

**EXHIBIT NO. T-\_\_\_\_\_ (CEL-1)**  
**DOCKET NO. UE-92\_\_\_\_\_**  
**WITNESS: C.E. LYNCH**

**BEFORE THE  
WASHINGTON UTILITIES & TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

**COMPLAINANT**

**VS.**

**PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT COMPANY**

**RESPONDENT**

**TESTIMONY**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

UE-920499

T-2 ✓

# CONTENTS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

OBJECTIVE, PURPOSE, AND USE OF COST OF SERVICE STUDIES.....	2
OVERVIEW OF PROCESS.....	4
1. Functionalization of Costs.....	5
2. Classification of Costs.....	6
3. Allocation of Costs.....	7
THE COMPANY'S COST OF SERVICE STUDY.....	9
1. Functionalization of Costs Under the Company's Cost of Service Study.....	13
2. Classification of Costs Under the Company's Cost of Service Study.....	13
a. Classification of Production Costs.....	13
b. Classification of Transmission Costs.....	16
c. Classification of Distribution Costs.....	18
d. Classification of Conservation Costs.....	20
e. Classification of General Costs.....	21
3. Allocation of Costs Among Classes Under the Company's Cost of Service Study.....	22
a. Allocation of Demand-Related Costs.....	24
b. Allocation of Energy-Related Costs.....	29
c. Allocation of Customer-Related Costs.....	29
SUMMARY OF COST OF SERVICE STUDY.....	30
COMPARISON OF SCENARIOS.....	32

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**PUGET SOUND POWER & LIGHT COMPANY  
TESTIMONY OF COLLEEN E. LYNCH**

**Q. Please state your full name, business address, and present position.**

A. My name is Colleen E. Lynch, and my business address is 411 - 108th Avenue N.E., Bellevue, Washington 98004-5515. My present position is Manager of Pricing for Puget Sound Power & Light Company.

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

A. The purpose of my testimony is to introduce and describe the methods used in the Company's proposed cost of service study, and to show the results that can be expected using the Company's proposed approach. As part of this presentation, I will propose a number of recommendations for the Commission's consideration. Finally, I will show the impact on cost of service results that could be expected if competing methods were adopted or if key assumptions or inputs to the Company's proposed method were changed.

**Q. Please outline your educational and business background.**

A. I graduated from the Eastern Washington University in 1979 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Economics and Mathematics. Thereafter, I was employed by Washington Public Power Supply System as a Cost Engineer at the

1 Hanford construction site. Beginning in 1981, I was  
2 employed by Pacific Power & Light Company in the  
3 position of Research Analyst in the rate department.  
4 Since 1983, I have been employed by Puget Sound Power &  
5 Light Company in various positions in the rate  
6 department. In my current position as Manager of  
7 Pricing, I am responsible for the development of both  
8 cost of service and rate design analyses.

9  
10 **OBJECTIVE, PURPOSE, AND USE OF**  
11 **COST OF SERVICE STUDIES**

- 11 **Q. What are the major objectives and applications of a cost**  
12 **of service study?**
- 13 **A. The purpose of performing a cost of service study is to**  
14 **attribute costs to different categories of customers**  
15 **(classes) based on how those customers cause costs to be**  
16 **incurred. The results of this process are then used for**  
17 **a number of purposes, including the basis for**  
18 **recommendations for the allocation of the revenue**  
19 **requirement across customer classes, or rate spread.**  
20 **Attached as page 1 of Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-2) is an excerpt**  
21 **from the National Association of Regulatory Utility**  
22 **Commissioner's (NARUC) Draft Electric Utility Cost**  
23 **Allocation Manual, February 1991, regarding the use of**  
24 **cost of service results.**

1 Q. Why is the Company filing an embedded cost of service  
2 study with this case?

3 A. The Company is filing a cost of service study because  
4 cost of service is a key consideration in rate spread  
5 and rate design decisions. An embedded cost of service  
6 study in particular is required under the Commission's  
7 order in Cause No. U-78-05. In addition, the Rate  
8 Design Collaborative Group (the "Collaborative Group")  
9 endorsed the concept of resolving key issues in cost of  
10 service and establishing cost of service as a major  
11 factor in rate spread decisions during this proceeding.  
12 (See Concept Nos. 2 and 4 of the Collaborative Group,  
13 Exhibit \_\_\_ (DWH-4), p. 18.) Finally, in the  
14 Commission's order in Docket No. UE-901183-T and UE-  
15 901184-P (the "Decoupling Proceeding"), the Company was  
16 directed to include a review of cost allocations and to  
17 provide cost allocations that would enable a  
18 determination of base and resource costs for each class  
(Third Supplemental Order, pp. 24-25).

