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I. INTRODUCTION

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, POSITION, AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A. Ralph C. Smith. I am a Senior Regulatory Consultant at Larkin & Associates, PLLC, 15728 Farmington Road, Livonia, Michigan 48154.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE LARKIN & ASSOCIATES.

A. Larkin & Associates is a Certified Public Accounting and Regulatory Consulting firm. The firm performs independent regulatory consulting primarily for public service/utility commission staffs and consumer interest groups (public counsels, public advocates, consumer counsels, attorneys general, etc.). Larkin & Associates has extensive experience in the utility regulatory field as expert witnesses in over 400 regulatory proceedings including numerous telephone, water and sewer, gas, and electric matters.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND.

A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Administration (Accounting Major) with distinction from the University of Michigan - Dearborn, in April 1979. I passed all parts of the C.P.A. examination in my first sitting in 1979, received my CPA license in 1981, and received a certified financial planning certificate in 1983. I also have a Master of Science in Taxation from Walsh College, 1981, and a law degree (J.D.) cum laude from Wayne State University, 1986. In addition, I have attended a variety of continuing education courses in conjunction with maintaining my
accountancy license. I am a licensed Certified Public Accountant and attorney in the State of Michigan. I am also a Certified Financial Planner™ professional and a Certified Rate of Return Analyst ("CRRA"). Since 1981, I have been a member of the Michigan Association of Certified Public Accountants. I am also a member of the Michigan Bar Association and the Society of Utility and Regulatory Financial Analysts ("SURFA"). I have also been a member of the American Bar Association ("ABA"), and the ABA sections on Public Utility Law and Taxation.

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE.

A. Subsequent to graduation from the University of Michigan, and after a short period of installing a computerized accounting system for a Southfield, Michigan realty management firm, I accepted a position as an auditor with the predecessor CPA firm to Larkin & Associates in July 1979. Before becoming involved in utility regulation, where the majority of my time for the past 40 years has been spent, I performed audit, accounting, and tax work for a wide variety of businesses that were clients of the firm.

During my service in the regulatory section of our firm, I have been involved in rate cases and other regulatory matters concerning numerous electric, gas, telephone, water, and sewer utility companies. My present work consists primarily of analyzing rate case and regulatory filings of public utility companies before various regulatory commissions and where appropriate, preparing testimony and schedules relating to the issues for presentation before these regulatory agencies.
I have performed work in the field of utility regulation on behalf of industry, state attorneys general, consumer groups, municipalities, and public service commission staffs concerning regulatory matters before regulatory agencies in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Washington D.C., West Virginia, and Canada as well as the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and various state and federal courts of law. My prior testimonies have included evaluations of numerous utility rate case filings and revenue requirement determinations.

Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE MONTANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ("MPSC" OR "COMMISSION")?

A. Yes. I testified before the Commission on behalf of the Montana Consumer Counsel in Docket No. D2017.9.79 concerning Montana-Dakota Utilities' ("MDU") Montana gas distribution utility revenue requirements and in Docket No. D2017.9.80 concerning Energy West Montana and Cut Bank Gas Company to evaluate the impact of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 ("TCJA" or "Act") on the revenue increase request of those utilities. I submitted testimony on the proposed corporate reorganization of MDU and Great Plains Natural Gas Co. in Docket No. D2018.1.6, and in the TCJA cases involving the MDU electric utility (Docket No. D2018.4.22) and NorthWestern Energy

Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED AN ATTACHMENT SUMMARIZING YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND REGULATORY EXPERIENCE?

A. Yes. Appendix A provides details concerning my experience and qualifications.

Q. HAVE YOU ATTACHED ANY EXHIBITS TO YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes. Exhibit Nos. ___(RCS-1) through ___(RCS-4) are attached to my testimony.

Q. WHAT IS SHOWN IN EACH OF THOSE EXHIBITS?

A. Exhibit No.__(RCS-1) shows the Net Plant in Service amounts remaining at December 31, 2025 through 2042, according to NorthWestern's corrected Exhibit ADD-5 confidential Excel files. These amounts result from NorthWestern's projected capital expenditures for the share of Colstrip Unit 4 to be acquired from PSE. The summary data presented in Exhibit No. __ (RCS-1) represents a more comprehensive view of the potential cost of the proposed Capacity Acquisition than is presented in NorthWestern’s testimony.

Exhibit No.__(RCS-2) shows illustrative recalculation of NorthWestern's revenue requirements for an acquired 92.5 MW interest in CU4 with incremental plant additions depreciated through December 31, 2025 (five year revenue requirement) and through December 31, 2030 (ten year revenue requirement) respectively.
Exhibit No.__(RCS-3) contains excerpts from NorthWestern's 2019 FERC Form 1 Annual Report at pages 123.14 and 123.15, which discuss NorthWestern's Asset Retirement Obligations (“AROs”) and show estimated amounts as of December 31, 2018 and 2019, respectively. A portion of NorthWestern's AROs relate to the reclamation and remediation costs at its jointly owned coal-fired generation facilities. Although NorthWestern's FERC Form 1 does not break out ARO amounts separately for its current 222 MW ownership interest in Colstrip Unit 4, I was able to locate that information in NorthWestern’s response to Data Request MEIC-065 in Docket No. 2018.02.12, NorthWestern’s most recent general rate case. That data request response states that the “Asset Retirement Cost” booked by NorthWestern for its existing Colstrip Unit 4 interest at that time was $12,880,640.

Exhibit No.__(RCS-4) contains NorthWestern's response to MEIC-065 from Docket No. 2018.02.12 concerning its Asset Retirement Obligation balance for CU4.

II. SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU APPEARING?

A. Larkin & Associates, PLLC, was retained by the Montana Consumer Counsel (“MCC” or “Consumer Counsel”) to evaluate NorthWestern Energy’s ("NorthWestern," "NWE" or "Company") proposed acquisition of Puget Sound Energy’s ("PSE" or "Puget") 185 MW share of Colstrip Unit 4 (“CU4”) and NorthWestern's revised proposed acquisition
of a 92.5 MW share of CU4. Accordingly, I am appearing on behalf of the Consumer
Counsel.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purpose of my testimony is to address the accounting, revenue requirement, and
certain ratepayer protection aspects, along with some of the economic implications of
the proposed transaction. Another witness for the MCC, Dr. David Dismukes, is
addressing in-depth the economic analysis of the proposed transaction.

Q. WHAT TASKS DID YOU PERFORM IN PREPARING YOUR TESTIMONY
IN THIS MATTER?

A. In developing this testimony, I have reviewed and analyzed the Company’s filing,
supporting testimonies, exhibits, filing requirements, and workpapers; the Company’s
responses to data requests from the PSC Staff, the Consumer Counsel and other
intervenors; and other relevant financial documents and data. I also reviewed prior
case material and prior Commission Orders.

III. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS IN THIS
CASE.

A. Preapproval should be denied because the economics of the proposed acquisition are
marginal even with the Puget PPA supporting approximately half the acquired capacity
for the first five years, and rapidly deteriorate (from a customer point of view) after the
Puget PPA terminates. In addition, the Reserve Fund element of NorthWestern’s
proposal is utterly inconsistent with sound rate making principles and must be rejected.
As an alternative, should the Commission determine to approve the proposed
acquisition at all, NorthWestern’s “Reserve Fund” proposal would still have to be
rejected, and the preapproval for any additional interest in CU4 capacity by
NorthWestern should be limited to the five-year term of the Puget PPA. I have reached
the following findings and conclusions in this case:

1. The additional capital investments that would necessarily follow the “initial
purchase price” of $0.50 for the proposed 92.5 MW capacity acquisition
will rapidly overwhelm and reverse the limited benefits to customers from
having the Puget PPA and Puget’s ongoing cost support for the acquired
capacity during the term of the PPA. As shown on Exhibit RCS-2, attached
to my testimony, NorthWestern's projections demonstrate that substantial
additional capital costs and net plant balances will accompany the additional
share in CU4 that it seeks approval to acquire in this proceeding.

2. Significant amounts of capital expenditures are projected for CU4 and will
very likely result in future requests for cost recovery by NorthWestern
whether or not CU4 is able to operate economically through the service life
projected by NorthWestern.
3. The Commission should deny NorthWestern’s Application in this proceeding. NorthWestern has not met its burdens of establishing that the acquisition it proposes (a) is in the public interest, and (b) would result in rates that are reasonable and just, and consistent with the objectives established in Sections 69-3-201, 69-3-1201 through 69-3-1209, MCA.

4. NorthWestern's proposed new Reserve Fund is unjustified, not reasonably related to its proposed acquisition of half of Puget’s share of CU4, and should be rejected. NorthWestern’s proposed amendment to its PCCAM to create a new Reserve Fund (Exhibit ADD-2) would divert all customer credits under the PCCAM to funding environmental remediation and decommissioning liabilities associated with NorthWestern's currently owned interest in CU4. The Commission should not authorize NorthWestern to divert PCCAM credits to fund costs of retirement, decommissioning and environmental remediation related to NorthWestern's current interest in CU4 through the proposed Reserve Fund. With the limited exception of the existing Colstrip Unit 4 asset retirement obligation already embedded in NorthWestern’s existing retail rates, there has been no determination that it is just and reasonable for NorthWestern’s customers to absorb the liabilities for which NorthWestern proposes to appropriate customer credits under its PCCAM. Nor has NorthWestern made any showing that such additional costs were prudently incurred. Indeed, NorthWestern and its predecessor, the Montana Power Company (MPC),
incurred a large portion (if not all) of these remediation and
decommissioning costs during operation of Colstrip Unit 4 on a merchant
basis between 1986 and 2009. The Commission therefore should reject
NorthWestern’s proposed Reserve Fund, under any disposition of
NorthWestern’s Application in this proceeding.

5. Any revenues, costs and savings related to NorthWestern's proposed
acquisition of a 92.5 MW share of CU4 should be accounted for and
reflected in a separate allowable generation asset cost of service limited to
that 92.5 MW acquisition, and which is not comingled with cost recovery
for NorthWestern's current existing ownership share of CU4. This is
necessary because the future ratemaking treatments of NorthWestern's
current interest and the acquisition proposed in this case may present
different ratemaking issues in NorthWestern regulatory proceedings and
rate cases.

6. The Commission should further limit any approval by establishing the
following allowable generation asset cost of service (§ 69-8-421(6)(d),
MCA) for the acquired portion of Puget’s interest in CU4:

a. NorthWestern will have the burden of establishing the justness and
reasonableness of any cost recovery associated with the acquired
Puget interest after the sunset date of the PPA (December 31, 2025).
b. As part of its burden under item a. above, NorthWestern should be required to demonstrate through a competitive solicitation process in full compliance with § 69-3-1207, MCA both (i) the need that it proposes to fill with any portion of the acquired Puget interest that it seeks to include in rate base after December 31, 2025 and (ii) that such portion of the acquired Puget interest meets the requirements of consumers in the most cost-effective manner consistent with NorthWestern’s obligation to serve.

c. The allowed cost of service for that portion of the acquired Puget interest should be limited to the pro forma cost of service set forth in Exhibit ADD-5, striking the footnote in that exhibit (i.e., that portion of the acquired Puget interest that is allowed into rate base), plus NorthWestern’s documented historical fuel and variable operation and maintenance costs established in its testimony in support of its Application.

d. NorthWestern must make a one-time adjustment to the base PCC to eliminate 100% of the costs and revenues from power purchases avoided by the acquisition of the Puget interest.

e. The fixed allowed generation cost of service for the 92.5 MW acquisition should be reduced by the $3.616 million of net revenues from the five-year 45MW PPA with Puget forecasted in the
supporting testimony of NorthWestern witness Markovich as shown
on Company Corrected Exhibit KJM-3.

IV. OVERVIEW OF NORTHWESTERN'S PROPOSED ACQUISITION

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE COLSTRIP UNIT 4.

A. As stated in NorthWestern’s Application on page 5, CU4 is a 740 MW coal-fired generating plant located in Rosebud County, Montana, and is operated in conjunction with Colstrip Unit 3. Colstrip Unit 4 entered commercial operation in 1986. Colstrip Units 1 & 2 and Colstrip Units 3 & 4 share certain common facilities, per the Common Facilities Agreement included as Attachment 1 to the Application.

Q. FROM WHAT SOURCE IS THE COAL SUPPLIED?

A. The Colstrip plant is served by the Rosebud mine, which is located nearby the plant. One of the owners of Colstrip, PacifiCorp, has a contract with [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL]
Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE OWNERSHIP OF COLSTRIP UNITS 3 & 4.

A. NorthWestern currently owns 30 percent, or 222 MW, of CU4. From its commissioning in 1986 until 2008, Northwestern and its predecessor, Montana Power Company, operated its interest in Colstrip Unit 4 on a “merchant” basis under a sale-and-leaseback arrangement approved by the Commission in Order No. 5168 in Dkt. No. 85.11.45 (issued November 27, 1985). On November 13, 2008, the Commission issued Order No. 6925f in Dkt. No. D2008.6.69, which approved the inclusion of NorthWestern’s 222 MW interest in Colstrip Unit 4 in rate base. Talen owns 30 percent of Colstrip Unit 3. The other owners of CU3 and CU4 are PSE, Portland General Electric (PGE), Avista, PacifiCorp, and Talen. The Ownership and Operation Agreement and the Reciprocal Sharing Agreement detail Talen and NorthWestern’s agreement to realize a 15 percent share of each unit’s generation for each of Talen and NorthWestern. The remaining ownership percentages of CU3 and CU4 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Ownership Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Energy</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland General Electric</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avista</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PacifiCorp</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the Ownership and Operation Agreement’s right of first refusal provision, if one of the owners is selling its share, the other owners have the right to acquire a portion of that share. As stated above, after the sale of Puget's share to NorthWestern was announced, Talen was the only company to exercise its right of first refusal.
Q. DO THE INTERESTS OF THE CURRENT OWNERS OF CU4 CONCERNING THE FUTURE OPERATION OF THE FACILITY DIFFER?

A. It appears so. Talen is a merchant generator. Talen is not a regulated utility. Talen is currently the operator of the Colstrip plant including CU3 and CU4.

The other owners of CU4, including NorthWestern, PSE, PGE, Avista, and PacifiCorp are regulated utilities. PSE operates in Washington State. Section 3(1)(a) of Washington’s 2019 Clean Energy Transformation Act requires that “[o]n or before December 31, 2025, each electric utility must eliminate coal-fired resources from its allocation of electricity” (Rev. Code Wash. § 19.405.030(1)(a)). NorthWestern provides electric and natural gas service to customers in Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska, and electric service in Yellowstone National Park. PGE operates in Oregon in the areas of Portland and East Multnomah County. Avista has operations in Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon. PacifiCorp is headquartered in Oregon and provides electric service to portions of Utah, Oregon, Wyoming, Washington, Idaho, and California. Legislation was enacted in Oregon in 2016 requiring PGE and PacifiCorp to remove coal-fired generation from their Oregon rate base by January 1, 2030. (Ore. Rev. Stat. § 757.518). Moreover, the other co-owner, Avista, supplies electricity in Washington, which requires divestiture of coal-fired resources by December 31, 2025. PGE and PacifiCorp may not be able to sell the output of their Colstrip shares into some portion of the wholesale market after January 1, 2030. It is

1 If and to the extent permitted by laws of the relevant State jurisdictions, PacifiCorp may also be able to reallocate generation from Colstrip to other States. https://billingsgazette.com/news/state-and-regional/colstrip-owner-accelerates-exit-plans-again/article_9d722c23-6ff7-5269-adca-f893b77a802c.html
also noted that PacifiCorp entered into a settlement to remove Colstrip from bills in Washington by the end of 2023.\(^2\)

The Colstrip plant and the coal mine that supplies the plant are both located in Montana, and NorthWestern is a regulated utility operating in Montana. Although NorthWestern provides utility service in Montana and not in Oregon or Washington, developments in the latter two states could affect the economic viability of Colstrip and the co-owners’ interests in continuing to operate CU3 and CU4.

**Q. WHAT IS NORTHWESTERN REQUESTING IN ITS APPLICATION?**

A NorthWestern’s Second Supplement to its Application requests Commission preapproval to acquire 92.5 MW of CU4 from Puget Sound Energy, Inc. ("Puget" or "PSE") for the purchase price of $0.50. NorthWestern’s Second Supplement to its Application (at pgs. 1-2) summarizes its request as seeking a Commission order authorizing NorthWestern to:

(i) purchase 92.5 MW of CU4 from Puget and place that asset in rate base;

(ii) sell 45 MW back to Puget for approximately five years pursuant to the power purchase agreement ("PPA");

(iii) include the revenue requirement in rates;

(iv) offset the rates for the revenue requirement with a reduction to the Power Costs and Credits Adjustment Mechanism ("PCCAM") rates;

(v) establish a Reserve Fund with the net proceeds from the PPA and 90% of the savings from the PCCAM, and charge against that fund for

---

expenditures and costs associated with environmental compliance, remediation, decommissioning, and post closure costs; and

(vi) make a compliance filing in approximately five years to reflect the revenue requirement for the capacity associated with the PPA and any corresponding change to PCCAM rates.

NorthWestern's Purchase Power Agreement with PSE

Q. HAS NORTHWESTERN PROJECTED THAT THE PPA WITH PSE WOULD PRODUCE REVENUE IN EXCESS OF COSTS RELATED TO SERVING PSE UNDER THAT PPA?

A. Yes. In the Company's corrected Exhibits KJM-1 through KJM-4, NorthWestern has presented scenarios wherein it projects revenue and costs related to the PPA with PSE. For example, in Corrected Exhibit KJM-3 (and NorthWestern's response to MEIC-079a update), the Company projects that net revenue would exceed costs for the five calendar year period, 2021 through 2025 by $3,615,767 related to a 45 MW sale to PSE, as follows:
Notably, NorthWestern projects a net loss on the PPA in 2024 [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL]

Q. IS IT POSSIBLE THAT UNSCHEDULED OUTAGES AT CU4, IF THEY OCCUR FOR A DURATION OF SEVERAL WEEKS, COULD CAUSE NET LOSSES ON THE PPA IN OTHER YEARS?

A. Yes, that would be possible.

Q. IS THE "NET VALUE" THAT NORTHWESTERN HAS PROJECTED FOR THE PPA WITH PSE ASSURED?

A. No. As noted above, it appears that the "net value" that NorthWestern has projected for the PPA could be adversely affected if there are some unscheduled outages at Colstrip which prevent the unit from operating at NorthWestern's projected capacity factor during the period of the PPA. As noted above, NorthWestern has projected a negative...
"net value" for the tracker year 2023/2024 which is [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] If unscheduled outages occur, presumably that would also present a risk of having negative "net value" for the PPA for those periods in a similar manner. Such outages have occurred since CU4 was rate based at the beginning of 2009 in 2009, 2013, and 2018.

Q. HOW DOES THE "NET VALUE" OF THE PUGET PPA THAT NORTHWESTERN HAS CALCULATED COMPARE WITH THE RECOVERY OF COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ANTICIPATED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES UNDER NORTHWESTERN'S PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE A 92.5 MW INTEREST IN CU4 FROM PSE?

A. Estimates for a 92.5 MW CU4 acquisition from Puget and the corresponding 45 MW sale via a PPA to Puget, are shown on Corrected Exhibit KJM-3 (and NorthWestern's response to MEIC-079a update). The Company projects that net revenue would exceed cost for the five calendar year period, 2021 through 2025 by $3,615,767 as a result of the 45 MW sale to PSE. However, the Company's revenue requirement calculations for a 92.5 MW CU4 capacity acquisition show an unrecovered net book value amount at December 31, 2025 of [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] as much as the claimed $3,615,767 “net benefit” (more appropriately described as net margin) from the 45 MW sale to Puget via the PPA for the five year period through 2025.
Below I discuss NorthWestern’s forecasted revenue requirements for five and ten-year periods and the implications for incurring capital costs substantially in excess of net margins associated with the 92.5 MW share of CU4 which NorthWestern is proposing to acquire from Puget in the next section of my testimony.

**NorthWestern's Estimated Revenue Requirement for the Proposed Acquisition of a 92.5 MW Share of CU4**

**Q. WHAT DOES NORTHWESTERN SHOW FOR THE 2021 REVENUE REQUIREMENT FOR THE PORTION OF CU4 THAT IT WOULD BE ACQUIRING FROM PSE?**

**A.** The Company's corrected Exhibit ADD-5 shows a net revenue requirement of $4,391,331 in 2021 for an acquired 92.5 MW share of CU4.

**Q. WHAT IS NORTHWESTERN PROPOSING FOR THE RATEMAKING TREATMENT FOR THE PORTION OF CU4 CAPACITY THAT IT WOULD ACQUIRE FROM PSE?**

**A.** NorthWestern is proposing that instead of increasing rates to reflect recovery of a 2021 Test Period Revenue Requirement in rates for 47.5 net MW (92.5 MW capacity purchase less 45 MW PPA with PSE), the Company would offset the required increase in net revenue requirement with a corresponding reduction of that amount to the Power Costs and Credits Adjustment Mechanism (“PCCAM”). As explained in Company
witness Hines’ corrected direct testimony at page JDH-7, NorthWestern proposes to offset its calculated 2021 revenue deficiency for the acquired CU4 interest with an equal and offsetting reduction to the PCCAM.

Q. WHAT DOES NORTHWESTERN PROPOSE TO DO WITH ANY ADDITIONAL POWER COST SAVINGS AND PPA REVENUE BEYOND THE AMOUNT THAT IT WOULD USE TO CREDIT TO THE PCCAM?

A. NorthWestern has proposed that 90% of all additional purchased power savings over base projections recorded in future PCCAM true-ups, regardless of the source, and all future PPA revenues would be placed into a new Reserve Fund. I discuss NorthWestern’s proposal for a new Reserve Fund in a subsequent section of my testimony and recommend that this part of NorthWestern’s proposal in the current docket be rejected whether or not the acquisition of an additional 92.5 MW of CU4 capacity is approved.

Q. WHAT RATIONALE DOES NORTHWESTERN PRESENT FOR THE NEW RESERVE FUND?

A. NorthWestern proposes that the amounts accumulated in the Reserve Fund would be used in each year to reimburse Northwestern for expenditures and costs associated with environmental compliance, remediation, decommissioning, and post-closure associated with its existing share of CU4. NorthWestern Energy’s Application, pages 1 and 3.
submit a compliance filing to reflect the revenue requirement for the 45 MW initially
being sold back to PSE and any corresponding reduction in PCCAM rates.4

Q. HAS NORTHWESTERN PROVIDED PROJECTIONS FOR ITS PROPOSED
ACQUISITION OF CU4 FROM PSE THAT SUGGEST SIGNIFICANT
ADDITIONAL COSTS RELATED TO THE ACQUIRED PORTION OF CU4?

A. Yes. NorthWestern has projected rate base, operating income, and revenue
requirement changes for years 2021 through 2041 for a 92.5 MW addition of CU4
capacity in the proprietary corrected version of Company witness Durkin’s Exhibit
ADD-5. Those NorthWestern presentations use the Company's currently authorized
depreciation rates for the Company's already owned share of CU4, and are based on a
projected retirement date of 2042. Using information from the proprietary corrected
version of Company witness Durkin's Exhibit ADD-5, the Company shows remaining
undepreciated net book value for the acquired portion of CU4 at the end of each year
2025 through 2042. The unrecovered net book value based on that information at the
end of 2025 (five years into the NorthWestern ownership period), at the end of 2030
(ten years) and at 2042 (date that NorthWestern has been using for depreciation of its
current interest in CU4) are shown on Exhibit No. ___(RCS-1) and are summarized
below for the 92.5 MW purchases:

---

4 Id. Page 3
V. RISKS POSED BY PROJECTED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR COLSTRIP UNIT 4

Q. IS THE $0.50 INITIAL PAYMENT FOR THE 92.5 MW CU4 ACQUISITION THE ONLY CAPITAL INVESTMENT THAT NORTHWESTERN WOULD BE MAKING IN CU4?

A. No, as shown in the confidential corrected versions of NorthWestern's Exhibit ADD-5, and summarized in my Exhibit __(RCS-1), NorthWestern has identified significant amounts of additional capital expenditures that are projected for the Colstrip plant that are well beyond the purchase price amount of $0.50 for half of PSE's interest in CU4. As discussed in my testimony and in the testimony of MCC witness Dismukes, those additional capital expenditure amounts do present substantial risks of future demands for cost recovery by NorthWestern that have not been factored into its Application in this proceeding, and that appear likely to make the proposed acquisition a particularly poor choice for an electric supply resource once the cost support provided by the Puget PPA terminates.
Q. WHAT PROJECTED CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR COLSTRIP UNIT 4 HAS NORTHWESTERN IDENTIFIED IN RESPONSES TO DISCOVERY?

A. Projected amounts of capital investment that are being reflected as Plant in Service each year for 2021 through 2042 are shown on the confidential corrected Excel versions of NorthWestern Exhibit ADD-5. By the end of 2042, for the 92.5 MW capacity purchase, NorthWestern projects to have booked [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL]

[END CONFIDENTIAL] of gross Plant in Service and [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [END CONFIDENTIAL] of net Plant in Service. Using NorthWestern's corrected projections from the confidential Excel files provided by the Company for its Exhibit ADD-5, amounts of gross and net plant in service as of December 31 for each year 2025 through 2042 for NorthWestern's proposed acquisition of the 92.5 MW interest in CU4 from Puget are summarized in my Exhibit No.__(RCS-1).

Q. AS THOSE ADDITIONAL CAPITAL EXPENDITURES RELATE TO NORTHWESTERN'S PROPOSED 92.5 MW INTEREST IN CU4, HOW HAS NORTHWESTERN PROPOSED TO ACCOUNT FOR AND DEPRECIATE THOSE COSTS?

