



Control Number: 49493



Item Number: 5

Addendum StartPage: 0

RECEIVED

2019 MAY 10 AM 10:49

APPLICATION OF ENTERGY TEXAS, § BEFORE THE STATE OFFICES
INC. TO ADJUST ITS ENERGY § OF PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
EFFICIENCY COST RECOVERY § ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS
FACTOR §

ENTERGY TEXAS, INC.’S LIST OF ISSUES

Entergy Texas, Inc. (“ETI” or “Company”) files this List of Issues in accordance with the Order of Referral that was issued on May 2, 2019. Consistent with the Order on Referral, this List of Issues is timely filed by May 10, 2019.

I. Issues to Be Addressed in this Proceeding

Pursuant to 16 Texas Administrative Code (“TAC”) § 25.182, ETI proposes the following list of issues to be addressed in this proceeding. This list of issues generally tracks the issues identified in the Preliminary Order in ETI’s last EECRF proceeding, Docket No. 48333, except that previous issue 4(d) has been deleted to reflect the expiration of PURA¹ § 39.903 as prescribed by PURA § 39.903(m), and rule references have been updated to reflect rule revisions adopted by the Commission earlier this year in Project No. 48692.

Application

1. Does the utility’s EECRF application comply with 16 TAC § 25.182(d) and contain the testimony and schedules in Excel format with formulas intact as required by 16 TAC § 25.181(d)(10) and address the factors required by 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(11)?

2020 Program Year

2. What is the utility’s growth in demand as defined in 16 TAC § 25.181(c), calculated at source under 16 TAC § 25.181(e)?
3. What are the utility’s appropriate demand-reduction goal and energy-savings goal for program year 2020 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?

¹ Public Utility Regulatory Act, Tex. Util. Code Ann. §§ 11.001-58.302 (West 2016 & Supp. 2017), §§ 59.001-66.016 (West 2007 & Supp. 2017) (“PURA”).

5

- i. 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?
 - ii. If so, 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(u)? If so, has the utility's demand reduction goal for program year 2020 been properly adjusted to remove any load that is lost because 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 2020 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(g)? 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?
 - i. Is the utility requesting in this application a performance bonus for a prior program year for which it has been granted a higher administrative spending cap?
 - ii. If so, were the factors that led to the utility being granted a higher administrative spending cap for the prior program year similar to the factors that the utility is relying upon to demonstrate that good cause supports the

higher administrative spending cap proposed in this docket? If so, should the Commission consider the utility's prior performance in determining whether to award a higher administrative spending cap?

5. Does the utility include evaluation, measurement, and verification (EM&V) costs assigned to the utility, and have any of these costs already been recovered in a prior EECRF proceeding?

Program Year 2018 Reconciliation

6. Were the costs recovered by the utility through its EECRF for program year 2018 in compliance with PURA § 39.905 and 16 TAC §§ 25.181 and 25.182?
7. Were the costs recovered by the utility through its EECRF for program year 2018 reasonable and necessary to reduce demand growth or energy consumption?
 - a. Are the actual costs of administration and costs of research and development for program year 2018 in compliance with the administrative spending caps in 16 TAC § 25.181(g) 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 2018 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 include, as administrative costs or otherwise, EECRF proceeding expenses for the utility's immediately previous EECRF proceeding? If so,
 - i. Do the EECRF proceeding expenses requested comply with 16 TAC § 25.245(b)(1)–(6)?
 - ii. Using the factors in 16 TAC § 25.245(c)(1)–(6), what amount of rate-case expenses actually and reasonably incurred by the utility, if any, does a preponderance of the evidence support?
 - iii. Should any of the utility's rate-case expenses be disallowed under 16 TAC § 25.245(d)? If so, how was the disallowance calculated?
 - iv. What amount, if any, of the utility's proceeding expenses should the Commission award pursuant to PURA §§ 36.062 and 36.061(b)?

- d. Does the EECRF application include, as administrative costs or otherwise, any municipality's EECRF proceeding expenses for the immediately previous EECRF proceeding?
 - i. Do the municipality's EECRF proceeding expenses requested comply with 16 TAC § 25.245(b)(1)–(6)?
 - ii. Using the factors of 16 TAC § 25.245(c)(1)–(6), what amount of rate-case expenses actually and reasonably incurred by the municipality, if any, does a preponderance of the evidence support?
 - iii. Should any of the municipality's rate-case expenses be disallowed under 16 TAC § 25.245(d)? If so, how was the disallowance calculated?
 - iv. What amount, if any, of the municipality's proceeding expenses should the Commission award pursuant to PURA § 33.023(b) that are not excluded by PURA § 36.062?
8. For each EECRF rate class, what is the appropriate amount, if any, of under- or over-recovered EECRF costs and interest consistent with 16 TAC § 25.182 for program year 2018?
 - a. Did the utility recover any of its energy-efficiency costs through base rates for program year 2018? If so, what is the actual amount of energy-efficiency revenues collected through base rates consistent with 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(2)?
 - b. What was the actual revenue collected through the utility's EECRF for program year 2018?
 - c. What were the actual costs that comply with 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(12) of the utility's energy-efficiency programs for program year 2018?

