



Public Utility Commission 550 Capitol St NE, Suite 215 Mailing Address: PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97308-2148 Consumer Services 1-800-522-2404 Local: (503) 378-6600 Administrative Services (503) 373-7394

January 25, 2011

Via Electronic Filing and U.S. Mail

OREGON PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION ATTENTION: FILING CENTER PO BOX 2148 SALEM OR 97308-2148

RE: <u>Docket No. UE 222</u> – In the Matter of IDAHO POWER COMPANY 2011 Annual Power Cost Update.

Enclosed for electronic filing in the above-captioned docket is the Public Utility Commission Staff's Rebuttal Testimony.

/s/ Kay Barnes Kay Barnes Regulatory Operations Division Filing on Behalf of Public Utility Commission Staff (503) 378-5763 Email: kay.barnes@state.or.us

c: UE 222 Service List (parties)

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

UE 222

STAFF REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ED DURRENBERGER

In the Matter of IDAHO POWER COMPANY 2011 Annual Power Cost Update.

January 25, 2011

CASE: UE 222 WITNESS: Ed Durrenberger

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

STAFF EXHIBIT 100

Rebuttal Testimony

January 25, 2011

Docket UE 222

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

 A. My name is Ed Durrenberger; I am a Senior Utility Analyst for the Electric & Natural Gas Division of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (OPUC). My business address is 550 Capitol Street NE Suite 215, Salem, Oregon 97301-2551.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.

A. My Witness Qualification Statement is found in Exhibit Staff/101.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. This testimony discusses the October Update portion of Idaho Power's Annual
Power Cost Update (APCU) filing. By way of background, the Commission
approved an APCU mechanism for Idaho Power in 2008 in Order No. 08-238.
The APCU is a tariff that annually revises the rates to account for changes in
the company's projected net power supply costs. Under the APCU, Idaho
Power first files an October Update for the purpose of establishing normalized
power supply expenses for the upcoming power cost year, in this case
beginning June 1, 2011. The October Update is based on normal water flows.
Later, after information about the winter snow pack and expectations for the
upcoming hydro generation year are available, the company files a March
Forecast that updates the normalized power costs with expected and actual
hydro generation information to produce an overall annual power cost update

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1

Q. DID YOU PREPARE AN EXHIBIT FOR THIS DOCKET?

A. No.

Q. HOW IS YOUR TESTIMONY ORGANIZED?

A. I will be discussing the inputs that go into determining the October Update of normalized power supply expenses. By order, the APCU mechanism is narrowly focused and highly formulaic. Only a limited number of power cost drivers are allowed to be updated and then, only in a way allowed for by the APCU order. The derivation of the actual net variable power cost is the output of the AURORA power cost dispatch model using the updated inputs.

Q. PLEASE PROCEED WITH YOUR EVALUATION OF THE OCTOBER UPDATE.

A. I have reviewed the October Update filing, as described in the testimony and exhibits of Mr. Scott Wright at Idaho Power. I find that the filing conforms to Order No, 08-238. In addition, the testimony and exhibits uses a format that the company established in previous filings of the October Update and one that I am familiar with and facilitates my evaluation of the filing.

System Load:

18The system load value used is 1826 aMW. This ties back into the expected19sales at the customer level figure of 14,624 million megawatt hours for the year20and represents a 0.5% increase in load growth from what was agree to in the212010 power cost year. I find this load to be reasonable considering my22expectation that Hoku Corporation will finally begin production in its solar cell23manufacturing facility sometime in the first quarter of 2011 and my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

understanding of load growth generally in the Idaho Power service territory for 2011.

Generation:

The overall normalized hydro generation amount projected for 2011 is consistent with the normalized hydro output from previous years as I would expect. The timing of the generation output, throughout the year, is slightly more favorable than the previous normalized projection; I find it to be acceptable.

The coal generation output derived from Bridger, Boardman and Valmy coal plants is modeled to be lower than in previous years in the first and fourth quarters of the power cost year and at a time when average coal generation unit costs appear lower than average power purchase unit costs. The company was able to demonstrate, however, that based on the re-pricing of power purchases and sales, as required by the AUT Order, and the nature of the AURORA power dispatch model to dispatch resources hourly based on prices, such an modeled outcome could be expected. I find the modeled output of the coal plants and the incidental output of Idaho Power's natural gas powered plants to be modeled correctly and acceptable. In addition, fuel prices for the thermal plants appear to have been modeled correctly and to represent appropriate expenses.

