



Control Number: 45916



Item Number: 13

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-16-4019
PUC DOCKET NO. 45916

RECEIVED
2016 MAY 10 AM 10:54

APPLICATION OF SOUTHWESTERN § PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY TO §
ADJUST ITS ENERGY EFFICIENCY § OF TEXAS
COST RECOVERY FACTOR §

SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY'S PROPOSED LIST OF ISSUES

As directed by the Public Utility Commission's ("Commission") Corrected Order of Referral dated May 4, 2016, Southwestern Public Service Company ("SPS") submits the following proposed list of issues to be addressed in this proceeding. SPS has not identified any issues that should not be addressed or any threshold legal and/or policy issues.

I. Issues to be Addressed

Application

1. Does the utility's EECRF application comply with 16 Texas Administrative Code ("TAC") § 25.181(f) and contain the testimony and schedules required by 16 TAC § 25.181(f)(10) and address the factors required by 16 TAC § 25.181(f)(11)?

2017 Program Year

2. What is the utility's growth in demand as defined in 16 TAC § 25.181(c)(25) and (44) calculated at source under 16 TAC § 25.181(e)(3)(A)?
3. Are the utility's demand reduction goal and energy savings goal for Program Year 2017 consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181(e)?
 - A. Has the utility requested a lower demand reduction goal under 16 TAC § 25.181(e)(2)?
If so, has the utility demonstrated that compliance with the goal specified in 16 TAC § 25.181(e)(1) is not reasonably possible and demonstrated that good cause supports the lower demand reduction goal proposed by the utility, or otherwise authorized by 16 TAC § 25.181(e)(3)(D)?

- a. Is the utility requesting in this application a performance bonus for a prior program year for which it has been granted a lowered demand reduction goal?
 - b. Were the factors that led to the utility being granted a lowered demand goal for the prior program year similar to the factors that the utility is relying upon to demonstrate that good cause supports the lower demand reduction goal proposed in this docket? If so, should the Commission consider the utility's prior performance in determining whether to award a lowered demand goal?
 - B. Has the utility received any identification notices under 16 TAC § 25.181(w)? If so, has the utility's demand reduction goal for Program Year 2017 been properly adjusted to remove any load that is lost as a result of identification notices submitted to the utility under that rule?
4. What is the appropriate amount of projected energy-efficiency-program costs to be recovered through the utility's 2017 EECRF?
- A. Are these costs reasonable estimates of the costs necessary to provide energy-efficiency programs and to meet the utility's goals under 16 TAC § 25.181?
 - B. Does the utility currently recover any energy-efficiency costs in its base rates? If so, what is the amount of projected program costs in excess of revenues collected through base rates?
 - C. Are the projected costs of administration and costs of research and development in compliance with the administrative spending caps in 16 TAC § 25.181(i)? If not, has the utility requested an exception to those caps under 16 TAC § 25.181(e)(2)? If so, has the utility demonstrated that compliance with the administrative spending cap is not reasonably possible and that good cause supports the higher administrative spending cap proposed by the utility?
5. What are the EM&V costs assigned to the utility for Program Year 2017, and have any of these costs already been recovered in a prior EECRF proceeding?

Program Year 2015 and 2015 EECRF proceeding

6. Do the costs recovered by the utility through its EECRF for Program Year 2015 comply with PURA § 39.905 and 16 TAC § 25.181?
7. Were the costs recovered by the utility through its EECRF for Program Year 2015 reasonable and necessary to reduce demand growth or energy consumption?
 - A. Were the actual costs of administration and costs of research and development for Program Year 2015 in compliance with the administrative spending caps in 16 TAC § 25.181(i) or higher spending caps otherwise established by the Commission? If otherwise established by the Commission, in which docket were the higher spending caps established?
 - B. Did any costs for Program Year 2015 result from payments to an affiliate? If so, do those costs meet the requirements for affiliate expenses in PURA § 36.058?
 - C. Does the EECRF application seek recovery of rate case expenses for the utility's immediately previous EECRF proceeding? If so, what amount, if any should the Commission award pursuant to PURA §§ 36.062 and 36.061(b)?
 - a. Did the utility file sufficient information that details and itemizes all rate-case expenses as required by 16 TAC § 25.245(b)(1)-(6)?
 - b. What amount of rate-case expenses actually and reasonably incurred by the utility, if any, does the presiding officer find reasonable, using the factors of 16 TAC § 25.245(c)(1)-(6)?
 - c. Does the presiding officer find any of the utility's rate case expenses should be disallowed under 16 TAC § 25.245(d)? If so, how was the disallowance calculated?
 - D. Does the EECRF application include any municipality's request for rate-case expenses for the immediately previous EECRF proceeding? If so, what amount, if any, should the Commission award pursuant to PURA §§ 36.062 and 36.061(b)?

- a. Did the municipality file sufficient information that details and itemizes all rate case expenses as required by 16 TAC § 25.245(b)(1)-(6)?
 - b. What amount of rate-case expenses actually and reasonably incurred by the municipality, if any, does the presiding officer find reasonable, using the factors of 16 TAC § 25.245(c)(1)-(6)?
 - c. Does the presiding officer find any of the municipality's rate-case expenses should be disallowed under 16 TAC § 25.245(d)? If so, how was the disallowance calculated?
8. For each EECRF rate class, what is the appropriate amount, if any, of under- or over-recovered EECRF costs consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181 for Program Year 2015?
- A. Did the utility recover any of its energy-efficiency costs through base rates for Program Year 2015? If so, what is the actual amount of energy-efficiency revenues collected through base rates consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181(f)(2)?
 - B. What was the actual revenue collected through the utility's EECRF for Program Year 2015?
 - C. What were the actual costs that comply with 16 TAC § 25.181(f)(12) of the utility's energy-efficiency programs for Program Year 2015?

