

PUBLIC

OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE

**DIRECT TESTIMONY
(CORRECTED)**

OF

CHARLES E. FUHRMAN

**IN RE: Interstate Power and Light Company
Docket No. RPU-2009-0002**

July 17, 2009

NOTE: Confidential material has been identified by placing it between curly brackets { }.

PUBLIC

1 **Q: Please state your name and business address.**

2 A: Charles E. Fuhrman. My address is 310 Maple Street, Des Moines Iowa.

3 **Q: By who are you employed and in what capacity?**

4 A. I am employed by the Consumer Advocate Division of the Iowa
5 Department of Justice (OCA) as a Utility Administrator 2. My position is
6 Chief, Technical Bureau. My duties involve overall supervision of the
7 OCA's technical staff.

8 **Q: Please describe your educational background and professional
9 experience.**

10 A: In December 1979 I was awarded a Bachelor of Science degree in
11 business administration, with majors in accounting and management, from
12 Northern State College, Aberdeen, South Dakota.

13 In January 1980, I commenced employment with the staff of the
14 South Dakota Public Utilities Commission. My duties involved matters
15 relating to the regulation of natural gas and electric utility companies
16 subject to the jurisdiction of the South Dakota Commission.

17 In September 1981, I accepted a position with the staff of the Iowa
18 State Commerce Commission (now Iowa Utilities Board). During my

PUBLIC

1 employment with the Iowa Utilities Board (Board or IUB) I held various
2 positions with duties relating to the regulation of natural gas, electric,
3 water, and telephone utility companies subject to the jurisdiction of the
4 Board. I have also participated in interstate natural gas pipeline company
5 proceedings held before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
6 (FERC).

7 On June 23, 1989 I joined the technical staff of the OCA. I presently
8 have over twenty-nine years experience in utility regulation with State
9 regulatory agencies and the OCA.

10 **Q: Have you previously presented testimony as an expert witness?**

11 A: I have presented testimony in proceedings conducted before the South
12 Dakota Public Utilities Commission, the Iowa Utilities Board, and the
13 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Attached, and identified as
14 Appendix A, is a listing of proceedings in which I have presented
15 testimony. This document identifies the jurisdiction, docket number, and
16 nature of utility service of said proceedings. I have also presented
17 testimony in United States Tax Court.
18

PUBLIC

INTRODUCTION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

Q: What is the purpose of your prepared direct testimony?

A: On March 17, 2009 Interstate Power and Light Company (IPL or Company) filed an electric rate increase application with the IUB. IPL has proposed a permanent annual Iowa jurisdiction electric rate increase of \$171 million, or about 16.6 percent of current annual revenue. By order issued April 13, 2009 the Board docketed IPL's rate increase and instituted an investigation to determine the reasonableness of IPL's proposed rate increase request. This matter has been identified by the Board as Docket No. RPU-2009-0002. I will be presenting testimony on behalf of the OCA.

I shall give an overview of the OCA's recommendations to the Board, identify the other OCA witnesses who will be presenting testimony in this proceeding, and describe the subject matter that each OCA witness will be addressing. In addition, I will be making recommendations to the Board concerning several of the pro forma adjustments proposed by IPL in this proceeding and address IPL's proposal to implement a new automatic adjustment clause for certain

PUBLIC

1 transmission expenses.

2 OVERVIEW

3 **Q: Would you please briefly summarize the OCA's recommendations in**
4 **this proceeding?**

5 A: The OCA's recommendation is that an IPL Iowa jurisdiction electric
6 revenue requirement of $1,208,602,542$ ~~$1,207,293,828$~~ should be approved by the Board.
7 This revenue requirement represents approximately a 1.91 ~~2.4~~ percent decrease
8 from adjusted test period annual revenue.

9 OCA also recommends that whatever rate increase may be
10 approved by the Board be applied on an across-the-board basis in lieu of
11 conducting a class cost of service study at this time or utilizing the results
12 of the study that IPL has prepared. Although IPL has conducted a class
13 cost-of-service study, the Company also recommends that the results of
14 the study not be implemented in this proceeding. While OCA does not
15 accept or endorse IPL's class cost-of-service study, the OCA does not
16 propose to litigate the issues in this proceeding since IPL does not propose
17 to use the study for setting rates in this proceeding. The OCA, however,
18 explicitly reserves the right to fully challenge IPL's class cost-of-service

PUBLIC

1 study methodology in a future proceeding.

2 IPL has indicated its intent to file a rate case in 2010 to coincide
3 with the in-service date of the proposed Whispering Willows wind
4 generation facility. 2010 will also be the conclusion of IPL's rate
5 equalization process that has been taking place over the past several years.
6 The OCA strongly supports the concept of cost-based rates. The deferral
7 of IPL conducting and implementing the results of a new class cost of
8 service study until 2010 is warranted under the current circumstances.
9 Revising rates in this proceeding based upon a new class cost of service
10 study prior to the completion of the rate equalization process would be
11 contrary to the Board's prior orders concerning the timing of rate
12 equalization, could result in unnecessary fluctuations in the rates IPL's
13 customers are assessed, and could result in unnecessary confusion for
14 IPL's customers.

15 **Q: Would you please identify the OCA witnesses who will be testifying in**
16 **this proceeding and highlight the primary issues that each OCA**
17 **witness will be addressing?**

18 A: Yes, I will.

PUBLIC

1 Mr. Brian Turner will be presenting the OCA's overall final
2 revenue requirement determination and sponsor the exhibits setting forth
3 the OCA's recommended income statement and rate base. He will also be
4 addressing IPL's proposed depreciation adjustments, flood adjustment,
5 and several other income statement issues proposed by IPL.

6 Mr. Fasil Kebede will be presenting testimony concerning IPL's
7 proposed rate base adjustments, salary and wage adjustments, the Emery
8 long-term service agreement adjustment, and emission control adjustment.

9 Mr. Mark Condon will be presenting testimony concerning various
10 IPL proposed employee-benefit adjustments.

11 Ms. Joyette Henry will be addressing the cash working capital
12 calculation.

13 Ms. Sheila Parker will present the OCA's proposed capital
14 structure issue and address IPL's proposed the fly-ash storage capital
15 lease issue.

16 Mr. Greg Vitale will be presenting the OCA's proposed return on
17 common equity.

18 Dr. David Habr will be addressing the issue of management

PUBLIC

1 efficiency.

2 I will present testimony concerning IPL's proposed adjustments for
3 transmission (wheeling) expense, transmission-related administrative and
4 general expense, capacity demand and sales adjustments, SGS#4
5 cancellation costs, IPL's proposed out-of-period income taxes adjustment,
6 and non-property related deferred income tax adjustments. As I indicated
7 previously, I will also be addressing IPL's proposal to institute a
8 transmission expense automatic adjustment cost recovery mechanism.

9 My recommendations regarding the various pro forma adjustments
10 that I will be addressing will be incorporated into Mr. Turner's revenue
11 requirement calculation schedules.

12 TRANSMISSION EXPENSE

13 **Q: Would you please describe IPL's proposed transmission expense**
14 **adjustments?**

15 A: The terms transmission expense, wheeling expense, and transmission
16 wheeling expense are used in reference to various IPL-proposed pro
17 forma adjustments and are synonymous. IPL has proposed several
18 transmission expense related adjustments, and as I indicated in my

PUBLIC

1 overview, IPL has also proposed that the Board authorize and approve the
2 implementation of an automatic adjustment clause mechanism for the
3 recovery of transmission expense. The individual transmission cost-
4 related adjustments proposed by IPL are described below.

5 IPL witness Mr. Christopher Hampsher's Exhibit ___(CAH-1),
6 Schedule B-9 sets forth the proposed adjustment to increase transmission
7 expense by \$58,414,537 to reflect the Iowa jurisdiction amount of
8 anticipated 2009 transmission expense.

9 IPL witness Mr. Hampsher's Exhibit ___(CAH-1), Schedule B-18
10 includes a \$1,260,253 adjustment to eliminate the effect of an out-of-
11 period transmission refund from test period Iowa jurisdiction book
12 transmission expense.

