

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. UE-16 _____

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

BRYAN A. COX

REPRESENTING AVISTA CORPORATION

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

I. INTRODUCTION

Q. Please state your name, employer and business address.

A. My name is Bryan A. Cox. I am employed by Avista Corporation as Director, Operations West. My business address is 1411 East Mission, Spokane, Washington.

Q. Please briefly describe your educational background and professional experience.

A. I am a 1992 graduate of Gonzaga University with a degree in Mathematics and a 2009 graduate of the University of Washington’s Foster School of Business with a Masters Degree in Business Administration. I joined the Company in 1997 and have spent 18 years in various technical and leadership positions in Information Technology, Natural Gas Delivery, Strategic Planning, and Gas and Electric Construction Services. Over the last two years I have led the West Electric Operations group which delivers service to most of our Washington operations as well as more recently the System Operations Department. I am a member of the Capital Planning Group that manages the five year Company capital budget.

Q. What is the scope of your testimony?

A. My testimony presents Avista’s transmission revenues and expenses for 2017 and 2018. I also discuss Avista’s Transmission capital expenditures, for the period January 2016 through the June 2018 rate period. As explained by Company witness Ms. Andrews, the Company is basing its electric revenue increase requested in this case on its electric Attrition Study. However, as explained by Company witness Ms. Smith, the Company is also presenting a traditional electric Pro Forma Study using a modified historical test period

1 with limited pro forma adjustments (modified test year Pro Forma), including Washington’s
 2 share of certain transmission capital projects I have described later in my testimony. I am
 3 also presenting explanation and documentation supporting transmission capital projects that
 4 are incorporated into Ms. Smith’s 2017 Cross Check Study, as well as the Company’s Cross
 5 Check Study for the January - June 2018 six-month period.¹

6 A table of contents for my testimony is as follows:

7	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
8	I. Introduction	1
9	II. Transmission Expenses for 2017 and 2018 (6 months)	3
10	III. Transmission Revenue for 2017 and 2018 (6 months)	8
11	IV. Transmission Capital Projects 2016 through June 2018	17

12

13 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits?**

14 A. Yes. Exhibit No. ____(BAC-2) provides the transmission revenue and expense
 15 adjustments.

¹As discussed by Ms. Andrews, the electric Attrition Studies analysis includes Washington’s share of the 2017 and June 2018 rate year transmission revenues described within my testimony. These revenues are included in Ms. Andrews’ electric Attrition Studies, Exhibit Nos. ____(EMA-2) and ____(EMA-4), page 4, column [I]. Washington’s share of the transmission revenues are also included in the Energy Recovery Mechanism (ERM) authorized base. See Company witness Mr. Johnson Exhibit No. ____(WGJ-5) for the “ERM Authorized Power Supply Expenses” included in this case.

1 **II. TRANSMISSION EXPENSES FOR 2017 and 2018 (6 months)**

2 **Q. Please describe the adjustments to the twelve months ended September**
 3 **30, 2015 test year transmission expenses to arrive at transmission expenses for the 2017**
 4 **– June 2018 ending rate period.**

5 A. Adjustments were made in this filing to incorporate updated information for any
 6 changes in transmission expenses from the October 2014 through the September 2015 test
 7 year to the 2017 rate year. No material changes were necessary for the incremental period
 8 ending June 2018 from the 2017 levels proposed by the Company. The changes in expenses
 9 and a description of each is summarized in Table No. 1, and an explanation of each change
 10 follows the table.

11 **TABLE NO. 1**
 12 **Transmission Expense Adjustment**

	2017 Test Year (System)⁽¹⁾	12ME 06.2018 Test Year (System)⁽²⁾
NWPP	\$ 21,000	\$ -
Colstrip O&M 500kV Lines	(16,000)	-
ColumbiaGrid Transmission Funding	57,000	-
ColumbiaGrid Transmission Planning	15,000	-
Order 1000 Functional Agreement	(25,000)	-
NERC CIP	(32,000)	-
PEAK Reliability	194,000	-
WECC Dues	22,000	-
WECC Loop Flow	-	-
Total Change in Transmission Expense	\$ 236,000	\$ -

13 (1) Represents the change in expense above or below the 2014-2015 historical test year level.
 14 (2) Represents the change in expense above or below the December 31, 2018 rate year level.

15 Northwest Power Pool (NWPP) (2017: \$21,000; 2018: \$0) – Avista pays its share of
 16 the NWPP operating costs. The NWPP serves the electric utilities in the Northwest by
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22

1 facilitating coordinated power system operations and planning, including contingency
2 generation reserve sharing, Columbia River water coordination and providing support to
3 coordinated regional transmission planning. Avista's share of the costs for 2017 is \$83,000,
4 an increase of \$21,000 over the 2014-15 test year. This increase in expense is primarily
5 related to increased labor and analytical support required in the development of new
6 standards intended to provide consistency in operations between various states in our region.

7 Colstrip Transmission (2017: -\$16,000; 2018: \$0) – Avista is required to pay its
8 portion of the O&M costs associated with its joint ownership share of the Colstrip
9 transmission system pursuant to the Colstrip Transmission Agreement. Under this
10 agreement, NorthWestern Energy (NWE) operates and maintains the Colstrip transmission
11 system. In accordance with NWE's proposed Colstrip transmission plan provided to the
12 Company, NWE will bill Avista an estimated \$312,000 for Avista's share of the Colstrip
13 O&M expense during the 2017 rate year. This is a decrease of \$16,000 from the actual
14 expense of \$328,000 incurred during the 2014-15 test year.

