Staff/400, Kaufman/33, Figure 6 has been updated for clarity and consistency. The confidential figure in column 2, row 3 has been updated to reflect sales in MWh rather than sales in dollars.
- Staff/400, Kaufman/33, lines 5-7 have been updated to be consistent with the changes to Staff/400, Kaufman/32, line 16 and to match Figure 6.

Included with this filing are the updated redacted pages. Confidential materials will be mailed to those parties that have signed the protective order in this docket.

Sincerely,

Sommer Moser  
Assistant Attorney General  
Business Activities Section

1 **Q. Please state your name, occupation, and business address.**

2 A. My name is Lance Kaufman. I am a Senior Economist employed in the  
3 Energy, Rates, Audits, and Finance Division of the Public Utility Commission of  
4 Oregon (OPUC). My business address is 201 High Street SE, Suite 100,  
5 Salem, Oregon 97301.

6 **Q. Have you previously provided testimony in this case?**

7 A. Yes, My previous testimony is Staff/200.

8 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

9 A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to parties regarding Jim Bridger  
10 coal costs, the DA-RT adjustments, costs related to take-or-pay requirements  
11 and PacifiCorp's avian related wind curtailment.

12 **Q. Did you prepare an exhibit for this docket?**

13 A. Yes. I prepared exhibit Staff/401, excerpts of Staff/200 workpapers; Staff/402,  
14 rail transportation estimates; Staff/403, 20 year coal model, Staff/404, EVA  
15 website; Staff/405 PacifiCorp market transactions summary; Staff/406,  
16 PacifiCorp non-confidential responses to data requests, and Staff/407,  
17 Confidential responses to data requests.

18 **Q. How is your testimony organized?**

19 A. My testimony is organized as follows:

20	Issue 1, Jim Bridger Coal Costs .....	2
21	Issue 2, DA-RT Adjustment .....	32
22	Issue 3, Coal Plant Dispatch .....	38
23	Issue 4, Avian Curtailment.....	44

**ISSUE 1, JIM BRIDGER COAL COSTS**

1  
2  
3 **Q. Please summarize Staff's position regarding PacifiCorp's obligation to**  
4 **analyze fuel supply options for Jim Bridger Plant?**

5 A. The majority of Jim Bridger Plant's fuel is sourced from Bridger Coal  
6 Company (BCC). The coal costs for BCC have escalated rapidly since  
7 2005.<sup>1</sup> PacifiCorp has an ongoing obligation to evaluate the least-  
8 cost/least-risk fuel sources for the Jim Bridger Plant, including evaluations of  
9 market alternatives to BCC coal. However, PacifiCorp performed no multi-  
10 year cost analysis of market alternatives until order to do so by the  
11 Commission.<sup>2</sup> PacifiCorp complied with Order 13-387 by filing its the Long-  
12 Term Fuel Supply Plan for Jim Bridger (Long Term Plan) on December 30,  
13 2015 – more than 2 years after the Commission's order. Staff does not  
14 agree with the Company that its analysis in the Long Term Plan is adequate  
15 to ensure that ratepayers are paying for the least-cost/least-risk fuel  
16 resources for Jim Bridger Plant in 2017 and over the long-term.<sup>3</sup> Prudent  
17 management of Jim Bridger's fuel supply would have included a long term  
18 comparison of PRB and BCC prior to major investments and after  
19 substantial market changes. This means that PacifiCorp should have

<sup>1</sup> See Staff/200, Kaufman/29.

<sup>2</sup> Staff/406, Kaufman/23 and Kaufman/32 through Kaufman/37, PacifiCorp Responses to Staff DR 221, Staff DR 239, Staff DR 240, Staff DR 244, and Staff DR 247. PacifiCorp claims to have evaluated PRB as a fueling source in 2013. However, this evaluation was limited to estimating the BCC closure costs and Jim Bridger facility upgrade costs. PacifiCorp does not appear to have weighed potential ongoing fuel savings against the fixed costs.

<sup>3</sup> Staff/200, Kaufman/59 to Kaufman/64.