19 Q. Could you please summarize the key recommendations that  
20 you are proposing in your testimony?

21 A. Yes. My recommendations are summarized as follows:

- 22 • All parties should use the same model framework for  
23 making cost of service presentations.
- 24 • The peak credit method should be used to classify  
production plant between demand and energy.

- 1 • Forward-looking relationships should be used in the  
embedded cost of service study to better signal  
costs to customers.
- 2 • Conservation costs should be treated as a resource  
3 cost.
- 4 • Cost of service, as it is approved by the  
5 Commission in this case, should be a major factor,  
along with parity guidelines, in rate spread  
6 considerations.
- 7 • The basic customer concept should be the basis for  
8 classifying distribution plant between demand and  
customer.
- 9 • The fully distributed customer-related cost of  
10 service resulting from applying the basic customer  
method should be recovered through a basic charge  
for those tariffs with a basic charge component.

11 It should be noted that many of these concepts are  
12 endorsed by either the Rate Design Task Force (the "Task  
13 Force") or the Collaborative Group, or both, as  
14 discussed later in my testimony. Mr. Knutsen describes  
15 the functions of the Task Force and the Collaborative  
16 Group in his testimony.

## 18 OVERVIEW OF PROCESS

19 **Q. Could you briefly describe the cost of service process?**

20 **A. Yes.** The cost of service process typically includes  
21 three steps: (1) functionalization of costs,  
22 (2) classification of costs, and (3) allocation of costs  
23 among customer classes.

## 1. Functionalization of Costs

1 Q. What do you mean by functionalization?

2 A. Functionalization identifies the task that the utility  
3 is performing when it incurs the cost. The list of  
4 tasks or functions typically identified in a cost of  
5 service study are **production or generation of**  
6 **electricity, transmission of that electricity to the**  
7 **local area, distribution of that electricity to the**  
8 **customers or points of delivery in the local area,**  
9 **provision of customer service, billing, and facilities**  
10 **to each customer in the service area, and a general**  
11 **function which includes costs such as administrative and**  
12 **general expenses. Some studies, including the one**  
13 **proposed by the Company, further identify tasks or sub-**  
14 **functions such as coal-fired production of electricity,**  
15 **hydro-electric production, generation-related**  
16 **transmission of electricity and non-generation-related**  
17 **transmission of electricity.**

18 Q. Is the functionalization of costs a controversial issue?

19 A. Typically not because this step usually follows the  
20 utilities code of accounts.  
21  
22  
23  
24

## 2. Classification of Costs

1 Q. Please describe what is involved in the classification  
2 of costs.

3 A. This step of the cost of service process involves the  
4 separation of the functionalized costs into  
5 classifications based on the components of utility  
6 service being provided. The three principal cost  
7 classifications for an electric utility are demand-  
8 related costs (costs that vary with the kW demand  
9 imposed by the customer), energy costs (costs which vary  
10 with the energy or kWh that the utility provides), and  
11 customer-related costs (costs that are related to the  
12 number of customers served). (See the NARUC Manual,  
13 p. 23).

14 Q. Do disputes between the parties typically arise in this  
15 step of the process?

16 A. Yes. In fact, in the collaborative process, this was  
17 the area on which we focused a great deal of time  
18 because of its influence on how much of the total costs,  
19 or revenue requirement, is ultimately assigned to a  
20 particular group of customers. This is the first point  
21 where the customer's service requirements (in terms of  
22 point of delivery on the system, time of use, overall  
23 level of use, and pattern of use) are linked or  
24



1 associated with the total cost of service or revenue  
2 requirement of the Company.

3 **Q. What issues are generally involved in the selection of a  
4 classification method?**

5 **A. The classification issues most often contested are:**

6 (1) whether the predominance method should be used  
7 (i.e., if a function is predominantly energy (or demand)  
8 related, it would be classified as 100% energy (or  
9 demand)); and (2) if the predominance method is not  
10 used, the determination of the proper classification  
11 scheme for each function (i.e., what relative portions  
12 should be classified to energy, to demand, and to  
13 customer).

### 14 **3. Allocation of Costs**

15 **Q. Would you please describe what you mean by the  
16 allocation of costs among customer classes?**

17 **A. Yes. The NARUC Manual at page 25 provides a good  
18 description of this process:**

19 After the costs have been functionalized and  
20 classified, the next step is to allocate them  
21 among the customer classes. To accomplish  
22 this, the customers served by the utility  
23 are separated into several groups based on  
24 the nature of the service provided and load  
characteristics. . . . It may be reasonable  
to subdivide the . . . classes based on  
characteristics such as size of load, the  
voltage level at which the customer is served  
and other service characteristics such as

whether a residential customer is all electric  
or not.