15 ColumbiaGrid Transmission Funding (2017: \$57,000; 2018: \$0) – Avista became a
16 member of the ColumbiaGrid regional transmission organization in 2006. ColumbiaGrid's
17 purpose is to enhance transmission system reliability and efficiency, provide cost-effective
18 coordinated regional transmission planning, develop and facilitate the implementation of
19 solutions relating to improved use and expansion of the interconnected Northwest
20 transmission system, and support effective market monitoring within the Northwest and the
21 entire Western interconnection. Avista supports ColumbiaGrid's general developmental and
22 regional coordination activities under the ColumbiaGrid Funding Agreement and supports
23 specific functional activities under the Planning and Expansion Functional Agreement and

1 the FERC Order 1000 Functional Agreement. Avista's ColumbiaGrid general funding
2 expenses for the 2014-15 test year were \$85,000 while 2017 rate year general funding
3 expenses are planned to be \$142,000. This increase is primarily due to an increase in labor
4 expenses due to organizational changes and filling of previously open positions.

5 ColumbiaGrid Transmission Planning (2017: \$15,000; 2018: \$0) – The
6 ColumbiaGrid Planning and Expansion Functional Agreement (PEFA) was accepted by the
7 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) on April 3, 2007, and Avista entered into
8 the PEFA on April 4, 2007. Coordinated transmission planning activities under the PEFA
9 allow the Company to meet its coordinated regional transmission planning requirements set
10 forth in FERC Order 890 issued in February 2007, and as outlined in the Company's Open
11 Access Transmission Tariff. Actual PEFA expenses for the 2014-15 test year were
12 \$158,000. The Company's PEFA expenses for 2017 are \$173,000, reflecting
13 ColumbiaGrid's staffing levels to support the PEFA.

14 ColumbiaGrid Order 1000 Functional Agreement (2017: -\$25,000; 2018: \$0) –
15 FERC Order 1000 requirements are implemented under the Amended and Restated Order
16 1000 Functional Agreement, signed on November 11, 2014 (Order 1000 Agreement). This
17 contract called for a \$50,000 payment late in 2014 that covered two years of payments for
18 2015 and 2016. Beginning in 2017, this contract calls for an annual payment of \$25,000.

19 NERC Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) (2017: -\$32,000; 2018: \$0) – The
20 Company has purchased several software and hardware products to assist in protecting
21 critical transmission control systems from intrusion and to meet applicable NERC standards.
22 These products provide for physical security, intrusion detection, virus protection and

1 vulnerability assessment. The Company's NERC CIP expenses for 2017 are \$75,000, a
2 decrease of \$32,000 from the 2014-15 test year actual expenses of \$107,000.

3 OASIS Expenses (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – These Open Access Same-time
4 Information System (OASIS) expenses are associated with travel and training costs for
5 transmission pre-scheduling and OASIS personnel. This travel is required to monitor and
6 adhere to NERC reliability standards, regional criteria development, FERC OASIS
7 requirements and OASIS user group forums with software vendor OATI. Issues regarding
8 the software are discussed and requests are made with the vendor for additional features that
9 will be needed for compliance standards mandated by NERC, NASB and FERC. Expenses
10 during the 2014-15 test year were \$15,000 and these are expected to remain unchanged for
11 2017.

12 Peak Reliability – Reliability Coordination (2017: \$194,000; 2018: \$0) – The
13 Company's Peak Reliability (PEAK) fees are scheduled to increase from the amount paid in
14 the historical test year of \$484,000, to \$678,000 in the 2017 rate year. The large increase is
15 attributable to the FERC requirement that the western interconnection reliability
16 coordination function be corporately and physically separated from other WECC functions.
17 This "bifurcation" was primarily the result of a transmission system outage in the Pacific
18 Southwest on September 8, 2011. A reference to the disturbance including "Causes and
19 Recommendations" may be found at [http://www.ferc.gov/legal/staff-reports/04-27-2012-](http://www.ferc.gov/legal/staff-reports/04-27-2012-ferc-nerc-report.pdf)
20 [ferc-nerc-report.pdf](http://www.ferc.gov/legal/staff-reports/04-27-2012-ferc-nerc-report.pdf). PEAK's budget is approved by its independent board of directors and
21 is allocated to the members of PEAK based net energy used to serve load within a member's
22 balancing area. Detailed allocation information is available on PEAK's website
23 www.peakrc.com.

1 WECC – Administration Dues (2017: \$22,000; 2018: \$0) – WECC is the
2 designated Regional Entity under federal statute responsible for coordinating and promoting
3 Bulk Electric System reliability throughout the western interconnection. WECC is
4 responsible for monitoring and measuring Avista’s compliance with reliability standards and
5 has substantially increased its staff and other resources to meet these FERC requirements.
6 The Company’s 2014-15 test year WECC dues and fees were \$421,000. The Company’s
7 total for dues and fees in the 2017 rate year are expected to be \$443,000.

8 WECC - Loop Flow (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – Loop Flow charges are spread across all
9 transmission owners in the West to compensate utilities that make system adjustments to
10 eliminate transmission system congestion throughout the operating year. WECC Loop Flow
11 charges can vary from year to year since the costs incurred are dependent on transmission
12 system usage and congestion. Loop Flow expenses for the 2014-15 test year were \$41,000.
13 Loop Flow expenses are expected to be unchanged for the 2017 rate year.

14 Addy Substation (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – The Company pays operation and
15 maintenance fees to Bonneville associated with a 115kV circuit breaker in Bonneville’s
16 Addy Substation that provides a direct interconnection for Avista’s retail load. In the test
17 year the expenses were \$9,000 and these are anticipated to remain unchanged for 2017.

18 Hatwai Substation (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – The Company pays operation and
19 maintenance fees to Bonneville associated with a 230kV circuit breaker owned by Avista
20 but located in Bonneville’s Hatwai Substation. In the test year the expenses were \$23,000
21 and these are expected to remain unchanged for 2017.