Performance Bonus

9. What were the utility's demand and energy reduction goals for Program Year 2015? If the Commission granted an exception for a lower demand goal, in what docket was the lower goal established?
10. What is the appropriate energy-efficiency performance bonus, if any, consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181(h) for Program Year 2015?
- A. Did the utility exceed its demand and energy reduction goals for Program Year 2015? If so, by what amounts?
 - B. What are the net benefits of the utility's energy-efficiency program for Program Year 2015?

- C. Did the utility exceed the EECRF cost caps in 16 TAC § 25.181(f)(7)?
- D. Did the Commission grant a good-cause exception, establishing a lower demand reduction goal, higher administrative-spending cap, or higher EECRF-cost cap for the utility for Program Year 2015? If so, should the Commission reduce the utility's performance bonus, consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181(h)(4)?
 - a. For the Program Year 2015, what factors did the utility rely upon to demonstrate that compliance with its demand-reduction goal, the administrative-spending cap, or the EECRF-cost cap was not reasonably possible?
 - b. Has the utility established that the factors the utility relied upon to demonstrate that compliance with the demand-reduction goal, administrative-spending cap or EECRF-cost cap was not reasonably possible actually occurred?
 - c. What other considerations, if any, should the Commission weigh in determining whether to reduce the utility's performance bonus?
 - d. What amount, if any, should the Commission reduce the utility's performance bonus?

EECRF Design

- 11. What are the appropriate 2017 EECRFs for each rate class consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181(f)?
 - A. What is the total cost that should be recovered through the utility's 2017 EECRFs?
 - B. What are the appropriate EECRF rate classes for the utility's 2017 EECRFs?
 - a. What retail rate classes were approved in the utility's most recent base-rate proceeding, excluding non-eligible customers? 16 TAC § 25.181(c)(49).
 - b. Has the utility proposed an EECRF for each eligible rate class?

- c. Has the utility requested a good-cause exception under 16 TAC § 25.181(f)(2) to combine one or more rate classes? If so, for each rate class that is proposed to be combined, does it have fewer than 20 customers, is it similar to the other rate classes, and does it receive services under the same energy-efficiency programs as the other rate classes? Has the utility demonstrated that good cause supports the proposed combining of rate classes?
- C. Are the costs assigned or allocated to rate classes reasonable and consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181?
 - i. Are the utility's program costs directly assigned to each EECRF rate class that receives services under the programs to the maximum extent possible?
 - ii. Is any bonus allocated consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181(h)(6)?
 - iii. Are administrative costs, including rate-case expenses, and research and development costs allocated consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181(i)?
 - iv. How are the EM&V costs assigned to the rate classes and is the assignment consistent with PURA § 39.905 and 16 TAC § 25.181?
 - v. Are any under- or over-recovered EECRF costs allocated to the rate classes consistent with 16 TAC § 25.181(f)(2)?
- D. Does the utility propose an EECRF for any commercial rate classes as a demand charge? If so, for each such rate class, do the base rates for that class contain demand charges? For each such rate class, should the EECRF for that rate class be an energy charge or a demand charge?
- E. What is the appropriate estimate of billing determinants for the 2017 program?
- F. What are the appropriate calculated or estimated system losses and line losses that should be used in calculating the 2017 EECRF charges?
- 12. Do the total 2017 EECRF costs, excluding EM&V costs and municipal rate-case expenses, exceed the EECRF cost caps prescribed in 16 TAC § 25.181(f)(7)? If so, did the utility request an exception to the EECRF cost caps pursuant to 16 TAC § 25.181(e)(2) and, if so,

has the utility demonstrated that compliance with the EECRF cost caps is not reasonably possible and demonstrated that good cause supports the higher EECRF cost caps?

- a. Is the utility requesting in this application a performance bonus for a prior program year for which it has been granted a higher EECRF cost cap?
- b. Were the factors that led to the utility being granted a higher EECRF cost cap for the prior program year similar to the factors that the utility is relying upon to demonstrate that good cause supports a higher EECRF cost cap in this docket? If so, should the Commission consider the utility's prior performance in determining whether to award a higher EECRF cost cap?

13. Do the incentive payments for each customer class in Program Year 2017 comply with 16 TAC § 25.181(g)?


Tariff

14. What tariff schedule should be adopted for the utility in compliance with 16 TAC § 25.181?

II. Conclusion

SPS requests the Commission adopt this list of issues and grant SPS such other relief to which it may be entitled.

Respectfully submitted,



WINSTEAD PC

Carrie Collier-Brown
State Bar No. 24065064
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
Office: (512) 370-2868
Facsimile: (512) 370-2850
Email: ccbrown@winstead.com

XCEL ENERGY SERVICES INC.

Matthew P. Loftus
State Bar No. 24052189
816 Congress Ave., Suite 1650
Austin, Texas 78701-2471
Office: (512) 236-6923
Facsimile: (512) 236-6935
Email: matthew.p.loftus@xcelenergy.com

ATTORNEYS FOR SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on the 10th day of May 2016, a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was served on all parties of record by hand delivery, Federal Express, regular first class mail, certified mail, electronic mail, or facsimile transmission.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke, positioned above a solid horizontal line.