## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

**UE 359** 

In the Matter of	
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,	)
2020 Annual Power Cost Update Tariff (Schedule 125).	)

# OPENING TESTIMONY OF THE OREGON CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD

June 25, 2019



## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

## **OF OREGON**

### **UE 359**

In the Matter of	)			
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY,	OPENING TESTIMONY OF THE OREGON CITIZENS' UTILITY			
2020 Annual Power Cost Update Tariff (Schedule 125).	) BOARD ) )			
	/			
Q. Please state your name, occupation	n, and business address.			
A. My name is William Gehrke. I am an Economist employed by Oregon Citizens'				
Utility Board (CUB). My business a	ddress is 610 SW Broadway, Ste. 400			
Portland, Oregon 97205.				
Q. Please describe your education background and work experience.				
<b>A.</b> My witness qualification statement is found in exhibit CUB/101.				
Q. What is the purpose of your testim	nony?			
A. I respond to issues raised in Portland General Electric Company's (PGE or the				
Company) Opening Testimony.				
Q. How is your testimony organized?				
A. My testimony is organized as follows:				
I. Inflation Rate				
II. Energy Imbalance Market (EIM)	Benefits			

III. Coal Inventory Management

1		I. Inflation Rate
2	Q.	Please summarize your adjustment.
3	A.	CUB proposes that the Company's most recently approved inflation rate from its
4		IRP be used in the Annual Update Tariff (AUT). The Public Utility Commission of
5		Oregon most recently approved a 2% general inflation rate in the Company's 2016
6		IRP. <sup>1</sup>
7	Q.	What does the Company assume as a general inflation rate in this filing?
8	A.	The Company assumes an inflation rate of 2.5%. The Company's inflation rate has
9		remained unchanged since the creation of MONET, which was created in the late
10		1990s.
11	Q.	What is the source of the inflation rate PGE uses?
12	A.	The source of the inflation rate is a long-term inflation forecast from Wharton
13		Econometric Forecasting Associates (WEFA). WEFA is currently operated by
14		Information Handling Services (IHS).
15	Q.	What costs has the Company applied the inflation rate to in past AUT
16		proceedings?
17	<b>A.</b>	The Company escalates the following costs using it long-term inflation rate:
18		Generating Plant Commodity and Transport Costs
19		Wind Day Ahead Forecast Error costs.
20	Q.	What has changed from a monetary policy prospective since the Company
21	-	established its long-term inflation forecast?

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  LC 66 – PGE's 2016 IRP Update- March 2018, Page 28 of 110.

- A. Since 2012, the Federal Open Market Committee has engaged in inflation targeting.
- 2 The Federal Reserve has dual mandate of maximizing employment and stabilizing
- prices. The Federal Reserve's inflation targeting policy sets a symmetrical inflation
- 4 target at a 2% level.
- O. Was inflation targeting a policy of the Federal Reserve when the Company
- 6 established its long-term inflation policy assumption in the 90s?
- 7 **A.** No.
- **Q.** What change do you propose to the Company's inflation proposal?
- A. Moving forward, CUB proposes the Company use the most recently approved
- inflation rate from its IRP for its inflation forecast. The most recently approved
- long-term inflation rate was 2%.<sup>2</sup> There should be a synchronization in the
- economic assumptions between the Company's AUT and the Company's IRP
- process.
- Q. Does CUB believe that observed inflation will be higher in some years and
- 15 lower in other years?
- 16 **A.** Yes. Inflation will sometimes be slightly higher, sometimes slightly lower.
- However, CUB expects inflation to fluctuate around 2%, because 2% inflation is
- the Federal Reserve's symmetrical inflation target.
- 19 Q. Why do you propose the usage of the Company's long-term inflation rate
- 20 **from its IRP?**

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Supra, note 1.

- **A.** The Company's MONET inflation rate has not been updated for nearly two decades.
- The Company's IRP long-term general inflation rate is updated on a biannual basis
- and on a more regular basis the Company's status quo.
- Q. What effect does this have on the Company's power cost forecast?
- 5 **A.** This adjustment reduces net power cost by \$70,000.
- 6 II. EIM Benefits
- **Q.** How has the Company previously modeled EIM benefits?
- 8 A. In its two prior general rate cases, UE 319 and UE 335, the Company relied on an
- 9 Energy and Environmental Economics, Inc. (E3) study to estimate the sub-hourly
- dispatch savings from participation in the EIM.
- Q. How does the Company propose to model EIM benefits in this proceeding?
- 12 **A.** The Company is proposing to use the 2018 Sub-Hourly Dispatch Savings as a basis
- for future EIM benefits. The Company has also included CAISO Grid Management
- 14 Charges and Hydro GHG Revenue.
- Q. Does CUB have a position on the Company's approach to estimating sub-
- 16 **hourly dispatch savings?**
- 17 **A.** Not at this time of the proceeding. CUB will address any concerns, if any, in later
- rounds of testimony.
- 19 Q. How does the Company estimate Hydro GHG revenue?
- A. The Company uses Hydro GHG revenue from 2018 as the basis of its 2020
- estimate. The Company reduces 2018 Hydro GHG revenue by 50% based on the
- average year to year reduction in GHG awards from 2018 to 2019.