1 **III. TRANSMISSION REVENUES FOR 2017 – 2018 (6 months)**

2 **Q. Please describe the adjustments to 2014-2015 test year transmission**
 3 **revenues to arrive at transmission revenues for the 2017 and June 2018 ending rate**
 4 **periods.**

5 A. Adjustments have been made in this filing to incorporate updated information
 6 for transmission revenue during the 2017 and incremental 6 month period ending June 2018
 7 as compared to the historical test year. Each revenue item described below is at a system
 8 level and is included in Exhibit No.__(BAC-2). With the exception of the Morgan Stanley
 9 point-to-point transmission service contract revenue, no material change in revenue is
 10 expected for the incremental 6 month period ending June 30, 2018. Table No. 2 below
 11 provides a summary of the changes in transmission revenues, and an explanation of each
 12 change follows the table.

13 **TABLE NO. 2**
Transmission Revenue Adjustment

	2017 Test Year (System) ⁽¹⁾	12ME 06.2018 Test Year (System) ⁽²⁾
Borderline Wheeling Transmission	\$ 271,000	\$ -
Borderline Wheeling - Low Voltage	-	-
Borderline Wheeling Ancillary Revenues	(6,000)	-
Seattle/Tacoma Main Canal	-	-
OASIS Nonfirm & Short-term Firm	(690,000)	-
Seattle and Tacoma - Main Canal Project	-	-
Seattle and Tacoma - Summer Falls Project	-	-
PacifiCorp - Dry Gulch Wheeling	(17,000)	-
Spokane Waste to Energy Plant	-	-
Grand Coulee Project Hydroelectric Authority	-	-
First Wind Transmission	(200,000)	-
Palouse Wind O & M	-	-
Stimson Lumber Agreement	-	-
Bonneville Power Administration - Parallel Capacity Support	-	-
Morgan Stanley Capital Group	-	(300,000)
Kootenai Electric Cooperative Fighting Creek (KEC)	-	-
	<u>\$ (642,000)</u>	<u>\$ (300,000)</u>

23 (1) Represents the change in expense above or below the 2014-2015 historical test year level.

(2) Represents the change in expense above or below the December 31, 2018 rate year level.

1 Borderline Wheeling – Transmission (2017: \$271,000; 2018: \$0) – The Company
2 provides borderline wheeling service (wheeling service over transmission and low-voltage
3 distribution facilities for service to loads of other utilities within the Company’s
4 transmission system footprint) to the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Consolidated
5 Irrigation District, East Greenacres Irrigation District, Spokane Tribe of Indians and Grant
6 County PUD (transmission only). Total revenue for the transmission portion of borderline
7 wheeling activities for the 2014-2015 test year was \$5,982,000. Total revenue in the 2017
8 rate year is estimated to be \$6,253,000, representing an increase of \$271,000 from the test
9 year. Revenue estimates for each transmission customer are determined as follows:

- 10 • **Bonneville Power Administration** – Network Integration Transmission Service
11 revenue is estimated based upon a three-year average for the 2013 to 2015 time
12 period, resulting in a figure of \$6,153,000 for the 2017 and 2018 rate year compared
13 to \$5,887,000 for the 2014-2015 test year. The Company has in the past used a five-
14 year average for estimating BPA borderline wheeling revenue but is proposing to use
15 a three-year average at this time in order to be consistent with the three-year average
16 used in all other instances where the Company estimates transmission revenues that
17 are based upon variable customer load figures (e.g. Grant County PUD and
18 PacifiCorp Dry Gulch).
- 19 • **Grant County PUD** – Power Transfer Agreement revenue is estimated using a
20 three-year average (2013-2015) resulting in a figure of \$28,000 for the 2017 rate
21 year compared to \$28,000 for the 2014-2015 test year.
- 22 • **Consolidated Irrigation District** – Point-to-Point Transmission Service revenue for
23 the 2014-2015 test year was \$32,000. The current contract will expire on September

1 30, 2016 but a follow-on contract is expected to be in place resulting in revenue that
2 is expected to remain substantially unchanged during the 2017 rate year.

3 • **East Greenacres Irrigation District** – Point-to-Point Transmission Service revenue
4 for the 2014-2015 test year was \$11,000. Under the current contract (with a term
5 through September 30, 2019) this revenue is expected to remain unchanged for 2017.

6 • **Spokane Tribe** – Point-to-Point Transmission Service revenue for the 2014-2015
7 test year was \$24,000. Under the current contract (with a term through December
8 31, 2019) this revenue is expected to be \$29,000 for 2017.

9 Borderline Wheeling – Low Voltage (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – Total revenues for the
10 low voltage portion of borderline wheeling activities for the 2014-2015 test year was
11 \$1,079,000. Total revenue in the 2017 rate year is estimated to remain substantially the
12 same. Revenue estimates for each transmission customer are as follows:

13 • **Bonneville Power Administration** – Wheeling revenue over low-voltage facilities
14 for the 2014-2015 test year was \$907,900. Revenue for the 2017 rate year is
15 expected to remain substantially the same.

16 • **Consolidated Irrigation District** – Electric Distribution Service revenue for the
17 2014-2015 test year was \$80,000. The current contract will expire September 30,
18 2016 but a follow-on contract is expected to be in place resulting in revenue that is
19 expected to remain substantially unchanged during the 2017 rate year.

20 • **East Greenacres Irrigation District** – Electric Distribution Service revenue for the
21 2014-2015 test year was \$51,000. Under the current contract (with a term through
22 September 30, 2019) this revenue is expected to remain unchanged for 2017.

1 • **Spokane Tribe** – Electric Distribution Service revenue for the 2014-2015 test year
2 was \$20,000. Under the current contract (with a term through December 31, 2019)
3 this revenue is expected to remain unchanged for 2017.