13 IPL witness Mr. Hampsher's Exhibit ___(CAH-1), Schedule B-25
14 sets forth an adjustment to transmission expense to reflect the true-up by
15 ITC-Midwest of 2008 transmission expense. Mr. Hampsher proposes two
16 alternatives for treatment of the 2008 true-up. The first alternative would
17 increase Iowa jurisdiction transmission expense by \$11,726,211 based
18 upon a four year amortization of the estimated true-up amount. His

PUBLIC

1 second alternative would not result in any increase in transmission
2 expense as the ITC-Midwest true-up amount would be fully offset using
3 the regulatory liability account established during the Transmission Sale
4 case, Docket No. SPU-07-11.

5 Lastly, IPL witness Mr. Hampsher's Exhibit___(CAH-1), Schedule
6 B-26 sets forth the proposed adjustment to increase transmission expense
7 by \$17,514,781 to reflect the Iowa jurisdiction amount of anticipated 2010
8 transmission expense.

9 **Q: Would you please provide an overview of the transmission expense**
10 **issues?**

11 A: Yes. As can be observed from my brief summary of each of the
12 transmission expense pro forma adjustments that have been proposed, IPL
13 is expecting to incur substantial increases in transmission expenses. The
14 reason for the increased transmission expenses IPL now proposes to
15 charge its ratepayers is increases in the rates charged by ITC-Midwest
16 (ITC). ITC is an independent transmission company that now owns and
17 operates the transmission system formerly owned and operated by IPL. I
18 say formerly owned and operated by IPL because in 2007 IPL sold its

PUBLIC

1 transmission system to ITC. The proceeding conducted before the Board
2 concerning IPL's proposal to sell its transmission assets to ITC was
3 identified as Docket No. SPU-07-11. The order of the Board allowing the
4 sale of IPL's transmission assets to ITC was issued on September 20,
5 2007 (Transmission Sale Order). Since the closing of the sale of IPL's
6 transmission assets to ITC, ITC has operated the transmission system and
7 charges IPL for transmission service. The transmission service rates
8 charged by ITC and billed to IPL are approved by the Federal Energy
9 Regulatory Commission (FERC) using the Midwest ISO Attachment O
10 formula rate mechanism. The cost recovery and rate-setting mechanism
11 used by ITC includes a true-up process wherein ITC conducts a
12 reconciliation of revenue collected through its rates with the costs
13 reported in the FERC Form No. 1 report. ITC then subsequently bills its
14 customers for under collections or makes refunds of over collections
15 prospectively.

16 **Q: You previously stated that the transmission expense pro forma**
17 **adjustments proposed by IPL represent substantial increases in**
18 **transmission costs. Did the sale of IPL's transmission system to ITC**

PUBLIC

1 **involve an expectation that higher transmission expense for IPL**
2 **would be the outcome?**

3 A: Yes. For a number of reasons it was expected that ITC's costs and,
4 consequently, what IPL would pay for transmission service, would be
5 greater if the transmission asset sale were approved than if IPL retained its
6 transmission system and continued to operate it. The OCA and other
7 Intervenors in the transmission sale case contended that approval of the
8 transaction would result in higher transmission costs, which IPL did not
9 dispute, and which the Board also acknowledged. In the rebuttal portion
10 of the transmission sale proceeding IPL and ITC (collectively the
11 Applicants) proposed what has been identified as the Alternative
12 Transaction Adjustment (or ATA). The ATA was intended to mitigate or
13 offset the anticipated increase in transmission costs which were expected
14 to result if Board approval of the transmission sale was granted. The
15 ATA was structured to offset the anticipated increase in transmission
16 expenses for at least eight-years. Thereafter, presently unquantifiable
17 benefits from ITC's ownership of the transmission system were expected
18 to have been achieved which would offset the expected higher

PUBLIC

1 transmission expenses.

2 The ATA was not considered as a benefit but rather as a means of
3 mitigating or offsetting the anticipated higher transmission costs. On
4 page 44 of the Transmission Sale Order the Board explicitly stated that
5 the “benefits” of the ATA “...are more accurately termed offsets to cost
6 increases that will result if the transaction is approved, not benefits from
7 the transaction.”

8 **Q: Please describe the ATA?**

9 A: The ATA consisted of several components. The first component was a
10 commitment by IPL to make a direct refund of \$13,040,000 to its
11 customers each year for an eight-year period beginning after ITC’s
12 transmission charges were included in IPL’s next rate case. In addition to
13 the eight-year refund proposal of IPL was a commitment by ITC to
14 provide a \$4,125,000 rate discount each year for eight years. ITC
15 committed to not seek recovery of this discount through its true-up
16 mechanism. Further, IPL committed to use a capital structure in its first
17 rate case following approval of the transmission asset sale that utilized a
18 common equity component of no more than 50 percent, which had an IPL

PUBLIC

1 calculated value of approximately \$12 million annually. Finally, ITC
2 agreed that it would forego recovery of the first \$15 million in transaction
3 costs associated with conducting the transmission sale proceeding. The
4 stated intent of the Applicants was that the ATA would hold IPL's
5 customers harmless for at least the first eight-years following approval of
6 the sale of IPL's transmission assets to ITC. Not only did the Applicants
7 assert that the ATA would hold customers harmless for at least eight-
8 years, but claimed that there would be an overall net present value benefit
9 of approximately \$15 million. The Applicants' Docket No. SPU-07-11
10 cost-benefit analysis summary showing the anticipated increase in
11 transmission costs and how the ATA would serve to offset those higher
12 costs over the eight-year period 2008 through 2015 was presented as
13 Exh ___ (CAH-2), Schedule K, page 1. I have included a copy of the
14 relevant parts of this exhibit with my testimony and have identified it as
15 OCA Exhibit ___ (CEF-1), Schedule A.

16 **Q: Are the ITC transmission charges which form the basis for the IPL's**
17 **proposed transmission expense pro forma adjustments in this**
18 **proceeding greater than the levels assumed in the Applicants' SPU-**

PUBLIC

1 **07-11 cost-benefit analysis that you just cited?**

2 A: Yes.

3 **Q: Are the cost-offsetting provisions of the ATA that you described**
4 **adequate to hold IPL’s customers harmless if the Board were to**
5 **approve the transmission expense pro forma adjustments that IPL**
6 **has proposed in this proceeding?**

7 A: No. The estimated 2009 and 2010 ITC transmission charges, which are
8 the foundation of IPL’s proposed transmission expense pro forma
9 adjustments in this proceeding, far exceed the levels reflected in the
10 Applicants’ SPU-07-11 cost-benefit analysis. As can be observed from
11 comparing line 10 to line 5 of my Schedule A, page 3, the difference
12 between the revenue requirement of ITC if the sale of IPL’s transmission
13 assets to ITC was approved and the revenue requirement assuming IPL’s
14 continued ownership of the transmission system was estimated to be more
15 than \$22 million per year higher for 2008, 2009, and 2010.

16 Mr. Hampsher’s 2009 transmission expense adjustment workpaper
17 WP B-9(b) submitted in this proceeding shows that IPL has now
18 estimated the 2009 ITC transmission expense charges to be about \$137.6

PUBLIC

1 million. This amount is about \$28.3 million higher than the \$109.3
2 million estimated ITC revenue requirement for 2009 that was allocated to
3 IPL's native load customers as shown on page 3, column (c), line 10 of
4 my Schedule A. This estimated \$109.3 million ITC 2009 revenue
5 requirement shown on my Schedule A, page 3, column (c), line 10 is
6 about \$22.8 million higher than the \$86.5 million estimated 2009 revenue
7 requirement shown on my Schedule A, page 3, column (c), line 5
8 associated with IPL retaining ownership of its transmission assets. The
9 cost offsets provided by the components of the ATA obviously only
10 mitigate a portion of the higher 2009 transmission costs, leaving IPL's
11 customers faced with substantial cost increases if IPL's proposed
12 adjustments are allowed by the Board. The 2009 transmission cost
13 estimates that I have just discussed and the resulting differences between
14 what was estimated during the SPU-07-11 proceeding and what is
15 proposed in this proceeding are shown below.