1  
2 **Q. What happens after the customer classes to be used in  
the cost allocation study have been designated?**

3 **A. The functionalized and classified costs are allocated**  
4 **among the classes as follows:**

- 5 • Demand-related costs - Allocated among the customer  
6 classes on the basis of demands (kW) imposed on the  
7 system during specific peak hours or specific peak  
8 situations.
- 9 • Energy-related costs - Allocated among the customer  
10 classes on the basis of energy (kWh) which the  
11 system must supply to serve the customers.
- 12 • Customer-related costs - Allocated among the  
13 customer classes on the basis of the weighted  
14 number of customers. Normally, weighting the  
15 number of customers in the various classes is based  
16 on an analysis of the relative level of customer-  
17 related costs (service lines, meters, meter  
18 reading, billing, etc.) per customer.

19 **See NARUC Manual, pp. 25-26.**

20 **Q. How do you determine which is the appropriate or best  
classification or allocation method to use?**

21 **A. As described above, the goal of a cost of service study**  
22 **is to allocate the costs according to the nature of the**  
23 **constituent costs. Accordingly, the best method is the**  
24 **one that best reflects the planning, engineering and**  
**operating characteristics of the electric utility**  
**system. The appropriateness of either the**  
**classification method or allocation method may change**  
**over time as the utility's operating environment,**

1 customer mix or regulatory or technological environment  
2 change. So, even though the basic customer method, for  
3 example, may be appropriate today for classifying  
4 distribution costs, it may not be appropriate in the  
5 future. Similarly, it may be appropriate for a utility  
6 to allocate production-related demand costs on the basis  
7 of twelve monthly coincident peak loads given the  
8 current influence of water heat on the system's total  
9 coincident peak load. However, if for technological or  
10 operational reasons the customer no longer places that  
11 load on the system, a factor which looks at seasonal  
12 coincident peak demands may become appropriate.

13 **Q. Are all costs or line items in the Company's revenue**  
14 **requirement allocated to classes of service using these**  
**types of factors?**

15 **A. No.** Certain utility costs are directly assignable, such  
16 as substations which serve a single customer,  
17 investments in street lighting facilities, or certain  
18 equipment installed on the customer's premise.

## 19 THE COMPANY'S COST OF SERVICE STUDY

20 **Q. What model was used to develop the Company's cost of**  
21 **service study?**

22 **A. The study was developed using a PC-based cost of service**  
23 **model developed by the Company during the rate design**  
24 **collaborative process. The Company has distributed**

1 preliminary copies of the model to participants in the  
2 collaborative process, and will deliver copies of the  
3 model to interested parties in this proceeding. The  
4 Company hopes that by using a common model or framework,  
5 the discussion on cost of service may be focused on  
6 assumptions and results rather than on differences in  
7 modeling techniques.

8 Q. Why did the Company develop a new model?

9 A. In the past, each party typically developed and  
10 submitted its own cost study using both different  
11 assumptions and different modeling frameworks. This new  
12 model eliminates one of the differences--the model  
13 framework--so that effort can be concentrated on  
14 assumptions, methods, and results. This model also  
15 includes a necessary and helpful level of detail  
16 unavailable in the models used by some of the other  
17 parties. The use of the Company's model was discussed  
18 and evaluated during the collaborative process. After  
19 reviewing the new model and comparing it to the models  
20 used by other parties, the Collaborative Group felt that  
21 the new model framework could be adopted without  
22 compromising any party's position. (See Concept No. 3  
23 of the Collaborative Group, Exhibit \_\_\_ (DWH-4), p. 18.)  
24

1 Q. What test period (revenue requirement) was used in the  
cost of service study?

2 A. The cost of service study is based on the same test  
3 period and revenue requirement approved by the  
4 Commission in Docket No. U-89-2688-T, the Company's 1989  
5 rate case. All allocation factors are based on data  
6 from the test period in that proceeding--the 12 months  
7 ended September 1988--as well.

8 Q. Why was this revenue requirement used?

9 A. This was done in order to remove or eliminate debate  
10 regarding revenue requirement issues from this  
11 proceeding. This particular revenue requirement  
12 contains all the components typically encountered in a  
13 general rate case proceeding, which must be allocated in  
14 a cost of service study, as well as those elements  
15 developed as a result of decoupling, which also must be  
16 treated in cost of service.

17 Q. What are some of the differences between the cost of  
18 service study proposed by the Company in this proceeding  
and that filed by the Company in its 1989 rate case?