Wholesale power sales and purchases:

The pricing of the power purchases and surplus sales use the APCU methods and modeling required by Order No, 08-238. The amounts of surplus sales

1 and power purchases are determined by the power cost dispatch model. I find 2 the market purchases and sales to be reasonable. 3 PURPA costs: 4 The amount of PURPA, avoided-cost-based-contract purchases appears to be 5 reasonable. The company includes only those contracts that have been 6 executed as of the filing. They represent an increase in energy deliveries from 7 the previous year of 1%. Idaho Power's PURPA costs are forecast to rise at a 8 rate disproportionate to the increase in amount of power delivered. Idaho 9 Power was able to demonstrate, in response to questions about this, that 10 avoided cost rates increase over time and that expecting overall PURPA power 11 purchase costs to grow at the same rate of energy growth is not a reasonable 12 assumption. I find modeled PURPA costs and energy to be reasonable. 13 October Update Comparison: 14 Idaho Power testimony discusses the overall effect of the 2011 October Update 15 compared to the previous 2010 October Update. I find the calculation of the 16 unit costs and overall revenue requirement to be to correctly stated. 17 Power Cost Allocation: 18 Idaho Power proposes that the allocation of 2011 October Update costs be 19 spread among customer classes in the same fashion as was agreed to in the 20 most recent APCU determination, Order No 10-191. I am not prepared to take 21 a stand on this matter at this time. Although I have discussed this filing with 22 the Staff rate spread/rate design experts, it is premature to propose that the

1

2

3

4

5

previous rate design methodology is appropriate for the power cost increment in 2011.

Q. ARE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES WITH THE OCTOBER UPDATE OF THE 2011 APCU THAT YOU WISH TO DISCUSS?

A. No, this concludes my testimony.

CASE: UE 222 WITNESS: Ed Durrenberger

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

STAFF EXHIBIT 101

Witness Qualification Statement

January 25, 2011

WITNESS QUALIFICATION STATEMENT

NAME:	Ed Durrenberger
EMPLOYER:	Public Utility Commission of Oregon
TITLE:	Senior Utility Analyst, Electric and Natural Gas Division
ADDRESS:	550 Capitol St. NE, Ste. 215, Salem, Oregon 97301
EDUCATION:	B.S. Mechanical Engineering Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon
EXPERIENCE:	I have been employed at the Oregon Public Utility Commission of since February of 2004. My current responsibilities include staff research, analysis and technical support on a wide range of electric and natural gas cost recovery issues with an emphasis on electricity and fuel costs.
OTHER EXPERIENCE:	I worked for over twenty years in industrial boiler plant engineering, maintenance and operations. In this capacity I managed plant operations, fuel supplies and utilities, environmental compliance issues and all aspects of boiler machinery design, installation and repair. I have also worked as a production manager and machine shop manager for an ISO certified high tech equipment manufacturer servicing the silicon wafer fabrication and biomedical business sectors.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

UE 222

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 at Salem, Oregon, this 25th day of January, 2011.

Barrey

Kay Barries Public Utility Commission Regulatory Operations 550 Capitol St NE Ste 215 Salem, Oregon 97301-2551 Telephone: (503) 378-5763

SERVICE LIST (PARTIES)

610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 gordon@oregoncub.org
610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 bob@oregoncub.org
610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 catriona@oregoncub.org
BUSINESS ACTIVITIES SECTION 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4096 stephanie.andrus@state.or.us
PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 cbearry@idahopower.com
PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 Inordstrom@idahopower.com
PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 ttatum@idahopower.com
PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 swright@idahopower.com
419 SW 11TH AVE, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 adam@mcd-law.com
419 SW 11TH AVE., SUITE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 wendy@mcd-law.com
419 SW 11TH AVE., SUITE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 lisa@mcd-law.com
PO BOX 2148 SALEM OR 97308-2148 ed.durrenberger@state.or.us