A. As shown in NorthWestern's revenue requirement projections (which were provided confidentially in response to MCC-007 and in the Company's Excel files for the corrected versions of its Exhibit ADD-5), NorthWestern would account for the CU4 capital expenditures by recording those as utility Plant in Service as they are placed
into service. Once the capital expenditures are recorded as utility Plant in Service, NorthWestern would record Depreciation Expense using its currently authorized depreciation rates (which were established in NorthWestern's last base rate case and reflect a projected retirement date of 2042). The standard utility accounting for Depreciation Expense results in a charge (debit) to Depreciation Expense, account 403, and a credit to Accumulated Depreciation (account 108). The charges to Plant in Service and the credits to Accumulated Depreciation over time result in an amount of net plant in service. The post-acquisition capital expenditures which would be recorded as additions to Plant in Service, are projected to be significant, as described above, and those amounts do present questions about cost recovery that have not been addressed clearly in NorthWestern’s Application or supporting testimony.

Q. ARE THERE FACTORS WHICH COULD RESULT IN CU4 BEING RETIRED PRIOR TO 2042?

A. Yes. An array of economic and political factors could result in CU4 being retired prior to 2042. MCC witness Dismukes discusses economic factors including the fixed and variable O&M costs of operating CU4 versus the projected cost of power from other sources which could render the operation of CU4 uneconomic at some point prior to 2042. For example, the other owners of CU3 and CU4, as discussed above, are in different situations than NorthWestern and are thus exposed to a different set of cost and political factors that could lead them to making differing decisions concerning the future operations of CU4.
Q. HAVE YOU CALCULATED AND PRESENTED ALTERNATIVE REVENUE REQUIREMENT CALCULATIONS FOR FIVE AND TEN-YEAR PERIODS, THAT WOULD DEPRECIATE ALL OF THE PLANT ADDITIONS FOR THE ACQUIRED CU4 INTEREST BY THE END OF THOSE FIVE AND TEN-YEAR PERIODS?

A. Yes. Exhibit No.____ (RCS-2), attached to my testimony, presents recalculations of the revenue requirements that were presented by NorthWestern in its Corrected Exhibit ADD-5 (and the Company's supporting confidential Excel workpapers). This presentation reflects a scenario where the projected capital expenditures projected for the acquired CU4 interest were to be subject to recovery within those five and ten-year periods, rather than through 2042.5 Recalculations are presented for the following:

- 92.5 MW acquisition - five years through December 31, 2025 (Exhibit No. __RCS-2, page 1)
- 92.5 MW acquisition - ten years through December 31, 2030 (Exhibit No. __RCS-2, pages 2-3)

As shown on Exhibit No.____ (RCS-2), under each of these scenarios, the revenue requirement for the acquired share of CU4 would be substantially higher than calculated by NorthWestern for these five and ten-year periods:

---

5 NorthWestern's calculations have reflected an assumed service life through 2042, which leaves a significant undepreciated net book value amount remaining at the end of the five and ten-year periods, as shown on Exhibit __-(RCS-1), as well as in 2042.
VI. NORTHWESTERN'S PROPOSED RESERVE FUND

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS NORTHWESTERN'S PROPOSED RESERVE FUND.

A. NorthWestern witness Crystal Lail's Direct Testimony at pages CDL-4 through CDL-7 and the Direct Testimony of NorthWestern witnesses Michael Barnes and Kevin Markovich discuss the Company's proposed Reserve Fund. NorthWestern proposes to create a new Reserve Fund to set aside funding for environmental compliance, and remediation and decommissioning of the Company's current interest in CU4. NorthWestern proposes to fund its new Reserve Fund with two revenue sources. The
first source is 90% of the savings after establishing the new proposed base power costs
and credits in the Power Costs and Credits Adjustment Mechanism ("PCCAM"). The
second source is the net revenue that NorthWestern would receive from PSE through
the Purchased Power Agreement ("PPA").

Q. WHAT DOES NORTHWESTERN PROPOSE TO DO WITH ANY
ADDITIONAL POWER COST SAVINGS AND PPA REVENUE BEYOND THE
AMOUNT THAT IT WOULD USE TO CREDIT TO THE PCCAM AS AN
OFFSET TO THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT?

A. NorthWestern has proposed that 90% of any purchased power savings and PCCAM
revenue be placed into NorthWestern’s proposed Reserve Fund. Ten percent of any
incremental purchased power savings and revenue credits would be kept by
NorthWestern. To be clear, the preapproval that NorthWestern has requested is being
used as a substitute for a base rate case to approve new resources. In that context, all
of the costs and benefits would be reflected in base rates and there would be no “10%
sharing” associated with it.
Q. WHAT DOES NORTHWESTERN PROPOSE TO DO WITH THE RESERVE FUND?

A. NorthWestern indicates that the Reserve Fund would be used sometime in the near future to pay for expenditures and costs associated with environmental compliance, remediation, decommissioning, and post-closure costs of NorthWestern’s existing, 222 MW interest in Colstrip Unit 4. After five years, NorthWestern proposes to submit a compliance filing to reflect the revenue requirement for the 45 MW initially being sold back to PSE and any corresponding reduction in PCCAM rates.

Q. WHAT DOES NORTHWESTERN PROPOSE FOR THE NEW RESERVE FUND AFTER THE EXPIRATION OF ITS PPA WITH PUGET?

A. At pages CDL-6 to CDL-7 of her Direct Testimony, NorthWestern witness Lail states that:

NorthWestern proposes to capture the operations and maintenance expenses ("O&M") for compliance with the 2012 Administrative Order on Consent and coal combustion ash residuals regulations, as described in the Barnes Direct Testimony, in a regulatory asset as incurred. Costs captured in the regulatory asset will be limited to amounts in excess of any environmental compliance and remediation costs included in NorthWestern’s recent rate review, Docket No. 2018.02.012. NorthWestern will also capture future decommissioning and post-closure costs in the regulatory asset.

Following the expiration of the PPA between Puget and NorthWestern, (4 years and 364 days), NorthWestern will submit a request to charge the costs accumulated in the regulatory asset against the Reserve Fund and be reimbursed, subject to the fund balance. Then, on an annual basis, NorthWestern proposes to submit a compliance filing requesting

---

6 NorthWestern Energy’s Application, pages 1 and 3.
7 Id. Page 3
to charge any costs in the regulatory asset against the Reserve Fund, subject to the fund balance. If there were to be any funds remaining in the Reserve Fund after charging it with the compliance, remediation, decommissioning and closure costs related to NorthWestern's current interest in CU4 (a situation that seems unlikely), NorthWestern witness Lail states at page 7 of her Direct Testimony that the Company, at that time, would seek direction from the Commission concerning the proper regulatory treatment of any remaining balance of the Reserve Fund.

Q. **HOW DOES NORTHWESTERN PROPOSE TO REVISE ITS PCCAM FOR ITS NEWLY PROPOSED "RESERVE FUND" IN THIS PREAPPROVAL DOCKET?**

A. NorthWestern’s proposed amendment to its PCCAM to create a new Reserve Fund (Exhibit ADD-2) would divert all customer credits under the PCCAM, whether associated with this resource or not, to funding environmental remediation and decommissioning liabilities associated with NorthWestern's currently owned interest in CU4. NorthWestern's Corrected Exhibit ADD-2, at pages 2-3 of 5, proposes to change Schedule No. EPCC-1, paragraph F, Power Costs and Credits Mechanism Annual Adjustment to divert power cost savings into a newly created Reserve Fund, by removing the term "rebated to customers" and replacing that with "deposited into the Reserve Fund ..." as follows:

The Mechanism’s annual adjustment shall be derived by:

1. Computing the difference between Base Power Costs and Credits Rates Revenues and actual Power Costs and Credits for the period. 90% of the
difference is recorded as a deferral and rebated to customers deposited into the Reserve Fund, established in Docket 2019.12.101, (when costs are less than revenues), or surcharged to customers (when costs are greater than revenues). Upon the expiration of the power purchase agreement between NorthWestern and Puget Sound Energy, Inc. approved in Docket 2019.12.101, 90% of the difference will be rebated or surcharged to customers.

This is not appropriate because the PCCAM tracker is supposed to be a balanced mechanism to track power costs and fairly recover or rebate both under-recovery (PCCAM cost increase) amounts and over-recovery (PCCAM cost decrease) amounts. NorthWestern’s proposal takes all of the over-recovery (PCCAM cost decrease) i.e., the fuel and purchase power cost savings and would apply them for a different purpose. If NorthWestern’s proposed treatment were to be adopted, the PCCAM would no longer be a balanced tracker mechanism, but would instead become an automatic funding mechanism for other costs that are not related to or caused by NorthWestern’s acquired 92.5 MW interest in CU4.

Q. **IS NORTHWESTERN'S REQUEST FOR A NEW "RESERVE FUND" IN ANY WAY SIMILAR TO A REQUEST FOR AN ACCOUNTING ORDER?**

A. No. Under an accounting order, the utility does not start collecting revenues immediately, and questions regarding the prudence of the cost incurrence and the use and usefulness of objects of proposed expenditures are deferred.

In this case, the "Reserve Fund" does not currently exist. As proposed by NorthWestern the new "Reserve Fund" would be used to divert funds from what would otherwise be customer rebates flowing through the PCCAM and apply those funds to
costs associated with NorthWestern's current 222 MW interest in CU4, including costs for environmental remediation and decommissioning. Under its “Reserve Fund” proposal, in contrast to a real accounting order, NorthWestern would start collecting for excess environmental remediation and decommissioning for its current ownership share of CU4 by charging such amounts against the power cost savings that are being accumulated in the Reserve Fund. Because Puget retains responsibility for its share of the environmental remediation and decommissioning costs associated with the 92.5 MW share of CU4 that would be acquired by NorthWestern from Puget, there is no relationship between the "Reserve Fund" and the acquisition that NorthWestern proposes in this proceeding. Separation, rather than comingling, of the costs associated with NorthWestern's (1) existing 222 MW interest in CU4 and (2) the new 92.5 MW interest proposed to be acquired from Puget, should be required, since different regulatory considerations apply to each.

Q. HAS THE COMMISSION ESTABLISHED CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING A REQUEST BY A UTILITY FOR AN ACCOUNTING ORDER OR OTHER SPECIALIZED ACCOUNTING MECHANISMS?

A. Yes. Typically, when a utility seeks an accounting order from the Commission, there are specific criteria that are supposed to be met for that order to be issued, which are summarized below.

“An accounting order represents an exception to test-year principles. It is the first step in mis-matching expenses incurred in one year with revenues from another
year. Therefore, regulatory agencies grant permission to deviate from normal accounting procedures only in limited circumstances.” Order No. 7528a, Dkt. No. 2016.11.88 at ¶ 17 (2017).

“The Commission has used the following standard for evaluating requests for accounting orders: (1) Is the amount material? (2) Is the event unplanned? (3) Is the event beyond the utility management's control? and (4) Is the problem unusual, abnormal, and not likely to be repeated?” Id. at ¶ 18.

“In determining whether or not the amount is material, this Commission has found persuasive FERC's materiality standard that holds in order to be considered extraordinary, "an item should be more than approximately 5 percent of income, computed before extraordinary items." Order 6829 P 11; Order 7252 PP 6, 9; 18 C.F.R. pt. 101 (2017) (See FERC General Instructions, Section 7, Extraordinary Items).” Id. at ¶ 19.

An accounting order then typically provides, with respect to the accounting treatment that it authorizes, that the utility “will have the opportunity, as well as the burden, to demonstrate in its next general rate case: (1) the appropriate level of costs to be recovered through ratemaking; and (2) the proper recovery period for those costs.” Order No. 5709d, Dkt. No. 93.6.24 (1994) at ¶ 153.

Q. DOES NORTHWESTERN'S “RESERVE FUND” PROPOSAL SATISFY ANY OF THESE CRITERIA?

A. No, it does not.
Q. SHOULD NORTHWESTERN'S REQUESTED "RESERVE FUND" BE APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION?

A. No. NorthWestern's requested new "Reserve Fund" should be rejected. Moreover, the special accounting treatment and diversion of what would otherwise be customer PCCAM rebate amounts in a power cost true-up account should be rejected even if the Company receives authorization for acquiring the 92.5 MW interest in CU4 from Puget. NorthWestern’s “Reserve Fund” proposal (Exhibit ADD-2) seeks to divert all customer credits under the PCCAM to funding NorthWestern’s unquantified environmental remediation and decommissioning obligations for its existing 30 percent, 222 MW interest in Colstrip Unit 4. Moreover, NorthWestern’s “Reserve Fund” proposal ensures that the Company will take ten percent of any realized benefits from its proposed Capacity Acquisition. The remaining 90 percent of customer credits would be diverted to the Reserve Fund in order to lock in consumers to pay for post-closure liabilities associated with NorthWestern’s existing interest in Colstrip Unit 4, without any determination concerning either the prudency of the incurrence of those costs, or the just and reasonable allocation of financial responsibility for them. The initial revenue requirement and cost impacts of a resource rate basing preapproval should not be considered an element of the PCCAM simply because it would require a reset of the PCCAM base amount. NorthWestern's proposal for this "Reserve Fund" thus diverts ratepayer funds for use in paying for post-closure liabilities associated with NorthWestern’s existing 222 MW interest in CU4, thus circumventing the normal
safeguards associated with an accounting order, including the requirement for the
determination of such cost recovery to be made in the future.

Q. ARE THERE OTHER REASONS FOR THE COMMISSION TO REJECT
CHANGES TO THE PCCAM TARIFF IN WHAT IS SUPPOSEDLY A PRE-
APPROVAL DOCKET?

A. Yes. This proposal by NorthWestern must be rejected because it is an unjustified
appropriation of ratepayer benefits. Moreover, because as NorthWestern explains,
Puget will continue to fund all remediation and decommissioning obligations
associated with the 92.5 MW interest in Colstrip Unit 4 that NorthWestern is proposing
to acquire, a new Reserve Fund is not needed to fund those liabilities because they are
being retained by Puget.

Typically, the types of remediation and decommissioning costs that
NorthWestern seeks to recover from its retail customers through its proposed revision
of its PCCAM tariff language in Exhibit ADD-2 via the new "Reserve Fund" are
recovered as part of an Asset Retirement Obligation. As explained by NorthWestern
in its FERC Form 1, the Company is obligated to dispose of certain long-lived assets,
including coal-fired generating facilities, upon their abandonment. NorthWestern
recognizes a liability for the legal obligation to perform an asset retirement activity in
which the timing and/or method of settlement are conditioned upon a future event.
Consistent with ARO accounting, NorthWestern measures the liability at fair value
when incurred and capitalizes a corresponding amount as part of the book value of the
related plant assets, which increases NorthWestern's utility plant and AROs. NorthWestern's FERC Form 1 states further that: "The increase in capitalized book utility plant cost is included in determining depreciation expense over the estimated useful life of these assets." The ARO is thus included in the cost of utility plant and is depreciated over the estimated life of the related asset. This is the practice that NorthWestern says that it follows in its 2019 FERC Form 1 Annual Report at pages 123.14 and 123.15, which have been included in Exhibit __ RCS-3. NorthWestern's AROs include estimated liabilities of $12,880,640 for the remediation, reclamation and removal costs for its current 222 MW capacity ownership of CU4. The source for the existing ARO value is NorthWestern's response to Data Request MEIC-065 in Docket 2018.02.12 (NorthWestern's most recent general rate case), which is presented in Exhibit __ RCS-4.

Instead of subjecting increases in its asset retirement obligations related to its existing 222 MW interest in CU4 to the review and evaluation process of a full rate case, NorthWestern’s Reserve Fund proposal presumes that recovery of all of these remediation, reclamation and decommissioning costs associated with its current 222 MW ownership of CU4 through retail rates is just and reasonable and seeks to create an open-ended funding mechanism (consisting of both the net revenues from the Puget PPA and any other credits that would otherwise reduce customer rates under the PCCAM) to be applied against as yet unquantified costs that are resulting from NorthWestern's current 222 MW ownership share of CU4. The creation and use of a
newly created Reserve Fund accounting mechanism for this purpose is unreasonable and unjust and should therefore be rejected.

Q. HOW WERE COSTS RELATED TO DISMANTLEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN-UP RELATED TO CU4 TREATED IN NORTHWESTERN'S MOST RECENT RATE CASE, DOCKET NO. 2018.02.012?

A. Amounts estimated by NorthWestern were utilized in deriving the Company's revenue requirement related to CU4. In Docket No. 2018.02.012, NorthWestern continued to base its depreciation and the cost of removal/negative net salvage component of depreciation rates for its existing share of CU4 on an anticipated useful life for CU4 continuing through 2042, consistent with expectations at the time of preapproval in 2008. To the extent that the reclamation and decommissioning costs in rates associated with NorthWestern's current 222 MW ownership share in CU4 are not recovering the full extent of those costs or are not recovering such costs over the correct period, that is an issue that should be examined in a NorthWestern base rate case. Recovery of remediation, reclamation and decommissioning costs associated with NorthWestern's current 222 MW ownership share in CU4 should not be provided for in a "Reserve Fund" by diverting savings associated with this proposed resource addition.

NorthWestern seeks, via the creation and application of this new Reserve Fund, to lock in ratepayer responsibility for remediation and decommissioning costs associated with the 30 percent, 222 MW interest in CU4 that NorthWestern placed in
rate base in 2009. This is unjustified. There has been no showing what these costs are, what caused the incurrence of these costs, whether that cost incurrence was prudent or why it is just and reasonable to make NorthWestern’s Montana retail customers responsible for those costs. Considering NorthWestern represented the plant to be “better than new” with an expected useful life through 2042 when it proposed to rate base its existing share, it is reasonable to expect that recovery of these costs will be disputed if the plant closes early. With the limited exception of the existing Colstrip Unit 4 asset retirement obligation that has already been embedded in NorthWestern’s existing retail rates, there has been no determination that it is just and reasonable for NorthWestern’s customers to absorb these liabilities. Nor has NorthWestern made any showing that all of the asset retirement and remediation costs associated with its current interest in CU4 have been or will have been prudently incurred. Indeed, NorthWestern and its predecessor caused the need for a large portion of these remediation and decommissioning costs during the operation of Colstrip Unit 4 on a merchant basis between 1986 and 2009.

NorthWestern’s proposed revision to its PCCAM tariff (Exhibit ADD-2) via the creation of a new "Reserve Fund" appropriates all savings over the duration of its proposed Power Purchase Agreement with Puget Sound Energy. Of that appropriation of benefits, 90 percent would go to fund NorthWestern’s decommissioning and remediation liabilities associated with its current 222 MW ownership interest in Colstrip Unit 4, and the remaining ten percent would simply be appropriated directly by NorthWestern’s shareholders under the PCCAM.
The Company's "Reserve Fund" proposal assigns to Montana retail customers the full costs of decommissioning and environmental remediation for a preexisting share of Colstrip Unit 4, without any determination whether those costs are reasonable or were prudently incurred.

The Commission should therefore reject NorthWestern’s proposed Reserve Fund, under any disposition of NorthWestern’s Application to acquire a 92.5 MW additional interest in CU4 from Puget in this proceeding.

Q. HOW DOES NORTHWESTERN’S AGREEMENT WITH PSE ADDRESS PSE’S RESPONSIBILITY FOR DISMANTLEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN-UP RELATED TO CU4?

A. NorthWestern maintains that its agreement with PSE does not increase NorthWestern's responsibility for CU4 related coal combustion residuals ("CCR"), CU4 environmental clean-up costs, and CU4 decommissioning and closure costs, because PSE remains responsible for PSE's existing obligations with regard to such costs. As such, NorthWestern is claiming that PSE would retain responsibility for estimated dismantlement and environmental clean-up costs based on PSE's current ownership in CU4. NorthWestern states in its response to NWEC/RNW-008 that PSE would retain that responsibility after its interest in CU4 (or half of PSE's interest in CU4) is transferred to NWE. NorthWestern's statements in this regard are not completely consistent with PSE filings in Washington wherein PSE has indicated that it has

---

8 See, e.g., Lail Direct Testimony at CDL-5.
retained the liability for such costs, but has represented in such filings that its liability
is being capped. If NorthWestern is correct that PSE is retaining PSE's responsibility
for PSE's share of the currently estimated CU4 dismantlement and environmental
clean-up costs, there is no need for a new Reserve Fund for such costs, since they are
remaining with PSE and are not being transferred to NorthWestern.

Q. SHOULD A CONDITION BE IMPOSED TO ASSURE THAT
NORTHWESTERN'S COST FOR COLSTRIP DISMANTLEMENT AND
ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN-UP COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE NEWLY
ACQUIRED SHARE IN CU4 IS NOT INCREASED AFTER PSE'S
OWNERSHIP EXIT?

A. Yes. A condition should be imposed to assure that the cost of dismantlement and
environmental clean-up costs and/or other closure costs related to NorthWestern's
potential new interest in CU4 do not fall to ratepayers in accordance with the claims
asserted by NWE to that effect.

---

Q. SHOULD NORTHWESTERN BE REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN A SEPARATE IDENTIFICATION OF COSTS RELATED TO ITS CURRENT EXISTING INTEREST IN CU4, AND WITH THE NEW INTEREST BEING ACQUIRED FROM PSE?

A. Yes. The costs related to NorthWestern's currently existing 222 MW interest in CU4 should be accounted for in a manner that such costs can be separately identified. This is necessary because the future ratemaking treatments of NorthWestern's current 222 MW interest and the newly acquired 92.5 MW interest may present different ratemaking issues in future NorthWestern regulatory proceedings and rate cases.

VII. EXPLANATION OF CONDITIONS REQUIRED TO COMPLY WITH § 69-8-421 (6)(c), MCA

Q. WHY SHOULD A SUNSET PROVISION BE REQUIRED FOR COST RECOVERY FOR THE 92.5 MW CU4 CAPACITY SHARE THAT NORTHWESTERN WOULD ACQUIRE FROM PUGET?

A. The economics of the proposed transaction, as discussed by Dr. Dismukes, are different for the first five years due to the PPA that NorthWestern would have with Puget to sell a 45 MW portion of Puget’s existing ownership share from its total 92.5 MW interest the Company proposes to acquire. The sunset provision would require that the allowed cost recovery for the 92.5 MW of CU4 cease to be of any force or effect on expiration of the proposed PPA with Puget. This is necessary to protect ratepayers from
substantial economic risks after the end of that period. Also, as explained by Dr. Dismukes, NorthWestern has failed to carry its burden of demonstrating that its proposal to acquire 92.5 MW of capacity in CU4 will result in rates that are reasonable and just beyond the expiration of the Puget PPA.

Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSION SPECIFY THAT ITS APPROVAL OF THE PROPOSED CAPACITY ACQUISITION IS LIMITED TO THE TERM OF THE PUGET PPA?

A. NorthWestern’s Application and the record in this proceeding do not meet NorthWestern’s burden of establishing that the proposed capacity acquisition results in rates that are reasonable and just after the Puget PPA expires. There is therefore no basis in the record in this case on which to approve the proposed capacity acquisition for a period that extends beyond the term of the Puget PPA.

Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSION SPECIFY THAT THE BURDEN OF PROOF SHALL REMAIN ON NORTHWESTERN FOR JUSTIFYING ANY COST RECOVERY OF THE 92.5 MW INTEREST IN CU4 BEING ACQUIRED FROM PUGET AFTER THE SUNSET DATE?

A. In the current proceeding, as explained by Dr. Dismukes, NorthWestern has not shown that the acquisition would be economic or in the public interest beyond the initial five-year term to which the PPA with Puget applies. The Commission should therefore state clearly that, to the extent it determines to approve the proposed acquisition at all, that approval extends no further than the expiration of the term of the Puget PPA and the
cost support that the PPA provides for the proposed acquisition. Without that cost
support from Puget, the proposed acquisition unquestionably fails both the public
interest requirement of Section 69-8-421(6)(c)(i), MCA, and the requirement of Section
69-8-421(6)(c)(ii) that the acquisition result in rates that are reasonable and just.

Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSION REQUIRE THAT NORTHWESTERN
DEMONSTRATE THROUGH A COMPETITIVE SOLICITATION PROCESS
THAT ANY COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE 92.5 MW OF CU4 CAPACITY
THAT IS BEING PROPOSED TO BE ACQUIRED MEET THE
REQUIREMENTS OF § 69-3-1207, MCA, AFTER DECEMBER 31, 2025?

A. NorthWestern characterizes its proposed acquisition of 92.5 MW of CU4 capacity from
PSE as an “opportunity purchase” exempted from the competitive procurement
requirements of Section 69-3-1207(5)(b) and (6), MCA. However, NorthWestern has
not carried its burden of showing that the proposed acquisition is in the public interest,
or that it would result in rates that are reasonable and just, at all. NorthWestern has
certainly not carried that burden as to its proposed acquisition once the cost support
provided by the Puget PPA ends. For these reasons, the Commission should not
approve the proposed acquisition, and should certainly not entertain approval of the
proposed acquisition for a period beyond the expiration of the cost support provided by
the Puget PPA.

To the extent that NorthWestern wishes to extend approval of its proposed
acquisition as an electricity supply resource beyond the expiration of the Puget PPA, it
will have had ample opportunity to test the value of that acquisition against a competitive procurement process and allow the marketplace to speak. Obviously, the “opportunity purchase” characterization will not apply at that point, assuming for the sake of argument that the characterization applies now. Thus, requiring that approval sunset with the expiration of the Puget PPA and that any subsequent application for approval of the acquisition be supported by the results of a competitive procurement in full compliance with Section 69-3-1207 will ensure that any post-Puget PPA acquisition proposal can meet the requirement that a proposed acquisition be consistent with the requirements and objectives in 69-3-201, and 69-3-1201 through 69-3-1209.

Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSION SPECIFY THE ALLOWED COST OF SERVICE FOR THE ACQUIRED PUGET SHARE OF CU4 CAPACITY?

A. The allowed cost of service for that portion of the acquired Puget interest should be limited to the pro forma cost of service set forth in NorthWestern's Corrected Exhibit ADD-5, striking the footnote in that exhibit (i.e., that portion of the acquired Puget interest that is allowed into rate base), plus NorthWestern’s documented historical fuel and variable operation and maintenance costs established in its testimony in support of its Application. Whereas the Company is proposing to track these costs through the PCCAM (and share 10%), for this transaction the costs for the five-year period covered by the PPA with Puget should be fixed. Simply put, the Commission should establish a fixed cost for this generation resource for the five-year period of approval.10

10 See the Direct Testimony of MCC witness David Dismukes for the MCC's proposal for the fixed charge (credit).
The substance of this proposed requirement is to ensure that NorthWestern adheres to the only cost of service it has presented in support of its Application. Put another way, the Commission should place the risk on NorthWestern, rather than on its ratepayers, that the projections on which the cost of service presented in Corrected Exhibit ADD-5 is based prove accurate in reality. This condition also ensures that NorthWestern actually carries its burden of justifying as reasonable and just any capital expenditures and operation and maintenance costs not factored into its cost of service presentation in support of its proposed acquisition.

Q. WHY SHOULD THE COMMISSION SPECIFY THAT NORTHWESTERN RETAINS THE BURDEN OF JUSTIFYING ANY COST RECOVERY RELATED TO THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION ONCE THE PUGET PPA TERMINATES?

A. The Commission’s clarification on this point should eliminate any ambiguity as to the scope of an approval – assuming that the Commission determines that any approval is justified on this record – so as to keep any approval strictly co-extensive with the cost support provided by the Puget PPA. Absent such clarification, NorthWestern may attempt to claim in the future that a partial approval of the acquisition for the duration of Puget’s cost support somehow changes its burden of establishing the reasonableness and justness of cost recovery beyond that point. To be clear, even an acquisition limited to the duration of Puget’s cost support is unsupported – the record in this case demonstrates a very marginal benefit to customers, based on information that appears to be incomplete and skewed. However, if the Commission were to determine to allow
the acquisition to proceed, the record clearly does not support an approval for any
period in which the cost support provided by the Puget PPA is missing.

Q. WHY SHOULD THE FIXED ALLOWED GENERATION COST FOR THE
92.5 MW OF CU4 CAPACITY BE REDUCED BY THE NET REVENUES
FROM THE 45 MW FIVE-YEAR PPA WITH PUGET?

A. A fixed generation cost of service for NorthWestern's 92.5 MW CU4 Capacity
Acquisition should be set and that fixed cost of service should be reduced by the net
revenues from the five-year 45 MW PPA with Puget. The supporting testimony of
NorthWestern witness Markovich as shown on Company Corrected Exhibit KJM-3 has
presented the Company's forecasts of net revenue (labeled as "Net Value") for the five-
year 45 MW PPA with Puget. The offset related to the five-year 45 MW PPA with
Puget should be used because this reflects the impact of the information that
NorthWestern has presented to the Commission as the basis for approving the
acquisition and its net projected benefits.

Q. HOW SHOULD THE COMMISSION TREAT A PORTION OF
NORTHWESTERN'S CALCULATED PUGET PPA "NET VALUE" AS AN
ASSURED COST OF SERVICE OFFSET, WHETHER OR NOT THAT "NET
VALUE" ACTUALLY MATERIALIZES AS PROJECTED BY THE
COMPANY?

A. MCC witness Dismukes is recommending that 50% of the net revenues that have been
forecasted by NorthWestern be reflected as an assured partial net benefit from the Puget
PPA. As recommended by Dr. Dismukes, that offset would apply whether or not such actual net revenues from the 45 MW PPA with Puget ultimately materialize as projected by NorthWestern.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. Yes, it does.
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Accomplishments
Mr. Smith's professional credentials include being a Certified Financial Planner™ professional, a Certified Rate of Return Analyst, a licensed Certified Public Accountant and attorney. He functions as project manager on consulting projects involving utility regulation, regulatory policy and ratemaking and utility management. His involvement in public utility regulation has included project management and in-depth analyses of numerous issues involving telephone, electric, gas, and water and sewer utilities.

Mr. Smith has performed work in the field of utility regulation on behalf of industry, public service commission staffs, state attorney generals, municipalities, and consumer groups concerning regulatory matters before regulatory agencies in Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Nevada, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, Washington DC, West Virginia, Canada, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and various state and federal courts of law. He has presented expert testimony in regulatory hearings on behalf of utility commission staffs and intervenors on several occasions.

Project manager in Larkin & Associates' review, on behalf of the Georgia Commission Staff, of the budget and planning activities of Georgia Power Company; supervised 13 professionals; coordinated over 200 interviews with Company budget center managers and executives; organized and edited voluminous audit report; presented testimony before the Commission. Functional areas covered included fossil plant O&M, headquarters and district operations, internal audit, legal, affiliated transactions, and responsibility reporting. All of our findings and recommendations were accepted by the Commission.

Key team member in the firm's management audit of the Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility on behalf of the Alaska Commission Staff, which assessed the effectiveness of the Utility's operations in several areas; responsible for in-depth investigation and report writing in areas involving information systems, finance and accounting, affiliated relationships and transactions, and use of outside contractors. Testified before the Alaska Commission concerning certain areas of the audit report. AWWU concurred with each of Mr. Smith's 40 plus recommendations for improvement.

Co-consultant in the analysis of the issues surrounding gas transportation performed for the law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore in conjunction with the case of Reynolds Metals Co. vs. the Columbia Gas System, Inc.; drafted in-depth report concerning the regulatory treatment at both state and federal levels of issues such as flexible pricing and mandatory gas transportation.

Lead consultant and expert witness in the analysis of the rate increase request of the City of Austin - Electric Utility on behalf of the residential consumers. Among the numerous ratemaking issues addressed were the economies of the Utility's employment of outside services; provided both written and oral testimony outlining recommendations and their bases. Most of Mr. Smith's recommendations were adopted by the City Council and Utility in a settlement.
Key team member performing an analysis of the rate stabilization plan submitted by the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Company to the Florida PSC; performed comprehensive analysis of the Company's projections and budgets which were used as the basis for establishing rates.

Lead consultant in analyzing Southwestern Bell Telephone separations in Missouri; sponsored the complex technical analysis and calculations upon which the firm's testimony in that case was based. He has also assisted in analyzing changes in depreciation methodology for setting telephone rates.

Lead consultant in the review of gas cost recovery reconciliation applications of Michigan Gas Utilities Company, Michigan Consolidated Gas Company, and Consumers Power Company. Drafted recommendations regarding the appropriate rate of interest to be applied to any over or under collections and the proper procedures and allocation methodology to be used to distribute any refunds to customer classes.

Lead consultant in the review of Consumers Power Company's gas cost recovery refund plan. Addressed appropriate interest rate and compounding procedures and proper allocation methodology.

Project manager in the review of the request by Central Maine Power Company for an increase in rates. The major area addressed was the propriety of the Company's ratemaking attrition adjustment in relation to its corporate budgets and projections.

Project manager in an engagement designed to address the impacts of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 on gas distribution utility operations of the Northern States Power Company. Analyzed the reduction in the corporate tax rate, uncollectibles reserve, ACRS, unbilled revenues, customer advances, CIAC, and timing of TRA-related impacts associated with the Company's tax liability.

Project manager and expert witness in the determination of the impacts of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 on the operations of Connecticut Natural Gas Company on behalf of the Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control - Prosecutorial Division, Connecticut Attorney General, and Connecticut Department of Consumer Counsel.

Lead Consultant for The Minnesota Department of Public Service ("DPS") to review the Minnesota Incentive Plan ("Incentive Plan") proposal presented by Northwestern Bell Telephone Company ("NWB") doing business as U S West Communications ("USWC"). Objective was to express an opinion as to whether current rates addressed by the plan were appropriate from a Minnesota intrastate revenue requirements and accounting perspective, and to assist in developing recommended modifications to NWB's proposed Plan.

Performed a variety of analytical and review tasks related to our work effort on this project. Obtained and reviewed data and performed other procedures as necessary (1) to obtain an understanding of the Company's Incentive Plan filing package as it relates to rate base, operating income, revenue requirements, and plan operation, and (2) to formulate an opinion concerning the reasonableness of current rates and of amounts included within the Company's Incentive Plan filing. These procedures included requesting and reviewing extensive discovery, visiting the Company's offices to review data, issuing follow-up information requests in many instances, telephone and on-site discussions with Company representatives, and frequent discussions with counsel and DPS Staff assigned to the project.
Lead Consultant in the regulatory analysis of Jersey Central Power & Light Company for the Department of the Public Advocate, Division of Rate Counsel. Tasks performed included on-site review and audit of Company, identification and analysis of specific issues, preparation of data requests, testimony, and cross examination questions. Testified in Hearings.

Assisted the NARUC Committee on Management Analysis with drafting the Consultant Standards for Management Audits.

Presented training seminars covering public utility accounting, tax reform, ratemaking, affiliated transaction auditing, rate case management, and regulatory policy in Maine, Georgia, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania. Seminars were presented to commission staffs and consumer interest groups.

**Previous Positions**

With Larkin, Chapski and Co., the predecessor firm to Larkin & Associates, was involved primarily in utility regulatory consulting, and also in tax planning and tax research for businesses and individuals, tax return preparation and review, and independent audit, review and preparation of financial statements.

Installed computerized accounting system for a realty management firm.

**Education**

Bachelor of Science in Administration in Accounting, with distinction, University of Michigan, Dearborn, 1979.

Master of Science in Taxation, Walsh College, Michigan, 1981. Master's thesis dealt with investment tax credit and property tax on various assets.


Continuing education required to maintain CPA license and CFP® certificate.


Michigan Bar Association.

American Bar Association, sections on public utility law and taxation.
Partial list of utility cases participated in:

- 79-228-EL-FAC Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (Ohio PUC)
- 79-231-EL-FAC Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (Ohio PUC)
- 79-535-EL-AIR East Ohio Gas Company (Ohio PUC)
- 80-235-EL-FAC Ohio Edison Company (Ohio PUC)
- 80-240-EL-FAC Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (Ohio PUC)
- U-1933 Tucson Electric Power Company (Arizona Corp. Commission)
- U-6794 Michigan Consolidated Gas Co. --16 Refunds (Michigan PSC)
- 81-0035TP Southern Bell Telephone Company (Florida PSC)
- 81-0095TP General Telephone Company of Florida (Florida PSC)
- 81-308-EL-EFC Dayton Power & Light Co.- Fuel Adjustment Clause (Ohio PUC)
- 810136-EU Gulf Power Company (Florida PSC)
- GR-81-342 Northern States Power Co. -- E-002/Minnesota (Minnesota PUC)
- Tr-81-208 Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (Missouri PSC)
- U-6949 Detroit Edison Company (Michigan PSC)
- 8400 East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. (Kentucky PSC)
- 18328 Alabama Gas Corporation (Alabama PSC)
- 18416 Alabama Power Company (Alabama PSC)
- 820100-EU Florida Power Corporation (Florida PSC)
- 8624 Kentucky Utilities (Kentucky PSC)
- 8648 East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. (Kentucky PSC)
- U-7236 Detroit Edison - Burlington Northern Refund (Michigan PSC)
- U6633-R Detroit Edison - MRCS Program (Michigan PSC)
- U-6797-R Consumers Power Company -MRCS Program (Michigan PSC)
- U-5510-R Consumers Power Company - Energy conservation Finance Program (Michigan PSC)
- 82-240E South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (South Carolina PSC)
- 7350 Generic Working Capital Hearing (Michigan PSC)
- RH-1-83 Westcoast Transmission Co., (National Energy Board of Canada)
- 82094-TP Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co. (Florida PSC)
- 82-165-EL-EFC Toledo Edison Company(Ohio PUC)
- 82-168-EL-EFC Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company (Ohio PUC)
- 830012-EU Tampa Electric Company (Florida PSC)
- U-7065 The Detroit Edison Company - Fermi II (Michigan PSC)
- 8738 Columbia Gas of Kentucky, Inc. (Kentucky PSC)
- ER-83-206 Arkansas Power & Light Company (Missouri PSC)
- U-4758 The Detroit Edison Company - Refunds (Michigan PSC)
- 8836 Kentucky American Water Company (Kentucky PSC)
- 8839 Western Kentucky Gas Company (Kentucky PSC)
- 83-07-15 Connecticut Light & Power Co. (Connecticut DPU)
- 81-0485-WS Palm Coast Utility Corporation (Florida PSC)
- U-7650 Consumers Power Co. (Michigan PSC)
- 83-662 Continental Telephone Company of California, (Nevada PSC)
- U-6488-R Detroit Edison Co., FAC & PIPAC Reconciliation (Michigan PSC)
- U-15684 Louisiana Power & Light Company (Louisiana PSC)
- 7395 & U-7397 Campaign Ballot Proposals (Michigan PSC)
- 820013-WS Seacoast Utilities (Florida PSC)
- U-7660 Detroit Edison Company (Michigan PSC)
- 83-1039 CP National Corporation (Nevada PSC)
- U-7802 Michigan Gas Utilities Company (Michigan PSC)
- 83-1226 Sierra Pacific Power Company (Nevada PSC)
- 830465-EI Florida Power & Light Company (Florida PSC)
- U-7777 Michigan Consolidated Gas Company (Michigan PSC)
- U-7779 Consumers Power Company (Michigan PSC)
| U-7480-R | Michigan Consolidated Gas Company (Michigan PSC) |
| U-7488-R | Consumers Power Company – Gas (Michigan PSC) |
| U-7484-R | Michigan Gas Utilities Company (Michigan PSC) |
| U-7550-R | Detroit Edison Company (Michigan PSC) |
| U-7477-R** | Indiana & Michigan Electric Company (Michigan PSC) |
| 18978 | Continental Telephone Co. of the South Alabama (Alabama PSC) |
| R-842583 | Duquesne Light Company (Pennsylvania PUC) |
| R-842740 | Pennsylvania Power Company (Pennsylvania PUC) |
| 850050-EI | Tampa Electric Company (Florida PSC) |
| 16091 | Louisiana Power & Light Company (Louisiana PSC) |
| 19297 | Continental Telephone Co. of the South Alabama (Alabama PSC) |
| 76-18788AA & 76-18793AA | Detroit Edison - Refund - Appeal of U-4807 (Ingham County, Michigan Circuit Court) |
| 85-53476AA & 85-534785AA | Detroit Edison Refund - Appeal of U-4758 (Ingham County, Michigan Circuit Court) |
| U-8091/U-8239 | Consumers Power Company - Gas Refunds (Michigan PSC) |
| TR-85-179** | United Telephone Company of Missouri (Missouri PSC) |
| 85-212 | Central Maine Power Company (Maine PSC) |
| ER-85646001 & ER-85647001 | New England Power Company (FERC) |
| 850782-EI & 850783-EI | Florida Power & Light Company (Florida PSC) |
| R-860378 | Duquesne Light Company (Pennsylvania PUC) |
| R-850267 | Pennsylvania Power Company (Pennsylvania PUC) |
| 851007-WU & 840419-SU | Florida Cities Water Company (Florida PSC) |
| G-002/GR-86-160 | Northern States Power Company (Minnesota PSC) |
| 7195 (Interim) | Gulf States Utilities Company (Texas PUC) |
| 87-01-03 | Connecticut Natural Gas Company (Connecticut PUC) |
| 87-01-02 | Southern New England Telephone Company (Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control) |
| 3673- | Georgia Power Company (Georgia PSC) |
| 29484 | Long Island Lighting Co. (New York Dept. of Public Service) |
| U-8924 | Consumers Power Company – Gas (Michigan PSC) |
| Docket No. 1 | Austin Electric Utility (City of Austin, Texas) |
| Docket E-2, Sub 527 | Carolina Power & Light Company (North Carolina PUC) |
| 870853 | Pennsylvania Gas and Water Company (Pennsylvania PUC) |
| 880069** | Southern Bell Telephone Company (Florida PSC) |
| 89-0033 | Illinois Bell Telephone Company (Illinois CC) |
| U-89-2688-T | Puget Sound Power & Light Company (Washington UTC) |
| R-891364 | Philadelphia Electric Company (Pennsylvania PUC) |
| F.C. 889 | Potomac Electric Power Company (District of Columbia PSC) |
| 87-11628 | Duquesne Light Company, et al, plaintiffs, against Gulf+Western, Inc. et al, defendants (Court of the Common Pleas of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania Civil Division) |
| 890319-EI | Florida Power & Light Company (Florida PSC) |
| 891345-EI | Gulf Power Company (Florida PSC) |
| ER 8811 0912J | Jersey Central Power & Light Company (BPU) |
| 6531 | Hawaiian Electric Company (Hawaii PUCs) |
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R0901595 Equitable Gas Company (Pennsylvania Consumer Counsel)
90-10 Artesian Water Company (Delaware PSC)
89-12-05 Southern New England Telephone Company (Connecticut PUC)
900329-WS Southern States Utilities, Inc. (Florida PSC)
90-12-018 Southern California Edison Company (California PUC)
90-E-1185 Long Island Lighting Company (New York DPS)
R-911966 Pennsylvania Gas & Water Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
1.90-07-037, Phase II (Investigation of OPEBs) Department of the Navy and all Other Federal Executive Agencies (California PUC)
U-1551-90-322 Southwest Gas Corporation (Arizona CC)
U-1636-91-134 Sun City Water Company (Arizona RU CO)
U-2013-91-133 Havasu Water Company (Arizona RU CO)
91-174*** Central Maine Power Company (Department of the Navy and all Other Federal Executive Agencies)
U-1551-89-102 Southwest Gas Corporation - Rebuttal and PGA Audit (Arizona Corporation Commission)
Docket No. 6998 Hawaiian Electric Company (Hawaii PUC)
TC-91-040A and TC-91-040B IntraState Access Charge Methodology, Pool and Rates
7233 and 7243 Hawaiian Nonpension Postretirement Benefits (Hawaiian PUC)
R-00922314 & M-920313C006 Metropolitan Edison Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
R00922428 Pennsylvania American Water Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
92-09-19 Southern New England Telephone Company (Connecticut PUC)
E-1032-92-073 Citizens Utilities Company (Electric Division), (Arizona CC)
UE-92-1262 Puget Sound Power and Light Company (Washington UTC))
92-345 Central Maine Power Company (Maine PUC)
R-932667 Pennsylvania Gas & Water Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
U-93-60** Matanuska Telephone Association, Inc. (Alaska PUC)
U-93-50** Anchorage Telephone Utility (Alaska PUC)
U-93-64 PTI Communications (Alaska PUC)
7700 Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. (Hawaii PUC)
E-1032-93-111 & U-1032-93-193 Citizens Utilities Company - Gas Division (Arizona Corporation Commission)
R-00932670 Pennsylvania American Water Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
U-1514-93-169/ Sale of Assets CC&N from Contel of the West, Inc. to Citizens Utilities Company (Arizona Corporation Commission)
7766 Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. (Hawaii PUC)
93-2006- GA-AIR The East Ohio Gas Company (Ohio PUC)
94-E-0334 Consolidated Edison Company (New York DPS)
94-0270 Inter-State Water Company (Illinois Commerce Commission)
94-0097 Citizens Utilities Company, Kauai Electric Division (Hawaii PUC)
PU-314-94-688 Application for Transfer of Local Exchanges (North Dakota PSC)
94-12-005-Phase I Pacific Gas & Electric Company (California PUC)
R-953297 UGI Utilities, Inc. - Gas Division (Pennsylvania PUC)
95-03-01 Southern New England Telephone Company (Connecticut PUC)
95-0342 Consumer Illinois Water, Kankakee Water District (Illinois CC)
94-996-EL-AIR Ohio Power Company (Ohio PUC)
95-1000-E South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (South Carolina PSC)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-1032-95-473</td>
<td>Citizens Utility Co. - Northern Arizona Gas Division (Arizona CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GR-96-285</td>
<td>Missouri Gas Energy (Missouri PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-10-45</td>
<td>Southern New England Telephone Company (Connecticut PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.96-08-001 et al.</td>
<td>California Utilities’ Applications to Identify Sunk Costs of Non-Nuclear Generation Assets, &amp; Transition Costs for Electric Utility Restructuring, &amp; Consolidated Proceedings (California PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96-324</td>
<td>Bell Atlantic - Delaware, Inc. (Delaware PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-05-12</td>
<td>Connecticut Light &amp; Power (Connecticut PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-00973953</td>
<td>Application of PECO Energy Company for Approval of its Restructuring Plan Under Section 2806 of the Public Utility Code (Pennsylvania PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-65</td>
<td>Application of Delmarva Power &amp; Light Co. for Application of a Cost Accounting Manual and a Code of Conduct (Delaware PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16705</td>
<td>Entergy Gulf States, Inc. (Cities Steering Committee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1072-97-067</td>
<td>Southwestern Telephone Co. (Arizona Corporation Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Docketed Staff Investigation</td>
<td>Delaware - Estimate Impact of Universal Services Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-314-97-12</td>
<td>US West Communications, Inc. Cost Studies (North Dakota PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-0351</td>
<td>Consumer Illinois Water Company (Illinois CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-8001</td>
<td>Investigation of Issues to be Considered as a Result of Restructuring of Electric Industry (Nevada PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-0000-94-165</td>
<td>Generic Docket to Consider Competition in the Provision of Retail Electric Service (Arizona Corporation Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-05-006-Phase I</td>
<td>San Diego Gas &amp; Electric Co., Section 386 costs (California PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9355-U</td>
<td>Georgia Power Company Rate Case (Georgia PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-12-020 - Phase I</td>
<td>Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company (California PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alaska PUC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II of 97-SCCC-149-GIT</td>
<td>Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Cost Studies (Kansas CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU-314-97-465</td>
<td>US West Universal Service Cost Model (North Dakota PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Zeeland, MI - Water Contract with the City of Holland, MI (Before an arbitration panel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-docketed Project</td>
<td>City of Danville, IL - Valuation of Water System (Danville, IL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-docketed Project</td>
<td>Village of University Park, IL - Valuation of Water and Sewer System (Village of University Park, Illinois)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
97-12-020  
Phase II  Pacific Gas & Electric Company Rate Case (California PUC)  
01-10-10  United Illuminating Company (Connecticut OCC)  
13711-U  Georgia Power FCR (Georgia PSC)  
02-001  Verizon Delaware § 271(Delaware DPA)  
02-BLVT-377-AUD  Blue Valley Telephone Company Audit/General Rate Investigation (Kansas CC)  
02-S&T-390-AUD  S&T Telephone Cooperative Audit/General Rate Investigation (Kansas CC)  
01-SFLT-879-AUD  Sunflower Telephone Company Inc., Audit/General Rate Investigation (Kansas CC)  
01-BSTT-878-AUD  Blue Stem Telephone Company, Inc. Audit/General Rate Investigation (Kansas CC)  
P404, 407, 520, 413  
426, 427, 430, 421/  
CI-00-712  Sherburne County Rural Telephone Company, dba as Connections, Etc. (Minnesota DOC)  
U-01-85  ACS of Alaska, dba as Alaska Communications Systems (ACS), Rate Case (Alaska Regulatory Commission PAS)  
U-01-34  ACS of Anchorage, dba as Alaska Communications Systems (ACS), Rate Case (Alaska Regulatory Commission PAS)  
U-01-83  ACS of Fairbanks, dba as Alaska Communications Systems (ACS), Rate Case (Alaska Regulatory Commission PAS)  
U-01-87  ACS of the Northland, dba as Alaska Communications Systems (ACS), Rate Case (Alaska Regulatory Commission PAS)  
96-324, Phase II  
03-WHST-503-AUD  Wheat State Telephone Company (Kansas CC)  
04-GNBT-130-AUD  Golden Belt Telephone Association (Kansas CC)  
Docket 6914  Shoreham Telephone Company, Inc. (Vermont BPU)  
Docket No.  
E-01345A-06-009  Arizona Public Service Company (Arizona Corporation Commission)  
Case No.  
05-1278-E-PC-PW-42T  Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company both d/b/a American Electric Power (West Virginia PSC)  
Docket No. 04-0113  Hawaiian Electric Company (Hawaii PUC)  
Case No. U-14347  Consumers Energy Company (Michigan PSC)  
Case No. 05-725-EL-UNC  Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (PUC of Ohio)  
Docket No. 21229-U  Savannah Electric & Power Company (Georgia PSC)  
Docket No. 19142-U  Georgia Power Company (Georgia PSC)  
Docket No.  
03-07-01RE01  Connecticut Light & Power Company (CT DPUC)  
Docket No. 19042-U  Savannah Electric & Power Company (Georgia PSC)  
Docket No. 2004-178-E  South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (South Carolina PSC)  
Docket No. 03-07-02  Connecticut Light & Power Company (CT DPUC)  
Docket No. EX02060363, Phases I&II  
Docket No. U-00-88  ENSTAR Natural Gas Company and Alaska Pipeline Company (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)  
Phase 1-2002 IERM,  
Docket No. U-02-075  Interior Telephone Company, Inc. (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)  
Docket No. 05-SCNT-1048-AUD  South Central Telephone Company (Kansas CC)  
Docket No. 05-TRCT-607-KSF  Tri-County Telephone Company (Kansas CC)  
Docket No. 05-KOKT-606-AUD  Kan Okla Telephone Company (Kansas CC)  
Docket No. 2002-747  Northland Telephone Company of Maine (Maine PUC)
Docket No. 2003-34  Sidney Telephone Company (Maine PUC)
Docket No. 2003-35  Maine Telephone Company (Maine PUC)
Docket No. 2003-36  China Telephone Company (Maine PUC)
Docket No. 2003-37  Standish Telephone Company (Maine PUC)
Docket Nos. U-04-022, U-04-023  Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
Case 05-116-U/06-055-U  Entergy Arkansas, Inc. EFC (Arkansas Public Service Commission)
Case 04-137-U  Southwest Power Pool RTO (Arkansas Public Service Commission)
Case No. 7109/7160  Vermont Gas Systems (Department of Public Service)
Case No. ER-2006-0315  Empire District Electric Company (Missouri PSC)
Case No. ER-2006-0314  Kansas City Power & Light Company (Missouri PSC)
Docket No. U-05-043,44  Golden Heart Utilities/College Park Utilities (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
A-122250F5000  Equitable Resources, Inc. and The Peoples Natural Gas Company, d/b/a Dominion Peoples (Pennsylvania PUC)
E-01345A-05-0816  Arizona Public Service Company (Arizona CC)
Docket No. 05-304  Delmarva Power & Light Company (Delaware PSC)
05-806-EL-UNC  Cincinnati Gas & Electric Company (Ohio PUC)
U-06-45  Anchorage Water Utility (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
03-93-EL-ATA, 06-1068-EL-UNC  Duke Energy Ohio (Ohio PUC)
PUE-2006-00065  Appalachian Power Company (Virginia Corporation Commission)
G-04204A-06-0463 et. al  UNS Gas, Inc. (Arizona CC)
U-06-134  Chugach Electric Association, Inc. (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
Docket No. 2006-0386  Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc (Hawaii PUC)
E-01933A-07-0402  Tucson Electric Power Company (Arizona CC)
G-01551A-07-0504  Southwest Gas Corporation (Arizona CC)
Docket No.UE-072300  Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (Washington UTC)
PUE-2008-00009  Virginia-American Water Company (Virginia SCC)
PUE-2008-00046  Appalachian Power Company (Virginia SCC)
E-01345A-08-0172  Arizona Public Service Company (Arizona CC)
A-2008-2063737  Babcock & Brown Infrastructure Fund North America, L.P. and The Peoples Natural Gas Company, d/b/a Dominion Peoples (Pennsylvania PUC)
08-1783-G-42T  Hope Gas, Inc., dba Dominion Hope (West Virginia PSC)
08-1761-G-PC  Hope Gas, Inc., dba Dominion Hope, Dominion Resources, Inc., and Peoples Hope Gas Companies (West Virginia PSC)
Docket No. 2008-0083  Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. (Hawaii PUC)
Docket No. 2008-0266  Young Brothers, Limited (Hawaii PUC)
G-04024A-08-0571  UNS Gas, Inc. (Arizona CC)
Docket No. 09-29  Tidewater Utilities, Inc. (Delaware PSC)
Docket No. UE-090704  Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (Washington UTC)
09-0878-G-42T  Mountainair Gas Company (West Virginia PSC)
2009-UA-0014  Mississippi Power Company (Mississippi PSC)
Docket No. 09-0319  Illinois-American Water Company (Illinois CC)
Docket No. 09-414  Delmarva Power & Light Company (Delaware PSC)
R-2009-2132019  Aqua Pennsylvania, Inc. (Pennsylvania PUC)
Docket Nos. U-09-069, U-09-070  ENSTAR Natural Gas Company (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
Docket Nos. U-04-023, U-04-024  Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility - Remand (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
W-01303A-09-0343 & SW-01303A-09-0343  Arizona-American Water Company (Arizona CC)
09-872-EL-FAC & 09-873-EL-FAC  Financial Audits of the FAC of the Columbus Southern Power Company and the Ohio Power Company - Audit I (Ohio PUC)
2010-00036  Kentucky-American Water Company (Kentucky PSC)
E-041000A-09-0496  Southwest Transmission Cooperative, IHnc. (Arizona CC)
E-01773A-09-0472  Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. (Arizona CC)
R-2010-2166208,  Central Illinois Light Company D/B/A AmerenILCO; Central Illinois Public
R-2010-2166210,  Service Company D/B/A AmerenIPS; Illinois Power Company D/B/A
R-2010-2166212, &  AmerenIP (Illinois CC)
PSC Docket No. 09-0602  Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company (West Virginia
10-0713-E-PC  PSC)
Docket No. 31958  Financial, Management, and Performance Audit of the FAC for Dayton Power and
Docket No. 10-0467  Light – Audit 1 (Ohio PUC)
PSC Docket No. 10-237  Financial Audit of the FAC of the Columbus Southern Power Company and the
U-10-51  Ohio Power Company – Audit II (Ohio PUC)
10-0699-E-42T  Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. (Hawaii PUC)
10-0920-W-42T  Southwest Gas Corporation (Arizona CC)
A.10-07-007  Kansas City Power & Light Company – Remand (Kansas CC)
A-2010-2210326  Virginia Appalachian Power Company (Commonwealth of Virginia SCC)
09-1012-EL-FAC  Pennsylvania-American Water Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
PSC Docket No. 2010-0080  Power Purchase Agreement between Chugach Association, Inc. and Fire Island
G-01551A-10-0458  Wind, LLC (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
10-KCPE-415-RTS  Docket No. 11-207  Artesian Water Company, Inc. (Delaware PSC)
A.10-12-005  Management Audit of Tidewater Utilities, Inc. Affiliate Transactions (Delaware
PSC Docket No. 11-207  Public Service Commission)
Cause No. 44022  Management Audit of Tidewater Utilities, Inc. Affiliate Transactions (Delaware
PSC Docket No. 10-247  Public Service Commission)
G-04204A-11-0158  UNS Gas, Inc. (Arizona Corporation Commission)
E-01345A-11-0224  Arizona Public Service Company (Arizona CC)
UE-111048 & UE-111049  Commonwealth Edison Company (Illinois CC)
Docket No. 11-0721  Purple Sound Energy, Inc. (Washington Utilities and Transportation
Docket No. 11-0721  Commission)
11AL-947E  Management Audit of Tidewater Utilities, Inc. Affiliate Transactions (Delaware
U-11-77 & U-11-78  Public Service Commission)
Docket No. 11-0767  Golden Heart Utilities, Inc. and College Utilities Corporation (The Regulatory
PSC Docket No. 11-397  Commission of Alaska)
Cause No. 44075  Management Audit of Tidewater Utilities, Inc. Affiliate Transactions (Delaware
Docket No. 11-0767  Public Service Commission)
Docket No. 11-397  Management Audit of Tidewater Utilities, Inc. Affiliate Transactions (Delaware
Cause No. 44075  Public Service Commission)
Docket No. 12-0001  Management Audit of Tidewater Utilities, Inc. Affiliate Transactions (Delaware
11-5730-EL-FAC  Public Service Commission)
PSC Docket No. 11-528  Financial, Management, and Performance Audit of the FAC for Dayton Power and Light – Audit 2 (Ohio PUC)
11-281-EL-FAC et al.  Delmarva Power & Light Company (Delaware PSC)
Financial Audit of the FAC of the Columbus Southern Power Company and the
Ohio Power Company – Audit III (Ohio PUC)
Cause No. 43114-IGCC-4S1 Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. (Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission)
Docket No. 12-0293 Ameren Illinois Company (Illinois CC)
Docket No. 12-0321 Commonwealth Edison Company (Illinois CC)
12-02019 & 12-04005 Southwest Gas Corporation (Public Utilities Commission of Nevada)
Docket No. 2012-218-E South Carolina Electric & Gas (South Carolina PSC)
Docket No. E-72, Sub 479 Dominion North Carolina Power (North Carolina Utilities Commission)
12-0511 & 12-0512 North Shore Gas Company and The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company (Illinois CC)
E-01933A-12-0291 Tucson Electric Power Company (Arizona CC)
Case No. 9311 Potomac Electric Power Company (Maryland PSC)
Cause No. 43114-IGCC-10 Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. (Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission)
Docket No. 36498 Georgia Power Company (Georgia PSC)
Case No. 9316 Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc. (Maryland PSC)
Docket No. 13-0192 Ameren Illinois Company (Illinois CC)
12-1649-W-42T West Virginia-American Water Company (West Virginia PSC)
E-04204A-12-0504 UNS Electric, Inc. (Arizona CC)
PUE-2013-00020 Virginia and Electric Power Company (Virginia SCC)
R-2013-2355276 Pennsylvania-American Water Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
Formal Case No. 1103 Potomac Electric Power Company (District of Columbia PSC)
U-13-007 Chugach Electric Association, Inc. (The Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
12-2881-EL-FAC Financial, Management, and Performance Audit of the FAC for Dayton Power and Light – Audit 3 (Ohio PUC)
Docket No. 36989 Georgia Power Company (Georgia PSC)
Cause No. 43114-IGCC-11 Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. (Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission)
UM 1633 Investigation into Treatment of Pension Costs in Utility Rates (Oregon PUC)
13-1892-EL FAC Financial Audit of the FAC and AER of the Ohio Power Company – Audit I (Ohio PUC)
E-04230A-14-0011 & E-01933A-14-0011 Reorganization of UNS Energy Corporation with Fortis, Inc. (Arizona CC)
14-255-EL RDR Regulatory Compliance Audit of the 2013 DIR of Ohio Power Company (Ohio PUC)
U-14-001 Chugach Electric Association, Inc. (The Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
U-14-002 Alaska Power Company (The Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
PUE-2014-00026 Virginia Appalachian Power Company (Commonwealth of Virginia SCC)
14-0117-EL-FAC Financial, Management, and Performance Audit of the FAC and Purchased Power Rider for Dayton Power and Light – Audit 1 (Ohio PUC)
14-0702-E-42T Monongahela Power Company and The Potomac Edison Company (West Virginia PSC)
R-2014-2428742 West Penn Power Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
R-2014-2428743 Pennsylvania Electric Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
R-2014-2428744 Pennsylvania Power Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
R-2014-2428745 Metropolitan Edison Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
Cause No. 43114-IGCC-12/13 Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. (Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission)
14-1152-E-42T Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company (West Virginia PSC)
WS-01303A-14-0010 EPCOR Water Arizona, Inc. (Arizona CC)
2014-000396 Kentucky Power Company (Kentucky PSC)
15-03-45 Iberdrola, S.A. Et Al, and UIL Holdings Corporation merger (Connecticut PURA)
A.14-11-003 San Diego Gas & Electric Company (California PUC)
U-14-111 ENSTAR Natural Gas Company (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
2015-UN-049 Atmos Energy Corporation (Mississippi PSC)
15-0003-G-42T Mountaineer Gas Company (West Virginia PSC)
PUE-2015-00027 Virginia Electric and Power Company (Commonwealth of Virginia SCC)
Electric Company Limited, and NextEra Energy, Inc. (Hawaii PUC)
15-0676-W-42T West Virginia-American Water Company (West Virginia PSC)
15-07-38** Iberdrola, S.A. Et Al, and UIL Holdings Corporation merger (Connecticut
PURA)
15-26** Iberdrola, S.A. Et Al, and UIL Holdings Corporation merger (Massachusetts
DPU)
15-042-EL-FAC Management/Performance and Financial Audit of the FAC and Purchased
Power Rider for Dayton Power and Light (Ohio PUC)
2015-UN-0080 Mississippi Power Company (Mississippi PSC)
Docket No. 15-00042 B&W Pipeline, LLC (Tennessee Regulatory Authority)
Commission of Alaska)
Docket No. 16-00001 Kingsport Power Company d/b/a AEP Appalachian Power (Tennessee
Regulatory Authority)
PUE-2015-00097 Virginia-American Water Company (Commonwealth of Virginia SCC)
15-1854-EL-RDR Management/Performance and Financial Audit of the Alternative Energy
Recovery Rider of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Ohio PUC)
P-15-014 PTE Pipeline LLC (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
P-15-020 Swanson River Oil Pipeline, LLC (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)
Docket No. 40161 Georgia Power Company – Integrated Resource Plan (Georgia PSC)
Formal Case No. 1137 Washington Gas Light Company (District of Columbia PSC)
160021-EI, et al. Florida Power Company (Florida PSC)
R-2016-2537349 Metropolitan Edison Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
R-2016-2537352 Pennsylvania Electric Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
R-2016-2537355 Pennsylvania Power Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
R-2016-2537359 West Penn Power Company (Pennsylvania PUC)
16-0717-G-390P Hope Gas, Inc., dba Dominion Hope (West Virginia PSC)
15-1256-G-390P (Reopening)/16-0922-
G-390P Mountaineer Gas Company (West Virginia PSC)
16-0550-W-P West Virginia-American Water Company (West Virginia PSC)
CEPR-AP-2015-0001 Puerto Rico Electric Power Authority (Puerto Rico Energy Commission)
E-01345A-16-0036 Arizona Public Service Company (Arizona CC)
Docket No. 4618 Providence Water Supply Board (Rhode Island PUC)
Docket No. 46238 Joint Report and Application of Oncor Electric Delivery Company LLC and
NextEra Energy Inc. (Texas State Office of Administrative Hearings; Texas
PUC)
UE-170033 & UG-170034 Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (Washington UTC)
Case No. U-18239 Consumers Energy Company (Michigan PSC)
Case No. U-18248 DTE Electric Company (Michigan PSC)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No. 9449</th>
<th>Merger of AltaGas Ltd. and WGL Holdings (Maryland PSC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal Case No. 1142</td>
<td>Merger of AltaGas Ltd. and WGL Holdings (District of Columbia PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case No. 2017-00179</td>
<td>Kentucky Power Company (Kentucky PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. 29849</td>
<td>Georgia Power Plant Vogtle Units 3 and 4, VCM 17 (Georgia PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. 2017-AD-112</td>
<td>Mississippi Power Company (Mississippi PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. D2017.9.79</td>
<td>Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. (Montana PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW-01428A-17-0058 et al</td>
<td>Liberty Utilities (Litchfield Park Water &amp; Sewer) Corp. (Arizona CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. 4800</td>
<td>Suez Water Rhode Island Inc. (Rhode Island PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Order No. 236.1</td>
<td>In the Matter of the Effects on Utilities of the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (West Virginia PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180047-EI</td>
<td>Duke Energy Florida, LLC. (Florida PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180046-EI</td>
<td>Florida Power &amp; Light Company (Florida PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180048-EI</td>
<td>Florida Public Utilities Company – Electric (Florida PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180052-GU</td>
<td>Florida Public Utilities Company – Indiantown (Florida PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180054-GU</td>
<td>Florida Division of Chesapeake Utilities Corporation (Florida PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180051-GU</td>
<td>Florida Public Utilities Company – Gas Division (Florida PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20180053-GU</td>
<td>Florida Public Utilities Company - Fort Meade (Florida PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause No. 45032 S4</td>
<td>Indiana American Water Company, Inc. Phase 2 (Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. D2018.1.6</td>
<td>Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. (Montana PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. D2018.4.24</td>
<td>NorthWestern Energy (Montana PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. D2018.4.22</td>
<td>Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. (Montana PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-0573-W-42T &amp; 18-0576-S-42T</td>
<td>West Virginia-American Water Company (West Virginia PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-0646-E-42T &amp; 18-0645 E-D</td>
<td>Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company (West Virginia PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause No. 45142</td>
<td>Indiana-American Water Company, Inc. (Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-18-043</td>
<td>Cook Inlet Natural Gas Storage Alaska, LLC (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-03214-17-0305</td>
<td>Citizens Telecommunications Company of The White Mountains, Inc. d/b/a Frontier Communications of The White Mountains (Arizona CC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. D2018.9.60</td>
<td>Montana-Dakota Utilities Co. (Montana PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. 4890</td>
<td>Narragansett Bay Commission (Rhode Island PUC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUR-2018-00131</td>
<td>Columbia Gas of Virginia (Virginia SCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL18-152-000</td>
<td>Louisiana PSC v. System Energy Resources, Inc. and Entergy Services, Inc. (FERC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUR-2018-00175</td>
<td>Virginia-American Water Company (Virginia SCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. D2018.2.12</td>
<td>NorthWestern Energy (Montana PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docket No. 42310</td>
<td>Georgia Power Company – Integrated Resource Plan (Georgia PSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-18-102</td>
<td>Municipality of Anchorage d/b/a Municipal Light &amp; Power Department (Regulatory Commission of Alaska)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUC Docket No. 49494  AEP Texas, Inc. (Texas PUC)
Application 18-12-009 Pacific Gas and Electric Company (California PUC)
19-0316-G-42T Mountaineer Gas Company (West Virginia PSC)
19-0051-EL-RDR Management/Performance and Financial Audit of the Alternative Energy
Recovery Rider of Duke Energy Ohio, Inc. (Ohio PUC)
ER-18-1182-001 System Energy Resources, Inc. (FERC)
E-01933A-19-0028 Tuscon Electric Power Company (Arizona CC)
G-01551A-19-0055 Southwest Gas Corporation (Arizona CC)
Docket No. 4975 Block Island Utility District d/b/a Block Island Power Company (Rhode Island PUC)
Docket No. 4994 Providence Water Supply Board (Rhode Island PUC)
19-0791-GA-ALT Plant in Service and Capital Spending Prudence Audit of Duke Energy Ohio (Ohio PUC)
20200070-EI Gulf Power Company (Florida PSC)
20200071-EI Florida Power & Light Company (Florida PSC)

* Testimony filed, examination not completed
** Issues stipulated
*** Company withdrew case
˄ Testimony filed, case withdrawn after proposed decision issued
˄˄ Issues stipulated before testimony was filed
Northwestern Energy
Remaining Net Book Value: Potential Capital Expenditures for which NorthWestern is Likely to Seek Future Cost Recovery
For NorthWestern's Acquired Share of Colstrip Unit 4 (92.5 MW)
As of Each Date Listed Below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Date: As of December 31,</th>
<th>Company Projected Plant (A)</th>
<th>Company Projected Accumulated Depreciation (B)</th>
<th>Net Plant, i.e., Potential Capital Expenditures for which NorthWestern is Likely to Seek Future Cost Recovery Amount (C)</th>
<th>Net Plant, i.e., Potential Capital Expenditures for which NorthWestern is Likely to Seek Future Cost Recovery Amount, Five-Year; Ten-Year and 2042 (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END CONFIDENTIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes and Source:
Northwestern's CORRECTED Exhibit ADD-5 92.5MW
## NorthWestern Energy
Revenue Requirement Analysis

### For NorthWestern's Acquired Share of Colstrip Unit 4 (92.5 MW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes and Source:
NorthWestern's CORRECTED Exhibit ADD-5 92.5MW
### Revenue Requirement Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
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</table>
NorthWestern Energy

Recalculations of NorthWestern's Revenue Requirements with Incremental Plant Additions Depreciated Through December 31, 2030

For NorthWestern's Acquired Share of Colstrip Unit 4 (92.5 MW)

## Revenue Requirement Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2028 Year-End</th>
<th>3-Mo Avg</th>
<th>2029 Year-End</th>
<th>3-Mo Avg</th>
<th>2030 Year-End</th>
<th>3-Mo Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NorthWestern's CORRECTED Exhibit ADD-5 92.5 MW
FERC FINANCIAL REPORT

These reports are mandatory under the Federal Power Act, Sections 3, 4(a), 304 and 309, and 18 CFR 141.1 and 141.400. Failure to report may result in criminal fines, civil penalties and other sanctions as provided by law. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission does not consider these reports to be of confidential nature.

Exact Legal Name of Respondent (Company)  
NorthWestern Corporation

Year/Period of Report  
End of  
2019/Q4
Information relating to our ownership interest in these facilities is as follows (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Facility</th>
<th>Ownership Percentage</th>
<th>Plant in Service (in $)</th>
<th>Accumulated Depreciation (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big Stone (SD)</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>$155,662</td>
<td>44,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal #4 (IA)</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>$62,565</td>
<td>35,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote (ND)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>$52,448</td>
<td>41,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colstrip Unit 4 (MT)</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>$311,399</td>
<td>98,415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December 31, 2019
Ownership percentages 23.4% 8.7% 10.0% 30.0%
Plant in service $155,662 $62,565 $52,448 $311,399
Accumulated depreciation 44,695 35,823 41,765 98,415

December 31, 2018
Ownership percentages 23.4% 8.7% 10.0% 30.0%
Plant in service $155,359 $60,758 $50,325 $309,163
Accumulated depreciation 45,894 34,394 41,379 89,734

(7) Asset Retirement Obligations

We are obligated to dispose of certain long-lived assets upon their abandonment. We recognize a liability for the legal obligation to perform an asset retirement activity in which the timing and/or method of settlement are conditional on a future event. We measure the liability at fair value when incurred and capitalize a corresponding amount as part of the book value of the related assets, which increases our utility plant and asset retirement obligations (ARO). The increase in the capitalized cost is included in determining depreciation expense over the estimated useful life of these assets. Since the fair value of the ARO is determined using a present value approach, accretion of the liability due to the passage of time is recognized each period and recorded as a regulatory asset until the settlement of the liability. Revisions to estimated AROs can result from changes in retirement cost estimates, revisions to estimated inflation rates, and changes in the estimated timing of abandonment. If the obligation is settled for an amount other than the carrying amount of the liability, we will recognize a gain or loss on settlement.

Our AROs relate to the reclamation and removal costs at our jointly-owned coal-fired generation facilities, U.S. Department of Transportation requirements to cut, purge and cap retired natural gas pipeline segments, our obligation to plug and abandon oil and gas wells at the end of their life, and to remove all above-ground wind power facilities and restore the soil surface at the end of their life. The following table presents the change in our gross conditional ARO (in thousands):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liability at January 1,</td>
<td>$40,659</td>
<td>$39,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accretion expense</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>2,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities incurred</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities settled</td>
<td>(46)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisions to cash flows</td>
<td>(215)</td>
<td>(1,368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability at December 31,</td>
<td>$42,449</td>
<td>$40,659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, we have identified removal liabilities related to our electric and natural gas transmission and distribution assets that have been installed on easements over property not owned by us. The easements are generally perpetual and only require remediation...
action upon abandonment or cessation of use of the property for the specified purpose. The ARO liability is not estimable for such
easements as we intend to utilize these properties indefinitely. In the event we decide to abandon or cease the use of a particular
easement, an ARO liability would be recorded at that time. We also identified AROs associated with our hydroelectric generating
facilities; however, due to the indeterminate removal date, the fair value of the associated liabilities currently cannot be estimated and
no amounts are recognized in the Financial Statements.

We collect removal costs in rates for certain transmission and distribution assets that do not have associated AROs. Generally, the
accrual of future non-ARO removal obligations is not required; however, long-standing ratemaking practices approved by applicable
state and federal regulatory commissions have allowed provisions for such costs in historical depreciation rates.

(8) Utility Plant Adjustments

We completed our annual utility plant adjustments impairment test as of April 1, 2019 and no impairment was identified. We
calculate the fair value of our reporting units by considering various factors, including valuation studies based primarily on a
discounted cash flow analysis, with published industry valuations and market data as supporting information. Key assumptions in the
determination of fair value include the use of an appropriate discount rate and estimated future cash flows. In estimating cash flows, we
incorporate expected long-term growth rates in our service territory, regulatory stability, and commodity prices (where appropriate), as
well as other factors that affect our revenue, expense and capital expenditure projections.

(9) Risk Management and Hedging Activities

Nature of Our Business and Associated Risks

We are exposed to certain risks related to the ongoing operations of our business, including the impact of market fluctuations in
the price of electricity and natural gas commodities and changes in interest rates. We rely on market purchases to fulfill a portion of
our electric and natural gas supply requirements. Several factors influence price levels and volatility. These factors include, but are not
limited to, seasonal changes in demand, weather conditions, available generating assets within regions, transportation availability and
reliability within and between regions, fuel availability, market liquidity, and the nature and extent of current and potential federal and
state regulations.

Objectives and Strategies for Using Derivatives

To manage our exposure to fluctuations in commodity prices we routinely enter into derivative contracts. These types of contracts
are included in our electric and natural gas supply portfolios and are used to manage price volatility risk by taking advantage of
fluctuations in market prices. While individual contracts may be above or below market value, the overall portfolio approach is
intended to provide greater price stability for consumers. We do not maintain a trading portfolio, and our derivative transactions are
only used for risk management purposes consistent with regulatory guidelines.

In addition, we may use interest rate swaps to manage our interest rate exposures associated with new debt issuances or to manage
our exposure to fluctuations in interest rates on variable rate debt.
Reference Line 17 of page 403.1 of NorthWestern Energy’s FERC Form 1 submission for the year ending December 31, 2017. Please explain what the Total Cost figure for Northwestern Energy’s share of Colstrip Unit 4 of $104,850,591 represents and why that differs from the Plant in Service figure for the unit.

RESPONSE:

The Total Cost of Colstrip Unit 4 as reported on line 17 of page 403.1 of the FERC Form 1 represents the cost of plant used in generation of electricity at this facility as well as the associated asset retirement obligation (“ARO”) balance. This figure differs from the Plant in Service reported in FERC Form 1 as it excludes Construction Work in Process and Plant Acquisition Adjustments and includes the ARO balance. See the following reconciliation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Colstrip Unit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plant in service FERC Form 1, Page 123.12</td>
<td>$ 307,711,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plus:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Retirement Costs</td>
<td>12,880,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Less:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Acquisition Adjustment</td>
<td>204,754,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Work in Process</td>
<td>10,987,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cost FERC Form 1, Page 403.1, Line 17</strong></td>
<td>$ 104,850,591</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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I. INTRODUCTION

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR FULL NAME, ADDRESS, AND OCCUPATION.