19 A. The cost of service study filed in this proceeding is  
20 different in several ways including:

- 21 • The model used by the Company is a PC-based model  
22 which is available to all parties for use during  
23 this case.
- 24

- 1 • Calculation of the peak credit method reflects the  
particular resources identified in the Company's  
most recent integrated resource plan.
- 2
- 3 • Distribution costs are classified between demand  
and customer on the basis of a basic customer  
method.
- 4
- 5 • Federal income tax expenses are allocated based on  
allocated rate base.
- 6
- 7 • Non-generation transmission plant is classified as  
100% demand-related.
- 8 • Production-related demand costs are allocated to  
the classes based on the contribution of each class  
to the top 200 hours of system coincident demand.
- 9

10 **Q. Please briefly describe how the cost of service study  
was performed.**

11 **A.** The Company's cost of service study is presented as  
12 Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-3). This costing analysis apportions  
13 the revenue requirement to the customer classes on the  
14 basis of cost occurrence. In preparing the analysis,  
15 costs which could be identified with a particular class  
16 of customers were directly assigned to that class.  
17 Those costs which were not directly assigned were first  
18 functionalized into five major functions:  
19 (1) production, (2) transmission, (3) distribution,  
20 (4) customer service, billing and facilities or  
21 (5) general. The costs within each major function were  
22 then classified by service characteristics and  
23 apportioned to the customer classes on the basis of the  
24

1 contribution of each class to the occurrence of those  
2 costs.

3 **1. Functionalization of Costs Under the Company's Cost**  
4 **of Service Study**

5 **Q. How were costs functionalized?**

6 **A.** Costs were generally functionalized on the basis of FERC  
7 accounting. Rate base items and expenses were  
8 functionalized among production; transmission;  
9 distribution; customer service, billing and facilities;  
10 and general.

11 **2. Classification of Costs Under the Company's Cost of**  
12 **Service Study**

13 **Q. How were the functionalized costs classified by service**  
14 **characteristics?**

15 **A.** Costs were then classified according to whether they are  
16 demand-related, energy-related or customer-related.  
17 Page 2 of Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-2) is a chart which shows  
18 the classification methods for each major functional  
19 area. This chart relates the 5 major functions to the  
20 standard classifications used.

21 **a. Classification of Production Costs**

22 **Q. How were production costs classified?**

23 **A.** The Company is proposing to use the peak credit method  
24 to classify production costs between demand and energy.

1 Mr. Hoff's testimony describes the approach the Company  
2 proposes to use to calculate the peak credit factor.  
3 The peak credit method considers the economic  
4 alternatives or opportunity costs of meeting system  
5 energy and peak requirements with existing production  
6 resources. This method recognizes that although a  
7 baseload plant is typically dispatched to provide  
8 long-term energy, it also contributes to total system  
9 peaking capability.

10 **Q. Why was the peak credit method used?**

11 A. The Company proposes to use the peak credit method  
12 because this method was endorsed by the Collaborative  
13 Group (See Concept No. 6, Exhibit \_\_\_ (DWH-4), p. 19);  
14 it has been used by the Company for at least the past  
15 ten years; and it is an approach considered reasonable  
16 by the Company's system planners.

17 **Q. What was the basis for the Collaborative Group's  
18 adoption of this method?**

19 A. The Collaborative Group reviewed the various methods  
20 typically used to classify production plant. The peak  
21 credit method was determined to be appropriate for  
22 several reasons. First, it is the method approved by  
23 the Commission in past orders. Second, it allows  
24 forward-looking capacity and energy relationships to be



1 reflected in the classification of embedded plant.

2 Third, the results of this calculation yielded results  
3 which were similar to those produced by other standard  
4 methods. (See Concept Nos. 6 and 7 of the Collaborative  
5 Group, Exhibit \_\_\_ (DWH-4), p. 19.)

6 **Q. How was this classification applied in the cost of  
service study?**

7 **A.** All production plant and related expenses were  
8 classified between demand and energy using the peak  
9 credit method. This results in 17% of production plant  
10 being classified to demand and the remainder to energy.  
11 Pages 1-2 of Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-4) show the calculation of  
12 the peak credit factor. Power supply expenses, which  
13 consist of purchases and interchanges, system control,  
14 load dispatching, and other associated expenses, were  
15 classified to either demand or energy, or both,  
16 depending upon the nature of the occurrence of those  
17 costs. Contracts providing both demand and energy were  
18 also classified using the peak credit method.

19 **Q. What are some other methods typically used to classify  
20 production plant?**

21 **A.** Page 3 of Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-2) briefly describes the  
22 three major categories of production classification  
23 methods considered by the Collaborative Group.  
24

1 Q. What is the effect of selecting the Company's proposed  
method versus these competing methods?

2 A. The effect of using the peak credit method as opposed to  
3 alternative classification methods for production plant  
4 is shown in Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-5), discussed later in my  
5 testimony. Typically, methods that assign more costs to  
6 demand result in a higher overall allocation of revenue  
7 requirement to the lower load factor customer classes  
8 (residential, for example) and a lower overall  
9 allocation to the higher load factor customer classes  
10 (high voltage, for example). As shown on page 2 of  
11 Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-5), the scenario that classifies  
12 production costs as 100% demand-related results in a  
13 parity ratio of 81% for residential as compared to a  
14 146% parity ratio for the high voltage class.  
15 Similarly, the energy only allocation method results in  
16 parity ratios of 97% and 77% for residential and high  
17 voltage, respectively.