1	Q.	Do you propose any changes to the Company's approach to estimating
2		Hydro GHG revenue?
3	A.	Yes. CUB proposes to estimate the reduction to 2020 Hydro GHG revenue by
4		using the average year to year reduction using all available data as of November
5		2019. The Company's proposed reduction in GHG revenue is based on only three
6		months of data. Using more months of data is a better approximate reduction in
7		GHG award quantity. This reduction can be applied to the EIM benefits estimation
8		in the November update.
9		III. Coal Inventory Management
10	Q.	How has the Company proposed to model the operation of Boardman
11		October 1 to December 31, 2020?
12	A.	The Company is proposing to model a 100% maintenance outage for Boardman
13		from October 1 <sup>st</sup> to December 31 <sup>st</sup> . This maintenance outage increases forecasted
14		power cost in the Company's initial filing by \$3.6 million.
15	Q.	Why is the Company modeling an outage for Boardman in 2020?
16	A.	On December 31, 2020, Boardman will definitively end its operations. If the
17		Company prudently manages Boardman's last year of operation and unforeseen
18		circumstances lead to unburned coal being present, customers would have to pay
19		significant decommissioning costs.
20	Q.	What unforeseen circumstances could lead to a large amount of coal
21		remaining at Boardman during the decommissioning process?
22	A.	Boardman could experience an unplanned outage which would prevent the
23		consumption of the coal stack. The Company is not planning on burning coal from

- October 1, 2020 to December 31, 2020 in order to reduce the risk of higher

  decommissioning costs. If Boardman has an unplanned outage between January

  and September 2020, the Company is planning on using the months of October
  December as a buffer to burn the remaining coal in the coal stack. CUB finds the

  Company's proposal to be reasonable.
- Q. What is the Company's proposal to address the possibility of some coal remaining on site after September 2020?
- The Company proposes to economically dispatch the unit to take into account the 8 9 avoided cost of disposing the remaining coal unit. If any coal is left on the ground after September 2020 and the plant is economic to run in the last quarter of 2020, 10 the Company is proposing to include the realized benefits as an NVPC reduction in 11 a subsequent AUT proceeding. The Company is proposing to file a deferred 12 accounting application and track the power cost difference between Mid-C hourly 13 prices and plant actual hourly dispatch costs from October 1st, 2020 until December 14 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020. 15

#### Q. What is CUB response to the Company's proposal?

16

A. CUB appreciates the Company proposing to file a deferral that would likely be in
the customer's favor. While deferred accounting appears to be a convenient remedy
in this situation, CUB would oppose the filling of a deferral. If the plant is not
projected to run in the last three months, then the modeling of a 100% maintenance
deration of Boardman would likely be the most accurate power forecast. CUB
proposes that any difference in net variable power cost be handled in the
Company's annual PCAM. The PCAM is designed to capture unusual power cost

- variation. It already allows the Company to share with customers the benefits and burdens of variations between expected power costs included in rates and actual power costs.<sup>3</sup>
- Q. How did the Company provide an estimate of the coal removal costs at Boardman?
- A. The Company's approach is simple. The estimate is the average of two quotes the
  Company received to remove material from Boardman. In future updates of UE
  359, CUB asks the Company to provide updates to its estimate of coal disposal
  costs.
  - Q. Does CUB have a comment on the Company's testimony regarding decommissioning costs?
- **A.** Yes. It is concerning to CUB that the Company has placed expected coal disposal 12 costs on the public record in this proceeding. CUB would consider this information 13 to be of significant commercial value—the Company's public disclosure of this 14 information has the potential to be detrimental to PGE customers. CUB is surprised 15 that the Company did not keep this information confidential. Third party 16 17 environmental remediation companies can use the Company's publicly available estimates, and tailor their own estimated costs for coal removal. These estimates 18 may be higher than what these companies would otherwise provide. If coal removal 19 20 is included in PGE decommissioning costs, CUB will closely examine the Company's coal removal costs and consider that it revealed its estimated coal 21 22 removal costs in a future prudence review.

10

11

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> OPUC Order No. 08-553 at 2.

#### WITNESS QUALIFICATION STATEMENT

**NAME:** William Gehrke

**EMPLOYER:** Oregon Citizens' Utility Board

**TITLE:** Economist

**ADDRESS:** 610 SW Broadway, Suite 400

Portland, OR 97205

**EDUCATION:** MS, Applied Economics

Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL

BS, Economics

Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL

**EXPERIENCE:** Provided testimony or comments in several Oregon Commission dockets.

Worked as an Economist for the Florida Department of Revenue. Worked as Utility Analyst at the Florida Public Service Commission, providing advice on rate cases and load forecasting. Attended the Institute of Public

Utilities Annual Regulatory Studies program in 2018.