16	Estimated 2009 IPL Trans. Exp. w/o Asset Sale	\$ 86.5 million	
17	Estimated Increase with Sale to ITC	<u>22.8 million</u>	
18	SPU-07-11 Estimated 2009 ITC Rev. Req.	\$109.3 million	
19	Current Estimated 2009 Transmission Exp.	\$137.6 million	153.9
20	Current 2009 Est. Over SPU-07-11 Estimate	<u>\$ 28.3 million</u>	44.6
21			

PUBLIC

1 As the above summary illustrates, the approval of the sale of IPL's
2 transmission assets to ITC is now estimated to result in about a ~~\$51~~^{67.4}
3 million increase in transmission costs (\$22.8 million plus ~~\$28.3~~^{44.6} million)
4 for 2009 versus what was estimated by the Applicants to be the costs if
5 the transmission asset sale to ITC did not occur. Also, as I previously
6 indicated, IPL has proposed other adjustments in this proceeding for ITC-
7 related transmission expense for an additional anticipated 2010 increase of
8 about \$17.5 million and about \$11.7 million (one-fourth of total) for the
9 true-up of 2008 ITC transmission expense. The transmission cost offsets
10 of the ATA which include an annual refund of \$13.04 million and an
11 annual ITC rate discount of \$4.125 million are simply inadequate to fully
12 offset the large ITC transmission cost increases that have been and will be
13 imposed upon IPL, and which IPL now proposes to pass along to its
14 customers.

15 **Q: What is your recommendation regarding the proposed IPL**
16 **transmission expense pro forma adjustments?**

17 A: It is my recommendation that IPL's transmission expense levels in this
18 proceeding be set so as to not exceed the estimated levels of the

PUBLIC

1 prospective ITC revenue requirement calculated by the Applicants in
2 SPU-07-11 that would be charged to IPL if the transmission asset sale was
3 approved. Although these the transmission cost levels that IPL was
4 expected to experience if the transmission asset sale was approved were
5 higher than what would be expected if IPL were to retain ownership of its
6 transmission system, the ATA was intended to be adequate to offset those
7 higher costs. IPL's witness Mr. John Larsen, Vice President of Alliant
8 Energy Corporation's Technical and Integrated Services Business Units
9 stated on page 18 and 19 of his rebuttal testimony in Docket No. SPU-07-
10 11 that:

11 By changing the use of the Transaction Adjustment
12 from an AFUDC offset to a customer refund, the
13 Joint Applicants essentially "zero out" any rate
14 increase effects from the Transaction for customers
15 over the first eight years of the Transaction. In other
16 words, the Alternative Transaction Adjustment
17 replaces a future customer benefit with a current and
18 ongoing customer benefit for eight years.

19 Moreover, the Board's Transmission Sale Order includes at least four
20 explicit instances (pg. 31, pg. 41, pg. 44, pg. 45) citing the Applicants'
21 commitment that IPL's customers would be held harmless for at least
22 eight years if the transmission asset sale to ITC was approved. I urge the

PUBLIC

1 Board to hold IPL to its sworn testimony given in SPU-07-11 and to
2 require IPL to honor its commitment. I propose that the Board allow
3 increases in transmission expense only to the extent of the IPL Iowa
4 jurisdiction electric operations portion of the ITC revenue requirement
5 level used in the Applicants' cost-benefit analysis shown on my
6 Exhibit___(CEF-1), Schedule A, page 3, line 10, as adjusted to take into
7 consideration ITC's promised rate discount component of the ATA.

2009 TRANSMISSION EXPENSE

8
9 **Q: The first proposed adjustment to increase transmission expense is set
10 forth by Mr. Hampsher on his Exhibit___(CAH-1), Schedule B-9.**

11 **Will you please describe this proposed adjustment further?**

12 **A:** As Mr. Hampsher's schedule shows, IPL's proposed adjustment is based
13 upon expected total 2009 transmission expense of \$153,711,056
14 compared to book test period transmission expense of \$91,640,567, which
15 results in an increase of \$62,070,489. IPL's Iowa jurisdiction electric
16 operations is allocated \$58,414,537 of this amount.

17 Of the \$153,711,056 estimated 2009 transmission expense,
18 \$137,560,863 relates to ITC. The comparable book test period

PUBLIC

1 transmission cost for ITC is \$77,831,227, making the ITC component of
2 the proposed transmission expense adjustment \$60,169,636 with the Iowa
3 allocation being \$56,625,644, which would constitute Mr. Hampsher's
4 proposed adjustment for 2009 ITC transmission expense.

5 **Q: Do you recommend that the Board allow the \$56,625,644 ITC-related**
6 **transmission expense adjustment for 2009?**

7 A: No, I do not. This amount is far in excess of the anticipated 2009 increase
8 in transmission expense estimated by the Applicants in SPU-07-11 and far
9 in excess of the amount which the ATA was intended to offset in order to
10 insulate customers from the higher costs resulting from the transmission
11 asset sale to ITC.

12 **Q: What would be the appropriate amount of adjustment to recognize**
13 **expected 2009 transmission expense that would effectively serve to**
14 **hold IPL's retail customers harmless, at least as envisioned in Docket**
15 **No. SPU-07-11?**

16 A: The appropriate amount of 2009 transmission expense pro forma
17 adjustment based upon a comparison of expected the SPU-07-11 "hold-
18 harmless" levels for 2009 ITC transmission charges to IPL is \$1,065,802,

PUBLIC

1 of which the Iowa electric allocation is \$1,003,026. This amount is
2 shown on column (b), line 6 of my Exhibit ___(CEP-1), Schedule B,
3 column (b). My calculation begins with the SPU-07-11 IPL estimated
4 2009 amount of ITC transmission costs of \$109,275,143 less the
5 \$3,795,000 IPL portion of the ITC discount included in the ATA. It is
6 necessary to perform this calculation as \$109,275,143 is the pre-discount
7 estimate. To determine what IPL would actually be billed, the discount
8 must be taken into consideration as I have done. The resulting net
9 estimate of ITC transmission charges to IPL is \$105,480,143. This
10 amount is compared to the SPU-07-11 estimated 2008 ITC transmission
11 charges to IPL of \$104,414,341 to arrive at the total adjustment of
12 \$1,065,802, of which 94.11 percent is allocated to IPL's Iowa electric
13 jurisdiction.

14 When the non-network/non-ITC Iowa electric allocation
15 transmission expense component of \$93,319 shown on page 2, column
16 (b), line 8 of my Exhibit ___(CEP-1), Schedule B and MISO network/non-
17 ITC Iowa electric allocation transmission expense component of
18 \$1,695,573 shown on page 2, column (b), line 9 of my Exhibit ___(CEP-

PUBLIC

Revised
1) 1), Schedule B are added, the resulting total 2009 Iowa electric
transmission expense adjustment is \$2,791,919, as shown on page 1,
column (b), line 10 of my Exhibit ___ (CEF-1), Schedule B. This is the
total amount of 2009 Iowa electric transmission expense adjustment I
recommend that IPL be allowed to include in its revenue requirement
calculation in this proceeding in lieu of the \$58,414,537 proposed by Mr.
Hampsher.

Although I have included the \$1,695,573 in my adjustment relating
to 2009 MISO network/non-ITC transmission charges, the amount is an
estimate, rather than a known and measurable amount. I have included
this as a placeholder, to show the approximate level until a better estimate
becomes known and measurable amount later this year. I recommend that
the actual amount the Board allows for this adjustment be based upon the
difference between 2009 actual numbers through September 30, 2009, to
be provided by IPL, plus October through December 2008, compared with
actual 2008 amounts, instead of the \$1,695,573 I have calculated. The
2009 estimated amounts for MISO network/non-ITC transmission
expense proposed by IPL are not based upon contract or other fixed-type

PUBLIC

1 charges, but are based upon MISO rates and forecast load. Consequently,
2 the October through December 2009 actual amounts will not be known
3 until they are actually incurred because the actual charges will be the
4 result of actual load during those months applied to whatever MISO rates
5 are in effect. Any actual increases or decreases in charges for those
6 months relative to the test period will not be known until after September
7 2009 and thus, should not be allowed as part of the adjustment.

OUT-OF-PERIOD TRANSMISSION EXPENSE

8
9 **Q: The next proposed adjustment for transmission expense is set forth**
10 **by Mr. Hampsher on his Exhibit ___(CAH-1), Schedule B-18. Will**
11 **you please describe this proposed adjustment?**

12 **A:** The adjustment shown on B-18 is one of two out-of-period items for
13 which adjustments have been proposed. The total transmission expense
14 component proposed is \$1,260,523 of which the Iowa portion is shown to
15 be \$1,186,278. This adjustment relates to non-ITC transmission refunds
16 received during the test period as the result of a transmission rate
17 settlement approved by the FERC. The adjustment is necessary so as to
18 properly reflect actual test period book information. The proper amount

PUBLIC

1 of the adjustment, however, is \$1,260,523, not the \$1,186,278 shown on
2 Mr. Hampsher's Schedule B-18 because the \$1,260,523 is the Iowa
3 allocation of the total amount. The \$1,186,278 Mr. Hampsher used is the
4 result of inadvertently performing the allocation to Iowa twice.