18 **b. Classification of Transmission Costs**

19 Q. Please explain the classification of transmission costs.

20 A. Transmission plant and expenses have been further  
21 functionalized into non-generation-related and  
22 generation-related transmission components or sub-  
23 functions. Non-generation-related transmission costs  
24

1 refer to costs associated with the Company's  
2 transmission system network. Generation-related  
3 transmission costs refer to costs for those transmission  
4 lines constructed in order to connect remote generation  
5 facilities to the system network.

6 The Company has classified the non-generation-  
7 related transmission as 100% demand-related, recognizing  
8 that the primary design consideration used in the  
9 planning and construction of the network (non-  
10 generation-related transmission) is the peak load the  
11 facilities must carry (given a set of reliability  
12 standards). The Company's proposal classifies  
13 generation-related transmission using the peak credit  
14 method, recognizing the association to the generating  
15 facility.

16 **Q. Why has the Company classified the non-generation-  
17 related plant in this manner?**

18 **A.** According to the Company's transmission system  
19 engineers, the principle reason the Company is investing  
20 in transmission plant is in response to peak loads. In  
21 other words, the system's peak demands are the primary  
22 consideration when analyzing the need for new  
23 transmission plant.  
24

1 Q. What other techniques are typically used to classify  
transmission costs?

2 A. Page 4 of Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-2) describes other common  
3 approaches used to classify transmission costs. The  
4 effect of selecting the Company's proposed method for  
5 functionalizing and classifying transmission costs  
6 versus these competing methods is shown in Exhibit \_\_\_\_  
7 (CEL-5), described later in my testimony.

8 c. Classification of Distribution Costs

9 Q. How were distribution costs classified?

10 A. The Company proposes to classify distribution costs as  
11 either demand-related or customer-related based on the  
12 basic customer method.

13 Q. Please describe the basic customer method.

14 A. Under the basic customer method, only those distribution  
15 costs relating to metering and service drop are treated  
16 as customer-related. All other costs are classified to  
17 demand. In effect, this method implies that the only  
18 costs which vary directly with the number of customers  
19 on the system are the cost of the meter and service drop  
20 (and related expenses).

1 Q. The Company has previously endorsed the minimum system  
2 technique for classifying distribution plant. Why has  
the Company proposed the basic customer approach in this  
proceeding?

3 A. We are using the basic customer method for purposes of  
4 this filing primarily in the interests of promoting  
5 consensus, although the Company continues to believe in  
6 the merits of the former approach. To allow the effects  
7 of using the minimum system method to continue to be  
8 considered, the Company has included that method as a  
9 scenario in Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-5). It should also be  
10 noted that the Task Force, in its final report,  
11 recommended that customer costs be identified in a  
12 manner more like the minimum system approach. (See  
13 Recommendation "A" regarding Residential Rate Design,  
14 Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (DWH-3), pp. 19-20.)

15 Q. What are some other methods used to classify  
16 distribution costs?

17 A. Page 5 of Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-2) identifies and describes  
18 several common methods used in the industry to classify  
19 distribution plant. In addition, page 6 of  
20 Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-2) shows each method and some actual  
21 values of factors derived using these methods. Some of  
22 these resulting factors are taken from actual cost  
23 studies and some are taken from utility surveys of the  
24 issue. This exhibit is intended to demonstrate possible

1 results; it is not my intent to defend the calculations  
2 and assumptions supporting these resulting factors. The  
3 exhibit shows the factors by distribution plant sub-  
4 function. The effect of selecting the Company's  
5 proposed method for classifying distribution costs  
6 versus these competing methods is shown in Exhibit \_\_\_\_  
7 (CEL-5), discussed later in my testimony.

8 **d. Classification of Conservation Costs**

9 **Q. How do you propose to classify conservation costs?**

10 **A.** The Company proposes to treat conservation investments  
11 and related expenses in the same manner as production  
12 costs. That is, these costs are classified between  
13 demand and energy using the peak credit method.

14 **Q. Why did you propose this treatment for conservation  
15 costs?**

16 **A.** This treatment is proposed for several reasons. First  
17 and foremost, conservation is a resource and should be  
18 treated as such for rate design purposes. Second, both  
19 the Collaborative Group and the Task Force encouraged us  
20 to treat the costs as a resource. (See Concept No. 7 of  
21 the Collaborative Group, Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (DWH-4), p. 19, and  
22 Rate Spread Concept B of the Task Force, Exhibit \_\_\_\_  
23 (DWH-3), pp. 12-13.) It should be pointed out that this  
24

1 treatment is no different than that used by the Company  
2 in its past studies.

