

portions of the testimony as requested by Alcoa. JP04 respectfully requests that the Hearing Officer reconsider striking page 4, lines 12-18 and page 7, line 5 through page 9, line 2, because that testimony is within the scope of this proceeding.

1. The Scope of the BP-12 Proceeding

The Hearings Officer has correctly concluded that BP-12 is not the proper proceeding for the parties to debate the terms of service by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) to its Direct Service Industrial customers (DSI). At page 70746, the FRN states:

BPA is assuming for the Initial Proposal that BPA will continue to serve Alcoa, Inc. (Alcoa) as well as Port Townsend Paper Corporation (Port Townsend) during FY 2012–2013. *BPA's decisions to serve the DSIs, along with the method and level of service to be provided DSIs in the FY 2012–2013 rate period, will not be determined in this proceeding.*

Pursuant to § 1010.3(f) of BPA's Procedures, the Administrator directs the Hearing Officer to exclude from the record all argument, testimony, or other evidence that seeks in any way to revisit the appropriateness or reasonableness of BPA's decisions regarding the service to the DSIs, *including BPA's decision to offer a contract and the method or level of such service.* (emphasis added)

Clearly, BPA intended this language to mean that BP-12 is not the appropriate forum for challenging its decision to offer power sales contracts to the DSIs; this issue has been raised and will be resolved in other proceedings.

On its face, however, the FRN does not preclude parties from introducing evidence for the sole and limited purpose of rebutting portions of BPA's direct case concerning the anticipated cost of service to DSI customers. These costs directly affect preference customer rates. The costs of serving BPA's customers, regardless of whether those customers are DSIs or other preference customers, and the prices those customers pay, are issues squarely within the scope of this proceeding. In fact, determining the allocation of the costs and benefits of the Federal Base System ("FBS") is the primary function of BPA wholesale power rate proceedings.

Disputing the allocation of costs is very different from disputing whether or not a customer should be served or how that customer should be served.

2. Portions of JP04's Stricken Testimony Should Not Be Stricken.

JP04 recognizes that no determinations regarding the method or level of DSI service will be made in the BP-12 Rate Proceeding and therefore does not question the Hearing Officer's conclusion that the majority of testimony stricken from the record. JP04 has just two specific areas of concern regarding the Order. JP04 asks the Hearing Officer to reconsider his decision to strike: (1) That portion of the testimony regarding the effect of DSI service on preference customers' rates, and (2) that portion of JP04's testimony on the anticipated cost of service to Columbia Falls Aluminum Company ("CFAC"). As explained below, these portions of JP04's testimony do not challenge BPA's decision to offer contracts to the DSIs and are within the scope of this proceeding.

a. Cost to Preference Customers

The first portion of stricken testimony with which JP04 has concern is found on page 4, lines 12-18 of BP-12-E-JP4-01. This particular portion of testimony, which refers to BPA's response to data request NR-BPA-1, does not address the method or level of service to the DSIs. It simply discusses BPA's projected cost to preference customers of the service to the DSIs. The JP04 witnesses state that, "BPA estimated the cost to preference customers of DSI service at 340 aMW to be \$55.6 million over the two year rate period, or an average of \$27.8 18 million per year." *Id.* at p. 4, lines 16-18. The allocation of costs is an issue frequently debated among the different types of BPA preference customers (i.e. Slice, Block, and Load Following) in BPA wholesale power rate proceedings. If a cost caused by one type of preference customer is borne by another, the one who bears the cost must be permitted to address the issue of cost causation in

the wholesale power rate proceeding. Likewise, preference customers should be able to address the costs they bear as a result of service to the DSIs in this rate proceeding, and this portion of the JP04 testimony does nothing more than that. BPA's estimates of the rate impacts of its decision to serve the DSIs are in the record in this proceeding, and preference customers must be allowed to rebut BPA's estimates of how serving the DSIs will impact preference customer rates. Preference customers can challenge these estimates without challenging BPA's underlying decision to serve the DSIs.