5 There was also a \$93,828 account 456 revenue component related
6 to the settlement which was not taken into consideration. Therefore, it is
7 necessary to make an adjustment of \$88,302 to increase test period
8 revenue to recognize the IPL Iowa electric jurisdiction allocation of this
9 item.

2008 ITC TRANSMISSION EXPENSE TRUE-UP

11 **Q: The next proposed adjustment to increase transmission expense is set
12 forth by Mr. Hampsher on his Exhibit ___ (CAH-1), Schedule B-25.**

13 **Will you please describe this proposed adjustment?**

14 **A:** The adjustment shown on B-25 is to recognize transmission expense that
15 IPL will be charged by ITC relating to the 2008 transmission charges true-
16 up. Mr. Hampsher explains the true-up process on page 48 of his direct
17 testimony. The \$54,174,400 amount proposed by Mr. Hampsher as the
18 basis for this adjustment is an estimate which IPL planned to revise when

PUBLIC

1 the actual true-up amount becomes known. The amount constitutes the
2 difference between what ITC recovered during 2008 and its total costs as
3 reported in the 2008 FERC Form 1 report. The FERC allows the 2008
4 true-up to be charged to and recovered from ITC's customers during 2010
5 as an add-on to ITC's 2010 transmission rates. The actual amount of the
6 2008 true-up is now known and is \$53,556,050. The total IPL allocation
7 of this amount is \$49,271,566 of which the IPL Iowa electric jurisdiction
8 allocation in turn is \$46,369,471. One-fourth of \$46,369,471 is
9 \$11,592,368.

10 **Q: Do you recommend that the Board allow IPL to approve IPL's**
11 **proposed adjustment for the ITC 2008 true-up?**

12 A: No. Although there should be an adjustment, I do not agree with the
13 estimated amount proposed by IPL or the revised amount based upon the
14 actual 2008 ITC true-up amount.

15 **Q: What amount do you recommend that Board permit?**

16 A: I recommend that ^{12,021,399}~~\$25,431,453~~ be used as the basis for the 2008 ITC true-
17 up adjustment. This amount is shown on page 1, column (a), line 6 of my
18 Revised
Schedule B.

PUBLIC

1 **Q: What is the rationale for your proposed 2008 ITC true-up**
2 **adjustment, and how did you calculate your recommended amount of**
3 **12,021,399**
~~\$25,431,453?~~

4 A: The rationale underlying my recommendation regarding the 2008 ITC
5 transmission expense true-up follows the same line of reasoning I used to
6 determine the 2009 transmission expense adjustment amount. As IPL
7 assured its customers and the Board that approval of the sale of its
8 transmission system to ITC would not be harmful to customers because of
9 the offsets provided by the ATA, I calculated the 2008 true-up adjustment
10 so as be consistent with the expected higher costs to IPL's customers
11 reflected in IPL's cost-benefit analysis relied upon by the Board in SPU-
12 07-11. I show my calculation on page 1, column (a) of my Schedule B. I
13 began my calculation with IPL's portion of the SPU-07-11 estimated 2008
14 ~~ITC~~ transmission revenue requirement of \$104,414,341. Since there was
15 no discount applied by ITC for 2008 transmission costs, I did not reduce
16 the 2008 estimated amount of \$104,414,341 as I did when calculating the
17 2009 ITC transmission expense adjustment. I then compared the
18 \$104,414,341 to IPL's actual 2008 book ~~ITC-related~~ transmission expense

PUBLIC

1 each year under its FERC-approved tariff. Doesn't this fact suggest
2 that a representative amount ~~be~~ could be used in setting IPL's
3 revenue requirement?

4 A: No. While I recognize that ITC has the ability to calculate and assess a
5 transmission cost true-up each year and that it is possible that there may
6 be an ITC transmission expense true-up in future years, the amount of
7 future true-ups is not known with any degree of certainty. For 2008, the
8 ITC true-up adjustment is a very significant amount of money and is
9 based upon an under recovery. Future true-ups may be for very different
10 amounts or could be based upon a situation when ITC over-recovered its
11 costs, thus requiring a refund, as opposed to the true-up requiring the
12 collection of an under-recovery as occurred during 2008. Therefore, it is
13 preferable to treat the 2008 ITC true-up as a one-time non-recurring item
14 for purposes of determining the revenue requirement in this proceeding.

15 **Q: IPL proposed two alternatives for including the 2008 ITC true-up in**
16 **the revenue requirement in this proceeding. The first IPL alternative**
17 **was to amortize the adjustment over four years with the unamortized**
18 **balance being included in rate base. The second, and preferred, IPL**

PUBLIC

1 alternative is to fully offset the true-up amount against the regulatory
2 liability account established for making the \$13,040,000 annual
3 refund per the ATA. Why do you propose the amortization method
4 rather than the alternative that fully offsets the 2008 true-up
5 adjustment?

6 A: I have opted to recommend adoption of the amortization method because I
7 believe that IPL's customers should receive annual refunds over eight
8 years as promised by IPL as part of the ATA and the commitment to hold
9 customers harmless for at least eight years. Using a large portion of the
10 amount set up to make refunds early in the eight-year period will deprive
11 IPL of funds to provide refunds in the later years to help offset the higher
12 ITC transmission charges customers will be exposed to.

13 **Q: IPL has also proposed that the unamortized portion of the true-up**
14 **amount be included in IPL's rate base if the amortization method is**
15 **used in this proceeding. Do you agree with this aspect of the**
16 **proposed adjustment?**

17 A: No. I recommend that no so-called "unrecovered 2008 ITC true-up costs"
18 be included in rate base and have indicated to Mr. Turner that zero be

PUBLIC

1 reflected in his schedules.

2 IPL will not actually be charged the true-up costs until 2010, and
3 will pay those amounts over the course of the entire year. While it might
4 be appropriate to include the unrecovered balance in rate base after the
5 amounts were actually paid, the fact is that IPL has not paid any of the
6 true-up amounts yet and should not be allowed to include anything in rate
7 base yet. I recommend that the issue of whether unrecovered true-up
8 costs should be allowed to be included in rate base be re-visited in the
9 2010 rate case that IPL has indicated it plans to file. By then there will
10 actually be a balance and the issue of whether it should or should not be
11 included in rate base can be resolved at that time. Including three-fourths
12 of the “unrecovered” 2008 true-up costs in rate base before the true-up
13 costs have actually been paid will result in IPL’s customers paying what I
14 believe would be an excessive amount of carrying costs since IPL would
15 be earning a return on money it has yet to pay. Waiting until the 2010 rate
16 case would resolve this issue.

17 2010 TRANSMISSION EXPENSE

18 **Q: The last of the proposed adjustments to increase transmission**

PUBLIC

1 expense is set forth by Mr. Hampsher on his Exhibit___(CAH-1),

2 **Schedule B-26. Will you please describe this proposed adjustment?**

3 A: As Mr. Hampsher's schedule shows, IPL's proposed adjustment is based
4 upon expected 2010 transmission expense of \$156,171,830 compared to
5 2009 transmission expense of \$137,560,863. The difference between the
6 \$156,171,830 and \$137,560,863 produces an adjustment of \$18,610,967.
7 IPL's Iowa jurisdiction electric operations is allocated \$17,514,781. The
8 \$156,171,830 estimated 2010 transmission expense consists solely of ITC
9 network transmission charges, which IPL indicates will be known and
10 measurable by September 2009. The \$156,171,830 is the amount of
11 estimated 2010 ITC transmission charges excluding IPL's portion of the
12 estimated \$54,174,400 2008 true-up which I previously discussed and
13 which the FERC allows ITC to recover during 2010. IPL has correctly
14 not included any adjustment for estimated 2010 non-ITC transmission
15 charges.

16 **Q: Do you recommend that the Board allow the \$17,514,830 ITC**
17 **transmission expense adjustment for 2010?**

18 A: No, I do not. This amount is in excess of the hold-harmless amount of

PUBLIC

1 anticipated increase in transmission expense relied upon in the
2 Transmission Sale Order.