3 **Q. What other methods are used for classifying conservation**  
4 **costs?**

5 **A.** Another method is to assign directly the conservation  
6 costs to the customer class receiving the benefits.  
7 This means that residential water heater conservation  
8 costs would be assigned to the residential class, for  
9 example, while industrial energy management costs would  
10 be assigned to the industrial class. Because all  
11 classes benefit from conservation to the extent it is  
12 considered a resource, we believe our approach is more  
13 appropriate.

14 **e. Classification of General Costs**

15 **Q. What are some examples of what you call general costs?**

16 **A.** These costs include investment in general plant,  
17 administrative and general expenses, local, state and  
18 federal taxes, etc.

19 **Q. How were these types of costs classified?**

20 **A.** These costs are generally classified and allocated  
21 following the classification and allocation of the four  
22 main functions. It should be noted that the  
23 Collaborative Group made several endorsements in the  
24 area of general costs relating to the treatment of

1 administrative and general expenses, general plant and  
2 federal income taxes. These include the following:

- 3 • General plant should be allocated in a manner  
4 derived from the allocation of production,  
transmission and distribution plant.
- 5 • Administrative and general expenses (excluding  
6 salaries, regulatory commission expense, and  
7 outside service employed) should follow the  
approach traditionally used by the Company.
- 8 • Federal income taxes should be allocated in a  
9 manner that is derived from the allocation of rate  
base.

10 (See Concept Nos. 8, 9 and 10 of the Collaborative  
11 Group, Exhibit \_\_\_ (DWH-4), p. 19.) The Company has  
12 applied the endorsed concepts in its proposed cost of  
13 service study.

### 14 3. Allocation of Costs Among Classes Under the 15 Company's Cost of Service Study

- 16 Q. How many classes of customers were considered in  
allocating costs among classes?
- 17 A. Historically, the Company considers six broad classes of  
18 customers: residential, secondary voltage, primary  
19 voltage, high voltage, street and area lighting, and  
20 firm resale. These classes are identified in large part  
21 according to the delivery voltage at which they take  
22 service.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**Q. What do you mean by delivery voltage?**

A. Delivery voltage refers to the point on the distribution or transmission system where the customer is taking service. For our residential and secondary general service, this is less than 600 volts. Delivery voltage for primary service is greater than 600 volts but less than 50,000 volts, and the high voltage class takes service directly from the transmission system, above 50,000 volts.

**Q. Why does your study focus on delivery voltage?**

A. There are certain costs which can be assigned to a class based on delivery voltage, such as losses and distribution costs.

**Q. Within these six broad classes, did you further segment the classes?**

A. Yes. Within each of the six broad classes of service, the Company has identified subclasses of service.

Page 7 of Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-2) presents the six broad classes of service, the associated subclasses, and some descriptive attributes and assumptions about each group. It is these characteristics that drive the allocation of costs to the specific group. The cost of service study is based on assumptions and characteristics regarding the service requirements of each class or subclass of customer included in the study. Typically, these

1 characteristics involve delivery voltage, degree of  
2 diversity, degree of coincidence, and magnitude of  
3 usage. These characteristics can be defined in terms of  
4 demand-related, energy-related and customer-related  
5 components.

6 **Q. How were costs allocated among the various customer**  
7 **classes?**

8 A. Once costs were classified into demand-related, energy-  
9 related and customer-related components, costs were then  
10 allocated to the customer classes on the basis of the  
11 contribution of each class to the total kilowatts of  
12 demand upon various segments of the system, total  
13 consumption of kilowatt-hours, and total number of  
14 customers in each class. The demand, energy, and  
15 customer allocation factors were adjusted and weighted  
16 to further reflect the actual occurrences of costs  
17 within the allocation process.

18 **a. Allocation of Demand-Related Costs**

19 **Q. How are demand-related costs allocated?**

20 A. As described above, demand-related costs can be  
21 identified in the production, transmission and  
22 distribution functional areas. Two separate sets of  
23 demand allocation factors are typically developed to  
24 allocate this classification of costs: system

1 coincident peak demand factors and class non-coincident  
2 peak demand factors. These two sets of demand-related  
3 allocation factors are shown in Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-4),  
4 page 3.

5 **Q. Why was it necessary to develop two sets of factors?**

6 A. Even though demand is recognized as a key consideration  
7 in the planning and investing in facilities in all the  
8 functional areas of a utility's system, the term demand  
9 is almost too broad. Actually a cost study will  
10 identify costs incurred as a result of a localized or  
11 non-coincident demand on a substation as opposed to  
12 costs incurred as a result of the combined demands on  
13 the system at time of system peak (allocation of  
14 production or transmission costs, for example). The  
15 timing of the demand or high usage is the key factor.  
16 The two sets of demand allocation factors are an attempt  
17 to reflect this sensitivity to different times of high  
18 use on the system in terms of cost causation.