A. My name is David E. Dismukes. My business address is 5800 One Perkins Place, Suite 5-F, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 70808. I am a Consulting Economist with the Acadian Consulting Group (“ACG”), a research and consulting firm that specializes in the analysis of regulatory, economic, financial, accounting, statistical, and public policy issues associated with regulated and energy industries. ACG is a Louisiana-registered partnership, formed in 1995, and located in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Q. DO YOU HOLD ANY ACADEMIC POSITIONS?

A. Yes. I am a full Professor, Executive Director, and Director of Policy Analysis at the Center for Energy Studies, Louisiana State University (“LSU”). I am also a full Professor in the Department of Environmental Sciences and Director of the Coastal Marine Institute in the College of the Coast and Environment at LSU and a full member of the graduate research faculty at LSU. In addition to my appointment at LSU, I also serve as a Senior Fellow at the Institute of Public Utilities at the Michigan State University where I teach energy regulatory staff and other utility stakeholders about principles, trends, and issues in the electric and natural gas industries. Appendix A provides my academic vitae, which includes a full listing of my publications, presentations, pre-filed expert witness testimony, expert reports, expert legislative testimony, and affidavits.
Q. FOR WHOM ARE YOU APPEARING AND WHAT IS THE SCOPE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A. I have been retained by the Montana Consumer Counsel (“MCC”) to provide an expert opinion regarding (1) the acquisition of an additional 92.5 megawatt (“MW”) ownership share of Colstrip Unit 4 (“CU4”) by NorthWestern Energy (“NorthWestern” or the “Company”) from Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (“Puget” or “PSE”) and (2) the proposed Purchase Power Agreement (“PPA”) between NorthWestern and Puget. My testimony will address the proposed acquisition and its purported benefits.

Q. HOW IS THE REMAINDER OF YOUR TESTIMONY ORGANIZED?

A. My testimony is organized into the following sections:

• Section II: Summary of Recommendations
• Section III: Overview of the Company’s Proposal
• Section IV: Nature of Company’s Request
• Section V: Proposed Reserve Fund
• Section VI: Market Test Deficiencies
• Section VII: Evaluation of Benefits
• Section VIII: Increased Ratepayer Cost Exposure
• Section IX: Conclusions and Recommendations
II. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Q. WHAT ARE YOUR PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS?

A. I recommend the Commission reject the Company’s CU4 acquisition preapproval request since NorthWestern has neither shown that the proposed acquisition is in the public interest nor that the Company’s proposal would result in rates that are reasonable and just. The Company has not shown that the proposed acquisition is both needed and the least cost resource available in the market. The Company has not compared this proposed resource to the results of a competitive bidding process. The purported benefits of the acquisition proposal are tied to a set of highly speculative claims that, in turn, are tied to unreasonable assumptions about CU4’s operating costs and the outlook for regional power markets. The Company’s supporting analyses do not include the costs of any capital additions for which the Company is likely to seek recovery from Montana ratepayers, thereby understating the capacity acquisition costs. Further, close to half of the proposed capacity acquisition is tied to a PPA with PSE. The Company’s request simply asks Montana ratepayers to provide a regulatory backstop for additional CU4 capacity that, in turn, will be marketed to Washington electricity customers. For these reasons, the Commission should reject this proposal.

Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE COMPANY’S RESERVE FUND?

A. Whether or not the Commission authorizes the proposed capacity acquisition, I recommend that the Commission reject the proposed reserve fund. The Fund is a ratemaking measure that should not be part of the current preapproval investigation as it is not even related to the proposed acquisition in CU4. The Commission, to date, has
not determined whether or to what extent Montana ratepayers should be responsible for
the Company’s environmental remediation and plant decommissioning costs for CU4.
There has been no Commission determination regarding the prudency of these costs’
incurrence. In addition, a significant portion of those costs were incurred during the
period between 1986 and 2008, when NorthWestern’s share of Colstrip Unit 4 was not
devoted to public service. Lastly, specific year-to-year financing of the proposed Fund
is left undefined, while additionally presuming prematurely that the liabilities the Fund
is designed to address are actually costs for which ratepayers are responsible.

Q. **DO YOU HAVE ANY ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS?**

A Yes. If the Commission chooses to approve the capacity acquisition, I offer the
following alternative recommendations to bring the proposal more closely into line
with the public interest:

- The 92.5 MW capacity acquisition should be approved for a five-year period only.
  
  The Company, if it seeks longer term recovery, should (1) request and be required
to justify cost recovery at a later date towards the close of the PPA with PSE and
(2) should subject the resource to the results of a competitive bidding process to
definitively show that the capacity acquisition proposed in this proceeding is the
least cost resource available in the market.

- No capital additions should be allowed into rates during the initial five-year period
  as the Company has not quantified the cost impacts of these capital additions as
  part of its presentation in support of authorization for its proposed acquisition.¹ The

¹ See Company Response to Data Request MCC-007.
Company’s allowed revenue requirement should be fixed at $4.4 million (derived as shown on page 1 of Exhibit DED-3) under the proposed 92.5 MW acquisition.

• The Commission should reject the Company’s Reserve Fund proposal in all respects.

• The Commission should require the Company to provide a minimum financial credit to ratepayers that is equal to 50 percent of the market sales, avoided purchases, and PPA revenues estimated in its application. This results in a credit of approximately $4.5 million, derived as shown on page 3 of Exhibit DED-3. When combined with the Company’s proposed first-year revenue requirement of approximately $4.4 million, this results in a minimum annual benefit to ratepayers of $140,440.

III. OVERVIEW OF THE COMPANY’S PROPOSAL

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE COMPANY’S APPLICATION.

A. The Company has filed an original and two supplemental applications in this proceeding. The Company’s original application, filed on February 5, 2020, requested approval to acquire a 185 MW ownership share in CU4 from PSE for $1.00. The original application also included a proposal to sell rights associated with a 90 MW share of the proposed acquisition under a PPA to PSE for a five-year period. The remaining 95 MW share of the proposed acquisition was to be used to serve native load

2 Note that acquisition of an additional 185 MW ownership share in CU4 is equal to acquisition of an additional 25 percent ownership stake in the facility. For convenience purpose the Company often refers to this proposed acquisition of additional ownership interest in CU4 interchangeable in terms of percentages and the associated capacity interest in the facility.

3 Company’s Application, filed February 5, 2020, p.1

4 Id.
and to make opportunity sales to the wholesale market.\textsuperscript{5} The Company’s original application proposed that the test year revenue requirements not include the portion of the resource used for the Puget PPA and also not include savings generated through avoided market purchases on behalf of its native load customers.\textsuperscript{6} However, the Company proposes to place additional purchased power savings and PPA margin revenue in a “Reserve Fund” to address expenditures and costs associated with the Company’s existing ownership stake in CU4 related to environmental compliance, remediation, decommissioning, and post-closure costs.\textsuperscript{7}

Q. DID THE COMPANY SUPPLEMENT ITS ORIGINAL CU4 ACQUISITION REQUEST?

A. Yes. On April 24, 2020, the Company amended its acquisition request from the original 185 MW request to reflect the announced exercise by Talen Montana, LLC, of its right of first refusal to acquire a portion of the ownership share in CU4 offered by Puget. As a result of Talen’s exercise of its right of first refusal, NorthWestern amended its application to request alternative approval in the event of Talen’s acquisition to acquire an ownership share in CU4 from PSE equal to at least 92.5 MW for $0.50.\textsuperscript{8} The April 24 supplemental filing also proposed under those circumstances to sell rights associated with a portion equal to 45 MW of this acquired ownership back to PSE under a five-year PPA, while using the remaining 47.5 MW share to “directly serve customers.”\textsuperscript{9} The supplemental application is consistent with the original application with the

\textsuperscript{5} Id.
\textsuperscript{6} Id.
\textsuperscript{7} Id.
\textsuperscript{8} Company’s Supplemental Application, filed April 24, 2020, p. 1.
\textsuperscript{9} Id.
exception that the supplemental request contains an alternative that is reduced by half of the amounts identified in the original application. Exhibit DED-1 provides a comparison of the original and April 24 supplemental application filings by the Company.

Q. **WHY DID THE COMPANY FILE THE APRIL 24 SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION?**

A. Various shares of the Colstrip Plant are owned by five companies including NorthWestern, Puget Sound Energy (“PSE”), Portland General Electric Company (“PGE”), the Washington Water Power Company (“Avista”), and Pacific Power & Light Company (“PacifiCorp”) through an Ownership and Operation Agreement (“O&O Agreement”). Talen Montana, LLC (“Talen”) owns a 30 percent share of CU3, and holds a right of first refusal to acquire an interest in CU4 should it become available. Likewise, the O&O Agreement requires PSE to offer the other co-owners, including Talen, the opportunity to purchase a proportionate interest in its 25 percent share of CU4. At the time of the Company’s original application, NorthWestern was the only party that expressed a public interest in the PSE CU4 capacity share. However, before the April 9th acceptance deadline, Talen exercised its right of first refusal under the O&O Agreement to acquire part of the PSE capacity. NorthWestern’s April 24 supplement advised the Commission that the 185 MW of Puget’s capacity interest in CU4 may then be split equally between NorthWestern and Talen for an acquisition.

---

10 Company’s Application, filed February 5, 2020, at p. 5.
12 Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 28:7-10.
price of fifty cents each.\textsuperscript{13} The Company’s April 24 supplement also stated that if Talen
failed to consummate the purchase, NorthWestern would continue to request that the
Commission approve its original request to purchase the full 185 MW.\textsuperscript{14}

**Q. HAS THE COMPANY SUBMITTED A SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL FILING TO THE COMMISSION REGARDING THIS PROPOSED ACQUISITION?**

**A** Yes. On August 19, 2020, the Company filed a second supplement to its original filing.\textsuperscript{15} This supplement was provided to acknowledge formally that Talen exercised its right of first refusal under the O&O Agreement to acquire half of the PSE capacity. The Company’s second supplement includes Amendment No. 1 to the Purchase and Sale Agreement ("PSA") between PSE and the Company.\textsuperscript{16} That Amendment No. 1 includes an Amended Exhibit F, a Vote Sharing Agreement among NorthWestern, PSE and Talen as Colstrip owners, which was reported to have been a sticking point in negotiations leading up to the PSA.\textsuperscript{17} Finally, the Company’s second supplement also introduced the Colstrip Unit 4 Purchase and Sale Agreement between PSE and Talen.

**Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE PROPOSED PPA BETWEEN PSE AND THE COMPANY.**

**A.** The Company proposes to sell 48.6 percent of its planned acquisition to PSE over a five-year period. This amounts to 45 MW under the Company’s supplemental application. The Company will not be obligated to sell any power to PSE under the PPA if CU4 is not operational, regardless of reason. PSE, however, will continue to

\textsuperscript{13} Id. at 26:14-20.

\textsuperscript{14} Id. at 28:7-16.

\textsuperscript{15} Company’s Second Supplemental Application, filed August 19, 2020, at p. 1.

\textsuperscript{16} Second Supplemental Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 2:20.

\textsuperscript{17} Company’s Response to Data Request MEIC-015, attachment “Operations July 2020.pdf,” at 5.
make monthly “base” payments that cover its share of the CU4 fixed costs. The Company proposes that the portion of CU4 capacity that is used to support the PPA not be part of its calculated revenue requirement under its PCCAM. NorthWestern has instead proposed accounting adjustments that would remove from rates the five-year PPA transaction. The Company forecasts $54.0 million in total sales revenues over the five-year term of the 45 MW PPA with PSE. The PPA allows the Company to deliver energy to PSE at either Colstrip or at the Mid-Columbia (“Mid-C”) trading hub at the same sales price. Lastly, the PPA contains an hourly floor on the sales price that Puget will pay based on variable costs incurred when CU4 is operating at its minimum level.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COMPANY’S PROPOSED RESERVE FUND.

A. The Company proposes to establish a Reserve Fund against which it proposes to charge unquantified future environmental compliance, remediation, decommissioning, and post-closure costs associated with its existing ownership stake in CU4. The Company proposes that the Reserve Fund would be funded by (1) 90 percent of the savings from the PCCAM regardless of source and (2) the net revenue from the PPA with PSE. The Company proposes to capture what it calls a “regulatory asset,” consisting of O&M expenses for compliance with the 2012 Administrative Order on Consent and coal combustion ash residuals regulations as well as future decommissioning and post-

---

18 Company’s Response to Data Request MCC-078.
19 Corrected Direct Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 11:8.
20 Id., Corrected Exhibit KJM-3.
21 Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 14:4-6.
22 Corrected Direct Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 11:12-14.
closure costs as those costs may be incurred. Costs “captured” in this regulatory asset are those in excess of environmental compliance and remediation costs included in the Company’s recent rate case. During the term of the PPA, NorthWestern proposes to “capture” these costs “as incurred” and charge the costs accumulated in the “regulatory asset” against the Reserve Fund and reimburse itself. Following expiration of the PPA, on an annual basis, the Company says that it will submit a compliance filing requesting to charge any costs in the regulatory asset against the Reserve Fund.

IV. NATURE OF THE COMPANY’S REQUEST

Q. IS THE APPROVAL PERIOD ASSOCIATED WITH THE COMPANY’S PROPOSED CAPACITY ACQUISITION CLEAR?

A. No. The Company’s filings obfuscate the full scope of its request in this proceeding. Much of the discussion and the overwhelming part of the analysis supporting the Company’s various filings concentrate on a five-year period since this is the period coincident with the PSE PPA. However, unless the Commission explicitly specifies a five-year period for cost recovery approval in this proceeding, NorthWestern may be expected to argue that Commission approval of the CU4 capacity acquisition request implies approval of recovery of all costs for the duration of the resource’s useful life and any remaining undepreciated capital expenditures, not limited to the five-year term of the Puget PPA. Thus, while the Company’s analytical support for this capacity...

24 Id. at 6:11-18.
25 Id. at 6:14-17.
26 Id. at 6:20-23.
27 Id. at 6:20-7:3.
28 Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 5:1-5.
acquisition request is focused on near-term outcomes (i.e., avoided market purchases, market sales, PPA sales revenues), the Commission’s approval will likely be argued to provide for cost recovery over a longer and indeterminate period, unless the Commission restricts its approval. Over time, the Company’s own workpapers show that CU4 will become more expensive to operate and require additional capital investment.\footnote{Corrected Direct Testimony of Andrew D. Durkin, Corrected Exhibit ADD-5.} Likewise, over time, regional wholesale power markets may become more competitive and diverse, which will result in greater pricing stability and lower overall prices. Thus, any arguable customer benefits from this CU4 capacity addition diminish rapidly after the five-year term of the Puget PPA.

Q. WILL THIS ACQUISITION CREATE LONG-TERM RATEPAYER FINANCIAL VALUE?

A. No. The Company estimates that the proposed acquisition will result in added long term costs when compared against the Company’s existing resource portfolio. Specifically, the Company estimates that the proposed 92.5 MW addition will result in more than $14 million in additional net costs to ratepayers over 20 years.\footnote{Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Bleau J. LaFave at 50:1-5.} The Company, however, dismisses these results as “unrealistic,” asserting that simply maintaining its current resource portfolio without any additional capacity assets is not
This argument represents a false dichotomy. It is unsupported by any analysis of market alternatives, and the empirical analyses underlying the Company’s application demonstrate that the capacity resource acquisition it proposes in this case will impose higher costs on ratepayers than the status quo.

Q. IS IT REASONABLE FOR THE COMMISSION SIMPLY TO ASSUME THAT THE COMPANY HAS PROPOSED A SHORT-TERM CAPACITY ACQUISITION BECAUSE THE COMPANY’S SUPPORT FOR ITS APPLICATION IS LIMITED TO THE NEAR TERM?

A. No. Unless the Commission specifically limits any authorization, it might be inclined to grant, the Company will likely argue that any authorization for the proposed acquisition should be viewed as a life-of-asset authorization. So viewed, the Company’s application should be rejected because the longer run benefits of this proposal do not exceed its costs. The Company’s application and supplements, however, place considerable emphasis on near term benefits. As I will show later in my testimony, even the short-term benefits promoted by the Company are at best ephemeral, to the extent that they exist at all. Over the long run, the additional CU4 capacity will not generate benefits that exceed its costs. Once the PSE PPA expires, that fixed cost support for the Company’s proposed CU4 acquisition will disappear. Unless the Commission specifically limits its authorization to the five-year term of the PSE PPA, the Company may be expected to argue that the replacement for the cost

---

31 Id., at 50:3-5.
support provided by the PSE PPA will have to come from Montana retail electricity

customers.

Q. HAS THE COMPANY EXAMINED THE SHORT-TERM CAPITAL
EXPENDITURES THAT MAY NEED TO BE MADE FOR THIS ADDITIONAL
CU4 CAPACITY?

A. Yes, and I have provided a summary of that analysis in Confidential Exhibit DED-2. Page 1 of this exhibit charts historic and projected capital additions at both CU3 and CU4. Both units have historically seen annual average capital expenditures of close to $24 million per year. 

CONFIDENTIAL# The Company’s current five-year PPA calculations, however, have not included any of these capital expenditures as a cost that will have to be incurred by ratepayers in the near term (prior to 2025). Page 2 of Exhibit DED-2 estimates the revenue requirements for these capital investments, while page 3 of Exhibit DED-2 presents the effects of the proposed growth of plant in service on the total annual revenue requirement associated with the acquisition. The analysis indicates that the Company will seek to require Montana ratepayers to cover additional costs through an increase in the revenue requirement needed to support these incremental capital expenditures.

---

32 Corrected Direct Testimony of Michael J. Barnes, Exhibit MJB-12.
33 See, Company’s Updated Response to Data Request MEIC-079.
Q. DOES THE PSE PPA MAKE THE ECONOMICS OF THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION APPEAR MORE FAVORABLE THAN THEY ACTUALLY ARE OVER A LONGER TERM?

A. Yes. The PSE PPA underscores another problem with the proposed resource acquisition: the Company claims it needs peaking resources, which are generally not the baseload, coal-fired steam generation that is CU4. Steam turbine generation resources of this type are designed to run all the time, not part of the time like a natural gas combustion turbine. The proposed capacity addition will leave a considerable amount of underutilized generation to sell as energy in the market at times when it is unneeded for native load. Indeed, a simple comparison of the Company’s estimated benefits from market sales relative to estimated benefits from reduced market purchases show that upwards of more than 89 percent of total generation revenue from the facility will not be used to serve retail customers. The Company needs this PPA, therefore, to justify the acquisition in the near term. As I will explain in Section VI of this testimony, without the fixed cost contribution being made by PSE under the PPA, the CU4 capacity would be uneconomic over any forecast horizon.

34 Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 19.
Q. DOES THE ACQUISITION PROPOSED BY THE COMPANY IMPOSE

SUBSTANTIAL RISKS ON MONTANA RATEPAYERS?

A. Yes. The Company’s capacity acquisition proposal rests on several speculative benefits that include (1) market sales, (2) avoided wholesale purchases, and (3) PPA revenues. Each of these claimed benefits is a function of (a) the Company’s operational efforts and (b) the market. Commission approval of the Company’s acquisition of 92.5 MW of CU4 capacity from Puget as proposed by NorthWestern would impose substantial performance and market risk on Montana ratepayers. For example, if the Company’s (or Talen’s) operation of CU4 is less efficient than NorthWestern has projected in this proceeding, under NorthWestern’s proposal, Montana ratepayers would bear the costs of those less efficient operations. As I will show later in my testimony, CU4, while relatively efficient compared to other similar units in the Western Interconnect, is still not as competitive with the market as it has been in years past, and is likely to become even less competitive over time given recent variable cost trends. Further, Western wholesale power markets are becoming more efficient and more integrated, increasing the dispatch of more thermal efficient renewable and natural gas generation. These trends will make it increasingly difficult for steam generators like CU4 to remain economically competitive.

Q. **IS TALEN TAKING A RISK IN ACQUIRING ITS OWNERSHIP SHARE OF THIS CU4 CAPACITY?**

A. Yes. However, Talen is an unregulated merchant power supplier not a regulated utility. Talen’s ownership share is not being supported by captive retail ratepayers and the risk of acquiring this ownership share rests with Talen and its shareholders.

Q. **IS THERE ANY WAY TO MITIGATE THIS RATEPAYER RISK?**

A. Yes, this risk can be allocated to the party which can best avoid or diversify away from it, and that is the Company. My primary recommendation is that the Commission should reject the Company’s acquisition proposal. However, if the Commission nonetheless authorizes NorthWestern to proceed with the acquisition, it should require the Company to provide a minimum annual credit to ratepayers for the purported benefits included in this proposal. A 50 percent credit related to market sales, avoided market purchases and PPA revenues included in this application would amount to approximately $4.7 million annually. This credit must be passed directly to ratepayers, not siphoned off to a Reserve Fund.

Q. **HAVE YOU PREPARED AN ESTIMATE FOR THIS RECOMMENDED ANNUAL RATEPAYER CREDIT?**

A. Yes. Exhibit DED-3 presents my estimate of the minimum annual ratepayer credit that should be provided to ratepayers through the PCCAM. As shown by Exhibit DED-3, page 1, the Company estimates a first-year revenue requirement associated with the proposed acquisition to be approximately $4.4 million. On page 2, I estimate a minimum benefit to ratepayers equal to 50 percent of the Company’s estimated benefits arising from the proposed acquisition related to market sales, avoided market
purchases, and PPA revenues. Finally, page 3 combines the elements of page 1 and 2, along with the remainder of the Company’s estimated costs and benefits that will accrue to the PCCAM from the proposed acquisition. I estimate that the Company should flow a minimum annual credit through the PCCAM of $4.5 million. When this minimum annual credit is netted against the Company’s proposed first year revenue requirement of $4.4 million, this results in a benefit to ratepayers of $140,440.

V. PROPOSED RESERVE FUND

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COMPANY’S PROPOSED RESERVE FUND.

A. The proposed reserve fund is an entirely new ratemaking proposal that has been injected by the Company into this pre-approval request, even though the object of the fund is unrelated to the proposed acquisition. The Company requests that the Commission entirely re-purpose the benefits that its ratepayers currently receive from (a) wholesale market power sales and (b) avoided wholesale market purchases. In the future, the Company requests that these financial benefits, rather than being utilized as bill credits, be used to fund future environmental and decommissioning costs that are unknown, unquantifiable, and unrelated to this proposed acquisition. The Company’s proposal, in effect, requests the Commission set up a ratepayer-funded bank account, with a broad and open-ended purpose, that has no restrictions, and has no target fund balance.
Q. WHAT KIND OF COSTS DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE TO RECOVER FROM THIS RESERVE FUND?

A. The Company states that this fund will be applied to pay future environmental compliance, remediation, decommissioning costs, and other post-closure costs for its current interest in CU4. The Company offers up potential Colstrip coal ash disposal pond remediation costs as an example of the types of expenses that will be paid for with ratepayer proceeds into this fund.

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE SPECIFIC RATEPAYER FUNDS THAT WILL BE USED TO FINANCE THIS PROPOSED RESERVE FUND.

A. The Company proposes to utilize two revenue streams that would otherwise be passed along to ratepayers as credits or savings under the PCCAM as currently formulated. First, all net revenues, cost reductions, or financial gains associated with the Company’s proposed five-year PSE PPA will be deposited into the Reserve Fund. Second, the Company proposes to place 90 percent of all savings accrued through the Company’s PCCAM into the proposed reserve fund. Thus, all gains on wholesale sales or reduction in future power costs that arise from any Company generating resource, not just those related to CU4, will cease to be credited back to current period ratepayers, but will be put into this deferred account for future application to costs that the Commission has not yet determined to have been prudently incurred or to be properly recoverable from Montana retail electricity consumers.
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36 Corrected Direct Testimony of Crystal D. Lail at 4:6-9.
37 Corrected Direct Testimony of Michael J. Barnes at 8:6-16.
38 Corrected Direct Testimony of Crystal D. Lail at 4:13.
39 Id. at 4:10-13.
Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE SIZE OF THESE POTENTIAL PPA NET REVENUES.

A. The Company estimates that the proposed PPA with PSE will generate approximately $3.6 million in net revenues over five years. Likewise, the Company estimates that the proposed acquisition will reduce its annual power costs recovered from ratepayers through the PCCAM by $8.5 million. These PCCAM benefits exceed by $4.1 million the proposed PCCAM offset of $4.4 million proposed by the Company that as discussed earlier, are not “benefits” but amounts needed to cover the CU4 acquisition’s annual revenue requirement.

Q. CAN YOU SUMMARIZE YOUR CONCERNS WITH THE COMPANY’S RESERVE FUND PROPOSAL?

A. Yes. The Company’s Reserve Fund proposal suffers from several deficiencies, including:

1. The proposed Reserve Fund is a ratemaking proposal, unrelated to the proposed resource acquisition, and is not relevant to the issue of whether the proposed CU4 capacity acquisition is in the public interest.

2. The proposed Reserve Fund ignores substantial issues regarding the assignment of environmental remediation liability that the Commission has not considered, and that should not be considered in this proceeding.

3. The cost level associated with future environmental liabilities and decommissioning, or even the date these will occur, are not currently known.

---

40 Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich, Corrected Exhibit KJM-3.
41 Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 19.
(4) The method by which the proposed Reserve Fund will be financed shifts performance and market risk away from the Company and onto ratepayers.

Q. **WHY SHOULD THE PROPOSED RESERVE FUND NOT BE PART OF THE CURRENT PROCEEDING?**

A. The Company is seeking approval of the proposed acquisition of PSE’s existing share of CU4 pursuant to MCA § 69-8-421. From a policy perspective, this statute emphasizes determinations of the public interest. However, the proposed Reserve Fund is a ratemaking proposal not required for the Company to acquire the proposed additional interest in CU4. Furthermore, the purported need for the proposed Reserve Fund does not arise from the proposed acquisition, as it addresses existing Company decommissioning and remediation liability.