3 **Q: What would be the appropriate amount of adjustment to recognize**
4 **expected 2010 transmission expense that would serve to hold IPL's**
5 **retail customers harmless consistent with the ATA terms discussed in**
6 **IPL's testimony in SPU-07-11, and in the SPU-07-11 Transmission**
7 **Sale Order?**

8 A: The appropriate amount of 2010 transmission expense based upon a
9 comparison of the expected 2009 and 2010 ITC revenue requirement
10 billable to IPL is \$4,479,450, of which the Iowa electric allocation is
11 \$4,215,611. This amount is shown on page 1, column (c), line 10 of my
12 Exhibit ___ (CEF-1), Schedule B. This is the amount of 2010 Iowa electric
13 transmission expense adjustment I recommend that IPL be allowed to
14 include in its revenue requirement calculation in this proceeding in lieu of
15 the \$17,514,781 proposed by Mr. Hampsher, unless the actual proposed
16 2010 ITC transmission charges assignable to IPL, which will become
17 known later in 2009, are less than \$109,959,593 (net of ITC discount). In
18 this somewhat unlikely case, the adjustment should be computed by

PUBLIC

Revised

1 substituting that amount for the \$109,959,593 on my Schedule B, page 1,
2 col. (c), line 3.

3 **Q: Your proposed transmission expense pro forma adjustments reflect a**
4 **substantial reduction from the levels that IPL believes that it will be**
5 **required to pay to ITC for transmission service. If the Board accepts**
6 **your recommendations, will such approval relieve IPL of the**
7 **obligation to pay ITC for transmission service?**

8 A: It is very unlikely that will be the case. As long as ITC is charging IPL its
9 FERC authorized rates, IPL will be obligated to pay ITC.

10 **Q: Will the fact that IPL will still have to pay ITC for transmission**
11 **service at levels in excess of what you have recommended the Board**
12 **allow IPL to recover from its customers unreasonably deprive IPL of**
13 **a reasonable opportunity to earn its Board-authorized return?**

14 A: No. IPL can use the gain realized from the sale of its transmission assets
15 to ITC to offset the ITC transmission expense which I have recommended
16 be excluded from the revenue requirement in this proceeding.

17 When the sale of IPL's transmission assets to ITC was approved by
18 the Board and subsequently closed, IPL realized a substantial gain.

PUBLIC

1 According to IPL's response to OCA data request number 113, IPL
2 realized an after-tax net gain of \$217,754,242. The gain was included
3 with what was transferred to IPL's parent, Alliant Energy Corporation as
4 a dividend. I have identified a copy of this data request response as OCA
5 Exhibit___(CEF-1), Schedule C. Although IPL utilized a portion of the
6 pre-tax gain (approximately \$88.7 million) to establish the regulatory
7 liability account for paying the eight-year \$13 million annual refund
8 committed to as part of the ATA, IPL's customers received no portion of
9 the after-tax gain amount of \$217,754,242. Although I have not
10 thoroughly investigated the income tax implications of using the gain as I
11 recommend, there could be income tax advantages to IPL that could
12 effectively make much more than the \$217.8 million after-tax gain
13 available for use in offsetting the ITC transmission costs. Moreover, the
14 timing of the transmission asset sale transaction was such that IPL was
15 able to take advantage of an opportunity that allowed the company to
16 spread the payment of income taxes on the gain from the transaction over
17 an eight-year period, providing an additional time value of money benefit
18 which could also be applied to the transmission costs.

PUBLIC

1 IPL, in effect, promised that its customers would be held harmless
2 for at least eight years if the transmission asset sale was approved. My
3 recommended adjustments will allow IPL to recover from retail customers
4 the level of transmission costs cited to justify the sale of its transmission
5 assets to ITC. It is those levels of transmission costs that IPL relied upon
6 as the basis for its assurances that the ATA would hold customers
7 harmless from the higher rates that would result. The Board specifically
8 cited this commitment several times in its Transmission Sale Order
9 allowing the sale of IPL's transmission asset to ITC to take place.

10 It is obvious that IPL did not seek a commitment from ITC that
11 transmission costs during the eight-year post-transaction period would not
12 exceed the levels underlying the commitment IPL made to its customers.
13 The failure of IPL to protect its shareholders from consequences due to
14 unanticipated IPC cost increases should not excuse IPL from being
15 required to live up to the promise made to its customers and to the Board.

16 For the Board to allow IPL to ignore the sworn testimony and
17 commitments that have been made by IPL and pass along to its customers
18 the ITC cost increases in excess of the levels used in SPU-07-11 would

PUBLIC

1 send the signal to utilities that sworn testimony and commitments to
2 customers and the Board need not be taken seriously. Accepting my
3 recommendations and requiring IPL to honor the commitment it has made
4 would constitute a clear and unequivocal message that the Board fully
5 intends to hold utilities to the commitments made in the sworn testimony
6 of their witnesses. Using the gain from the transmission sale to pay for
7 the higher-than-expected ITC transmission charges would mitigate the
8 potential harm to IPL's stockholders. To the extent the gain and tax
9 deferral benefits resulting from the transmission sale are inadequate to
10 fully cover ITC transmission charges during the eight-year hold-harmless
11 period, the shareholders should be responsible for those costs as part of
12 the bargain made by IPL's management in deciding to sell its
13 transmission assets.

TRANSMISSION A&G EXPENSE

14
15 **Q: Please describe the transmission A&G adjustment proposed by IPL
16 and shown on Mr. Hampsher's Exhibit ___ (CAH-1), Schedule B-31.**

17 **A: This proposed adjustment also relates to the transmission sale case, SPU-
18 07-11. In assuming that Applicants would receive the Board's approval**

PUBLIC

1 the sale of IPL's transmission assets to ITC, ITC recognized that it would
2 need to establish an operating structure and hire personnel to operate the
3 newly-acquired transmission system. A number of IPL's employees who
4 worked in the area of transmission operations were expected to go to work
5 for ITC. As a result of the expected transfer of personnel from IPL to
6 ITC, IPL was of the belief that the company would experience a reduction
7 of administrative and general (A&G) expenses. The amount of the A&G
8 adjustment proposed in this proceeding is the same as was used in the
9 Applicants' cost-benefit analysis in SPU-07-11. Although I had my
10 doubts in SPU-07-11 about the potential of IPL being able to realize those
11 savings, the amount was included in IPL's cost-benefit analysis which
12 was cited by the Board in determining that IPL's customers would be held
13 harmless due to the ATA, and I believe IPL should be held to the cost-
14 benefit analysis relied upon to justify the sale of its transmission assets.
15 Consequently, I believe the proposed transmission A&G adjustment
16 should be accepted.

17 **Q: You stated that you have based the amount of your proposed**
18 **transmission expense pro forma adjustments on the "hold-harmless"**

PUBLIC

1 levels of transmission expense reflected in the SPU-07-11 proceeding
2 cost-benefit analysis sponsored by the Applicants. Does this mean
3 that your adjustments actually hold IPL's customers harmless from
4 the higher transmission costs resulting from the sale of IPL's
5 transmission system to ITC?

6 A: No. As can be seen from my Schedule B, page 1, column (d), line 3, the
7 2008 through 2010 three-year total transmission expense level based upon
8 SPU-07-11 costs that I used to calculate the pro forma transmission
9 expense adjustments totals almost \$320 million. The estimated IPL
10 transmission revenue requirements for the same period, as shown on my
11 Schedule A, page 3, columns (b) through (d), on line 5, which assumes
12 IPL did not sell its transmission assets, is approximately \$260 million for
13 the same period. The difference of almost \$60 million is not offset by the
14 some \$26.08 million in refunds that will be made by IPL during 2009 and
15 2010 and the value of the cost of capital benefit of the ATA, which was
16 estimated by IPL in SPU-07-11 to be worth about \$24 million over the
17 same two-year time period. In my view, the cost of capital benefit
18 estimated by IPL is overstated. In any case, this some \$60 million ITC-

PUBLIC

1 related transmission costs which IPL's customers will be required to pay
2 for 2008, 2009, and 2010 transmission expense, based upon my
3 adjustments, is about \$10 million more than what they would have paid if
4 IPL had not sold its transmission system, irrespective of the some \$50
5 million offsets provided by the ATA, and including the ITC discounts
6 (which are taken into consideration in my calculation of allowable
7 transmission expense).