4 Borderline Wheeling – Ancillary Services (2017: -\$6,000; 2018: \$0) – The
5 Company provides various ancillary services in association with long-term firm
6 transmission service provided under its Open Access Transmission Tariff. Ancillary
7 services revenue for the 2014-2015 test year was \$1,627,500. Revenue in the 2017 rate year
8 has been set at \$1,621,500, representing a decrease of \$6,000 from the test year. Ancillary
9 services are necessary to support the transmission of electric power from one point to
10 another given the obligations of balancing areas and transmitting utilities within those
11 balancing areas to maintain reliable operation of the interconnected transmission system.
12 The revenue estimate is based upon an ancillary services rate of \$8.94 per kW multiplied by
13 billing determinants of 2% (regulation and frequency response), 1.5% (Operating Reserves –
14 Spinning) and 1.5% (Operating Reserves – Supplemental), applied to a three-year average of
15 a customer’s monthly peak loads. Revenue estimates for each transmission customer are as
16 follows:

17 • **Bonneville Power Administration** – Using three-year average load figures for the
18 2013-2015 time period, ancillary services revenue is estimated to be \$1,606,000 for
19 the 2017 rate year compared to \$1,612,000 for the 2014-2015 test year.

20 • **Consolidated Irrigation District** – Using three-year average load figures for the
21 2013-2015 time period, ancillary services revenue is estimated to be \$6,500 for the
22 2017 rate year compared to \$6,500 for the 2014-2015 test year.

1 • **East Greenacres Irrigation District** – Using three-year average load figures for the
2 2013-2015 time period, ancillary services revenue is estimated to be \$4,500 for the
3 2017 rate year compared to \$4,500 for the 2014-2015 test year.

4 • **Spokane Tribe** – Using three-year average load figures for the 2013-2015 time
5 period, ancillary services revenue is estimated to be \$4,500 for the 2017 rate year
6 compared to \$4,500 for the 2014-2015 test year.

7 OASIS Non-Firm and Short-Term Firm Transmission Service (2017: -\$690,000;
8 2018: \$0) – OASIS is an acronym for Open Access Same-time Information System. This is
9 the system used by electric transmission providers for selling available transmission capacity
10 to eligible customers. The terms and conditions under which the Company sells its
11 transmission capacity via its OASIS are pursuant to FERC regulations and Avista’s Open
12 Access Transmission Tariff. The Company calculates its rate year adjustments using a
13 three-year average of actual OASIS Non-Firm and Short-Term Firm revenue. OASIS
14 transmission revenue may vary significantly depending upon a number of factors, including
15 current wholesale power market conditions, forced or planned generation resource outage
16 situations in the region, the current load-resource balance status of regional load-serving
17 entities, and the availability of parallel transmission paths for prospective transmission
18 customers.

19 The use of a three-year average is intended to strike a balance in mitigating both
20 long-term and short-term impacts to OASIS revenue. A three-year period is intended to be
21 long enough to mitigate the impacts of non-substantial temporary operational conditions (for
22 generation and transmission) that may occur during a given year, and short-enough so as to
23 not dilute the impacts of long-term transmission and generation topography changes (e.g.,

1 major transmission projects which may impact the availability of the Company's
2 transmission capacity or competing transmission paths, and major generation projects which
3 may impact the load-resource balance needs of prospective transmission customers). If
4 there are known events or factors that occurred during the period that would cause the
5 average to not be representative of future expectations, then adjustments may be made to the
6 three-year average methodology. However, volatility in OASIS revenue from year-to-year
7 can be expected. For example, during the 2014-2015 test period, a single power marketer
8 purchased short-term firm and non-firm transmission capacity from the Company in
9 amounts significantly exceeding any prior activity. This single customer had purchased, on
10 average, approximately \$760,000 of such services over the previous three years. During the
11 calendar year encompassing the majority of the test period, this same customer purchased
12 \$1,650,000 of transmission service, 217% of its previous years' average. While this
13 example does not fully explain the differential between test period and pro-forma period
14 OASIS revenues in this filing, the example underscores the fact that OASIS revenue can be
15 volatile, entirely outside the scope and purview of the Company as a transmission provider.
16 In this filing, the Company is using a three year average for the time period of January 2013
17 to December 2015. The OASIS revenue for the 2014-15 test year was \$3.517 million and
18 the three-year average results in 2017 rate year revenue of \$2.827 million.

19 Seattle and Tacoma – Main Canal Project (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – Effective March 1,
20 2008, and continuing through October 31, 2026, the Company entered into long-term point-
21 to-point transmission service arrangements with the City of Seattle and the City of Tacoma
22 to transfer output from the Main Canal hydroelectric project, net of local Grant County PUD
23 load service, to the Company's transmission interconnections with Grant County PUD.

1 Service is provided during the eight months of the year (March through October) in which
2 the Main Canal project operates, and the agreements include a three-year ratchet demand
3 provision. Both contracts run to October 31, 2026. Revenues under these agreements
4 totaled \$360,000 during the test year and are expected to remain unchanged for 2017.

5 Seattle and Tacoma – Summer Falls Project (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – Effective March
6 1, 2008, and continuing through October 31, 2024, the Company entered into long-term use-
7 of-facilities arrangements with the City of Seattle and the City of Tacoma to transfer output
8 from the Summer Falls hydroelectric project across the Company’s Stratford Switching
9 Station facilities to the Company’s Stratford interconnection with Grant County PUD.
10 Charges under these use-of-facilities arrangements are based upon the Company’s
11 investment in its Stratford Switching Station and are not impacted by the Company’s
12 transmission service rates under its Open Access Transmission Tariff. Revenues under these
13 two contracts totaled \$74,000 in the 2014-15 test year and are expected to remain unchanged
14 for 2017.

15 PacifiCorp Dry Gulch (2017: -\$17,000; 2018: \$0) – Revenue under the Dry Gulch
16 use-of-facilities agreement has been adjusted to \$230,000 for the 2017 rate year, which is a
17 \$17,000 decrease from the 2014-15 test year actual revenue of \$247,000. The Company is
18 calculating its adjustment using a three-year average of actual revenue. Revenue under the
19 Dry Gulch Transmission and Interconnection Agreement with PacifiCorp varies depending
20 upon PacifiCorp’s loads served via the Dry Gulch Interconnection and the operating
21 conditions of PacifiCorp’s transmission system in this area. The use of a three-year average
22 is intended to mitigate the impacts of potential annual variability in the revenues under the
23 contract. The contract includes a twelve-month rolling ratchet demand provision and

1 charges under this agreement are not impacted by the Company's open access transmission
2 service tariff rates.