Performance Bonus

9. What were the utility's demand and energy reduction goals for program year 2018? If the Commission granted an exception for a lower demand goal, in what docket was the lower goal established?
10. What is the appropriate performance bonus, if any, consistent with 16 TAC § 25.182(e) for program year 2018?
 - a. Did the utility exceed its demand and energy reduction goals for program year 2018? If so, by what amounts?

- b. What are the net benefits of the utility's energy-efficiency program for program year 2018?
- c. Did the utility exceed the EECRF cost caps in 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(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 2018?
 - i. For the program year 2018, 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?
 - ii. 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?
 - iii. What other considerations, if any, should the Commission weigh in determining whether to reduce the utility's performance bonus?
- e. If the answer to issue 10d is yes, should the utility's requested performance bonus be approved? If not:
 - i. Should the Commission deny the entire amount of the requested performance bonus?
 - ii. If the Commission should not deny the entire bonus, what amount of the utility's requested performance bonus should be approved? In answering this issue, what are the parties' proposed methodologies for Commission approval of a portion of the bonus and are the calculations and the data upon which any proposed methodologies are based included in the evidentiary record?

EECRF Rate Classes

- 11. What are the proper EECRF rate classes for the utility's 2020 EECRF?
 - a. What retail rate classes were approved in the utility's most recent base-rate proceeding, excluding non-eligible customers, consistent with 16 TAC § 25.182(c)(2)?
 - b. Has the utility proposed an EECRF for each eligible rate class?

- c. Has the utility requested a good-cause exception under 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(2) to combine two 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?

EECRF Rate Design

- 12. What is the total cost that should be recovered through the utility's 2020 EECRFs under 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(1)?
- 13. What are the 2020 EECRFs for each rate class calculated under 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(2)?
 - a. Are the costs assigned or allocated to rate classes reasonable and compliant with 16 TAC § 25.181 and 25.182?
 - 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 in accordance with 16 TAC § 25.182(e)(6)?
 - iii. Are administrative costs, including rate-case expenses, and research and development costs allocated in accordance with 16 TAC § 25.181(g)?
 - iv. If applicable, how are the evaluation, measurement, and verification costs assigned to the rate classes, and is the assignment compliant with PURA § 39.905 and 16 TAC § 25.181 and 25.182?
 - v. Are any under- or over-recovered EECRF costs allocated to the rate classes in accordance with 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(2)?
 - b. 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?
 - c. What is the estimate of billing determinants for the 2020 program?
 - d. What are the most current, available calculated or estimated system losses and line losses for each eligible retail rate class?
 - i. Were these line losses used in calculating the 2020 EECRF charges?
 - ii. Are the calculated or estimated line losses in evidence in this docket?

14. Do the total 2020 EECRF costs, excluding evaluation, measurement, and verification costs and municipal rate-case expenses, exceed the EECRF cost caps prescribed in 16 TAC § 25.182(d)(7)? If so, did the utility request an exception to the EECRF cost caps under 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. If so, 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?
15. Do the incentive payments for each customer class in program year 2018 comply with 16 TAC § 25.181(f)?

Tariff

16. What tariff schedule should be adopted for the utility in compliance with 16 TAC § 25.182?

Issues unique to ETI

17. Should any of the costs charged to ETI by Entergy Services, LLC under project code F3PPEECRF3 in calendar year 2018 be characterized as energy-efficiency costs?
 - a. If so, which charges, if any, constitute energy-efficiency costs necessary to provide energy efficiency programs?
 - b. If so, which charges, if any, constitute the costs of administration?
 - c. If so, which charges, if any, constitute the costs of research?

II. Issues Not to Be Addressed in this Proceeding

Given the limited scope of the annual EECRF proceeding as provided under 16 TAC § 25.182(d), this proceeding should not address any issue other than those set forth above.

III. Conclusion

In consideration of the preceding, ETI requests that the Commission adopt a preliminary order consistent with the issues listed above and grant such further relief to which ETI may be entitled.

Date: May 10, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

Wajiha Rizvi
Entergy Services, Inc.
919 Congress, Suite 701
Austin, Texas 78701
(512) 487-3943 telephone
(512) 487-3958 facsimile



By: _____

Wajiha Rizvi
State Bar No. 24079218
wrizvi@entergy.com

ATTORNEY FOR ENTERGY TEXAS, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of ETI Proof of Notice has been served by facsimile, e-mail, U.S. mail, overnight delivery or hand-delivered to the parties of record on this 10th day of May 2019.



Wajiha Rizvi