b. Price of Service to CFAC

The second area of concern to JP04 begins on page 7, line 5 through page 9, line 2. This portion of the testimony involves a question-and-answer regarding BPA's projected costs to serve CFAC. JP04 does not argue or suggest in its testimony that BPA may not offer a power sales agreement to CFAC. JP04 recognizes that this issue will be decided in a different proceeding. JP04's testimony simply addresses the cost to the preference customers of BPA's service to CFAC. Specifically, JP04 is arguing that, if CFAC is served, "BPA use the same pricing principles for the power portion of the costs of unanticipated DSI load that it is using for unanticipated preference customer load." *Id.* p. 8, lines 16-18. The applicability of Unanticipated Load Service to preference customers is being addressed by Parties to this proceeding,^{1/} and testimony regarding its applicability to DSIs should be treated no differently. Regardless of whether a party is a preference customer or a DSI, it should be allowed to testify about the price BPA customers should pay for service.

^{1/} See BP-12-E-JP02-04 (Unanticipated Load Service Under FPS-12).

3. **Conclusion**

Joint Party 4 respectfully requests that the Hearing Officer reconsider striking page 4, lines 12-18 and page 7, line 5 running through page 9, line 2, as these sections are within the scope of this proceeding.

DATED this 7th day of March, 2011

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Betsy Bridge

Betsy Bridge
Attorney for Northwest Requirements Utilities

/s/ Zabyrn Towner

Zabyrn Towner
Attorney for Pacific Northwest Generating Cooperative and
Members

/s/ Richard Lorenz

Richard Lorenz
Attorney for Public Power Council

/s/ Irion Sanger

Irion Sanger
Attorney for Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
BEFORE THE
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION**

Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Proposed) **BPA Docket No. BP-12**
Power Rate Adjustments Public)
Hearing and Opportunities for)
Public Review and Comment)

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF:

PUBLIC POWER COUNCIL,

INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES,

NORTHWEST REQUIREMENTS UTILITIES, AND

**PACIFIC NORTHWEST GENERATING COOPERATIVE (for both itself and the
PNGC Members)**

SUBJECT:

DSI SERVICE ASSUMPTIONS AND RATES

WITNESSES:

Michael Deen
Kevin O'Meara
Lincoln Wolverton
Geoffrey Carr
Douglas Brawley

January 20, 2011

INDEX

TESTIMONY OF:

Michael Deen

Kevin O’Meara

Lincoln Wolverton

Geoffrey Carr

Douglas Brawley

SUBJECT: DSI SERVICE ASSUMPTIONS AND RATES

Section 1:	Introduction and Purpose of Testimony.....	3
Section 2:	Assumed DSI Service Level for FY 2012-2013.....	4
Section 3:	IP Rate Issues.....	9

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

TESTIMONY OF:

Michael Deen
Kevin O’Meara
Lincoln Wolverton
Geoffrey Carr
Douglas Brawley

SUBJECT: DSI Service Assumptions and Rates

Section 1: Introduction and Purpose of Testimony

Q: Please state your names and qualifications.

A: My name is Michael Deen. My qualifications are shown at BP-12-Q-PP-02.

A: My name is Kevin O’MearA: My qualifications are shown at BP-12-Q-PP-03.

A: My name is Lincoln Wolverton. My qualifications are shown in BP-12-Q-IN-01.

A: My name is Geoff Carr. My qualifications are shown in BP-12-Q-NR-01-E01.

A: My name is Douglas Brawley. My qualifications are shown in BP-12-Q-PN-02.

Q: What is the purpose of your testimony?

A: The purpose of this testimony is to address issues related to service of Direct Service Industry customers during the WP-12 Rate Period. Firstly we will address BPA’s assumptions regarding the level, duration, and character of DSI load to be served during FY 2012-2013. Secondly we will address issues in how BPA has set the IP rate, including costs allocated to the IP rate through the melded PFp rate, the level of the Value of Reserves Credit, and also the calculation of the Section 7(c)(2) Industrial Margin.