Q. **WHAT SUPPORT DOES THE COMPANY OFFER FOR THIS RESERVE FUND PROPOSAL?**

A. The Company attempts to tie this request to post-closure costs and the environmental liability associated with uncertain future coal ash remediation. However, the terms of the purchase with PSE state that it will retain responsibility for all post-closure costs and the environmental liability associated with the acquired interest in CU4. Instead, the Company states that the proposed acquisition and reserve fund will “provide[] a revenue stream to help fund environmental and decommissioning costs associated with NorthWestern’s existing 220 MW of CU4.”

---

42 NorthWestern Energy’s Application for Approval of Capacity Resource Acquisition at 3.
43 MCA § 69-8-421(6)(c)(i).
44 Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 12:4-9.
45 Id. at 21:6-11, emphasis added.
CU4, and its remediation liabilities, are unrelated to the proposed acquisition and any
determination of whether it is in the public interest.

**Q. LET’S TURN TO YOUR SECOND CONCERN. ARE THERE VALID POLICY**
**REASONS FOR THE COMMISSION TO DECLINE TO ADDRESS ISSUES**
**ASSOCIATED WITH THE REMEDIATION LIABILITY OF THE**
**COMPANY’S EXISTING OWNERSHIP SHARE OF CU4?**

**A. Yes. The Commission has not decided the degree, if any, to which the Company’s**
environmental remediation and decommissioning liabilities should ultimately be
allocated to retail customers. CU4 has changed hands several times in its 34-year
operational history. There has been no finding that these costs were prudently incurred.
Further, for a significant portion of this history, the facility was operated on a merchant
basis. From its commissioning in 1986 to January 1, 2009, Colstrip Unit 4 had “never
been devoted to public service.”\(^\text{46}\) The Commission’s determination as to whether
NorthWestern’s rates and charges are reasonable and just requires an evaluation of
these considerations on an appropriately developed evidentiary record. Importantly,
my testimony in this case does not offer any recommendations or findings by the
Commission concerning cost responsibility or any environmental remediation,
decommissioning or similar costs at this time. The issue is being raised simply to invite
the Commission’s attention to it as one that (1) has yet to be decided and (2) should be
decided as part of a general rate case, and on a fully developed evidentiary record. The

\(^{46}\) *In the Matter of an Application by NorthWestern Corporation for Approval of its Interest in Colstrip Unit 4 as an Electricity Supply Resource under Certain Terms and Conditions Including Certain Treatment of Net Operating Losses*, Docket No. D2008.6.69, Order No. 6925f at ¶ 247.
Company’s proposed Reserve Fund should not be used as a Trojan horse to shift total CU4 environmental responsibility to Montana ratepayers through this preapproval.

Q. LET’S TURN TO YOUR THIRD CONCERN. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE COMPANY ESTIMATED THE FUTURE DECOMMISSIONING COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH CU4.

A. The Company has reviewed publicly available decommissioning studies and concluded that decommissioning costs for coal facilities average $29,469 per MW of installed capacity.47 For CU4, combined with its sister Unit 3, this translates into an estimated decommissioning requirement of approximately $43.6 million, or $6.5 million for the Company’s ownership share. However, in this analysis the Company found that actual decommissioning costs can range from as low as $19,265 per MW to as much as $45,432 per MW.48 The Company’s estimates of future decommissioning requirements are nothing more than estimates, and actual requirements are not known at this time, with particular uncertainty associated with future expenses required to remediate Colstrip coal ash disposal ponds.

Q. WHY WOULD THE CREATION OF THE RESERVE FUND SHIFT REGULATORY RISK FROM THE COMPANY ONTO RATEPAYERS?

A. The creation of a Reserve Fund will simply function as a “catch all” account that will take an unknown amount of money away from ratepayers to pay for unknown costs that may or may not arise at an unknown future date. NorthWestern’s proposed Reserve Fund may serve to insulate the Company from a substantial portion of the risks

47 Corrected Direct Testimony of Michael J. Barnes, Exhibit MJB-9.
48 Id.
that are associated with these regulatory unknowns by transferring the risks associated
with their occurrence presumptively onto ratepayers.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROPOSED RESERVE FUND?

A. I recommend that the Commission reject the proposed reserve fund given the concerns
and deficiencies I discussed earlier. The Fund is a ratemaking measure that is not
necessary to approve to determine whether acquiring additional capacity at CU4 is in
the public interest. The Commission, to date, has not defined the environmental
liability for which Montana ratepayers should be responsible. The Fund is entirely
speculative in terms of the magnitude and nature of its future costs.

VI. MARKET TEST DEFICIENCIES

Q. DOES THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION ARISE FROM A COMPETITIVE
BIDDING PROCESS?

A. No. The Company has characterized its proposed acquisition as an “opportunity
resource”, exempted from the competitive solicitation requirements of Section 69-3-
1207, MCA.49 The proposed acquisition was not identified in the Company’s 2019
Resource Procurement Plan filed with the Commission in late August of last year.50 In
addition, the 2019 Plan discusses the intent to evaluate resources submitted in response
to the issuance of an initial competitive solicitation for up to 400 MW of long-term
capacity followed by additional solicitations.51

49 Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 6:11-14.
51 Id., at 1-13.
Q. **IS THE COMPANY IN THE PROCESS OF TESTING THE MARKET FOR COMPETITIVELY SOURCED RESOURCES?**

A. Yes. In December 2019, NorthWestern announced plans to issue a request for proposals (“RFP”) on January 31, 2020 for about 280 megawatts of dispatchable capacity resources starting in 2023. This RFP is based upon the Company’s 2019 Plan, which argues that the Company faces a “capacity deficit” of 645 MW relative to estimated levels of Company-owned generation that would be required to meet a one-day-in-ten-year resource adequacy standard relying exclusively on Company-owned generation. The RFP, however, noted that this capacity need (deficit) may be considerably lower, by about 170 MW, if the Company were to acquire a 185 MW unnamed “opportunity resource.”

Q. **WHAT WAS THE RFP TIMELINE FOR REVIEW?**

A. The RFP indicated a series of site walks, conference calls, and question submissions from potential bidders. Final proposals were due from bidders by May 8, 2020. The initial proposal reviews were scheduled to occur in the second and third quarters of 2020, with more detailed evaluations to be undertaken in the remainder of 2020:Q3 and continuing through 2020:Q4. Final resource/bid selection was scheduled for the first quarter of 2021.
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52 Company’s Response to Data Request MEIC-025, Attachment “MEIC 25 a 2020 Capacity RFP” at 3.
53 *Id.*
54 *Id.* at 4.
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Q. **WHY WAS THE PSE SHARE OF CU4 NOT INCLUDED OR COMPARED TO RESOURCES INCLUDED IN THE CURRENT COMPETITIVE SOLICITATION?**

A. The Company claims that the nature of the proposed acquisition makes it “nearly impossible” for it to have been included as part of a competitive solicitation. The Company, for instance, notes that the proposed PPA with PSE, the transmission component of the deal, and the proposed Reserve Fund are all critical components of the CU4 acquisition and are components that would have been difficult to include in a competitive bidding process.

Q. **DO YOU AGREE THAT CU4 IS NOT COMPARABLE WITH OTHER COMPETITIVE RESOURCES?**

A. No. The “unique components” the Company references should not preclude the proposed acquisition from inclusion in a competitive solicitation. For example, the proposed PSE PPA merely reduces the amount of generation capacity available to serve native load. Further, the Company would have to allocate transmission costs to the delivery of on-system generation and would have to charge itself for transmission for off-system sales. The Company has chosen to characterize the transmission component of this transaction as separate from the capacity acquisition, even though it will need the transmission component of this transaction in order to integrate its proposed capacity acquisition to serve load. Finally, the proposed Reserve Fund is not a necessary part of the proposed acquisition.

---

56 Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 6:12-14.
57 Id. at 6:14-18.
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Q. DOES THE FAILURE TO TEST THE MARKET UNDERMINE THE COMPANY’S ASSERTIONS ABOUT THE CU4 ACQUISITION?

A. Yes. The Company claims the proposed CU4 acquisition is the “least cost resource” at its disposal. This assertion cannot be evaluated by the Commission since no alternatives have been compared to the CU4 proposal.

Q. IS THERE A PRECEDENT FOR THE USE OF COMPETITIVE SOLICITATIONS IN MONTANA?

A. Yes. I have reviewed several Montana statutes on this subject. I am not offering a legal opinion on those statutes, but my reading of the plain intent of the statutes, from a policy analyst’s perspective, is that there is a strong preference toward the use of market tests to secure new generation resources. For instance, Section 69-8-421(6)(c)(ii), MCA requires that the Commission find that the proposed procurement of a capacity resource is “consistent with the objectives in” Sections 69-3-201 and 69-3-1201 through 69-3-1209. Section 69-3-1204, MCA, requires NorthWestern to perform the following analyses to support resource acquisitions:

(i) an evaluation of the full range of cost-effective means for the public utility to meet the service requirements of its Montana customers, including conservation or similar improvements in the efficiency by which services are used and including demand-side management programs in accordance with 69-3-1209;

(ii) an annual electric demand and energy forecast developed pursuant to commission rules that includes energy and demand forecasts for each year within the planning period and historical data, as required by commission rule;

(iii) an assessment of planning reserve margins and contingency plans for the acquisition of additional resources developed pursuant to commission rules;

(iv) an assessment of the need for additional resources and the utility’s plan for acquiring resources;

(v) the proposed process the utility intends to use to solicit bids for energy and capacity resources to be acquired through a competitive solicitation process in accordance with 69-3-1207; and

(vi) descriptions of at least two alternate scenarios that can be used to represent the costs and benefits from increasing amounts of renewable energy resources and demand-side management programs, based on rules developed by the commission.

These provisions strongly support the proposition that any previously deregulated utility seeking approval of an electric supply resource must have subjected the proposed resource to a competitive solicitation as required in Section 69-3-1207, MCA. Section 69-3-1207, MCA also reinforces this requirement, providing detailed descriptions of information a public utility must provide the Commission prior to conducting a competitive solicitation.

Q. ARE THERE OTHER PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE COMPANY’S FAILURE TO INCLUDE THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION IN ITS RECENTLY ISSUED RFP FOR DISPATCHABLE CAPACITY?

A. Yes. Several distortions in the current RFP process have potentially arisen in light of the Company’s failure to include the proposed acquisition within its recently issued RFP for dispatchable capacity. Rather than seek 450 MW of dispatchable capacity indicated by the Company’s 2019 Plan, the Company has limited its RFP to only 280 MW due to a then-unnamed opportunity purchase of 185 MW intended to refer to the current proposed acquisition. However, even if the Commission approves the current proposed acquisition, it should be recognized that the Company’s current proposed acquisition is limited to 92.5 MW, only 47.5 MW of which will be available to the Company to meet retail requirements for the first five years.
Q. HOW DOES THIS IMPACT THE COMPANY’S CURRENT RFP FOR
DISPATCHABLE CAPACITY?

A. Even if one were to accept the Company’s arguments about the extent of its capacity needs, the merits of meeting even part of that need with this acquisition, instead of the resources competing in the RFP, are not being adequately tested. This is solely because the Company failed to include the proposed acquisition in its RFP. This problem is entirely of the Company’s making as a result of its failure to follow established processes for securing additional generation capacity.

Q. SHOULD THE COMMISSION DEFER ANY DECISIONS ON THE ADDITION OF ANY NEW CAPACITY RESOURCES UNTIL THE COMPANY HAS THOROUGHLY TESTED THE MARKET?

A. Yes. The Commission should not approve the current CU4 capacity acquisition request since it does not comply with the spirit (and arguably not with the letter) of the state policy preference for competitive bidding when preapproval of resources is requested. The Company’s failure to seek competitive bids has also hampered the Commission’s ability to adequately review the claimed benefits of the proposed acquisition against market alternatives. This is especially true since the Company is actively reviewing competitive bids for dispatchable capacity, which it claims that the proposed capacity acquisition provides.
VII. EVALUATION OF BENEFITS

A. Claimed Market Price Volatility Avoidance Benefits

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS NORTHWESTERN’S CLAIMS CONCERNING VOLATILITY BENEFITS OF THE CU4 ACQUISITION.

A. The Company claims that one of the key parts of the proposed acquisition is its ability to decrease the Company’s “reliance upon an increasingly short capacity market.”

The Company claims that its current generation shortfall leaves it significantly exposed to volatile wholesale energy prices.

Q. IS THIS THE FIRST TIME THE COMPANY HAS EXPRESSED CONCERNS ABOUT ITS WHOLESALE ENERGY MARKET EXPOSURE?

A. No. The Company’s 2019 Plan discussed its supposedly heavy market exposure relative to other regional utilities. The 2019 Plan asserts that regional coal plant retirements are making the wholesale market less reliable and prices more volatile.

Q. HAS THE COMPANY PROVIDED ANY EXAMPLES OF THIS MARKET VOLATILITY?

A. Yes. The Company notes that in early March 2019, Mid-C peak power prices reached nearly $1,000 per MWh for the first time since 2000, with natural gas also reaching record high prices. In this filing, the Company provided a back-cast of its potential past PPA revenues that would have arisen during this market event had the PPA been in place at that time, and states that the proposed PSE PPA would have generated more

---

60 Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 4:3-5.
63 2019 Plan at 1-1.
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than $3.7 million in value over the period of March 3 and 4, 2019 alone had the contract been in place during this extreme super-spike in wholesale energy prices.

Q. ARE SUPER-SPIKES IN WHOLESALE ENERGY PRICES COMMON FOR THE MID-C HUB?

A. No. Page 1 of Exhibit DED-4 presents historic Mid-C prices for the period January 2018 through early September 2020. The exhibit shows that while wholesale energy prices do exhibit some volatility, the March 2019 event was a unique price spike relative to recent trends. The March 2019 event, for instance, represented a prominent deviation from other recent high price periods such as the summer of 2018 and the winter of 2019 when for short periods wholesale energy prices exceeded $200 per MWh.

Q. HAVE WHOLESALE ENERGY PRICES BECOME MORE STABLE OVER THE PAST YEAR?

A. Yes. Page 2 of Exhibit DED-4 presents Mid-C prices for the period May 2019 through July 2020. In this more recent period, prices have been much more stable, never exceeding $70 per MWh. Also noticeable in this chart is the fact that wholesale energy prices have been trending downwards throughout most of the year, falling from more than $50 per MWh in late October 2019 to a June 2020 low of less than $5 per MWh.

Q. WHAT CAUSED THE MARCH 2019 PRICE SPIKE?

A. There were several simultaneous factors that drove this event. One factor driving the wholesale price spike was weather. An Arctic blast blanketed the northern U.S.,

65 Corrected Direct Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 16:2-4.
pushing temperatures to monthly record lows during March 2019.\textsuperscript{66} Much of Montana 
experienced low temperatures between minus-20 to minus-40 degrees Fahrenheit, with 
wind-chills approaching minus 50 degrees.\textsuperscript{67} These abnormally low temperatures 
coincided with a regional natural gas system strained from an earlier rupture of a 
pipeline in British Columbia, and reduced availability of hydro, wind, and transmission 
assets for a variety of reasons.\textsuperscript{68} While the Company claims the super-spike pricing 
event was driven by “decreased market liquidity” it does acknowledge the role that 
these unique events played on regional energy markets.\textsuperscript{69}

Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE RECENT MID-C PRICING TRENDS.

A. Exhibit DED-4, page 3, presents daily on-peak Mid-C prices for the period July 1, 2020 
through September 4, 2020. During this period, the Mid-C Hub experienced two events 
periods of abnormally high on-peak prices. First, during August 14 to 19, and then a 
second spike in prices on September 2. Both of these events are tied to the recent 
wildfires in the Western US. However, during both events, Mid-C prices, while higher 
than prior month averages, were still contained to under $200 per MWh, and prices 
have since returned to prior trading ranges.

Q. HAVE YOU EXAMINED MID-C MARKET PRICES RELATIVE TO THE 
COST OF NATURAL GAS FIRED GENERATION?

A. Yes. Exhibit DED-5 presents the results of an analysis of the implied capacity premium 
present within the Mid-C wholesale market for the period March 2013-early September

\textsuperscript{66} Pricing Event of March 2019 – System Impact Assessment (August 20, 2019); WECC.
\textsuperscript{67} Livingston, Ian (March 4, 2019); "Historically cold March temperatures are freezing a large part of the 
Lower 48;" Washington Post.
\textsuperscript{68} Pricing Event of March 2019 – System Impact Assessment (August 20, 2019); WECC at pp. 6-10.
\textsuperscript{69} 2019 Plan at 1-1.
2020. This analysis examines the average daily Mid-C prices compared against the implied fuel costs of an average natural gas combined cycle generation unit. This analysis finds that, in general, there exists limited premium in the Mid-C market over variable fuel costs.

Q. WHAT DOES THIS ANALYSIS IMPLY?
A. The results shown on Exhibit DED-5 imply that, notwithstanding isolated peak events, the volatility expressed in Mid-C markets is generally manageable and not as extreme as suggested by the Company. The avoidance of this wholesale market pricing volatility, in and of itself, does not serve as justification for increasing the Company’s capacity position in CU4.

Q. HOW DO THESE GENERAL RESULTS COMPARE TO CU4’S PERFORMANCE AND POTENTIAL BENEFITS?
A. Exhibit DED-6 examines the reported 2019 operating statistics of CU4 against the average market clearing heat rate implied by Mid-C trading. This analysis finds that natural gas prices would have to increase to levels in excess of at least $2.38 per MMBtu to provide a benefit for additional CU4 capacity. Natural gas prices of this level were seen for a limited period during the 2019/2020 winter but have not been consistently reached since January 2015.

Q. HAVE YOU CONDUCTED ANY OTHER ANALYSIS OF CU4?
A. Yes. Exhibit DED-7 examines the potential margin benefits of CU4 during the years 2015 to 2019 (five years). This analysis compares Mid-C prices against reported CU4 variable operating costs by S&P Global to determine an extra margin created during this period. This margin is then compared to the facility’s annual fixed costs to
determine a margin net of fixed costs. Exhibit DED-7 shows that CU4 (the entire unit) generated approximately $9.4 million in annual average net margin for the years 2015 through 2019. Prorating this calculated margin net of fixed costs for NorthWestern’s proposed 92.5 MW ownership share acquisition to the 740 MW total capacity of CU4 translates to a historical average net annual margin of less than $1.2 million associated with the proposed acquisition of an additional 92.5 MW interest in CU4. This relatively small benefit does not offer any compelling support for the acquisition of additional CU4 capacity, particularly where potential alternatives to the proposed acquisition have not been examined.

Q. WHAT DOES YOUR REVIEW OF CU4’S HISTORICAL MARGINS NET OF FIXED COSTS LEAD YOU TO CONCLUDE ABOUT NORTHWESTERN’S PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF AN ADDITIONAL INTEREST IN CU4?

A. The historical margin net of fixed costs appears likely to diminish going forward. CU4 fixed costs are likely to increase above their historical levels during the 2015-2018 period for a variety of reasons. The causes of expected increases in CU4’s fixed costs include increasing challenges in maintaining compliance with EPA’s Mercury and Air Toxics Standard and other air quality standards, and upcoming major repairs to CU4. At the same time, as noted by Puget in its Application to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission for authorization to sell its share of CU4 to NorthWestern, market prices of power are declining in the Northwest as more gas-fired and renewable
generation enters the market.\textsuperscript{70} The combination of increased fixed costs and lower market prices strongly suggests diminishing future net margins. This, in turn, suggests that even the near-term projected benefits of the proposed acquisition (including the cost support furnished by the PSE PPA) are likely overstated.

B. Claimed Sales Revenue Benefits

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE COMPANY’S CLAIMED CU4 SALES AND PURCHASE BENEFITS.

A. The Company claims that the CU4 acquisition will facilitate a lower level of market purchases and a higher level of market sales.\textsuperscript{71} In total, the Company asserts that the proposed capacity acquisition, if approved, will reduce overall costs since net market sales revenues (which are credits to ratepayer bills) will increase and overall market purchases (which represent ratepayer cost) will go down.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COMPANY’S ESTIMATE OF ITS POTENTIAL NET MARKET SALES REVENUES.

A. Company witness Markovich estimates on-system market sales of 286,203 MWh.\textsuperscript{72} Company witness Markovich projects that the Company’s total revenues from these market sales would be approximately $7.8 million.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{70} In the Matter of the Application of Puget Sound Energy for an Order Authorizing the Sale of All of Puget Sound Energy’s Interest in Colstrip Unit 4 and Certain of Puget Sound Energy’s Interests in the Colstrip Transmission System; Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Docket No. UE-200115; Application at 11-12.

\textsuperscript{71} Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 20:1-3; and Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 18:19-21.

\textsuperscript{72} Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 19; Note, the Company’s estimates of PCCAM benefits and costs are exclusive of the proposed PPA portion of its proposed acquisition.

\textsuperscript{73} Id.
Q. WHAT ARE THE COMPANY’S PROJECTED TOTAL PCCAM BENEFITS?

A. Company witness Markovich predicts total PCCAM benefits of $8.5 million. However, as shown later, the Company’s estimate of total PCCAM benefits is likely overstated since the projection of variable costs utilized by the Company in its estimation is significantly lower than historic averages. Furthermore, the market prices utilized by the Company are inconsistent with current forward prices reported in the market.

Q. DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE TO CREDIT ITS PCCAM TO ACCOUNT FOR THE ANTICIPATED BENEFITS IT ESTIMATES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED ACQUISITION?

A. No. While the Company proposes to credit its PCCAM if the proposed acquisition is approved, the Company does not propose that this credit reflect the full amount of the benefits that the Company claims will flow from the proposed acquisition, but rather only an amount sufficient to offset the increase in revenue requirement associated with the proposed acquisition. Specifically, the Company proposes a PCCAM credit equal to $4.4 million which reflects the annual revenue requirement of the new acquisition.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE COMPANY’S PROJECTED VARIABLE COSTS COMPARE TO ITS HISTORIC TRENDS.

A. Exhibit DED-8 provides a chart that compares the Company’s historic variable operating costs relative to forecast costs included in the current application. The chart shows that the Company’s variable costs over the period 2014 through 2019 have been

74 Id.
75 Corrected Direct Testimony of John D. Hines at 19:17-20.
76 Corrected Direct Testimony of Andrew D. Durkin at 15:4-8.
increasing by as much as 3.5 percent on an annual average basis.  #BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL#

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN HOW THE COMPANY’S CURRENT MARKET PRICE OUTLOOK HAS CHANGED SINCE ITS ORIGINAL FILING.

A. The Company has used two different forward curves in estimating the benefits of its proposed CU4 acquisition. Its original application utilized a forward curve that examined the outlook of the market as of October 31, 2019.77 This forward curve was for energy delivered at the Mid-C hub. The Company updated this forward curve as of March 31, 2020, in its supplemental filing given the changed future market price outlook.78 The outlook for future power prices (at the Mid-C hub), however, has changed once again since the Company’s supplemental filing. Exhibit DED-9 compares the forward curves in each of the Company’s applications with the current outlook. Page 1 of this exhibit provides the changes between the Company’s (1) original application, (2) its supplemental application and (3) current forward on-peak prices reported as of September 4, 2020. Page 2 of the exhibit provides a comparable analysis for Mid-C off-peak prices.

---

77 Corrected Direct Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 14:1-2.
78 Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 19:8-9.
Q. HAS THE COMPANY IDENTIFIED ANY OTHER MARKET SALES BENEFITS FROM THE CU4 CAPACITY ACQUISITION PROPOSALS?

A. Yes. The Company notes there are also wholesale revenue benefits associated with the PSE PPA. The Company proposes to treat the PPA as a stand-alone transaction outside the PCCAM\textsuperscript{79} for which no revenue requirement will be presented until five years after the close of the transaction. The Company notes that PSE will pay both for electricity at market prices and will also make a mandatory contribution to fixed costs that includes fixed O&M costs, property taxes, and other regulatory assessments.\textsuperscript{80}

Q. HOW MUCH REVENUE DOES THE COMPANY ANTICIPATE COLLECTING UNDER THE PSE PPA OVER ITS FIVE-YEAR TERM?

A. The Company’s original application provides two sets of PPA revenues, one on a projected year basis\textsuperscript{81} and a second on a “back-cast” basis.\textsuperscript{82} The original proposed 90 MW PPA (as corrected on July 2, 2020) is estimated by the Company to produce a total of $7.2 million in “net value” (after costs and taxes) from the PPA over five years.\textsuperscript{83} The Company’s original filing also includes a five-year back-cast using prices from a single year (2019) when unusual price spikes occurred in the Mid-C market. Exhibits DED-10 and DED-11 provide summaries of these Company-estimated revenues and “net value” calculations. Exhibit DED-10 provides the estimates of the Company’s forward-looking analysis while Exhibit DED-11 presents the net value estimates from the Company’s “back-cast” analysis.

\textsuperscript{79} Corrected Direct Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich, at 11:8-10.
\textsuperscript{80} Id. at 12:3-8.
\textsuperscript{81} Corrected Exhibit KJM-1; Corrected Exhibit KJM-3.
\textsuperscript{82} Corrected Exhibit KJM-2; Corrected Exhibit KJM-4.
\textsuperscript{83} Corrected Exhibit KJM-1.
Q. DID THE COMPANY UPDATE THESE PPA NET VALUE ESTIMATES IN ITS SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATION?