19 Within each set of demand allocation factors, it  
20 may be appropriate to exclude the peak contribution of a  
21 given class depending upon the functional category being  
22 allocated. The nature of the cost to be allocated must  
23 be considered in light of the service requirements of  
24 the customer. An example of this is the exclusion of

1 the high voltage class' NCP demand when calculating the  
2 allocation factors used to allocate distribution demand-  
3 related costs, given that high voltage customers take  
4 delivery off the transmission system.

5 **Q. Please define and describe the use of system coincident**  
6 **peak demand factors.**

7 **A.** System coincident peak demand refers to the load  
8 required by a given class of customer when the system  
9 peak load occurs. System coincident peak demands are  
10 generally used to allocate production and transmission  
11 demand-related costs, since these functional cost areas  
12 are designed or incurred in order to either produce or  
13 deliver the peak demands placed on the system.

14 **Q. In general, how are system coincident demand allocation**  
15 **factors calculated?**

16 **A.** The Company identifies the actual hours in the test  
17 period of highest system coincident peak demand. Using  
18 load research information, the Company then identifies  
19 the contribution of each class to these hourly peak  
20 demands and makes adjustments for peak losses. Either  
21 the single highest or extreme system coincident peak  
22 demand or the average of some or all of the high system  
23 coincident peak demands are then used to compute the set  
24 of system coincident allocation factors. The number of  
hours utilized in the calculations, in turn, are

1 dependent on the functional category of costs being  
2 allocated.

3 **Q. In the past, the Company has based these factors on the**  
4 **system's twelve highest hours of demand. Is the Company**  
5 **continuing to follow this approach?**

6 **A. No.** We are proposing to use 200 hours, which represents  
7 the annual number of hours of operation for the  
8 combustion turbines reflected or incorporated in the  
9 Company's planning models. In our view, using 200 hours  
10 better matches the allocation factor with the planning  
11 criteria actually used by the Company. The effect of  
12 using a system coincident demand allocation factor based  
13 on a different number of hours versus that proposed by  
14 the Company is shown in Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-5), discussed  
15 later in my testimony.

16 **Q. What is the effect of including more or fewer hours of**  
17 **system coincident peak demand in the calculation of the**  
18 **system coincident peak demand allocation factors?**

19 **A. Page 8 of Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-2) shows that between the**  
20 **range of 1 to 4,000 hours, the effect of including**  
21 **additional hours in the calculation of the allocation**  
22 **factor tends to benefit the lower load factor classes,**  
23 **such as the residential class, at the cost of the higher**  
24 **load factor classes, such as the high voltage class.**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**Q. What is class non-coincident peak demand?**

A. Class non-coincident peak demand is the highest demand of the class at a point in time regardless of the demands of any other class. Such demands are often referred to as localized demands.

**Q. How were these calculated?**

A. Using load research data, the Company was able to identify the highest class non-coincident peak hours. The allocation factor calculation is based on the percentage of the highest demand of a given class to the sum of the highest demands of all classes. Adjustments, similar to those made in calculating the system coincident demand factors, are often made.

**Q. Once the two types of demand factors have been calculated, how are they used in the study?**

A. The system coincident peak demand factors are used to allocate production and transmission demand-related costs. This is in recognition of the fact that these costs are incurred in response to the peak coincident demands placed on the system. The class non-coincident peak demand factors are used to allocate distribution demand-related costs. This recognizes the fact that investments in substations, for example, are more dependent on localized class level demands than the combined or coincident peak demands. Page 2 of

1 Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-2) shows the demand factors typically  
2 used to allocate functionalized and classified costs.

3 **b. Allocation of Energy-Related Costs**

4 **Q. How are energy-related costs typically allocated among**  
5 **the classes?**

6 **A.** Energy costs are allocated using energy factors derived  
7 from the class total kWh consumption for the test  
8 period. Adjustments to normalize the results and to  
9 reflect losses are made to the class level kWh  
10 consumption figures. Page 4 of Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-4)  
11 shows the calculation of the energy calculation factor.

12 **c. Allocation of Customer-Related Costs**

13 **Q. Please explain the allocation of customer-related costs.**

14 **A.** Customer-related costs are generally allocated based on  
15 the number of customers or meters taking service from  
16 the utility. As in the case of the demand allocation  
17 factors, a set of customer-related classification  
18 factors are generally developed. Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-4),  
19 pages 5-7, demonstrates the different types of customer-  
20 related factors used by the Company. The set is derived  
21 through a combination of weighting factors and  
22 consideration of the particular functionalized  
23 classified component of the revenue requirement being  
24 allocated. For example, the costs associated with

1 serving only secondary delivery voltage customers should  
2 not include primary delivery voltage customers in its  
3 allocation factor.