~~*Q: Has PPC and other public power entities provided commentary to BPA on its policies towards DSI service in other processes or venues?*~~

1 ~~A: Yes. PPC and other entities have provided extensive commentary on DSI service~~
2 ~~issues both to BPA and also in legal proceedings. It is the position of PPC and~~
3 ~~many other groups that BPA is not under any obligation to provide service to DSI~~
4 ~~customers, and by doing so at the expense of preference customers BPA is~~
5 ~~violating both the law and sound business principles.~~

6 ~~**Section 2: Assumed DSI Service Level for FY 2012-2013**~~

7 ~~Q: What are BPA's assumptions for the level of DSI load to be served at the IP rate~~
8 ~~during the rate period?~~

9 ~~A: BPA is assuming approximately 340 aMW of service to Alcoa's Intaleco smelter~~
10 ~~and Port Townsend Paper Company at the IP rate for the entire FY 2012-2013~~
11 ~~period.~~

12 ~~Q: Have you quantified the cost to preference customers of BPA's proposed level of~~
13 ~~DSI service for the rate period?~~

14 A: BPA staff performed this calculation in response to data request NR-BPA-1
15 (Attachment 1). On the basis of differences between augmentation costs and DSI
16 revenues, BPA estimated the cost to preference customers of DSI service at 340
17 aMW to be \$55.6 million over the two year rate period, or an average of \$27.8
18 million per year.

19 ~~Q: Are BPA's DSI service assumptions appropriate?~~

20 ~~A: No. Even under BPA's current agreements, which are under litigation, BPA has~~
21 ~~only made the determination to supply power to the current DSI customers~~
22 ~~through May of 2012. BPA should not assume any further DSI service after that~~
23 ~~time.~~

1 ~~Q: Why should BPA adopt this alternate assumption?~~

2 ~~A: It is our understanding that in response to the PNGC II court opinion, BPA~~
3 ~~instituted the “Equivalent Benefits Test” methodology to establish whether sales~~
4 ~~to DSI customers meet sound business principles. BPA conducted such an~~
5 ~~analysis in October 2010 to justify the current sales to DSI customers extending~~
6 ~~through May 2012. Although we do not endorse the validity of the Equivalent~~
7 ~~Benefits Test as a means of establishing whether BPA is following sound business~~
8 ~~principles in serving DSI customers, in this proceeding BPA has not provided any~~
9 ~~forecast or reasoning to support why sales to the DSI customers at the proposed~~
10 ~~levels past May 2012 will meet even that standard.~~

11 ~~Q: Are there reasons to believe that sales to DSI customers past May 2012 would not~~
12 ~~pass even BPA’s Equivalent Benefits methodology?~~

13 ~~A: Yes. A number of facts are forecast to be different after May of 2012 than for the~~
14 ~~last period BPA conducted an Equivalent Benefits Test analysis. Specifically, in~~
15 ~~its most recent Equivalent Benefits analysis, BPA assumed lower market prices~~
16 ~~than it is now forecasting will prevail after May of 2012.~~

17 ~~Using the same reasoning as BPA in its response to Data Request NR-~~
18 ~~BPA-01, the cost to preference customers of DSI service over the 19-month~~
19 ~~period from June 2012 through September 2013 would be approximately \$41.1~~
20 ~~million, or nearly \$2.2 million per month.~~

21 ~~In BPA’s October 29th, 2010 Record of Decision Granting Alcoa’s~~
22 ~~Request to Extend the Initial Period of Alcoa’s Power Sales Agreement~~
23 ~~(Attachment 2), BPA calculated a total value of “tangible” financial benefits of~~

1 ~~selling power to Alcoa of approximately \$10.4 million for sales made during the~~
2 ~~Extended Initial Period from May 27th, 2011 through May 26th, 2012. This yields~~
3 ~~a per month value of approximately \$866,000 in “tangible” financial benefits to~~
4 ~~offset power sales costs as a result of DSI service.~~