ITC TRANSMISSION EXPENSE ADJUSTMENT MECHANISM

8
9 **Q: IPL's witness Mr. Erik C. Madsen proposes that IPL be permitted to**
10 **implement an automatic adjustment clause mechanism for ITC**
11 **transmission costs similar to the purchased gas adjustment clause and**
12 **the energy adjustment clause. Do you agree with Mr. Madsen that**
13 **such a mechanism should implemented?**

14 **A:** Yes. The approval of the sale of IPL's transmission system to ITC has
15 resulted in transmission expenses no longer being significantly within the
16 control of IPL. IPL has no option but pay ITC at whatever FERC-
17 approved rates ITC charges, and little practical ability to challenge ITC's
18 rates. Transmission charges, while perhaps not as large a component of

PUBLIC

1 IPL's total costs as fuel, are still significant. I also believe that the level
2 of ITC transmission charges is likely to be subject to significant
3 fluctuations from year-to-year. Consequently, I am recommending that
4 IPL be permitted to implement the proposed automatic adjustment
5 mechanism, but with some qualifications.

6 **Q: What qualifications do recommend the Board impose upon IPL's**
7 **implementation of the automatic adjustment mechanism for ITC**
8 **transmission charges?**

9 A: As I have previously testified, IPL committed to hold its customers
10 harmless if the Board approved the sale of its transmission assets to ITC.
11 The underlying basis for this commitment involved specific assumptions
12 of what post-transaction transmission costs would be. My
13 recommendations concerning the appropriate level of 2009 ITC
14 transmission costs, 2010 ITC transmission costs, and the allowable level
15 of true-up of 2008 ITC transmission costs were based upon those
16 amounts. If the Board allows IPL to implement that transmission
17 automatic adjustment, IPL should not be allowed to include in the
18 automatic adjustment mechanism any more transmission costs than the

PUBLIC

1 levels I have recommended. Beyond 2010, IPL should not be allowed to
2 include annually in the automatic adjustment mechanism any more
3 transmission costs than the Iowa jurisdiction electric operations allocation
4 of transmission costs shown on page 3, line 10 of my Schedule A, less the
5 ITC discount of \$4,125,000 that I previously discussed, of which the IPL
6 electric operation share is about \$3,795,000.

7 **Q: Your Schedule A, page 3, line 10 only shows information for the time**
8 **period 2008 through 2012. What levels of transmission expense**
9 **should be recoverable through the ITC transmission expense**
10 **automatic adjustment mechanism for the remaining four years of the**
11 **eight-year hold-harmless period?**

12 **A:** I have attached Exhibit__(CEF-1), Schedule D. This is a reproduction of
13 the 2008 through 2016 portion of Schedule F of the cost-benefit analysis
14 prepared by IPL in response to the Board's questions in Docket No. SPU-
15 07-11. This schedule was prepared by IPL to show a twenty-year cost-
16 benefit analysis assuming inclusion of the ATA in the analysis. Line 2
17 represents the estimated ITC revenue requirement impact upon IPL if the
18 transmission sale was approved by the Board. The amounts shown on

PUBLIC

1 line 2 for the years 2013 through 2016, less \$3,795,000, should be the
2 maximum amount IPL should be allowed to recover from its customers
3 through the automatic adjustment mechanism.

4 **Q: Are there any other qualifications regarding implementation of the**
5 **proposed automatic adjustment mechanism that the Board should**
6 **require?**

7 A: All adjustments made to the revenue requirement in this proceedings
8 related to transmission expense should be eliminated and an adjustment
9 reflected to remove book 2008 ITC-related transmission expense from the
10 revenue requirement calculation so as to exclude ITC transmission-related
11 costs from base rates. Due to the large amount of the 2008 ITC
12 transmission cost true-up, I would recommend that the true-up be spread
13 over a four-year period so as to lessen the severity of the rate impact upon
14 IPL's customers. As for the proposal to include any unamortized portion
15 in rate base, I continue to recommend that this issue be addressed in IPL's
16 planned 2010 rate case. Following the implementation of final rates in
17 this proceeding, all Board approved ITC-related transmission expense
18 recovery should be through the automatic adjustment mechanism and

PUBLIC

1 none as a part of base rates.

2 SGS #4 PRE-CONSTRUCTION (CANCELLATION) COSTS

3 **Q: Please describe the adjustment to recover Sutherland Generating**
4 **Station Unit 4 preliminary survey and investigation costs proposed by**
5 **IPL and shown on Mr. Hampsher’s Exhibit ___(CAH-1), Schedule B-**
6 **34.**

7 A: Although Mr. Hampsher identifies the costs as “preliminary survey and
8 investigation costs” associated with pre-construction activities for the
9 proposed SGS unit number 4 generating plant, the term “cancelation
10 costs” is also used in reference to such costs. This is somewhat of a
11 misnomer as the costs are not a result of IPL canceling plans to build the
12 plant, but are costs incurred prior to IPL’s decision to cancel plans to
13 construct the plant before actual construction commenced. For the
14 purposes of my testimony, however, both terms refer to the same costs.

15 In any case, SGS#4 is, or was, a coal-fired electric generation
16 facility that IPL planned to construct in Marshalltown, Iowa. The Board
17 granted IPL a preliminary certificate to construct the SGS#4 plant in
18 Docket No. GCU-07-1 and approved advance ratemaking principles

PUBLIC

1 applicable to the plant in Docket No. RPU-08-1. On March 26, 2009, the
2 Board issued an order accepting IPL's notice of its plan to cancel the
3 construction of the proposed SGS#4 plant. During the time prior IPL's
4 decision to cancel plans to construct SGS#4, IPL incurred and deferred
5 some \$30.3 million in pre-construction costs (and proposes to collect from
6 its customers over \$45 million.

7 IPL has proposed that it be allowed to recover the SGS#4
8 preliminary survey and investigation costs from ratepayers over a five-
9 year period or be allowed to use the proceeds from the regulatory liability
10 account established using the gain from the sale of the Duane Arnold
11 Energy Center (DAEC). This transaction was authorized by the Board in
12 Docket No. SPU-05-15. The amortization approach proposed by IPL
13 would result in about \$8.5 million being included in IPL's revenue
14 requirement in this proceeding if the adjustment is allowed by the Board.
15 If the entire amount were charged against the DAEC regulatory liability
16 account, there would be no immediate impact upon ratepayers, but the
17 regulatory liability account, with was to be used to offset AFUDC
18 associated with the construction of new generation, would be substantially

PUBLIC

1 reduced, leaving less available to help offset the cost of future generating
2 plant.

3 **Q: What basis does IPL rely upon in seeking recovery of the SGS#4**
4 **cancellation costs from ratepayers?**

5 A: IPL witness Mr. Thomas L. Aller discusses IPL's decision to not go
6 forward with the construction of the proposed SGS#4 facility. Mr. Aller
7 cites the Board's approval of ratemaking principle number 4 in IPL's
8 ratemaking principles proceeding Docket No. SPU-08-1 as allowing IPL
9 to recover the SGS#4 preliminary survey and investigation costs. This
10 ratemaking principle provides that:

11 If IPL cancels construction of the proposed SGS Unit
12 4 for good cause, IPL's prudently incurred costs shall
13 be amortized over a period of no more than five years
14 no later than six months after the cancellation. The
15 annual amortization shall be included in the
16 calculation of IPL's revenue requirement, but the
17 unamortized balance shall not be included in rate
18 base in any determination of interim and final rates
19 thereafter during the period of amortization provided
20 however, that the prudence of the costs and the good
21 cause for cancellation may be disputed by any party
22 and shall be subject to determination by the Board.

23 **Q: What is your recommendation concerning IPL's proposal to recover**
24 **the SGS#4 preliminary survey and investigation costs?**

PUBLIC

1 A: I have two alternatives concerning the treatment of the SGS#4 costs. My
2 first (and primary) recommendation is that the Board not permit IPL to
3 recover any of these costs from its ratepayers. In the event the Board does
4 not adopt this recommendation, I recommend that IPL's shareholders and
5 ratepayers share in bearing those costs.

6 I have concerns with what should constitute the appropriate amount
7 of "prudently incurred costs" that should be considered eligible for
8 recovery, in the event the Board decides to allow IPL to recovery some or
9 all of the SGS#4 preliminary survey and investigation costs . I will
10 address this matter later.