A. Yes. The Company updated both the current anticipated net value (based on the lower capacity acquisition level of 92.5 MW) using updated forward prices, and also updated the back-cast using the same historic wholesale power prices, but using the new acquisition level. The Company now estimates a total net value of $3.6 million over five years using updated wholesale power prices. The revised back-cast analysis is estimated to have a net value of $13.5 million over five years.

Q. DO YOU AGREE WITH THE COMPANY’S METHODS FOR ESTIMATING THE NET VALUE OF THE PROPOSED PSE PPA?

A. No. The Company’s analysis suffers from several shortcomings all of which tend to overstate PSE PPA net benefits. First, the analysis covers several years and has been done on a nominal future dollar basis, rather than on a net present value (“NPV”) basis. Second, the Company uses constant variable costs in its PPA benefits analysis while allowing market prices to vary. Third, the Company’s back-cast analysis is done in a fashion entirely inconsistent with most common back-casting approaches. Fourth, wholesale power prices have changed since the Company’s supplemental filing, and those changes in market prices need to be incorporated into the analysis. I explain each of these flaws in the Company’s arguments, and the manner in which those flaws undercut the credibility of the Company’s arguments, below.

84 Corrected Exhibit KJM-3.
85 Corrected Exhibit KJM-4.
86 Corrected Exhibit KJM-3.
87 Corrected Exhibit KJM-4.
Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE PROBLEMS WITH THE COMPANY’S FAILURE TO CALCULATE THESE ESTIMATES ON AN NPV BASIS.

A. The Company’s analysis fails to consider the time value of money. A dollar in the future, for instance, is not worth as much as a dollar today, and most financial analyses, and other forms of valuation that span multiple years, tend to calculate dollars on an NPV rather than future dollar basis. The use of an NPV that discounts future dollars to a current value finds a “net value” of $3.1 million, approximately 13-14 percent lower than the estimate provided by the Company. This revised NPV calculation has been provided as a separate row in Exhibit DED-10 and Exhibit DED-11. The discount rate used in the calculation is the Company’s weighted average cost of capital (“WACC”). This represents the Company’s financing costs that are used for ratemaking purposes in the setting of ratepayer rates. The use of the Company’s WACC as the discount rate in the NPV calculation is appropriate because ratepayers will be bearing the risks associated with uncertain future returns through the proposed PPA.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PROBLEMS WITH THE VARIABLE COST ASSUMPTIONS USED IN THE COMPANY’S PPA NET VALUE ANALYSIS.

A. The Company uses a constant variable cost of $16.47/MWh in its PPA net benefits analysis. As I noted earlier in my testimony, Exhibit DED-8 shows that the Company’s variable costs have and will likely continue to increase in the future. Using the same variable cost estimates I discussed earlier in my revised market sales net revenue analysis, the overall margins (net value) created by the PSE PPA are negative.
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as shown in Exhibit DED-12. These revised estimates show that the Company’s five-year total net value of the proposed PPA portion of the 92.5 MW acquisition is negative $11.6 million in future dollar terms and negative $9.2 million in NPV terms.

Q. ARE THERE ANY OTHER ISSUES WITH THE COMPANY’S CONSTANT VARIABLE COST ASSUMPTIONS?

A. Yes. The Company’s assumptions do not comport with representations about those same trends offered by one of the CU4 owners which is PSE. For instance, PSE is currently seeking approval for this PPA by its Washington regulators. PSE has provided estimates to its Washington regulators indicating that moving forward with the PPA (with NorthWestern) is better than the continued ownership and operation of the CU4 unit. PSE’s analysis before its Washington regulators posits notably higher variable costs to continue to operate CU4. PSE estimates annual total operating costs of CU4 ranging from $38.30/MWh to $44.00/MWh annually for the next five years (May 2021 through May 2025). In terms of variable costs, PSE assumed annual dispatch costs for CU4 generally increasing from $20.70/MWh in the 12 months ending May 2021, to $21.50/MWh in the 12 months ending May 2025.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PROBLEMS WITH THE COMPANY’S BACK-CAST ANALYSIS.

A. The Company calculates a five-year back-cast using historic 2019 market prices. The Company’s back-cast effectively assumes that 2019 prices will remain in place for a

---

89 In the Matter of the Application of Puget Sound Energy for an Order Authorizing the Sale of All of Puget Sound Energy’s Interest in Colstrip Unit 4 and Certain of Puget Sound Energy’s Interests in the Colstrip Transmission System; Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Docket No. UE-200115; Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song; Exhibit CLS-7. (Exhibit DED-17)
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five-year period. In other words, the Company’s presentation assumes that 2019 prices will be repeated five years in a row. This is not reasonable nor consistent with common back-casting approaches that tend to use information over a comparable term such as using five years of pricing data over a five year period, not one year of pricing data, five times in a row.

Q. HAVE YOU UPDATED THE COMPANY’S CALCULATIONS FOR NEW MARKET PRICES?

A. Yes. Exhibit DED-13 provides a more appropriate back-casting analysis using the prior five-year period (2015-2019) which estimates a lower net value benefit of less than $200,000. These net benefits fall to approximately $140,000 on an NPV basis. This analysis shows that, contrary to the Company’s representation, net benefits associated with the proposed PPA with PSE would have been limited even during the previous five years of Colstrip operations, when market prices were higher and variable costs were lower than now forecasted.

Q. ARE NET BENEFITS EVEN AT A LEVEL SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCED FROM THE COMPANY’S PROJECTIONS GUARANTEED TO MATERIALIZE?

A. No. In fact, given my earlier discussion of pressures on CU4’s margins net of fixed costs from increasing fixed costs and decreasing market prices for CU4 output, the back-cast shown in Exhibit DED-13 strongly suggests that the proposed acquisition is unlikely to produce a net benefit to consumers even with the cost support from the PSE PPA.
Q. ARE THERE ANY IMPORTANT “TAKE-AWAYS” FOR THE COMMISSION TO CONSIDER IN YOUR REVISED ANALYSES OF THE COMPANY’S WHOLESALE REVENUE BENEFITS?

A. Yes. The Company’s analysis of market sales benefits (general market sales and PPA sales) are likely overstated. More importantly, the Company’s proposal imposes considerable risk onto ratepayers for this transaction given the uncertainty of market prices and the likelihood that the Company may not attain the revenue streams it anticipates. Ratepayers should not bear the risk of these revenue stream shortfalls either in the short run or after the five-year PPA has expired. Ratepayers will receive no PCCAM benefits in the short term if the Company’s wholesale sales do not materialize. As I noted earlier, the purported $4.4 million credit applied to the PCCAM is not a “benefit” but simply reflects an adjustment for the CU4 acquisition’s revenue requirement.

Q. WHAT IS THE LONGER-TERM RISK OF THE CU4 ACQUISITION RELATIVE TO THE PSE PPA?

A. The PSE PPA will come off the books in five years. After this period, the Company will likely be required to put any excess capacity associated with this acquisition to the market, particularly in non-peak time periods. It is also likely the case, as I have shown elsewhere in my testimony, that the Company will have additional required capital expenditures in order to keep CU4 running and viable into the near future (e.g., see Exhibit DED-2). The current PSE PPA has a guaranteed fixed cost contribution that is made by PSE over a five-year period and that fixed cost contribution will end with the termination of the contract. Exhibit DED-14 shows that if this fixed cost
contribution were removed, the PPA’s net value (overall net revenue contribution) would be negative, even using the Company’s own assumptions and calculations. The second page of this Exhibit shows that the net revenue contribution only grows more negative with more realistic assumptions and data as I discussed earlier. This underscores the importance of limiting any approval in this proceeding, to the extent that the Commission concludes that an approval actually satisfies the requirements of § 69-8-421(6)(c), to a five-year period coextensive with the PSE PPA given the overall uncertainty and likelihood that costs will exceed benefits after the PSE PPA expires.

C. Benefit from Avoided Market Purchases

Q. HAS THE COMPANY ASSERTED ANY ADDITIONAL BENEFITS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED CU4 ACQUISITION?

A. Yes. The Company states that acquiring the additional share of CU4 would allow it to reduce its reliance on market purchases that it makes on behalf of its retail customers.91 The Company speculates that its overall electric supply costs may see a net decrease due to these avoided market purchases. The Company estimates that these avoided market purchases will reduce its overall PCCAM costs by $0.9 million if it secures 92.5 MW of CU4.92

Q. IS THERE INFORMATION SUPPORTING FUTURE DECLINING MARKET PRICES?

A. Yes. PSE, in its current Washington filing, notes that PSE expects its proposed sale of its share of CU4 capacity to produce approximately $25 to $46 million in net present

91 Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 20:1-3.
92 Id., at 19.
value savings for PSE.93 These PSE savings were estimated by comparing estimated
CU4 operating costs to estimated costs of replacing displaced energy and capacity
requirements from CU4 with market resources for the next five years (May 2021
through May 2025).94 The forecast prices PSE assumed for these market resources
ranged from $25.6/MWh to $28.1/MWh for replacement energy, and $12.0/kw-year to
$13.2/kw-year for replacement winter capacity. The forecast prices presented by PSE
to the WUTC in support of its proposed sale of its CU4 interest are below the forecast
prices on which NorthWestern bases its claims of benefits from avoiding purchases in
the same market, as shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NorthWestern Energy</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>29.47</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>29.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Difference</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Puget Sound Energy estimates are for 12 months ending in May of the succeeding year while
NorthWestern Energy estimates are for 12 calendar months.

Q. WOULD ANY AVOIDED PURCHASE BENEFITS BE FLOWED BACK
THROUGH THE PCCAM AS A FINANCIAL CREDIT TO REDUCE
RATEPAYER BILLS?

A. No. Any financial savings that are generated from the CU4 acquisition would be
diverted to the Company’s proposed Reserve Fund: ratepayers will get no current or

93 In the Matter of the Application of Puget Sound Energy for an Order Authorizing the Sale of All of
Puget Sound Energy’s Interest in Colstrip Unit 4 and Certain of Puget Sound Energy’s Interests in the
Colstrip Transmission System; Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Docket No. UE-
200115; Direct Testimony of Cindy I. Song at 2:22 to 3:5. (Exhibit DED-16)
94 Id.; Exhibit CLS-7. (Exhibit DED-17)
known financial benefit from this CU4 transaction under the Company’s proposal. Instead, ratepayers would receive a ledger entry offsetting NorthWestern’s future liability for environmental remediation and decommissioning costs for the 30 percent/220 MW share of Colstrip Unit 4 that it currently owns\footnote{“Our Company;” NorthWestern Energy, available online at: \url{http://www.northwesternenergy.com/our-company}.} despite the fact that, at this time, the Commission has not ruled on the prudency of these costs, or any other allocation of these costs between the Company’s ratepayers and its shareholders. This seems unreasonable considering, among many other reasons, that the Company operated its existing 30 percent share of CU4 on a merchant basis from its commissioning in 1986 until it was placed in rate base in January 2009. As the Commission has observed, during that 1986 to 2009 period, or approximately two-thirds of its operating history, “CU4 has never been devoted to public service.”\footnote{Order No. 6925f, Docket No. D2008.6.69 at ¶ 247.}

**Q. WILL RATEPAYERS BEAR THE RISK OF THESE AVOIDED MARKET PURCHASES?**

**A.** Yes. The Company’s estimates are just that, an “estimate.” The Company offers no minimum guaranteed credits for its future avoided purchase revenues. Such a guaranteed credit would assist in reducing both future performance and market risk of the CU4 capacity acquisition for ratepayers.

**Q. WHAT DO YOU MEAN BY PERFORMANCE RISK?**

**A.** If this transaction is approved by the Commission, it will be up to the Company to market the output from this additional capacity to maximize its market sales revenues. Likewise, it will be up to the Company to aggressively maintain cost and operational
efficiencies to assure the plant is competitive with the market to assure avoided market purchase savings (i.e., the more efficient the capacity is, the more likely it will displace market purchases). Any slip in the diligence with which the Company pursues market sales or avoids market purchases will result in the incurrence of additional costs by ratepayers for which they receive no benefit.

Q DOES THE COMPANY ACKNOWLEDGE THE UNCERTAINTY ASSOCIATED WITH THESE AVOIDED PURCHASES (AS WELL AS MARKET SALES)?

A Yes. The Company clearly notes that any PCCAM savings will not be reflected in rates “until the savings are realized” which will occur at a point after the additional share “is added to its supply portfolio.”\(^{97}\) The Company also clearly notes that ratepayers will only receive their share of any PCCAM savings credit “if and when NorthWestern’s actual PCC are less than the PCC that NorthWestern recovers.”\(^{98}\) The Company’s offer to “credit” $4.4 million to the base PCC is not a true ratepayer financial credit, nor should the Commission consider this a benefit of any kind. The $4.4 million credit is simply an adjustment to cover the cost (revenue requirement) of using the acquired CU4 capacity as part of the Company’s supply portfolio.

---

\(^{97}\) Corrected Direct Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 8:10-12.

\(^{98}\) Id. at 7:5-8.
VIII. INCREASED RATEPAYER COST EXPOSURE

Q. HAVE ANY OTHER CU4 OWNERS REFLECTED UPON THE CHALLENGES OF OWNING COAL-FIRED GENERATION?

A. Yes. In its application to sell its interest in CU4, PSE remarked about how the growing challenges posed by coal-fired generation have eroded previous benefits from what traditionally has been a low-cost source of power. Specifically, PSE noted that increased compliance costs and declining electricity market prices due to increased competition from low-cost natural gas generation and the proliferation of renewable resources have made it difficult for coal-fired generation units to remain competitive. PSE noted that CU4 reflected these general market trends with continually escalating maintenance and operating costs in a declining electricity market.

Q. WHAT TRENDS RELATED TO COAL ARE MATERIALIZING IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST?

A. As recently as last year, 2,868 MW of coal-fired generation capacity from six separate generation units in the region were scheduled to be retired in the near future. These retirements include the Centralia facility in Washington, the Boardman facility in

100 Id. at ¶ 24.
101 Id.
102 EIA Form-860, Energy Information Administration.
103 Brown, Alex and Sophie Quinton (March 9, 2020); “As U.S. Coal Plants Shutter, Centralia Area Tests an Off-Ramp;” The Daily Chronicle.
Oregon, and two of the four generation units comprising the Colstrip Facility. Some of these retirements have since already occurred, with two of the existing generation units at Colstrip, CU1 and CU2, being shuttered on January 5, 2020. Likewise, the Boardman facility in Oregon and one of the two generators at the Centralia facility in Washington will be retired later this year. Additionally, in Montana, Montana Dakota Utilities has announced plans to close its coal-fired Lewis and Clark Station in Sidney sometime this year, and two additional coal-fired generators at Heskett Station in Mandan, North Dakota.

Q. WHAT HAS BEEN DRIVING THE RECENT MOVEMENT AWAY FROM COAL-BASED GENERATION RESOURCES IN THE NORTHWEST?

A. States in the Pacific Northwest and in the Western U.S. have implemented policies that discourage coal-fired generation. Washington, for example, in 2019 passed Senate Bill 5116, which requires all electric utilities operating in the state to eliminate coal-fired resources from their resource portfolios by the end of 2025. In passing Senate Bill 5116, Washington joined Oregon, which in 2016 passed Senate Bill 1547 requiring all electric utilities in the state to eliminate coal-fired resources from their resource portfolios by the end of 2029. Likewise, California in 2018 passed Senate Bill 100

104 Flatt, Courtney (January 7, 2019); “PGE Looks to Renewable Energy as Boardman Coal Plant Closes,” Northwest Public Broadcasting.
105 Desroches, Kayla (January 6, 2020); “It’s Like Losing a Family Member: Colstrip Power Plant Closes 2 Units;” Montana Public Radio.
107 Washington Senate Bill 5116 specifically requires state electric utilities to eliminate coal-fired resources from their “allocation of electricity,” defined as “the costs and benefits associated with resources used to provide electricity to an electric utility’s retail electricity customers.”
108 Oregon Senate Bill 1547 specifically requires state electric utilities to eliminate coal-fired resources from their “allocation of electricity,” defined as “the costs and benefits associated with resources used to provide electricity to an electric utility’s retail electricity customers.”
which modified existing laws to establish that 100 percent of total retail sales of
electricity in California must come from eligible renewable energy resources and zero-
carbon resources by the end of 2045.

Q. **HOW DO THESE CHANGES RELATE TO THE COLSTRIP UNITS?**

A. The Company and Talen, PSE, PGE, PacifiCorp, and Avista all own interests in the
remaining active Colstrip generation units (CU3, CU4). Each of these owners, except
for NorthWestern and Talen, serve retail loads in either Washington or Oregon and are
thus subject to these states’ future prohibition on coal-based generation. Indeed, PSE’s
current sale of its interest in CU4 to the Company is driven by its need to divest from
coal-based generating resources by 2025.¹⁰⁹

Q. **HOW DO REGIONAL POLICY CHANGES IMPACT COAL GENERATION
FROM FACILITIES LIKE COLSTRIP?**

A. These policy changes impact facilities like Colstrip in several ways. First, several
Colstrip owners will likely need to divest their ownership shares in the facilities,
including CU4, in the next few years. Such divestitures are likely to complicate the
availability of capital for CU4 or push NorthWestern and Talen into an increasingly
untenable position as the “last owners standing” in a resource whose economics are
becoming increasingly uncompetitive. Furthermore, these regulatory changes may
negatively impact the future marketability of CU4 generation in Western wholesale
markets, particularly if the states in the region continue to place prohibitions on coal-

¹⁰⁹ In the Matter of the Application of Puget Sound Energy for an Order Authorizing the Sale of All of
Puget Sound Energy’s Interest in Colstrip Unit 4 and Certain of Puget Sound Energy’s Interests in the
Colstrip Transmission System; Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Docket No. UE-
200115; Application at ¶ 2.
fired generation, and particularly if California’s carbon pricing regime spreads to other States. This is very important in this proceeding since such a large part of the purported benefits of the proposed acquisition are associated with wholesale power sales. The significant potential cost exposure for Montana ratepayers with the Company’s CU4 proposal includes a highly plausible future scenario in which coal-based electric generation is prejudiced or is required to pay for its negative environmental attributes.

**Q. ARE THERE OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH CU4?**

**A.** Yes. CU4 has exhibited a number of challenges over the past two years in meeting the Maximum Attainable Technology Standard (“MATS”) test pursuant to federal Mercury and Air Toxics Standards. Emissions tests reported to the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (“MDEQ”) for June 21, 2018 and June 26, 2018 found that Colstrip was operating in excess of MATS limits for airborne non-mercury hazardous air pollutant emissions, measured by proxy as particulate matter (“PM”). CU3 was immediately removed from service on June 28, 2018 while CU4 was removed from service on June 29, 2018. Once these units were taken out of service, Talen conducted limited operations for purposes of evaluation of corrective actions. These units remained out of full service until September 4, 2018, for CU4, and September 11, 2018, for Unit 3. These outages, and the issues associated with the cost incurred for
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110 Lutey, Tom (August 10, 2018), “Air pollution problems continue to plague Colstrip as 2 largest generators remain shut down,” Billings Gazette.


112 *Id.* at 10:1-2.

113 *Id.* at 10:3-5.

114 *Id.* at 10:5-6.
replacement power during these outages were discussed in detail in Docket No. 2019.09.058.

Q. **HOW DO THESE OUTAGES RELATE TO THE ISSUES IN THIS PROPOSED CAPACITY ACQUISITION PROCEEDING?**

A. The Company, and its co-owners and operator (Talen), appear to face ongoing PM emissions challenges at Colstrip. Exhibit DED-15, for instance, compares Colstrip’s PM emissions relative to other coal units in the Western interconnect and shows that these per MWh emissions are relatively high on an output basis. More important to this proceeding, however, is the Company’s testimony before the Commission in Docket 2019.09.058 which clearly noted that it is not unusual for the Colstrip facility to report PM MATS emissions levels at or very near its permitted limit. The Company cited Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (“CEMS”) data for the period from February 2018 to June 2018 as evidence of those typically high, but characterized by NorthWestern as non-worrisome, PM emission level trends. The Company’s testimony before the Commission noted the continued uncertainty associated with the causes for the June PM test failure and also noted that it could not guarantee that the facility may not exceed its permitted emissions rate in the future. This creates an additional concern in evaluating the CU4 capacity request in this proceeding since it raises the possibility that additional replacement power cost could arise from future PM test failures (and outages). The need for additional replacement
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power, in turn, potentially raises the ongoing costs of operating CU4 and could significantly lower potential capacity acquisition benefits. The Commission needs to consider this possibility in the evaluation of the Company’s request.

IX. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Q. WHAT ARE YOUR PRIMARY RECOMMENDATIONS?

A. I recommend the Commission reject the Company’s CU4 capacity acquisition preapproval request since NorthWestern has neither shown that the proposed acquisition is in the public interest nor that the Company’s proposal would result in rates that are reasonable and just. The Company has not shown that the proposed capacity acquisition is both needed and the least cost resource available in the market. The Company has not compared this proposed resource to the results of a competitive bidding process. The purported benefits of the capacity acquisition proposal are tied to a set of highly speculative claims that, in turn, are tied to unreasonable assumptions about CU4’s operating costs and the outlook for regional power markets. The Company’s supporting analyses do not include the costs of any capital additions for which the Company is likely to seek recovery from Montana ratepayers, thereby understating the capacity acquisition costs. Further, close to half of the proposed capacity acquisition is tied to a PPA with PSE. The Company’s request simply asks Montana ratepayers to provide a regulatory backstop for additional CU4 capacity that, in turn, will be marketed to Washington electricity customers. For these reasons, the Commission should reject this proposal.
Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE COMPANY’S RESERVE FUND?

A. Whether or not the Commission authorizes the proposed capacity acquisition, I recommend that the Commission reject the proposed reserve fund. The Fund is a ratemaking measure that should not be part of the current preapproval investigation as it is not even related to the proposed acquisition in CU4. The Commission, to date, has not determined whether or to what extent Montana ratepayers should be responsible for the Company’s environmental remediation and plant decommissioning costs for CU4. There has been no Commission determination regarding the prudency of these costs’ incurrence. In addition, a significant portion of those costs were incurred during the period between 1986 and 2008, when NorthWestern’s share of Colstrip Unit 4 was not devoted to public service. Lastly, specific year-to-year financing of the proposed Fund is left undefined, while additionally presuming prematurely that the liabilities the Fund is designed to address are actually costs for which ratepayers are responsible.

Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS?

A. Yes. If the Commission chooses to approve the capacity acquisition, I offer the following alternative recommendations to bring the proposal more closely into line with the public interest:

- The 92.5 MW capacity acquisition should be approved for a five-year period only. The Company, if it seeks longer term recovery, should (1) request and be required to justify cost recovery at a later date towards the close of the PPA with PSE and (2) should subject the resource to the results of a competitive bidding process to
definitively show that the capacity acquisition proposed in this proceeding is the least cost resource available in the market.

• No capital additions should be allowed into rates during the initial five-year period as the Company has not quantified the cost impacts of these capital additions as part of its presentation in support of authorization for its proposed acquisition.\textsuperscript{118} The Company’s allowed revenue requirement should be fixed at $4.4 million (derived as shown on page 1 of Exhibit DED-3) under the proposed 92.5 MW acquisition.

• The Commission should reject the Company’s Reserve Fund proposal in all respects.

• The Commission should require the Company to provide a minimum financial credit to ratepayers that is equal to 50 percent of the market sales, avoided purchases, and PPA revenues estimated in its application. This results in a credit of approximately $4.5 million, derived as shown on page 3 of Exhibit DED-3. When combined with the Company’s proposed first-year revenue requirement of approximately $4.4 million, this results in a minimum annual benefit to ratepayers of $140,440.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY FILED ON SEPTEMBER 25, 2020?

