June 14, 2021

## VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Utah Public Service Commission
Heber M. Wells Building, $4^{\text {th }}$ Floor
160 East 300 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
Attention: Gary Widerburg
Commission Administrator

## RE: Docket No. 21-035-01

Update to the Application to Increase the Deferred Rate through the Energy Balancing Account Mechanism

On March 15, 20201, in accordance with Utah Public Service Commission ("Commission") Rule 746-1-203, PacifiCorp, d.b.a. Rocky Mountain Power, filed its Application to increase the deferred EBA rate through the Energy Balancing Account mechanism.

Since this filing, Rocky Mountain Power noticed an error in its jurisdictional load allocation. To correct the Application submitted in March, Rocky Mountain Power submits a Motion for Leave to File Supplemental Testimony. Included as Exhibit A to the Motion for Leave is testimony from witness Jack Painter fully describing the error along with an update to the EBA deferral shown in Exhibit RMP__(JP-1S). Also included are confidential workpapers and revised EBA Filing Requirements 2 and 3.

Rocky Mountain Power respectfully requests that all formal correspondence and requests for additional information regarding this filing be addressed to the following:

| By E-mail (preferred): | $\frac{\text { datarequest@pacificorp.com }}{\text { utahdockets@pacificorp.com }}$ <br> By regular mail: |
| :--- | :--- |
| jana.saba@pacificorp.com <br> emily.wegener@pacificorp.com |  |
|  | Data Request Response Center <br> PacifiCorp |
|  | 825 NE Multnomah, Suite 2000 <br> Portland, OR 97232 |
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Informal inquiries may be directed to Jana Saba at (801) 220-2823.
Sincerely,

cc: Service List - Docket No. 21-035-01

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 21-035-01
I hereby certify that on June 14, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by electronic mail to the following:

## Utah Office of Consumer Services

| Michele Beck | $\underline{\text { mbeck@utah.gov }}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Alyson Anderson | $\underline{\text { akanderson@utah.gov }}$ |
| Bela Vastag | $\underline{\text { bvastag@utah.gov }}$ |
| Alex Ware | $\underline{\text { aware@utah.gov }}$ |
| ocs@utah.gov |  |

Utah Association of Energy Users
Phillip J. Russell (C)
prussell@jdrslaw.com
Neal Townsend (C)
ntownsend@energystrat.com

Division of Public Utilities
dpudatarequest@utah.gov
Western Resource Advocates
Sophie Hayes $\quad \frac{\text { sophie.hayes } @ \text {,westernresources. }}{\text { org }}$
Nancy Kelly nkelly@,westernresources.org
Assistant Attorney General
Patricia Schmid pschmid@agutah.gov
Justin Jetter
jjetter@agutah.gov
Robert Moore
Victor Copeland
rmoore@agutah.gov
vcopeland@agutah.gov

## Rocky Mountain Power

| Data Request Response Center | datarequest@pacificorp.com |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jana Saba | jana.saba@pacificorp.com |
| Emily Wegener | utahdockets@pacificorp.com |
| emily.wegener@pacificorp.com |  |



Mary Penfield
Adviser, Regulatory Operations

Emily L. Wegener (12275)
1407 West North Temple, Suite 320
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116
Telephone No. (801) 220-4526
Facsimile No. (801) 220-3299
E-mail: emily.wegener@pacificorp.com
Attorney for Rocky Mountain Power

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH 

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER TO DECREASE ) THE DEFERRED EBA RATE THROUGH THE )

Docket No. 21-035-01 ENERGY BALANCING ACCOUNT ) MECHANISM

## MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY

Pursuant to Utah Admin. Code R746-1-109, Rocky Mountain Power, a division of PacifiCorp ("Company"), hereby submits this motion ("Motion") for leave to file supplemental testimony and exhibits not contemplated in the Commission's Scheduling Order and Notice of Hearing issued March 31, 2021 ("Scheduling Order").

On March 15, 2021, the Company filed the above-captioned application ("Application") to the Public Service Commission of Utah ("Commission") pursuant to energy balancing account mechanism ("EBA") tariff Schedule 94, requesting approval to recover approximately $\$ 1.7$ million in deferred EBA Costs ("EBAC"). Since filing the Application, the Company has discovered an error in its jurisdictional load calculation and seeks leave to file supplemental testimony and exhibits attached hereto as Exhibit A to explain and correct the mistake.