11 **Q: Why do you recommend that IPL not be allowed to recover the**
12 **SGS#4 preliminary survey and investigation costs costs?**

13 A: First, I believe that IPL's reliance on the Docket No. RPU-08-1
14 ratemaking principle #4 is misplaced. Although the Board did approve
15 ratemaking principles in Docket No. RPU-08-1, IPL did not accept those
16 principles and did not proceed to construct the plant. Instead, IPL notified
17 the Board that it had cancelled plans to construct the SGS#4 plant and that
18 accordingly, the ratemaking principles approved by the Board were moot,

PUBLIC

1 with the exception of principle number 4, relating to cancellation cost
2 recovery. Secondly, IPL's unwillingness to accept the terms of the
3 Board's ratemaking principles decision does not, in my opinion, constitute
4 "good cause" for cancelling plans to construct SGS#4.

5 I submit for the Board's consideration that IPL should not be
6 permitted to pick and choose from among the Board's approved
7 ratemaking principles and select only the one which it wants. The Board
8 considered IPL's request for approval of ratemaking principles and
9 approved all of IPL's requested ratemaking principles, although not
10 exactly as IPL proposed. It is my opinion that none of the proposed
11 ratemaking principles have any force and effect unless they are all
12 accepted by IPL and IPL proceeds with construction of SGS#4. For
13 ratemaking principle number 4 to be of any effect, IPL would need to
14 actually start construction of the plant and at some point cancel
15 construction activities for good cause. There is nothing in the Board's
16 order that I saw which would suggest that ratemaking principle number 4
17 was equally applicable whether IPL accepted the Board's approved
18 ratemaking principles and proceeded with construction or decided the

PUBLIC

1 ratemaking principles were not acceptable and withdrew its application
2 for a certificate as provided for by Iowa law. IPL offers little in the way
3 of argument, justification, or rationale for being allowed to recover the
4 SGS#4 cancelation costs other than it is allowed pursuant to ratemaking
5 principle number 4.

6 **Q: In the event the Board does determine that ratemaking principle**
7 **number 4 may be relied-upon in the manner proposed by IPL, do you**
8 **agree that “good cause” existed to cancel SGS#4?**

9 A: No. Although Mr. Aller discusses a number of factors considered in
10 reaching the decision to cancel plans to construct SGS#4, with the
11 possible exception of weight placed by IPL on the uncertainty relating to
12 future environmental regulation, the “cause” for cancelation of SGS#4
13 appears to me to be IPL’s unwillingness to accept risk that the Company
14 perceived being exposed to as a result of the ratemaking principles
15 established by the Board. There were a number of parties involved in
16 IPL’s ratemaking principles proceeding. The Board considered the
17 evidence presented by IPL and the other parties and issued an order
18 establishing ratemaking principles deemed to be just and reasonable. If,

PUBLIC

1 as is obvious, IPL did not like those ratemaking principles as a whole, it is
2 certainly IPL's prerogative to not accept them and walk away from the
3 project. This is not, however, a suitable reason to charge its customers
4 almost \$43 million that had been spent to get to the point of receiving
5 Board-approved ratemaking principles. IPL's perception that the Board's
6 decision involved too much risk for IPL's stockholders should not be
7 considered a "good cause" to saddle just the ratepayers with costs of the
8 magnitude proposed by IPL.

9 **Q: What factors do you think could constitute "good cause" to cancel the**
10 **plant?**

11 A: The first that comes to mind is that more up-to-date studies showed that
12 changes in load requirements demonstrated that the plant was not needed
13 to meet the long-term electricity requirements of IPL's customers.
14 Another might be that for whatever reasons the estimated cost to construct
15 the plant had increased so significantly that building the plant could no
16 longer be justified.

17 **Q: Did IPL cite either of those considerations as being among the**
18 **"combination of factors" IPL's decision to cancel SGS#4 was based**

PUBLIC

1 **upon?**

2 A: No. Mr. Aller did not discuss, that I read, IPL's perception of changes in
3 its customers' future electricity requirements being a consideration, nor
4 did he state that the estimated cost to build SGS#4 had increased to
5 unacceptable levels. In regard to the cost issue, he stated only that IPL's
6 primary contractor KBV Sutherland Power Contractors indicated the plant
7 could not be built at the level of cost cap set by the Board in its
8 ratemaking principles decision.

9 **Q: You recommended that as an alternative, IPL's shareholders and**
10 **ratepayers share in bearing the SGS#4 cancellation costs. What is the**
11 **basis for this recommendation?**

12 A: As I previously discussed, I do not believe the Board should allow IPL to
13 rely upon ratemaking principle number 4 as a guarantee that it may
14 recover the cancellation costs from its customers. If the Board disagrees
15 with my interpretation in whole or in part, there is still this issue of how
16 much "good cause" existed to cancel plans to build the plant and whether
17 the company, its shareholders, or its ratepayers primarily benefit from the
18 decision to not go forward. If good cause existed to cancel plans to build

PUBLIC

1 SGS#4, the decision was probably good for both the stockholders and
2 ratepayers. Consequently then, it is reasonable that both parties should
3 share in the cost of the decision, with each bearing fifty percent of the
4 allowable costs.

5 **Q: You stated that in the event recovery was allowed by the Board, you**
6 **had concerns regarding the appropriate amount of what should**
7 **constitute the preliminary survey and investigation costs eligible for**
8 **recovery. Would you please describe these concerns?**

9 A: Yes. I believe that IPL has overstated the amount of SGS#4 preliminary
10 survey and investigation costs that should be eligible for recovery,
11 regardless of whether ratepayers, stockholders, or both pay them. Mr.
12 Hampsher's Schedule B-34 shows \$45,345,000 as the total amount which
13 IPL proposes to recover. This amount is simply not the correct amount
14 should recovery be allowed by the Board.

15 **Q: Why is the amount of SGS#4 preliminary survey and investigation**
16 **costs proposed by Mr. Hampsher incorrect?**

17 A: There are two amounts included in the \$45,354,000 Mr. Hampsher
18 proposes that IPL be allowed to recover which I believe should not be

PUBLIC

1 considered as recoverable SGS#4 preliminary survey and investigation
2 costs. The first is the \$15,057,918.97 shown on Mr. Hampsher's
3 Workpaper WP B-34(a). This \$15,057,918.97 represents costs charged

4 { [REDACTED]
5 [REDACTED]
6 [REDACTED]
7 [REDACTED]
8 [REDACTED]
9 [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]
12 [REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]

15 [REDACTED] } The \$15,057,918.97 should be excluded
16 from any amount of SGS#4 preliminary survey and investigation costs
17 that the Board might deem recoverable from IPL's ratepayers.

18 Of the remaining \$30,287,393 of deferred SGS#4 preliminary

PUBLIC

1 survey and investigation costs that are shown on Mr. Hampsher's
2 Workpaper WP B-34(a), \$5,836,556 relates to land that IPL purchased to
3 be used for SGS#4. IPL is currently holding this land and plans to hold it
4 for future use. It would be improper to permit IPL to recover the cost of
5 this land from ratepayers. If IPL has plans to use the land for a future
6 generating plant, or other purposes, the land should be accounted for
7 appropriately until put into use. If IPL has no plans for future use of the
8 land, it should be sold, in which case IPL would recover some, all, or
9 potentially more than was paid for the land. The \$5,836,556 in land costs
10 should be deducted from the \$30,287,393. \$30,287,393 less \$5,836,556
11 is \$24,450,837, which is the maximum amount of SGS#4 preliminary
12 survey and investigation costs which should be considered eligible for
13 recovery, not the \$45,345,000 proposed by IPL. The Iowa electric
14 allocation of the \$24,450,837 would be \$23,010,683.

