Exh. SRM-6T Dockets UE-191024 *et. al.* Witness: Steven R. McDougal

## BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PACIFICORP dba PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Respondent.

Dockets UE-191024, UE-190750, UE-190929, UE-190981, UE-180778 (*Consolidated*)

## PACIFICORP

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF STEVEN R. MCDOUGAL

## ATTACHED EXHIBITS

Exhibit No. SRM-7—Depreciation Expense Comparison

Exhibit No. SRM-8—Washington Depreciation

1	Q.	Are you the same Steven R. McDougal who previously filed testimony in the
2		2018 Depreciation Study proceeding, docket UE-180778, on behalf of PacifiCorp
3		dba Pacific Power & Light Company (PacifiCorp or the Company)?
4	A.	Yes.
5		Purpose of Supplemental Testimony
6	Q.	What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony?
7	A.	The purpose of my supplemental testimony is to update the depreciation impact to
8		Washington from the Company's supplemental filing in this proceeding. My
9		supplemental testimony supports the calculation and impact of including the revised
10		decommissioning costs and other plant closure costs.
11	Q.	Please summarize the update to the decommissioning costs.
12	A.	As set forth in the 2020 Inter-Jurisdictional Allocation Protocol, the Company
13		engaged a third party to perform updated Decommissioning Studies for certain steam
14		plants. <sup>1</sup> The initial Decommissioning Study included revised decommissioning cost
15		estimates for seven of the twelve steam plants. These plants included Hunter,
16		Huntington, Dave Johnson, Jim Bridger, Naughton, Wyodak, and Hayden. A second
17		Decommissioning Study was conducted to provide a revised decommissioning cost
18		estimate for the Colstrip plant. The first component of the revised decommissioning
19		cost is for the Base Estimate and includes revised cost estimates for decommissioning
20		and reclamation. These costs are included in the depreciation rate calculation that is
21		supported in the supplemental testimony of Mr. John J. Spanos, Exhibit JJS-8T. The
22		second component of the decommissioning cost is for Other Plant Closure Costs such

\_\_\_\_\_

Supplemental Testimony of Steven R. McDougal

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Exhibit No. EL-3 at 29.

1		as material and supply inventory, rolling stock, coal pile excavation and haul-off, coal
2		mine closure and other miscellaneous costs. The revised decommissioning costs are
3		discussed further in the supplemental testimony of Mr. Chad A. Teply, Exhibit CAT-
4		28T.
5	Q.	What is the impact on depreciation after the inclusion of the Base Estimate
6		decommissioning and reclamation cost.
7	A.	The incremental impact on coal plant depreciation of the Company's supplemental
8		filing from updating the Base Estimate is \$36.7 million total-Company, or
9		\$8.3 million Washington-allocated as shown in column D of Exhibit SRM-7. The
10		revised coal plant deprecation expenses, compared to the Company's approved
11		depreciation rates, are \$327.3 million total-Company, or \$73.6 million Washington-
12		allocated. Further details on this calculation can be found in Exhibit SRM-8.
13	Q.	Please describe the Other Plant Closure Costs?
14	A.	Although separately identified, the Other Plant Closure Costs are necessary for the
15		
		Company to fully recover all costs associated with closing a plant during the
16		Company to fully recover all costs associated with closing a plant during the remaining operational life of the plant. For example, each generation plant has a
16 17		
		remaining operational life of the plant. For example, each generation plant has a
17		remaining operational life of the plant. For example, each generation plant has a certain level of materials and supplies inventory that is required to operate the plant.
17 18		remaining operational life of the plant. For example, each generation plant has a certain level of materials and supplies inventory that is required to operate the plant. Under normal retirement circumstances, these costs would be included in the closure
17 18 19		remaining operational life of the plant. For example, each generation plant has a certain level of materials and supplies inventory that is required to operate the plant. Under normal retirement circumstances, these costs would be included in the closure costs of the generation plant; however, because the Washington proposed depreciable
17 18 19 20		remaining operational life of the plant. For example, each generation plant has a certain level of materials and supplies inventory that is required to operate the plant. Under normal retirement circumstances, these costs would be included in the closure costs of the generation plant; however, because the Washington proposed depreciable life of each unit can differ from the actual plant retirement date, it is important the

Supplemental Testimony of Steven R. McDougal

1		CAT-30. Approximately \$138.9 million of the total amount for Jim Bridger is directly
2		related to the Bridger Coal Mine. The Company performed a more detailed analysis
3		on the Bridger Coal Mine and has included the revised estimated separately.
4		Accordingly, the proposed amount included for Jim Bridger is \$59.1 million.
5	Q.	Please explain the Bridger Coal Mine amount included in the Other Plant
6		Closure Costs?
7	A.	The Bridger Coal Mine is an operational mine that provides coal to Jim Bridger.
8		Traditionally, the cost associated with the mine and coal extraction are included in net
9		power costs over the life of the mine. The Washington assumed life for Jim Bridger
10		is the end of 2023, which is shorter than the assumed life of the Bridger Coal Mine.
11		The additional costs included for the Bridger Coal Mine provide the Company the
12		opportunity to recover the costs associated with the undepreciated mine investment
13		and reclamation within the same timeframe. The undepreciated mine investment is
14		estimated at \$22.4 million and the reclamation contribution is estimated at \$95.8
15		million.
16	Q.	How does the Company plan to recover and use the Other Plant Closure Costs?
17	A.	The Company is proposing to recover the Other Plant Closure Costs over the
18		remaining depreciable life, or December 31, 2023, and in the revenue requirement of
19		this general rate case filing. If approved, the amount collected from Washington
20		customers would be deferred to a regulatory liability. The regulatory liability will
21		then be debited when actual plant retirement occurs and Other Plant Closure costs are
22		accrued. This treatment will allow the Company an opportunity for full recovery of
23		the associated closure costs of a generation plant. Additional details supporting the

Supplemental Testimony of Steven R. McDougal

- 1 revenue requirement calculation of the Other Plant Closure Costs can be found in the
- 2 supplemental testimony and exhibits of Ms. Shelley E. McCoy, Exhibit SEM-6T.

## 3 Q. Does this conclude your supplemental testimony?

4 A. Yes.