1. Under Utah Admin. Code R746-1-401, parties are only permitted to file pre-hearing testimony "as required or permitted in the Commission's scheduling order, or as otherwise directed by the Commission." Additionally, Utah Admin. Code R746-1-109 allows the Commission to deviate from any rule if the party making the motion to deviate demonstrates that the hardship of complying with the rule outweighs its benefits.
2. The Scheduling Order does not contemplate additional written testimony until after the Division of Public Utilities ("Division") issues its audit report on November 5, 2021.
3. As described more fully in the proposed supplemental testimony attached hereto as Exhibit A, the Company discovered an error in its jurisdictional load calculation that resulted from a partial failure on the metering of an interstate transmission line between Utah and Idaho occurring between July 2019 and March 2020. This error resulted in an understatement of Utah load and an overstatement of Idaho load during this time period. Idaho's order on the Company's most recent Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism filing adjusts the Company's Idaho revenue to account for this error. The proposed supplemental testimony explains the similar adjustment to the EBA.
4. The Company has notified the Division and the Office of Consumer Services about the error and its intent to file supplemental testimony.
5. The supplemental testimony is beneficial to all parties' understanding of the Company's correction to its original filing. The benefit of the explanation outweighs any hardship caused by filing testimony not contemplated by the Scheduling Order. Considering that the

Division's audit is not due until November 5, 2021, nearly five months from now, there is little if any hardship posed from allowing the testimony.

Accordingly, the Company respectfully requests that the Commission grant the Motion.

DATED this 14th day of June 2021.

Respectfully submitted,

## ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER



## Exhibit A


Q. Please state your name, business address and present position with PacifiCorp, dba Rocky Mountain Power ("the Company").
A. My name is Jack Painter and my business address is 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 600, Portland, Oregon 97232. My title is Net Power Cost Specialist.
Q. Are you the same Jack Painter who submitted direct testimony on behalf of the Company in this proceeding?
A. Yes.
Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony?
A. My supplemental testimony discusses the Company's update to the Company's Application to correct jurisdictional loads. This update affects the allocation of net power costs ("NPC") to the EBA.

## Q. Why did the jurisdictional loads change?

A. On April 28, 2021, the Company was contacted by staff with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission ("IPUC") to research a discrepancy between loads and sales. As part of analyzing the load data, the Company identified a partial meter failure on an interstate transmission line between Utah and Idaho at the Treasureton substation in Idaho that occurred between July 2019 and March 2020. Initially, the failure occurred intermittently and continued to increase until ultimately the meter was only registering approximately two-thirds of the actual energy. The line flow on this line is typically from Idaho to Utah, so this partial failure understated the power leaving Idaho to Utah which resulted in understating Utah loads. Data was used from the Wheelon substation to correct the erroneous data at the Treasureton substation.
Q. Please describe how the Company calculates and allocates the jurisdictional load.
A. At the most basic level, the amount of actual load allocated to a jurisdiction is calculated by netting energy flow into and out of each jurisdiction while accounting for the amount of energy generated within its borders, as described in the following equation. Actual Load at input $=$ Input at borders + Generation within borders - Output at borders. Any load that is physically in the jurisdiction but outside PacifiCorp's service territory is subtracted out so that only PacifiCorp customer load is included. Once the Company calculates each jurisdiction's actual load, it is then able to calculate the percentage of load attributable to each jurisdiction.