3 Spokane Waste to Energy Plant (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – Spokane Waste to Energy
4 pays a use-of-facilities charge for the ongoing use of its interconnection to Avista's
5 transmission system. The 2017 rate year revenue associated with the use-of-facilities charge
6 is \$28,000, the same as the 2014-15 test year.

7 Grand Coulee Project Hydroelectric Authority (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – The
8 Company provides operations and maintenance services on the Stratford-Summer Falls
9 115kV Transmission Line to the Grand Coulee Project Hydroelectric Authority under a
10 contract signed in March 2006. These services are provided for a fixed annual fee. Annual
11 charges under this contract totaled \$8,100 in the 2014-15 test year and will remain the same
12 for the 2017 rate year.

13 First Wind (2017: -\$200,000; 2018: \$0) – First Wind signed a transmission service
14 contract with the Company based on its initial intent to sell the output from a wind facility to
15 an entity other than Avista. Avista has since signed a power purchase agreement with First
16 Wind which voided its need for transmission service. First Wind has delayed its use of the
17 100 MW of reserved transmission service up to the maximum of five years. Unless First
18 Wind develops another generation project or is able to re-market the capacity, Avista
19 expects this agreement to be terminated during 2016. The 2014-15 test year included a
20 \$200,000 extension of service payment. No revenue associated with this agreement is
21 expected during the 2017 rate year.

22 Palouse Wind O&M (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – Per Avista's interconnection agreement
23 with the Palouse Wind project, the interconnection customer pays O&M fees associated with

1 directly-assigned interconnection facilities owned and operated by Avista. O&M revenue
2 for the 2014-15 test year was \$52,000. Revenue during the 2017 rate year is expected to
3 remain unchanged.

4 Stimson Lumber Agreement (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – Low-voltage facilities
5 associated with the Company’s Plummer Substation are dedicated for use by Stimson
6 Lumber resulting in low voltage use-of-facilities revenue of \$9,000 during the 2014-15 test
7 year. The 2017 rate year revenue from this agreement is expected to remain unchanged.

8 Hydro Tech Systems Agreement (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – Low-voltage facilities in
9 the Company’s Greenwood Substation are dedicated for use by the Meyers Falls generation
10 project resulting in low voltage use-of-facilities revenue of \$6,000 during the 2014-15 test
11 year. Revenue during the 2017 rate year is expected to remain unchanged.

12 Bonneville Power Administration – Parallel Capacity Support (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0)
13 – Avista and Bonneville executed a Parallel Operation Agreement on December 12, 2012,
14 wherein Avista provides Bonneville with parallel transmission capacity in support of
15 Bonneville’s integration of several wind resource projects. Avista provides ongoing parallel
16 capacity support under the agreement at a monthly charge of \$266,000. Revenue for the
17 2014-15 test year was \$3,192,000. Bonneville has indicated its intent to construct additional
18 transmission facilities to bypass Avista’s system and terminate this agreement. If BPA
19 chooses to bypass Avista’s system, it will take some time to complete construction. If the
20 Company learns that BPA will bypass Avista’s system prior to June 30, 2018, the Company
21 will update transmission revenue in the Company’s power supply update as discussed by
22 Company witness Mr. Johnson. The 2017 rate year reflects the same revenue of \$3,192,000.

1 Morgan Stanley – Point-to-Point Transmission Service (2017: \$0; 2018: -\$600,000)
 2 – Morgan Stanley Capital Group has purchased 25 MW of Long-Term Firm Point-to-Point
 3 Transmission Service from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2017. The 2014-15 test year
 4 revenues were \$300,000 and will remain unchanged for 2017, but will reduce \$300,000 for
 5 the 6-month period ending June 30, 2018.

6 Kootenai Electric Cooperative Fighting Creek (KEC) (2017: \$0; 2018: \$0) – KEC
 7 has purchased 3 MW of Long-Term Firm Point-to-Point Transmission Service from April 1,
 8 2014 to March 31, 2019. The 2014-15 test year included revenues of \$88,000 that will
 9 remained unchanged for 2017.

10

11

IV. TRANSMISSION CAPITAL PROJECTS

12 **Q. Please explain how the Company prepared it's case with regards to**
 13 **transmission capital projects.**

14 A. The Company started with the historical test period ending September 30,
 15 2015 and included actual transfers to plant for the last quarter of 2015 incorporated in
 16 Company witness Ms. Schuh's and Ms. Smith's Pro Forma Adjustments. The Company then
 17 reviewed the planned capital projects for 2016 and determined a threshold for pro forma
 18 capital projects according to the Company's most recent WUTC Order 05². The Company
 19 has identified transmission projects for the modified test year Pro Forma that are one-half of
 20 one percent of the Company's rate base – i.e., \$6.3 million or greater. The remaining
 21 planned capital projects for 2016 through the first half of 2018 reflect the cross check

² Dockets UE-150204 and UG-150205 (Consolidated), Order 05, Paragraph 39 and 40.

1 adjustments included in Ms. Smith's electric Cross Check Study. For further discussion
2 regarding the modified test year Pro Forma adjustments and the Cross Check adjustments
3 please see Ms. Schuh's testimony and Ms. Smith's testimony.

4 **Q. Please discuss the drivers for the Company's capital transmission**
5 **projects that will be completed from January 1, 2016 through June 30, 2018.**

6 A. Avista continuously needs to invest in its transmission system to maintain
7 reliable customer service and meet mandatory reliability standards. The capital transmission
8 projects are being planned and constructed to meet either compliance requirements, improve
9 system reliability, fix broken equipment, or replace aging equipment that is anticipated to
10 fail.