#### 4 **SUMMARY OF COST OF SERVICE STUDY**

5 **Q. What is shown on Summary 1 of Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-3)?**

6 A. Summary 1 of Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-3) shows a class level  
7 income statement for each class considered in the cost  
8 study. The bottom line of this report shows the  
9 realized rate of return for each class of customers  
10 based on the allocated operating expenses, income and  
11 rate base for that class.

12 **Q. Please explain Summary 2 of Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-3).**

13 A. Summary 2 relates operating revenues to revenue  
14 requirements for each class of customer. This schedule  
15 shows the parity level of each class versus all other  
16 classes. This report often serves as the basis for  
17 cost-based rate spread decisions, as discussed in  
18 Mr. Hoff's testimony.

19 **Q. What is shown on Schedules A through D of Exhibit \_\_\_**  
20 **(CEL-3)?**

21 A. Schedules A through D detail the functionalization,  
22 classification and allocation of revenues, expenses, and  
23 rate base items, by ID, to the customer classes. Also  
24



1 shown on these supporting schedules are the allocation  
2 techniques used in the cost of service process.

3 Q. What is shown on Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-6)?

4 A. Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-6) shows the specific cost of service  
5 results used by Mr. Hoff as the starting point for  
6 developing his recommendations on rate spread and rate  
7 design. Pages 1 to 6 show the cost based basic charge  
8 by schedule. (See Concept No. 11A of the Collaborative  
9 Group, Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (DWH-4), p. 19.) Pages 7 to 9 show  
10 the cost-based rate spread. (See Concept No. 4 of the  
11 Collaborative Group, Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (DWH-4), p. 4 and Rate  
12 Spread Concept A of the Task Force, Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (DWH-3),  
13 p. 12). Pages 10 to 11 show the cost basis used by  
14 Mr. Hoff to separate the current Schedule 24 into three  
15 separate rate schedules.

16 Q. Have you prepared an exhibit showing the identification  
17 of base and resource costs?

18 A. Yes. The Commission in the Decoupling Proceeding  
19 directed the Company to identify base and resource costs  
20 for each class. (Third Supplemental Order, p. 25.)  
21 This analysis is shown on page 1 of Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-5).

22 ~~Mr. Hoff explains in his testimony why the use of the~~  
23 ~~resulting base and resource costs are not appropriate~~

24 *excluded, on motion by Trotter, 9/23/92  
alh*

*excluded, on motion, 9/23/92*

~~for either a rate spread or authorized revenue calculation.~~

### COMPARISON OF SCENARIOS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Q. What is shown on the Comparison of Results table of Exhibit \_\_\_\_ (CEL-5)?

6 A. This table summarizes the effects of applying different  
7 assumptions, methodologies or input values when  
8 functionalizing, classifying and allocating specific  
9 cost items in the cost study. Each scenario reflects  
10 only the change indicated, and is not intended to show  
11 cumulative effects.

12 Q. Please describe each set of scenarios.

13 A. Page 2 of this table examines the effects on parity  
14 relationships of classifying production costs at various  
15 points on the spectrum from 100% demand-related to 100%  
16 energy-related. These classifications can be  
17 accomplished either through an explicit selection of a  
18 classification method or implicitly through assumptions  
19 applied within a given method. For example, it is  
20 possible to calculate the peak credit method to be equal  
21 to 7% demand and 93% energy if a limited number of hours  
22 of extreme peak are assumed to be priced at the near  
23 term cost of peak capacity. As noted in both my  
24 testimony and Mr. Hoff's, the assumptions used by the

1 Company in the calculation of the peak credit  
2 classification factors are well within the reasonable  
3 range of results which may be arrived at using this  
4 approach.

5 Page 3 of Exhibit \_\_\_ (CEL-5) shows the effects on  
6 parity relationships of incrementing the number of hours  
7 of peak demand used in the calculation of the system  
8 coincident peak demand allocation factors. The  
9 scenarios used are the single highest peak, 12 highest  
10 peak hours, 200 highest peak hours, 1500 highest peak  
11 hours and the 12 monthly highest coincident peak hours.  
12 As shown on these pages, the effect of including more  
13 hours in the allocation is to benefit the residential  
14 class to the detriment of the high voltage class.

15 Page 4 shows the effects on parity relationships of  
16 classifying transmission costs as either 100% demand-  
17 related or according to production cost classification.

18 Page 5 shows the effects on parity relationships of  
19 applying the minimum grid method, the basic customer  
20 method (as proposed) or the modified basic customer  
21 method of classifying distribution costs.

22 **Q. Does this complete your testimony?**

23 **A. Yes, it does.**