1 evaluated PRB in 2005, before investing in the BCC's underground  
2 operations, and again in 2013, after BCC costs escalated substantially.<sup>4</sup>  
3 Other parties have repeatedly sought to evaluate BCC coal against market  
4 sources.<sup>5</sup> Because PacifiCorp did not meet its obligation to analyze least-  
5 cost/least-risk fueling sources for Jim Bridger, Staff recommends that the  
6 Commission impose a disallowance on the Company. In its opening  
7 testimony and again in this testimony, Staff demonstrates that had  
8 PacifiCorp performed such an analysis, PacifiCorp would have found  
9 switching to PRB coal in 2017 saves customers ██████████ in present  
10 value revenue requirement (PVR).<sup>6</sup>

11 Staff's proposed disallowance is not grounded in the results of the Jim  
12 Bridger long term coal cost analysis, but in the fact that PacifiCorp failed to  
13 perform such long term analysis in a timely manner. Staff proposes that the  
14 size of the disallowance be calculated as the difference between the 2017  
15 cost to use PRB versus BCC fuel at Jim Bridger Plant.<sup>7</sup>

16 **Q. Please summarize Staff's recommendation to the Commission to**  
17 **address PacifiCorp's imprudence.**

18 A. Staff recommends the Commission impose a \$95.2 million (\$23.5 million  
19 Oregon-allocated) prudence disallowance based on the 2017 TAM savings

---

<sup>4</sup> PacifiCorp claims that the 2005 investment included an analysis of PRB coal, however, they have not provided any documentation of such analysis. See Staff/406, Kaufman/23 and Kaufman/32 through Kaufman/37, PacifiCorp Response to Staff DR 221, Staff DR 240, Staff DR 239, Staff DR 244, and Staff DR 247.

<sup>5</sup> See Staff/200, Kaufman/58.

<sup>6</sup> See Staff/403, Kaufman/1.

<sup>7</sup> Staff's calculations for both scenarios include Jim Bridger facility upgrade costs and BCC closure costs.

**ISSUE 2, DA-RT ADJUSTMENT**

**Q. What is Staff's position regarding the DA-RT adjustment?**

A. Staff's position is that:

- The DA-RT adjustment is arbitrary;
- The DA-RT adjustment does not increase accuracy of the NPC;
- Properly correlating load and market prices is a more appropriate remedy to PacifiCorp's concerns regarding system balancing transactions; and
- PacifiCorp is capable of properly implementing correlated load and market in GRID.

**Q. Where does PacifiCorp agree with Staff?**

A. PacifiCorp agrees that refining the forward price curve is a potential solution. PacifiCorp disagrees with Staff's other three positions.

**Q. Please provide evidence that the DA-RT adjustment is arbitrary.**

A. There are two very clear signs that the DA-RT adjustment is arbitrary. First, PacifiCorp's Reply Update forecasts █ percent fewer transactions than PacifiCorp's Direct filing. However, The Reply Update DA-RT adjustment █. The specific values are provided in the Figure below.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

The Company's rationale for the DA-RT adjustment is that real time transactions are more costly than GRID recognizes. According to the Company's rationale, decreasing real time transactions by ■ percent should decrease the DA-RT adjustment but in practice it has a negligible effect.

The problems with DA-RT are acutely highlighted by calculating the DA-RT adjustment under a scenario when PacifiCorp is expected to make no market transactions. Staff modified the Reply Update GRID inputs to restrict market sales to zero.<sup>65</sup> Under this scenario, where PacifiCorp makes no market sales, there should be no costs for system balancing. However, the DA-RT adjustment was ■.

**Q. Why does Staff think the DA-RT adjustment does not increase the accuracy of the NPC forecast?**

A. PacifiCorp creates the illusion of a link between market transaction costs and GRID performance. PacifiCorp accomplishes this by observing that it has recently under-forecasted NPC, then observing that PacifiCorp tends to make more purchases above the average monthly price and more sales below the

<sup>65</sup> Staff accomplished this by changing the market capacity to 0.01 MW for every period.

1 the lowest marginal price.<sup>78</sup> The error caused the Company to overestimate  
2 NPC.

3 **Q. Staff's Opening Testimony states that PacifiCorp should include**  
4 **inventory flexibility in its modeling of take-or-pay requirements. The**  
5 **Company contends that your proposal lacks specificity.<sup>79</sup> Please**  
6 **respond.**

7 A. PacifiCorp's own fuel risk management appears to place the entire burden of  
8 minimum take requirements on flexible inventory and uneconomic dispatch.<sup>80</sup>  
9 Given that PacifiCorp's own hedging policy is to use inventory capacity to  
10 manage minimum take requirements, it is reasonable to expect them to have a  
11 specific plan with regards to how to model this relationship. If PacifiCorp did  
12 not have specifics in mind when it chose to rely on inventory levels to absorb  
13 minimum take requirements, Staff proposes that PacifiCorp allow 2017 year-  
14 end inventory levels to reach maximum capacity prior to artificially modifying  
15 dispatch tier GRID prices.