## Q. What steps does the Company take to ensure that jurisdictional loads are calculated accurately?

A. Several layers of analysis are conducted to ensure that the jurisdictional loads are accurate. Data inputs to the jurisdictional loads are validated with alternate data sources. For example, PacifiCorp has an end of hour check out with Balancing Area Authorities at the opposite end of tie lines. These end of hour, checked out values are compared against inputs into the jurisdictional loads. PacifiCorp utilizes Itron's MV90 software to interrogate meters used in calculating the jurisdictional loads. The MV90 software has automated validation checks on the meter clock, register reads to profile data tolerances, and volts dropping to zero. Each component of the load calculation is graphed to look for consistency of load shape. Once calculated, the load data is compared against PacifiCorp's Energy Accounting System for reasonability and consistency with historical load shapes.
Q. Why didn't the Company previously detect the jurisdictional load error?
A. Typically, a failure of an instrument transformer will be a complete failure with volts registering at zero. MV90's automated validation identifies the data as failing the validation check and the failed validation is investigated. In the case of the Treasureton meter, the three volts channels in the meter were still registering voltage. One of the three phases had partially failed, registering lower voltage. Because the validation check passed, erroneous data was not suspected.
Q. Has the Company changed any of its processes in response to the problem uncovered with the jurisdictional loads calculation?
A. Yes. The Company has added a control to ensure the three volts readings are in line with each other. The report looks at the values for all three volts channels. If any of the three volts readings is lower than the other two, meter engineers are contacted for analysis of the meter's accuracy.

## Q. What action did the Company and IPUC take as a result of this error?

A. IPUC staff recommended that the IPUC reduce the Company's recovery under the Idaho Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism application in 2021 by the amount of the jurisdictional load error. The Company accepted the adjustment, and its application was approved. ${ }^{1}$

## Q. How do the jurisdictional loads impact the EBA deferral calculation?

A. When updating the loads to the EBA workpapers in tab (5.1) Actual Factors, the System Energy (SE) and System Generation (SG) allocation factors are recalculated. Because Utah loads were understated, both the SE and SG allocation factors increase which
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result in higher allocated NPC to the EBA.

## Q. What is the impact to the 2021 EBA?

A. As shown in my Exhibit RMP__(JP-1S), the updated SE and SG allocation factors resulted in a $\$ 4.9$ million change to the EBA deferral, comprised of $\$ 4.3$ million in additional NPC and $\$ 577$ thousand in interest. With this update, the Company's requested collection in Electric Service Schedule No. 94 ("Schedule 94") is $\$ 6.6$ million, which is a decrease of $\$ 31.2$ million or 1.5 percent.
Q. Did the Company update the proposed rate spread and rates for Schedule 94 as presented by Mr. Robert M. Meredith in this supplemental filing?
A. No. The Company will update and present the final rates once the approved recovery amount is known.
Q. Did the Company update the filing requirements as part of this supplemental filing?
A. The Company reviewed the filing requirements to determine if any were impacted by the updated allocation factors. Due to the fact that most of the filing requirements related to total Company NPC, which were not impacted, only two filing requirements were affected. EBA Filing Requirements 2 and 3 have been updated and provided with this supplemental filing.
Q. Is it appropriate to update the EBA deferral calculation due to the change in Utah loads?
A. Yes. The purpose of the EBA is to either recover or refund the difference between actual and base NPC on a Utah allocated basis. After the Company discovered the discrepancy in Utah allocated loads, it updated the EBA deferral calculation to reflect the changes.

Because the Utah loads were understated, ultimately NPC allocated to Utah were also and therefore it is appropriate to update the EBA.

## Q. Why should the Company be permitted to recover for a jurisdictional allocation error that took place, in part, outside of the deferral period?

A. The Commission has previously accepted the Company's view that the statute authorizing the EBA "does not preclude updates when new information becomes available." ${ }^{2}$ The Company did not know of the partial meter failure when it submitted its EBA application in 2020 or 2021. It is providing this update soon after discovery of the issue. Idaho has already reduced the Company's recovery due to the overallocation of load to Idaho for the entire period that the partial meter failure condition existed. If Utah does not approve the change, the Company will not be allowed to recover its prudently incurred costs.
Q. Does this conclude your supplemental testimony?
A. Yes.

[^1]Rocky Mountain Power
Exhibit RMP _(JP-1S)
Docket No. 21-035-01
Witness: Jack Painter

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF UTAH

## ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

Exhibit Accompanying Supplemental Testimony of Jack Painter
Updated Commission Order Calculation Method (Dynamic Annual Allocation Factor)

June 2021


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ In the Matter of Rocky Mountain Power's Application Requesting Approval of \$16.1 Million Net Power Cost Deferral (ECAM), Case No. PAC-E-21-09, Order No. 35055 at 3 (May 28, 2021).

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of Its Proposed Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism, Docket No. 09-035-15, Order at 12-13 (February 16, 2017) (reversed in part on other grounds) (permitting prior period accounting entries pertaining to operating periods prior to the EBA deferral period).