15 **Q: If the Board determines that IPL should be allowed to rely upon the**
16 **SGS#4 cancelation cost ratemaking principle number 4, that good**
17 **cause did exist to cancel plans to construct SGS#4, and that the**
18 **\$23,010,683 should be recoverable from ratepayers, do you have an**

PUBLIC

1 **opinion as to whether the amortization method or using the DAEC**
2 **regulatory liability account is the more reasonable method of**
3 **recovery?**

4 A: Yes. My recommendation would be to be to use the regulatory liability
5 balance to offset these costs. There is more than enough in the DAEC
6 regulatory liability account to allow for full offset of the \$23,010,683.
7 Using the regulatory liability account will reduce the amount of rate
8 increase IPL's customers would otherwise experience. Not only are
9 customer's facing a substantial rate increase request from IPL, but the
10 current economic situation is not a good time for higher rates, so all
11 reasonable steps which can mitigate the amount of any increase should be
12 taken. If the Board agrees with my recommendation that costs eligible for
13 recovery should be shared between ratepayers and stockholders, the one-
14 half of the \$23,010,683 for which ratepayers would be responsible should
15 be deducted from the DAEC regulatory liability account.

CAPACITY DEMAND

17 **Q: Please describe the capacity demand adjustment proposed by IPL**
18 **and shown on Mr. Hampsher's Exhibit ___(CAH-1), Schedule B-7.**

PUBLIC

1 A: Mr. Hampsher proposed an adjustment for changes in capacity demand
2 purchase costs. The total amount of proposed adjustment is \$7,035,905 of
3 which the IPL Iowa electric jurisdiction allocation is \$6,621,490.

4 **Q: Do you recommend that the Board allow the \$6,621,490 capacity**
5 **demand adjustment proposed by IPL?**

6 A: While I agree that an adjustment is appropriate, the amount originally
7 proposed by Mr. Hampsher is not the appropriate amount. The majority
8 of the adjustment is comprised of capacity demand costs associated with
9 the DAEC purchased power agreement. The IPL Iowa electric
10 jurisdiction allocation of the DAEC-related amount is \$4,980,301. This is
11 the appropriate amount of the adjustment. I show the calculation of this
12 amount on my Exhibit __ (CEF-1), Schedule F.

13 The remaining amounts included as part of IPL's proposed
14 adjustment consisted of estimates of 2009 capacity purchases IPL planned
15 to make. I have excluded these items from my adjustment.

16 **Q: Why have you excluded the other portions of IPL's proposed capacity**
17 **demand adjustment?**

18 A: Subsequent to the filing of the IPL rate case, IPL has changed its plans

PUBLIC

1 with regard to capacity demand purchases and has determined that there
2 will be no such purchases during 2009. As indicated by IPL's response to
3 OCA data request number 45, a copy of which I have identified as OCA
4 Exhibit__ (CEF-1), Schedule G, changes made by the Midwest ISO and
5 anticipated decreases in demand and energy requirements has prompted
6 IPL to decide that no capacity purchases will be made during 2009.
7 Therefore, it is necessary to remove the 2009 non-DAEC estimated
8 capacity demand amounts from IPL's adjustment.

CAPACITY SALES

9
10 **Q: Please describe the capacity sales adjustment proposed by IPL and**
11 **shown on Mr. Hampsher's Exhibit__ (CAH-1), Schedule B-17.**

12 A: Mr. Hampsher proposed an adjustment for changes in capacity sales. The
13 total amount of proposed adjustment is \$81,000 of which the IPL Iowa
14 electric jurisdiction allocation is \$76,229.

15 **Q: Do you recommend that the Board allow the \$76,229 capacity sales**
16 **adjustment proposed by IPL?**

17 A: I have recommended to OCA witness Mr. Turner that he use zero in his
18 revenue requirement schedules for this issue. The 2009 amount of

PUBLIC

1 capacity sales is not sufficiently known at this time, nor do I believe that it
2 will become known, so as to provide a reasonable basis for an adjustment.
3 Moreover, as IPL has revised its plans and no longer intends to make any
4 capacity purchases during 2009, there would be less capacity available for
5 IPL to sell. The test period amount is sufficiently representative and is
6 what should be used for setting rates in this proceeding.

OUT-OF-PERIOD INCOME TAXES

7
8 **Q: Please describe the out-of-period income taxes adjustment proposed**
9 **by IPL and shown on Mr. Hampsher's Exhibit __ (CAH-1), Schedule**
10 **B-37.**

11 **A:** I have reviewed this adjustment and recommend that it be accepted. The
12 adjustment eliminates non-recurring and/or out-of-period items from book
13 test period operating results.

NON-PROPERTY RELATED DEFERRED INCOME TAXES

14
15 **Q: Please describe the non-property related deferred income taxes**
16 **adjustment proposed by IPL and shown on Mr. Hampsher's**
17 **Exhibit __ (CAH-1), Schedule B-38.**

18 **A:** Iowa precedent established by the Board and followed in numerous past

PUBLIC

1 rate cases provides that deferred federal income taxes for ratemaking
2 purposes are to be based solely upon property-related tax/book timing
3 differences. For accounting purposes IPL accrues and books deferred
4 federal income taxes for all tax/book time differences. Therefore, it is
5 necessary to calculate a pro-forma adjustment in rate cases to reverse the
6 non-property related deferred federal income taxes. I believe that the
7 adjustment reflected on Mr. Hampsher's Schedule B-38 is appropriate and
8 should be accepted.

9 **Q: Does this conclude your prepared direct testimony?**

10 **A:** Yes, it does.

Charles E. Fuhrman
APPENDIX A
Page 1 of 2

JURISDICTION
SOUTH DAKOTA

DOCKET NUMBER

UTILITY
SERVICE
ELECTRIC
NATURAL GAS
ELECTRIC
NATURAL GAS
ELECTRIC
ELECTRIC
ELECTRIC

IOWA

RPU-79-7
RPU-81-34
RPU-81-40
RPU-81-54
RPU-82-2
FCU-82-4
RPU-83-23
RPU-85-14
RPU-85-21
RPU-86-10
ARG-86-150
ARG-86-151
ARG-86-152
ARG-86-154
ARG-86-155
ARG-86-222
ARG-86-225
RPU-87-3
RPU-87-6
RPU-89-1
PGA-88-118
RPU-89-3
RPU-89-7
RPU-89-9
RPU-90-10
RPU-91-2
RPU-91-5
RPU-91-6
RPU-92-5
INU-93-1
ECR-93-1

ELECTRIC
GAS/ELECTRIC
TELEPHONE
WATER
ELECTRIC
NATURAL GAS
ELECTRIC
NATURAL GAS
NATURAL GAS
WATER
NATURAL GAS
ELECTRIC
NATURAL GAS
NATURAL GAS
NATURAL GAS
ELECTRIC
WATER
WATER
NATURAL GAS
ELECTRIC
GAS/ELECTRIC
ELECTRIC
ELECTRIC/GAS

Charles E. Fuhrman
APPENDIX A
Page 2 of 2

ECR-93-2	ELECTRIC
RFU-94-2	NATURAL GAS
RPU-94-3	NATURAL GAS
PGA-94-140	NATURAL GAS
APP-96-1/RPU-96-8	ELECTRIC
TF-98-113/114	ELECTRIC
SPU-98-8	MERGER CASE
RPU-01-03	ELECTRIC
ARC-01-150/151	ELECTRIC
RPU-01-9	ELECTRIC
RPU-02-3	ELECTRIC
ARU-02-1	ELECTRIC
ERB-02-151	ELECTRIC
ERB-02-156	ELECTRIC
RPU-02-6	ELECTRIC
RPU-02-7	NATURAL GAS
RPU-05-2	NATURAL GAS
SPU-05-15	ELECTRIC
SPU-07-11	ELECTRIC
RPU-08-1	ELECTRIC
RPU-08-3	NATURAL GAS
RPU-09-3	ELECTRIC

FERC

RP82-71	NATURAL GAS
CP82-542	NATURAL GAS
CP83-14	NATURAL GAS

October 09, 2009

IOWA UTILITIES BOARD

RPU-2009-0002

(Corrected)

STATE OF IOWA)
)
COUNTY OF POLK)

SS: AFFIDAVIT OF CHARLES E. FUHRMAN

I, Charles E. Fuhrman, being first duly sworn on oath, depose and state that I am the same Charles E. Fuhrman identified in the foregoing Direct Testimony; that I have caused the foregoing Direct Testimony to be prepared and am familiar with the contents thereof, and that the foregoing Direct Testimony as identified therein is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief as of the date of this Affidavit.

/s/ Charles E. Fuhrman
Charles E. Fuhrman

Subscribed and sworn to before me, A Notary Public, in and for said County and State, this 16th day of July, 2009.

/s/ Craig F. Graziano
Notary Public

My Commission expires: June 14, 2011.