5 ~~As can be seen from this exercise, based on the evidence available to date~~
6 ~~in this rate proceeding, “tangible” financial benefits from DSI sales would have to~~
7 ~~increase by 250% from BPA’s last R.O.D. on the topic to justify DSI service~~
8 ~~beyond May 2012 in the upcoming rate period.~~

9 ~~*Q: Would it be unduly burdensome for BPA to perform an analysis to forecast*~~
10 ~~*whether it is likely that DSI service will be justified after May 2012 under the*~~
11 ~~*Equivalent Benefits Test?*~~

12 ~~A: No it would not. BPA has all the substantial information it would need to perform~~
13 ~~such a forecast analysis already in the record for this proceeding, most notably in~~
14 ~~the form of market price forecasts and loads and resource studies. By not~~
15 ~~performing some type of Equivalent Benefits Test forecast BPA is effectively pre-~~
16 ~~judging the outcome of that process at the expense of preference customers during~~
17 ~~an extremely adverse economic time.~~

18 ~~We fully understand that ratemaking is by nature an uncertain process and~~
19 ~~must be based on forecasts and further that the Equivalent Benefits Test and~~
20 ~~levels of DSI service are outside the scope of this proceeding. However, by~~
21 ~~including DSI service as an input in this proceeding after May of 2012 BPA has~~
22 ~~made an implicit but clear assumption that that service will at that time pass the~~
23 ~~Equivalent Benefits Test. They have not, however, provided any analysis to show~~

1 ~~that this outcome is likely. On the contrary, it appears that the record to date in~~
2 ~~this proceeding would support the assumption that DSI service will not continue~~
3 ~~past May of 2012 based on the Equivalent Benefits standard as currently~~
4 ~~implemented by BPA:~~

5 *Q: Are there other issues related to the level of assumed DSI service during the rate*
6 *period that you would like to raise?*

7 A: Yes. We would like to address the possibility of service to additional DSI load
8 during the rate period.

9 *Q: What has BPA said with regard to service to additional DSI load?*

10 A: In the Policy Testimony, BPA states that “During the week of November 8, 2010,
11 BPA received a call from Columbia Falls Aluminum Company (CFAC) inquiring
12 about a possible power sales contract; however, such a sale is not certain enough
13 to be included in the forecast amount of service to DSIs for FY 2012-2013.” (BP-
14 12-E-BPA-11, Page 19, lines 7 to 10). BPA then tested the TPP effects of levels
15 of service to DSI loads from 340 aMW up to the “maximum permissible” of 480
16 aMW and found the TPP was still 95%. (BP-12-E-BPA-15, Page 66, lines 3 to
17 7.)

18 *Q: What are your concerns about this additional service to the DSIs?*

19 A: As described above, service to the DSIs at the proposed level of 340 aMW is
20 costly to BPA’s public power customers. Additional service would be even more
21 costly. Also, this implied potential for service to additional DSI load is
22 inconsistent with the way in which unanticipated load is addressed for preference

1 customers. Additional service to unanticipated preference load is dealt with
2 through the Unanticipated Load Service rate.

3 *Q: What is BPA's definition of Unanticipated Load?*

4 A: BPA provides the following definition: "Unanticipated load is any request by a
5 customer for firm power requirements service received by BPA after February 1,
6 2011, that results in an increase in the customer's load placed on BPA during the
7 FY 2012-2013 rate period that was not requested and thus not forecast when
8 setting the rates for that rate period." (BP-12-E-BPA-21, Page 16, lines 16 to 19).

9 *Q: What pricing principles does BPA apply to unanticipated public power load?*

10 A: BPA proposes that: "the energy rate be the greater of the posted rate or the
11 forecast market price to ensure that BPA recovers its cost for purchased power, if
12 any, and does not absorb the cost of purchasing power to meet unanticipated load
13 that is at a higher price than the rate that would otherwise be applied to
14 unanticipated load". (BP-12-E-BPA-21, Page 20, lines 13 to 16).