11 Compliance requirements are driven by the North American Electric Reliability
12 Corporation (NERC) standards, which are national standards that utilities must meet to
13 ensure interconnected system reliability. Beginning June 2007, compliance with these
14 standards was made mandatory and failure to meet the requirements could result in
15 monetary penalties of up to \$1 million per day per infraction. The majority of the reliability
16 standards pertain to transmission planning, operation, and equipment maintenance. The
17 standards require utilities to plan and operate their transmission systems in such a way as to
18 avoid customers experiencing outages or adversely impacting, neighboring utility systems
19 due to the loss of transmission facilities. Therefore, the transmission system must be
20 designed so that the loss of up to two facilities simultaneously will not impact the
21 interconnected transmission system. The transmission system must be operated at all times
22 such that a loss of a facility will not result in a System Operating Limit exceedance (voltage,
23 thermal or stability limit). If such an exceedance occurs, it must be mitigated prior to the

1 loss of the next facility. The mitigation efforts can include system configuration changes,
2 generation changes, or removal of firm load from the transmission system. These
3 requirements drive the need for Avista to continually invest in its transmission system.
4 Avista is required to perform system planning studies in both the near term (1-5 years) and
5 long term (5-10 years). If a potential violation is observed in the future years, then Avista
6 must develop a project plan to ensure that the violation is fixed prior to it becoming a real-
7 time operating issue. Avista plans for the future projects and attempts to ensure that the
8 design and construction of the required projects are completed prior to the time they are
9 needed. Avista continues to have a need to develop these compliance-related projects as
10 system load grows, new generation is interconnected (including wind and solar), and the
11 system functionality and usage changes.

12 **Q. How does Avista's Transmission Department prioritize capital projects**
13 **before they are submitted to the capital planning group?**

14 A. Avista capital transmission project requirements are developed through
15 system planning studies, engineering analysis, or scheduled upgrades or replacements. The
16 larger specific projects that are developed through the system planning study process
17 typically go through a thorough internal review process that includes multiple stakeholder
18 review to ensure all system needs are adequately addressed. For the smaller specific
19 projects, projects are selected to meet specific system needs or equipment replacement.
20 Both project costs and system benefits are considered in the selection of the final projects
21 within the transmission department.

22 **Q. Please provide a brief description of the transmission-related capital**
23 **projects that are included in the Company's modified test year Pro Forma Study, and**

1 **those included in the Company's Cross Check Studies for January 1, 2016 through**
2 **June 30, 2018?**

3 A. As shown in Table No. 3 below for 2016 the Company has included transmission
4 projects in the modified test year Pro Forma totaling \$11.5 million (on a system basis). The
5 remaining capital transmission projects are included in the Cross Check Studies for 2016,
6 2017 and through June 30, 2018, and total \$48.9 million, \$57.8 million, and \$7.0 million,
7 respectively, on a system basis. The following table and descriptions have been divided into
8 four different areas that are driving the transmission-related capital projects in this case:
9 Reliability Improvements, Reliability Compliance, Contractual Requirements, and
10 Reliability Replacements. Details about the transmission-related capital projects are
11 discussed below.

TABLENO. 3			
Transmission Capital Projects (System)			
Business Case Name	2016	2017	6 Mos. Ended
	\$(000's)	\$(000's)	June 2018
			\$(000's)
Modified Test Year Pro Forma Projects:			
<u>Reliability Improvements:</u>			
Noxon Switchyard Rebuild	\$ 11,500		
Cross Check Projects:			
<u>Reliability Compliance Projects:</u>			
Transmission - NERC Low Priority Mitigation	\$ 1,675	\$ 3,000	
Transmission - NERC Medium Priority Mitigation	2,576	1,000	
SCADA - SOO & BUCC	1,002	1,044	460
Environmental Compliance	50	50	21
<u>Contractual Requirements:</u>			
Tribal Permits and Settlements	314	281	126
Colstrip Transmission	568	398	216
<u>Reliability Improvements:</u>			
Noxon Switchyard Rebuild		6,700	
Substation - Station Rebuilds	4,260	5,640	
Westside Rebuild Phase One	2,525		
S Region Voltage Control	5,000		
SCADA Completion		1,000	2,000
Transmission - Reconductors and Rebuilds	17,559	20,830	
Spokane Valley Transmission Reinforcement	1,340	7,200	
<u>Reliability Replacements:</u>			
Storms	1,000	1,000	502
Substation - Capital Spares	5,200	4,565	1,515
Substation - Asset Mgmt. Capital Maintenance	4,100	4,100	1,670
Transmission - Asset Management	1,772	1,000	515
	\$ 48,942	\$ 57,808	\$ 7,025
Total Planned Transmission Capital Projects	\$ 60,442	\$ 57,808	\$ 7,025

1 **The following planned transmission reliability improvement project is included in the**
 2 **Company's modified test year Pro Forma Study using thresholds defined in**
 3 **Commission Order 05³:**

4
 5 **Noxon Switchyard Rebuild – 2016: \$11,500,000**

6 The existing Noxon Rapids 230 kV Switchyard requires reconstruction due to the
 7 present age and condition of the equipment in the station. The existing bus has
 8 suffered a number of recent failures and is configured as a single bus with a
 9 tiebreaker separating the East and West buses. The station is the interconnection
 10 point of the Noxon Rapids Hydroelectric development as well as a principal
 11 interconnection point between Avista and BPA, and as such is a significant asset in
 12 the reliable operation of the Western Montana Hydro Complex. Equipment outages
 13 within the Station (planned or unplanned) can cause significant curtailments of the
 14 local generation output. Due to the significance of the station, a complete rebuild
 15 will require coordination with Avista's Energy Resources Department and
 16 neighboring utilities, primarily BPA. The Noxon Switchyard Rebuild Project is
 17 proposed to be a Greenfield Double Bus Double Breaker 230 kV switching station to
 18 replace the existing Noxon Switchyard. See Exhibit No.__(KKS-5), Section 7,
 19 pages 44 through 52 for the business case and other information related to this
 20 project. Additional workpapers have also been provided with the Company's filing.