16 **Q. Staff's Opening Testimony did not provide a dollar figure for its**  
17 **adjustment. Can you provide an update?**

18 A. Yes, Staff calculates that the cost of minimum take requirements under the  
19 initial filing to be \$16,268,297 on a system basis. The Company's Reply filing

---

<sup>78</sup> See Staff/407, Kaufman/1, PacifiCorp response to Staff 200.

<sup>79</sup> See PAC/400, Dickman/50, lines 6-10.

<sup>80</sup> See Staff/406, Kaufman/26, PacifiCorp response to Staff DR 231. The Response to DR 231 also references PacifiCorp's coal inventory policy, the 2010 version of this policy is provided in Staff/212. Staff has reviewed both the 2010 policy and the nearly identical 2013 policy. The report and analysis supporting the coal inventory policy does not evaluate the cost risk associated with take-or-pay requirements.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

UE 307

I certify that I have, this day, served the foregoing document upon all parties of record in this proceeding by delivering a copy in person or by mailing a copy properly addressed with first class postage prepaid, or by electronic mail pursuant to OAR 860-001-0180, to the following parties or attorneys of parties.

Dated this 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2016 at Salem, Oregon



---

Kay Barnes  
Public Utility Commission  
201 High Street SE Suite 100  
Salem, Oregon 97301-3612  
Telephone: (503) 378-5763



**UE 307 SERVICE LIST**

<b>CITIZENS UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON</b>	
CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 dockets@oregoncub.org
MICHAEL GOETZ <b>(C) (HC)</b> CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	610 SW BROADWAY STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 mike@oregoncub.org
ROBERT JENKS <b>(C) (HC)</b> CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 bob@oregoncub.org
<b>INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES</b>	
BRADLEY MULLINS <b>(C)</b> MOUNTAIN WEST ANALYTICS	333 SW TAYLOR STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97204 brmullins@mwanalytics.com
TYLER C PEPPE <b>(C) (HC)</b> DAVISON VAN CLEVE, PC	333 SW TAYLOR SUITE 400 PORTLAND OR 97204 tcp@dvclaw.com
S BRADLEY VAN CLEVE <b>(C)</b> DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC	333 SW TAYLOR - STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97204 bvc@dvclaw.com
<b>NOBLE AMERICAS ENERGY SOLUTIONS</b>	
GREGORY M. ADAMS <b>(C) (HC)</b> RICHARDSON ADAMS, PLLC	PO BOX 7218 BOISE ID 83702 greg@richardsonadams.com
GREG BASS NOBLE AMERICAS ENERGY SOLUTIONS, LLC	401 WEST A ST., STE. 500 SAN DIEGO CA 92101 gbass@noblesolutions.com
KEVIN HIGGINS <b>(C) (HC)</b> ENERGY STRATEGIES LLC	215 STATE ST - STE 200 SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111-2322 khiggins@energystrat.com
<b>PACIFICORP UE 307</b>	
PACIFICORP, DBA PACIFIC POWER	825 NE MULTNOMAH ST, STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97232 oregondockets@pacificcorp.com
KATHERINE A MCDOWELL <b>(C) (HC)</b> MCDOWELL RACKNER & GIBSON PC	419 SW 11TH AVE., SUITE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 katherine@mcd-law.com
MATTHEW MCVEE <b>(C) (HC)</b> PACIFICORP	825 NE MULTNOMAH PORTLAND OR 97232 matthew.mcvee@pacificcorp.com
<b>STAFF UE 307</b>	
JOHN CRIDER <b>(C) (HC)</b> PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON	PO BOX 1088 SALEM OR 97308-1088 john.crider@state.or.us
SOMMER MOSER <b>(C) (HC)</b> PUC STAFF - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301 sommer.moser@doj.state.or.us
MICHAEL T WEIRICH <b>(C) (HC)</b> PUC STAFF--DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	BUSINESS ACTIVITIES SECTION 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4096 michael.weirich@state.or.us