15 *Q: What is your proposal with regard to Unanticipated DSI load?*

16 A: We propose that BPA use the same pricing principles for the power portion of the
17 costs of unanticipated DSI load that it is using for unanticipated preference
18 customer load. That is, BPA should apply a rate to this load that recovers its cost
19 of purchased power to serve this load. To this estimate would be added the
20 industrial margin and any Section 7(b)(3) surcharges less an amount for value of
21 reserves provided, if any such value is demonstrated. Any unanticipated DSI load
22 should be served at the greater of the posted IP rate as adjusted by this testimony
23 or the actual market price for the power used to serve this load. Actual market is

1 proposed here in order to ensure that BPA's other customers do not absorb the
2 cost of serving this load.

3 **Section 3: IP Rate Issues**

4 *Q: Has BPA allocated a proper share of all appropriate costs to the IP rate?*

5 A: No. In sections 2.1.3.3 and 2.1.3.4 of WP-12-E-BPA-01, BPA states the costs of
6 the Low Density Discount (LDD) and the Irrigation Rate Discount (IRD) are
7 allocated entirely to the PF load pool. Given that Section 7(c)(2) directs that the
8 IP rate "shall be based upon the Administrator's applicable wholesale rates to such
9 public body and cooperative customers", which do include costs of the LDD and
10 IRD, it seems appropriate that the IP loads should receive an allocation of those
11 costs as well.

12 *Q: Do you have any commentary on the calculation of the 7(c)(2) Industrial Margin?*

13 A: Yes. First we would like to commend BPA for going through the effort to work
14 with PPC to collect current data from preference customers serving large
15 industrial loads to update the 7(c)(2) Margin Study comprehensively.

16 *Q: Are there any issues with the calculation of the Margin?*

17 A: Yes. We believe that the costs of Washington state revenue taxes should be
18 included in the weighted margin calculation.

19 *Q: Has this issue been argued before?*

20 A: Yes. The issue of Washington state revenue taxes in the Margin calculation has
21 been argued in previous BPA rate proceedings, most recently in WP-10. Before
22 presenting our arguments for this proceeding, we would like to summarize our

1 understanding of why BPA chose to exclude state revenue taxes in WP-10 based
2 on the discussion of the issue in the WP-10 Final Record of Decision.

3 Although BPA's discussion of the issue is extensive, the conclusion
4 reached on page 378 of WP-10-A-02 (Attachment 3) is relatively straightforward.
5 In essence, BPA determines that Washington state revenue taxes are not a
6 component of a "typical" industrial margin unless a majority of BPA's preference
7 customers serving industrial loads are subject to such taxes. BPA then relies on
8 evidence presented in the WP-02 proceeding to establish that fact.

9 *Q: Do you agree with BPA's analysis?*

10 *A: No. BPA should follow the directives of Section 7(c)(2) in setting the typical*
11 *margin. In particular, as stated in Section 7(c)(2) BPA should use "typical*
12 *margins included by such public body and cooperative customers in their retail*
13 *industrial rates but shall take into account the comparative size and character of*
14 *the loads served."*

15 To that effect, the question is not whether a majority of BPA's preference
16 customers serving any type of industrial load are subject to Washington revenue
17 taxes, but whether a majority of those serving *comparable* industrial loads are. In
18 other words, the test should be whether a majority of those preference customers
19 serving loads qualifying for inclusion in the 7(c)(2) Margin Study (those with
20 peak loads over 3.5 MW) are located in the state of Washington.

21 The answer to this question is yes. Of the 33 utilities determined to have
22 loads qualifying for inclusion in the Margin Study conducted for WP-12, 19, or
23 58%, are located in the state of Washington. Further, on an energy basis, 86% of

1 the load in the study is served by those Washington utilities. Under the
2 methodology established by BPA to determine loads of a comparable size and
3 character pursuant to Section 7(c)(2), Washington state revenue taxes are clearly a
4 component of “typical” margins and as such should be included in the final
5 weighted calculation.