21
 22
 23 **The following projects are included in the Company's Cross Check Study for the years**
 24 **2016, 2017 and half of 2018: (For the following capital projects, see Exhibit**
 25 **No.__(KKS-5) for business cases supporting these projects, as well as additional**
 26 **workpapers for certain projects filed with the Company's case)**

27
 28 **I. Reliability Compliance Projects:**

29
 30 **Transmission – NERC Low Priority Mitigation – 2016: \$1,675,000; 2017:**
 31 **\$3,000,000**

32 This program reconfigures insulator attachments, and/or rebuilds existing
 33 transmission line structures, or removes earth beneath transmission lines in order to
 34 mitigate ratings/sag discrepancies found between "design" and "field" conditions as
 35 determined by LiDAR survey data. This program was undertaken in response to the
 36 October 7, 2010 North American Electric Reliability Corporation's (NERC) "NERC
 37 Alert" - Recommendation to Industry, "Consideration of Actual Field Conditions in
 38 Determination of Facility Ratings". This Capital Program covers mitigation work on
 39 Avista's "Low Priority" 115kV transmission lines. Mitigation brings lines in
 40 compliance with the National Electric Safety Code (NESC) minimum clearances
 41 values. These code minimums have been adopted into the State of Washington's
 42 Administrative Code (WAC 296-46B-010).

43

³ *Id.*

1 **Transmission - NERC Medium Priority Mitigation – 2016: \$2,576,000; 2017:**
 2 **\$1,000,000**

3 This program reconfigures insulator attachments, and/or rebuilds existing
 4 transmission line structures, or removes earth beneath transmission lines in order to
 5 mitigate ratings/sag discrepancies found between "design" and "field" conditions as
 6 determined by LiDAR survey data. This program was undertaken in response to the
 7 October 7, 2010 North American Electric Reliability Corporation's (NERC) "NERC
 8 Alert" - Recommendation to Industry, "Consideration of Actual Field Conditions in
 9 Determination of Facility Ratings". This Capital Program covers mitigation work on
 10 Avista's "Medium Priority" 230 kV and 115 kV transmission lines. Mitigation
 11 brings lines in compliance with the National Electric Safety Code (NESC) minimum
 12 clearances values. These code minimums have been adopted into the State of
 13 Washington's Administrative Code (WAC 296-46B-010).

14
 15 **SCADA –SOO&BUCC –2016: \$1,002,000; 2017: \$1,044,000; January – June**
 16 **2018: \$460,000**

17 This program replaces and/or upgrades existing electric and natural gas control
 18 center telecommunications and computing systems as they reach the end of their
 19 useful lives, require increased capacity, or cannot accommodate necessary equipment
 20 upgrades due to existing constraints. Included are hardware, software, and operating
 21 system upgrades, as well as deployment of capabilities to meet new operational
 22 standards and requirements. Some system upgrades may be initiated by other
 23 requirements, including NERC reliability standards, growth, and external projects
 24 (e.g. Smart Grid). Examples of upgrades to be completed under this program are
 25 Critical Infrastructure Protection version 5 (NERC requirement), Gas Control Room
 26 Management (PHMSA requirement), WECC RC Advanced Applications, and
 27 Technology Refresh (network and storage).

28
 29 **Environmental Compliance – 2016: \$50,000; 2017: \$50,000; January – June**
 30 **2018: \$21,000**

31 This item includes implementation of Forest Service Special Use Permits, waste oil
 32 disposal, including PCBs, and environmental compliance requirements related to
 33 storm water management, water quality protection, property cleanup and related
 34 issues.

35
 36
 37 **II. Contractual Requirements:**

38
 39 **Tribal Permits – 2016: \$314,450; 2017: \$281,000; January – June 2018:**
 40 **\$126,000**

41 The Company has approximately 300 right-of-way permits on tribal reservations that
 42 need to be renewed. The costs include labor, appraisals, field work, legal review,
 43 GIS information, negotiations, survey (as needed), and the actual fee for the permit.

1 **Colstrip Transmission – 2016: \$568,044; 2017: \$397,862; January – June 2018:**
2 **\$216,000**

3 As a joint owner of the Colstrip Transmission projects, Avista pays its ownership
4 share of all capital improvements. Northwestern Energy either performs or contracts
5 out the capital work associated with the joint owned facilities.
6

7 **III. Reliability Improvements:**

8
9 **Noxon Switchyard Rebuild –2017: \$6,700,000**

10 This project is described in detail above in the Pro Forma section.
11

12 **Substation – Distribution Station Rebuilds – 2016: \$4,260,296; 2017: \$5,640,000;**

13 This program replaces and/or rebuilds existing substations as they reach the end of
14 their useful lives, require increased capacity, or cannot accommodate necessary
15 equipment upgrades due to existing physical constraints. Included are Wood
16 Substation rebuilds as well as upgrading stations to current design and construction
17 standards. Some station rebuilds may be initiated by other requirements, including
18 obligation to serve, growth, and external projects. Examples of substation rebuilds to
19 be completed under this program in the next five years are Kamiah (Wood
20 Substation), 9th & Central, Gifford and Southeast (Equipment Additions), Ford and
21 Sprague (Service Life Retirement) and Hallett & White (Growth).
22

23 **Westside Rebuild Phase I –2016: \$2,525,000**

24 Phase I of this project will extend the existing Westside Substation 115 kV and 230
25 kV buses to allow for a new 250 MVA Autotransformer. This installation will
26 eliminate transformer overload contingencies in the Spokane area. This is a three
27 phase project to complete the remainder of the station rebuild.
28