6 *Q: How did BPA go about calculating a Value of Reserves (VOR) credit in*
7 *establishing the IP rate?*

8 A: BPA has valued the reserves to be supplied by DSIs by using BPA’s own cost of
9 supplying Operating Reserves (BP-12-E-BPA-17, p. 10). BPA assumes this
10 represents a “marginal price.” They based the marginal price on the cost BPA’s
11 Operating Reserves (Supplemental), \$7.04 per kW per month, because “the DSI-
12 supplied reserves are used to meet BPA’s reserve obligations.” (BP-12-E-BPA-
13 01, p. 96, lines 17-18). Then, BPA determined the amount of interruptible load
14 the DSIs will supply, or 10 percent of the total DSI load net of the wheel-turning
15 load that cannot be curtailed, 33.4 aMW. Based on the quantity and price, BPA
16 calculated the total yearly VOR and divided that dollar amount by the total DSI
17 load being served, yielding a \$0.95 credit on a per MWh basis.

18 *Q: Is this valuation appropriate?*

19 A: No. BPA has demonstrated no need for DSI operating reserves. BPA’s
20 Generation Inputs Study does not demonstrate that BPA is able to carry less
21 contingency reserves or avoid a cost that it would otherwise incur in the absence
22 of reserves available from the DSIs.

1 BPA has to this point refused to provide substantive responses to requests
2 for its reporting to the Northwest Power Pool Reserve Sharing Group on BPA’s
3 share of contingency reserves. In the absence of evidence to the contrary we
4 assume that BPA would be able to meet its contingency reserve obligations
5 without the DSIs contribution to reserves. Thus, based on Section 5(d)(3)(A) of
6 the Northwest Power Act, “additional power system reserves” are not “required
7 for the region’s firm loads.”

8 To the extent that BPA is able to meet its contingency reserve obligations
9 without DSI contribution and without a need to incur additional cost, the
10 economic value of DSI reserves to BPA is zero and should be reflected as such.
11 In the absence of evidence to the contrary we assume this is the case given the
12 general flexibility of the FCRPS and given that BPA has had no known
13 difficulties meeting its obligations during recent years when it was not receiving
14 any reserves from DSI customers.

15 *Q: Has BPA forecasted in its Generation Inputs Study any need for incremental*
16 *operating or contingency reserves (non-spinning) beyond those reserves that it*
17 *forecasts supplying from FCRPS generating resources?*

18 A: Not to our knowledge.

19 *Q: Does BPA’s Generation Inputs Study reflect any reduction in operating or*
20 *contingency reserves (non-spinning) forecasted to be supplied from FCRPS*
21 *generating resources as a result of BPA obtaining such reserves from DSI*
22 *customers?*

23 A: Not to our knowledge.

1 *Q: Are there any other issues with BPA's calculation of the value of reserves credit?*

2 A: Yes. Even if we were to accept that the DSI reserves are being valued at an
3 appropriate rate, in Table 3.22 of the Power Rates Study Documentation (WP-12-
4 E-BPA-01A), BPA specifies that "PS may restrict 10 percent of all Net Firm
5 Power under this Agreement for up to 105 Event Minutes per Event *and 1 event*
6 *per day*" (*emphasis added*). If this is correct, the value of the interruptible
7 reserves should reflect that they may only be called on once per day. If the
8 reserves provide coverage for 105 minutes of any day, the quantity of
9 interruptible load should be discounted by a factor of 105/1440, the number of
10 minutes covered divided by the number of minutes in a day. Taking into account
11 this factor, the value of the credit would be 0.07 \$/MWh.

12 *Q: Does this conclude your testimony?*

13 A: Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served the foregoing testimony on Bonneville Power Administration's Office of General Counsel and Hearing Clerk and all litigants in this proceeding by uploading the document to the 2012 Rate Adjustment Proceeding (BP-12) secure websites pursuant to BP-12-HOO-02.

DATED: January 21, 2011.

Michael Deen
Public Power Council
825 NE Multnomah St., Suite 1225
Portland, Oregon 97232
503 595 9770