29 **South Region Voltage Control – 2016: \$5,000,000**

30 Avista's south region 230 kV, primarily around Lewiston-Clarkston, experiences
31 excessive high voltage during light load periods. Voltages exceed equipment ratings
32 over 35% of the time. Operation of equipment outside of equipment ratings imposes
33 potential legal and regulatory risks to the Company on top of increasing large scale
34 outage possibilities. With automatic control, existing overvoltages can be reduced, if
35 not eliminated, on the 230 kV buses at Dry Creek, Lolo and North Lewiston as well
36 as Moscow and Shawnee.
37

38 **SCADA Completion – 2017: \$1,000,000; January – June 2018: \$2,000,000**

39 This project will complete the installations of SCADA and EMS/DMS capability to
40 all Avista substations. This will provide System Operations with clear visibility,
41 indication and control at every substation. In addition, Grid Modernization will have
42 the necessary communication infrastructure for complete installation and operation
43 on all distribution feeders. System Planning, Asset Management, Operations and
44 Engineering will have real time and historical data to support efficient, flexible and
45 safe operation and design of the system for the future.

1 **Transmission Reconductors and Rebuilds – 2016: \$17,559,000; 2017:**
 2 **\$20,830,000**

3 This program reconductors and/or rebuilds existing transmission lines as they reach
 4 the end of their useful lives, require increased capacity, or present a risk management
 5 issue. Projects include: ER 2423 – System Transmission: Rebuild Condition; ER
 6 2457 – Benton Othello 115 kV Recondition; ER 2550 – Burke-Thompson A&B
 7 115kV Transmission Rebuild Proj; ER 2556 – CDA-Pine Creek 115kV
 8 Transmission Line: Rebuild; ER 2557 – 9CE-Sunset 115kV Transmission Line:
 9 Rebuild; ER 2564 – Devils Gap-Lind 115kV Transmission Rebuild Proj; ER 2577 –
 10 Benewah-Moscow 230kV – Structure Replacement; ER 2576 – Addy-Devils Gap
 11 115kV – Rec/Rbld 266 & 397 Cond; ER 2582 – Beacon-Bell-Francis&Cdr-Waikiki
 12 115kV – Reconfig; ER 2597 – Cabinet-Noxon 230kV Transm Line Rebuild Project.

13
 14 **Spokane Valley Transmission Reinforcement – 2016: \$1,340,032; 2017:**
 15 **\$7,200,000**

16 The Spokane Valley Transmission Reinforcement Project includes rebuilding 4.4
 17 miles of the Beacon - Boulder #2 115 kV Transmission Line, constructing the new
 18 Irvin Switching Station, rebuilding 1.75 miles of the Irvin - Opportunity 115 kV Tap,
 19 installing four 115 kV circuit breakers at Opportunity Substation, and constructing a
 20 new 2.2 mile 115 kV transmission line from Irvin to Millwood/Inland Empire Paper.
 21 The completion of these projects is required to mitigate existing and future
 22 performance and reliability issues of the Transmission System in the Spokane
 23 Valley. Opportunity Substation was completed and energized in 2015; the Irvin-
 24 Millwood line was completed in 2014; Irvin Substation construction will break
 25 ground in 2016 and is expected to be energized in 2017; and the Beacon-Boulder line
 26 will then be able to be rebuilt.

27
 28 **IV. Reliability Replacements:**

29
 30 **Storms -2016: \$1,000,000; 2017: \$1,000,000; January – June 2018: \$502,000**

31 This program will replace cross arms, poles and structures as required due to storms,
 32 and fires on distribution and transmission lines.

33
 34 **Substation – Capital Spares – 2016: \$5,200,000; 2017: \$4,565,000; January –**
 35 **June 2018: \$1,515,000**

36 This program maintains our fleet of Power Transformers and High Voltage Circuit
 37 Breakers. This fleet of critical apparatus is capitalized upon receipt and placed in
 38 service for both planned and emergency installations as required. The annual
 39 program expenditures may vary significantly in years when a 230/115
 40 autotransformer is purchased. In years without an autotransformer purchase, only
 41 minor variations will occur based on planned projects as well as replenishing
 42 apparatus fleet levels required for adequate capital spares. These are long lead time
 43 items so sufficient levels need to be maintained.

1 **Substation Asset Management Capital Maintenance – 2016: \$4,100,000; 2017:**
2 **\$4,100,000; January – June 2018: \$1,670,000**

3 Avista has several different equipment replacement programs to improve reliability
4 by replacing aged equipment that is beyond its useful life. These programs include
5 transmission air switch upgrades, restoration of substation rock and fencing, recloser
6 replacements, replacement of obsolete circuit switchers, substation battery
7 replacement, meter replacements and upgrades, relay replacements, high voltage fuse
8 upgrades, transformer replacements, breaker replacements, installation of diagnostic
9 monitors, substation air switch replacements, and voltage regulator replacements.
10 All of these individual projects improve system reliability and customer service. The
11 equipment is replaced when it is approaching the end of its useful life.

12
13 **Transmission – Asset Management – 2016: \$1,772,260; 2017: \$1,000,000;**
14 **January – June 2018: \$515,000**

15 This item includes Transmission Minor Rebuilds in ER 2057, and Air Switch
16 Replacements in ER 2254. Transmission Minor Rebuilds are developed using data
17 received from the prior year's Wood Pole Inspection Program. Minor Rebuilds may
18 also use data received from annual Aerial Patrol Inspections. Both inspection
19 programs are undertaken to maintain compliance with NERC Standard FAC-501-
20 WECC-1. Air Switch Replacements are made based either on condition, capacity, or
21 functionality issues. Prioritization of installations and replacements are made from
22 information provided by Avista System Operations, Operations Offices, or
23 Substation Engineering.

24
25 **Q. Does this complete your pre-filed direct testimony?**

26 A. Yes it does.