A. Yes.

\textsuperscript{118} See Company Response to Data Request MCC-007.
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## Comparison of Original and Supplemental CU4 Proposed Acquisition: Overview of Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Application</th>
<th>Supplemental Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Acquisition Size (MW)</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acquisition Price ($)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PPA Size (MW)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of PPA (Years)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Avoided Cost ($ per MWh)</td>
<td>$28.62</td>
<td>$31.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-year Capacity Acquisition Costs ($ per MWh)</td>
<td>$26.71</td>
<td>$23.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Company Application at 1; Corrected Testimony of Bleau J. LaFave at 33:17-19; Company Supplemental Application at 1; Corrected Testimony of Bleau J. LaFave at 48:18-20.
Comparison of Original and Supplemental CU4 Proposed Acquisition: Total Cost Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original Application</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Supplemental Application</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCCAM Base with CA</td>
<td>PCCAM Base</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>PCCAM Base with CA</td>
<td>PCCAM Base</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU4 Volume (MWh)</td>
<td>2,318,256</td>
<td>1,672,925</td>
<td>645,331</td>
<td>1,995,591</td>
<td>1,672,925</td>
<td>322,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On System Market Purch (MWh)</td>
<td>246,400</td>
<td>284,159</td>
<td>(37,759)</td>
<td>247,697</td>
<td>284,159</td>
<td>(36,462)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On System Market Sales (MWh)</td>
<td>(1,316,546)</td>
<td>(708,974)</td>
<td>(607,572)</td>
<td>(995,177)</td>
<td>(708,974)</td>
<td>(286,203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CU4 Variable Costs</td>
<td>$38,181,680</td>
<td>$27,553,075</td>
<td>$10,628,605</td>
<td>$32,867,377</td>
<td>$27,553,075</td>
<td>$5,314,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On System Market Purch</td>
<td>$11,036,236</td>
<td>$11,992,327</td>
<td>$956,091</td>
<td>$11,057,522</td>
<td>$11,992,327</td>
<td>$934,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;INC&quot; Purchases</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$5,188,073</td>
<td>$(5,188,073)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$5,188,073</td>
<td>$(5,188,073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Reserves</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,183,624</td>
<td>$(1,183,624)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,183,624</td>
<td>$(1,183,624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission Expense</td>
<td>$5,566,794</td>
<td>$2,936,008</td>
<td>$2,630,786</td>
<td>$4,175,268</td>
<td>$2,936,008</td>
<td>$1,239,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$134,028,825</td>
<td>$144,549,367</td>
<td>$(10,520,542)</td>
<td>$136,027,114</td>
<td>$144,549,367</td>
<td>$(8,522,253)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Corrected Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at pp. 6, 19.
Colstrip Units 3-4 Capital Additions:
Historic and Projected
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## Determination of Minimum Ratepayer Credit: CU4 2021 Revenue Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Source: Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Andrew D. Durkin, Redacted Exhibit ADD-5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (A)</td>
<td>CU4 Acquisition Revenue Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Required Annual Return on Ratebase Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Net Plant in Service $ 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plus Incremental Working Capital $ (1,041,539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Less Deferred Income Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total Ratebase $ (1,041,539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Return on Ratebase 6.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Required Return $ (72,074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Additional Cost of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Incremental Fixed Operating Costs $ 3,780,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Depreciation Expense -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Incremental Property and Other Taxes $ 675,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MPSC and MCC Tax $ 24,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Deferred Income Tax -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Current Income Tax $ (17,735)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Total Additional Cost of Service $ 4,463,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Total CU4 Acquisition Revenue Requirement $ 4,391,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Andrew D. Durkin, Redacted Exhibit ADD-5
## Determination of Minimum Ratepayer Credit: Calculation of PPA and 50 percent Market Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Company Estimated Benefits and Costs for 92.5MW Purchase of CU4</th>
<th>Proposed Minimum Ratepayer Credit Associated with 50 Percent of Claimed Benefits</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Market-Related PCCAM Benefits Attributed to Acquisition</td>
<td>$934,805</td>
<td>$467,403</td>
<td>KJM Revised Testimony at 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reduced On-System Market Purchases</td>
<td>$934,805</td>
<td>$467,403</td>
<td>KJM Revised Testimony at 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increased On-System Market Sales</td>
<td>7,769,314</td>
<td>3,884,657</td>
<td>KJM Revised Testimony at 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Total Market-Related PCCAM Benefits Attributed to Acquisition</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,704,119</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,352,060</strong></td>
<td>KJM-3: Line 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Average Annual Estimated Net Value of PPA with PSE</td>
<td>$723,153</td>
<td>$361,577</td>
<td>KJM-3: Line 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Market Benefits and PPA Net Value</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,427,272</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,713,636</strong></td>
<td>KJM-3: Line 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Corrected Supplemental Testimony of Kevin J. Markovich at 19 and Exhibit KJM-3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (A)</td>
<td>CU4 Acquisition Revenue Requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Required Annual Return on Ratebase Investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Net Plant in Service</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Plus Incremental Working Capital</td>
<td>(1,041,539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Less Deferred Income Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total Ratebase</td>
<td>(1,041,539)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Return on Ratebase</td>
<td>6.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Required Return</td>
<td>($72,074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Additional Cost of Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Incremental Fixed Operating Costs</td>
<td>$3,780,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Incremental Property and Other Taxes</td>
<td>675,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MPSC and MCC Tax</td>
<td>24,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Deferred Income Tax</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Current Income Tax</td>
<td>(17,735)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Total Additional Cost of Service</td>
<td>$4,463,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Total CU4 Acquisition Revenue Requirement</td>
<td>$4,391,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (B)</td>
<td>Traditional PCCAM Costs and Credits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Incremental Variable Operating Costs</td>
<td>$5,314,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Increased Transmission Expenses</td>
<td>1,239,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Reduced On-System Market Purchases</td>
<td>(467,403)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Reduced Capacity Reserve Purchases</td>
<td>(1,183,624)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Reduced Ancillary Services Purchases</td>
<td>(5,188,073)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Total Reduced Market Purchases</td>
<td>(6,839,100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Increased On-System Market Sales</td>
<td>($3,884,657)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Total Incremental Cost</td>
<td>($3,884,657)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Total Traditional PCCAM Costs and Credits</td>
<td>($4,170,195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>(C) PPA with PSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Variable Revenue</td>
<td>($9,048,368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>PSE Fixed O&amp;M Payment</td>
<td>($1,750,432)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>($10,798,800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Variable Cost</td>
<td>$5,462,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Fixed O&amp;M Base</td>
<td>3,055,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>822,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>MPSC &amp; MCC Taxes</td>
<td>673,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$10,075,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>PPA with PSE Net Expenses (Value)</td>
<td>($361,577)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Total Annual PCCAM Fixed Charge (Credit)</td>
<td>($140,440)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historically, wholesale prices at the Mid-Columbia ("Mid-C") hub sees only limited occurrences of extreme "needle" type pricing. Recently the occurrence of these events has been limited.

A focus on more recent trends generally shows on-peak prices trading in a reasonable range.

Note: Data is through July 2020 to exclude the temporary impacts associated with recent wild-fire induced price spikes.

Source: Wholesale Electricity and Natural Gas Market Data, U.S. Energy Information Administration, available online at:
“https://www.eia.gov/electricity/wholesale/.”
Recent price spikes driven by wildfire events in the region have largely receded and are more moderate in nature compared to previous price spikes.

### Historic Operating Statistics vs. Mid-C Implied Market Clearing Heat Rate

| Source: Platt's Megawatt Daily; and S&P Global; and EIA Average Tested Heat Rates by Prime Mover and Energy Source. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECO Price ($/MMBtu)</td>
<td>$32.56</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
<td>$23.11</td>
<td>$19.91</td>
<td>$21.09</td>
<td>$30.25</td>
<td>$35.66</td>
<td>$17.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECO Implied Heat Rate (Btu/kWh)</td>
<td>$10,593</td>
<td>$8,117</td>
<td>$10,917</td>
<td>$12,162</td>
<td>$12,625</td>
<td>$25,475</td>
<td>$28,612</td>
<td>$11,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCC Implied Heat Rate (Btu/kWh)</td>
<td>$7,627</td>
<td>$7,627</td>
<td>$7,627</td>
<td>$7,627</td>
<td>$7,627</td>
<td>$7,627</td>
<td>$7,627</td>
<td>$7,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Cost ($/MWh)</td>
<td>$23.45</td>
<td>$31.01</td>
<td>$16.15</td>
<td>$12.48</td>
<td>$12.74</td>
<td>$9.06</td>
<td>$9.51</td>
<td>$11.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Source: Platt's Megawatt Daily; and S&P Global; and EIA Average Tested Heat Rates by Prime Mover and Energy Source. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Mar. 2013 to Sept. 2020</th>
<th>Average Excluding 2018 and 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECO Price ($/MMBtu)</td>
<td>$26.77</td>
<td>$24.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECO Implied Heat Rate (Btu/kWh)</td>
<td>$2.08</td>
<td>$2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCC Implied Heat Rate (Btu/kWh)</td>
<td>$12,843</td>
<td>$10,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Cost ($/MWh)</td>
<td>$15.90</td>
<td>$18.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Premium ($/MWh)</td>
<td>$10.87</td>
<td>$6.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mid-C Implied Required Natural Gas Price for CU4
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Source: Platt's Megawatt Daily; and S&P Global.

### Summer Capacity (kW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>629,000</td>
<td>629,000</td>
<td>629,000</td>
<td>629,000</td>
<td>629,000</td>
<td>629,000</td>
<td>629,000</td>
<td>629,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fixed O&M Costs ($/kW-Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29.13</td>
<td>$33.32</td>
<td>$28.41</td>
<td>$36.54</td>
<td>$34.47</td>
<td>$27.86</td>
<td>$28.67</td>
<td>$31.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Fixed O&M Costs ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,323</td>
<td>$20,958</td>
<td>$17,870</td>
<td>$22,984</td>
<td>$21,682</td>
<td>$17,524</td>
<td>$18,033</td>
<td>$19,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Generation (MWh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,831,810</td>
<td>4,297,201</td>
<td>4,780,705</td>
<td>3,946,017</td>
<td>4,390,782</td>
<td>3,829,005</td>
<td>4,113,332</td>
<td>3,884,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fuel Costs ($/MWh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16.20</td>
<td>$16.93</td>
<td>$16.28</td>
<td>$18.39</td>
<td>$17.30</td>
<td>$17.11</td>
<td>$19.14</td>
<td>$17.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Fuel Costs ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29,675</td>
<td>$72,752</td>
<td>$77,830</td>
<td>$72,567</td>
<td>$75,961</td>
<td>$65,514</td>
<td>$78,729</td>
<td>$67,334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Non-Fuel Variable O&M Costs ($/MWh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.22</td>
<td>$2.36</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
<td>$3.28</td>
<td>$3.24</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td>$3.51</td>
<td>$3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Non-Fuel Variable O&M Costs ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,898</td>
<td>$10,141</td>
<td>$14,581</td>
<td>$12,943</td>
<td>$14,226</td>
<td>$14,818</td>
<td>$14,438</td>
<td>$12,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total O&M Costs ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$53,897</td>
<td>$103,851</td>
<td>$110,281</td>
<td>$108,494</td>
<td>$111,868</td>
<td>$97,856</td>
<td>$111,200</td>
<td>$99,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total O&M Costs ($/MWh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$29.42</td>
<td>$24.17</td>
<td>$23.07</td>
<td>$27.49</td>
<td>$25.48</td>
<td>$25.56</td>
<td>$27.03</td>
<td>$25.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mid-C Implied Heat Rate (Btu/kWh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,593</td>
<td>8,117</td>
<td>10,917</td>
<td>12,162</td>
<td>12,625</td>
<td>25,475</td>
<td>28,612</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Required Natural Gas Price ($/MMBtu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2.78</td>
<td>$2.98</td>
<td>$2.11</td>
<td>$2.26</td>
<td>$2.02</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.94</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Excluding 2018 and 2019: 10,883

Required Natural Gas Price ($/MMBtu) Average: 2.38
## Historic Operating Margins, (2015 to 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Market Value ($000)</th>
<th>Colstrip Unit 4</th>
<th>Total Fixed Costs ($000)</th>
<th>Total Market Value Net of Fixed Costs ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed Costs $kW-Year</td>
<td>Capacity MW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$ 19,777</td>
<td>$ 28.41</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>$ 21,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 10,567</td>
<td>$ 36.54</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>$ 27,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$ 20,407</td>
<td>$ 34.47</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>$ 25,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 54,509</td>
<td>$ 27.86</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>$ 20,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$ 57,156</td>
<td>$ 28.67</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>$ 21,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total CU4 Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 32,483</strong></td>
<td><strong>740</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 23,080</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>92.5 MW Acquisition</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,060</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,885</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Platt's Megawatt Daily; and S&P Global.
Peer Comparison of Historic and Projected Variable O&M Costs: Non-Fuel Variable O&M ($/MWh)
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Peer Comparison of Historic and Projected Variable O&M Costs: Total Fuel Costs ($/MWh)
Comparison of Company Proposed and Updated Mid-C Forward Curves:

On-Peak Mid-C Forward Curve

- Original Application (10/31/2019) -- Annual Avg. Price = $36.73
- Supplemental Application (3/31/2020) -- Annual Avg. Price = $33.03
- Updated Analysis (9/04/2020) -- Annual Avg. Price = $37.21

Source: Company’s Responses to Data Requests MCC-027 and MEIC-079; S&P Global.
Comparison of Company Proposed and Updated Mid-C Forward Curves: Off-Peak Mid-C Forward Curve

- Original Application (10/31/2019) -- Annual Avg. Price = $26.54
- Supplemental Application (3/31/2020) -- Annual Avg. Price = $23.89
- Updated Analysis (9/04/2020) -- Annual Avg. Price = $24.19

Source: Company’s Responses to Data Requests MCC-027 and MEIC-079; S&P Global.
## Company Estimated Net Value from Proposed PPA

**Witness:** Dismukes  
**Docket No.:** 2019.12.101  
**Exhibit:** DED-10

**Source:** Company’s Updated Response to Data Request MEIC-79.

### Proposed PPA Under 92.5 MW Total Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$9,438,277</td>
<td>$9,419,966</td>
<td>$9,377,076</td>
<td>$7,727,236</td>
<td>$9,279,286</td>
<td>$45,241,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed O&amp;M Payment from PSE</strong></td>
<td>$1,671,005</td>
<td>$1,664,564</td>
<td>$1,826,894</td>
<td>$1,695,354</td>
<td>$1,894,343</td>
<td>$8,752,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$11,109,282</td>
<td>$11,084,529</td>
<td>$11,203,970</td>
<td>$9,422,590</td>
<td>$11,173,629</td>
<td>$53,994,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable Cost</strong></td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$4,719,940</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$27,313,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Costs</strong></td>
<td>$4,284,622</td>
<td>$4,292,394</td>
<td>$4,390,617</td>
<td>$5,487,341</td>
<td>$4,609,510</td>
<td>$23,064,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$9,933,075</td>
<td>$9,940,847</td>
<td>$10,039,069</td>
<td>$10,207,281</td>
<td>$10,257,962</td>
<td>$50,378,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Value</strong></td>
<td>$1,176,207</td>
<td>$1,143,682</td>
<td>$1,164,901</td>
<td>$(784,691)</td>
<td>$915,667</td>
<td>$3,615,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Value (NPV)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,108,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Company’s Updated Response to Data Request MEIC-79.*
## Company Estimated Net Value from Proposed PPA Under Backcast

**Witness:** Dismukes  
**Docket No.:** 2019.12.101  
**Exhibit:** DED-11

**Source:** Company’s Updated Response to Data Request MEIC-80.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$11,657,930</td>
<td>$11,641,871</td>
<td>$11,620,975</td>
<td>$9,999,524</td>
<td>$11,581,525</td>
<td>$56,501,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed O&amp;M Payment from PSE</td>
<td>$1,415,814</td>
<td>$1,461,131</td>
<td>$1,522,282</td>
<td>$1,408,680</td>
<td>$1,637,735</td>
<td>$7,445,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$13,073,744</td>
<td>$13,103,002</td>
<td>$13,143,258</td>
<td>$11,408,205</td>
<td>$13,219,259</td>
<td>$63,947,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Cost</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$4,704,464</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$27,298,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>$4,295,741</td>
<td>$4,303,819</td>
<td>$4,401,593</td>
<td>$5,498,580</td>
<td>$4,621,088</td>
<td>$23,120,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$9,944,194</td>
<td>$9,952,271</td>
<td>$10,050,046</td>
<td>$10,203,044</td>
<td>$10,269,541</td>
<td>$50,419,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value</td>
<td>$3,129,550</td>
<td>$3,150,731</td>
<td>$3,093,212</td>
<td>$1,205,160</td>
<td>$2,949,719</td>
<td>$13,528,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value (NPV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,246,452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** All figures are in USD.
Revised Estimated Net Value from Proposed PPA – Using Updated Forecasted Market Prices

Note: Company’s analysis revised to account for increases in variable operating costs shown in Exhibit DED-8.
Source: S&P Global; Company’s Updated Response to Data Request MEIC-79.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed PPA Under 92.5 MW Total Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$10,517,995</td>
<td>$9,985,262</td>
<td>$9,861,072</td>
<td>$8,023,891</td>
<td>$9,492,404</td>
<td>$47,880,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed O&amp;M Payment from PSE</td>
<td>$1,159,365</td>
<td>$1,323,481</td>
<td>$1,516,955</td>
<td>$1,716,581</td>
<td>$1,632,753</td>
<td>$7,349,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$11,677,360</td>
<td>$11,308,742</td>
<td>$11,378,027</td>
<td>$9,740,472</td>
<td>$11,125,157</td>
<td>$55,229,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Cost</td>
<td>$8,371,329</td>
<td>$8,696,783</td>
<td>$9,039,774</td>
<td>$7,856,106</td>
<td>$9,783,544</td>
<td>$43,747,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>$4,287,838</td>
<td>$4,293,664</td>
<td>$4,391,602</td>
<td>$5,489,140</td>
<td>$4,609,236</td>
<td>$23,071,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$12,659,167</td>
<td>$12,990,446</td>
<td>$13,431,376</td>
<td>$13,345,246</td>
<td>$14,392,779</td>
<td>$66,819,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value</td>
<td>$(981,807)</td>
<td>$(1,681,704)</td>
<td>$(2,053,349)</td>
<td>$(3,604,774)</td>
<td>$(3,267,622)</td>
<td>$(11,589,255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value (NPV)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$(9,165,572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed PPA Under 92.5 MW Total Acquisition</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$8,834,950</td>
<td>$8,738,153</td>
<td>$9,001,426</td>
<td>$9,382,357</td>
<td>$11,471,401</td>
<td>$47,428,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed O&amp;M Payment from PSE</td>
<td>$2,465,513</td>
<td>$2,565,055</td>
<td>$2,514,896</td>
<td>$1,571,913</td>
<td>$1,604,525</td>
<td>$10,721,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$11,300,464</td>
<td>$11,303,208</td>
<td>$11,516,322</td>
<td>$10,954,271</td>
<td>$13,075,925</td>
<td>$58,150,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Cost</td>
<td>$6,629,845</td>
<td>$7,431,880</td>
<td>$7,042,667</td>
<td>$5,991,174</td>
<td>$7,768,450</td>
<td>$34,864,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>$4,285,705</td>
<td>$4,293,632</td>
<td>$4,392,385</td>
<td>$5,496,011</td>
<td>$4,620,277</td>
<td>$23,088,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$10,915,550</td>
<td>$11,725,512</td>
<td>$11,435,052</td>
<td>$11,487,185</td>
<td>$12,388,727</td>
<td>$57,952,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value</td>
<td>$384,914</td>
<td>$(422,304)</td>
<td>$81,270</td>
<td>$(532,914)</td>
<td>$687,199</td>
<td>$198,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value (NPV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$141,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Backcast revised to reflect actual operating conditions during the years 2015 through 2019.
Source: Platt's Megawatt Daily; and Company's Updated Response to Data Request MEIC-80.
## Proposed PPA Under 92.5 MW Total Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$9,438,277</td>
<td>$9,419,966</td>
<td>$9,377,076</td>
<td>$7,727,236</td>
<td>$9,279,286</td>
<td>$45,241,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed O&amp;M Payment from PSE</strong></td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
<td>- $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$9,438,277</td>
<td>$9,419,966</td>
<td>$9,377,076</td>
<td>$7,727,236</td>
<td>$9,279,286</td>
<td>$45,241,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variable Cost</strong></td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$4,719,940</td>
<td>$5,648,452</td>
<td>$27,313,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Costs</strong></td>
<td>$4,284,622</td>
<td>$4,292,394</td>
<td>$4,390,617</td>
<td>$5,487,341</td>
<td>$4,609,510</td>
<td>$23,064,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>$9,933,075</td>
<td>$9,940,847</td>
<td>$10,039,069</td>
<td>$10,207,281</td>
<td>$10,257,962</td>
<td>$50,378,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Value</strong></td>
<td>$(494,798)</td>
<td>$(520,881)</td>
<td>$(661,993)</td>
<td>$(2,480,045)</td>
<td>$(978,676)</td>
<td>$(5,136,394)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Value (NPV)</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(4,057,882)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Company’s Updated Response to Data Request MEIC-79.
Revised Estimated Net Value Removing Fixed Cost Contribution:
Revised Estimate without Fixed Cost Contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed PPA Under 92.5 MW Total Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Revenue</td>
<td>$10,517,995</td>
<td>$9,985,262</td>
<td>$9,861,072</td>
<td>$8,023,891</td>
<td>$9,492,404</td>
<td>$47,880,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed O&amp;M Payment from PSE</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>$10,517,995</td>
<td>$9,985,262</td>
<td>$9,861,072</td>
<td>$8,023,891</td>
<td>$9,492,404</td>
<td>$47,880,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Cost</td>
<td>$8,371,329</td>
<td>$8,696,783</td>
<td>$9,039,774</td>
<td>$7,856,106</td>
<td>$9,783,544</td>
<td>$43,747,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>$4,287,838</td>
<td>$4,293,664</td>
<td>$4,391,602</td>
<td>$5,489,140</td>
<td>$4,609,236</td>
<td>$23,071,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenses</td>
<td>$12,659,167</td>
<td>$12,990,446</td>
<td>$13,431,376</td>
<td>$13,545,246</td>
<td>$14,392,779</td>
<td>$66,819,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value</td>
<td>$(2,141,172)</td>
<td>$(3,005,184)</td>
<td>$(3,570,304)</td>
<td>$(5,321,355)</td>
<td>$(4,900,375)</td>
<td>$(18,938,390)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Value (NPV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$(15,130,398)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Company’s analysis revised to account for increases in variable operating costs shown in Exhibit DED-8.
Source: S&P Global; Company’s Updated Response to Data Request MEIC-79.
Peer Comparison of Coal Unit Particulate Matter (“PM”) Emissions

Note: Data includes only Western Interconnect coal plants.
Source: National Emissions Inventory (“NEI”), Environmental Protection Agency; and U.S. Energy Information Administration.
Q. Please summarize your testimony.

A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide the quantitative analysis performed in support of the potential sale of PSE’s interests in Colstrip Unit 4. My testimony is focused on the quantitative analysis only. Please see the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Ronald J. Roberts, Exh. RJR-1T, for a discussion of (i) the qualitative factors considered in the potential sale of PSE’s interests in Colstrip Unit 4 to NorthWestern Energy and (ii) all factors considered in the potential sale of (a) an 8.2 percent interest in the Colstrip to Broadview Segment of the Colstrip Transmission System and (b) a 9.1 percent interest in the Broadview to Townsend Segment of the Colstrip Transmission System. Also included in the Prefiled Direct Testimony of Mr. Roberts, Exh. RJR-1T, is a discussion of the contract terms for the transactions described above and for a five-year power purchase agreement with NorthWestern Energy for 90 megawatts (MW) of output from Colstrip Unit 4, commencing June 1, 2020, and expiring on May 15, 2025 (the “NorthWestern Energy PPA”). Collectively, these transactions are referred to as the “Proposed Transactions” throughout this testimony.

Q. What were the results of the quantitative analyses performed in support of the potential sale of PSE’s interests in Colstrip Unit 4, and what conclusion did PSE draw from these results?

A. PSE’s analyses of the proposed sale of PSE’s interests in Colstrip Unit 4 (referred to as the “Proposed Colstrip Unit 4 Sale” throughout this testimony) consistently demonstrated an economic benefit to PSE customers over the status quo. The final results, which were presented to the Board of Directors in October 2019, project that the Proposed Colstrip Unit 4 Sale would result in a net present value savings of approximately $25 to $46 million\(^1\) compared to a Business As Usual scenario (representing the costs associated with ongoing PSE ownership interests in Colstrip Unit 4). PSE determined from these results that the Proposed Colstrip Unit 4 Sale represents a quantitatively prudent solution to help meet PSE’s obligation under the Clean Energy Transformation Act to eliminate coal-fired generation from its resource portfolio before 2026 that presents no harm to customers.

II. BACKGROUND AND TIMING

Q. Please provide a timeline of the quantitative analyses conducted by PSE to support the Proposed Colstrip Unit 4 Sale.

A. NorthWestern Energy first approached PSE in July 2019 regarding the Proposed Transactions. At the time, this was a relatively conceptual offer with few details. Based on this preliminary information presented by NorthWestern Energy, PSE performed an initial quantitative analysis on July 22, 2019 to determine the financial feasibility of the Proposed Colstrip Unit 4 Sale. As the conversation continued with NorthWestern Energy between July and October 2019 and more information became available, PSE continued to refine its analysis of the Proposed Colstrip Unit 4 Sale. This testimony describes PSE’s analytical

---

\(^1\) As used in this testimony, total costs and savings refers to net present value.
### Scenario 1 - No Hedging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>May 2021</th>
<th>May 2022</th>
<th>May 2023</th>
<th>May 2024</th>
<th>May 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90 MW NWE PPA</td>
<td>90 MW</td>
<td>90 MW</td>
<td>90 MW</td>
<td>90 MW</td>
<td>90 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NWE PPA capacity</td>
<td>483,692</td>
<td>460,969</td>
<td>457,209</td>
<td>453,600</td>
<td>457,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Energy (MWh)</td>
<td>483,692</td>
<td>460,969</td>
<td>457,209</td>
<td>453,600</td>
<td>457,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Subtotal PPA cost</td>
<td>$13 M</td>
<td>$12 M</td>
<td>$12 M</td>
<td>$12 M</td>
<td>$13 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>O&amp;M Adder</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
<td>$3 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total PPA</td>
<td>$16 M</td>
<td>$15 M</td>
<td>$15 M</td>
<td>$15 M</td>
<td>$16 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>95 MW Replacement</td>
<td>510,564</td>
<td>486,579</td>
<td>482,609</td>
<td>478,800</td>
<td>482,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Energy replacement</td>
<td>$14 M</td>
<td>$13 M</td>
<td>$12 M</td>
<td>$13 M</td>
<td>$14 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Replacement energy (MWh)</td>
<td>510,564</td>
<td>486,579</td>
<td>482,609</td>
<td>478,800</td>
<td>482,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mid-C price ($/MWh)</td>
<td>$26.7/MWh</td>
<td>$26.5/MWh</td>
<td>$25.6/MWh</td>
<td>$26.4/MWh</td>
<td>$28.1/MWh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Capacity (MW)</td>
<td>95 MW</td>
<td>95 MW</td>
<td>95 MW</td>
<td>95 MW</td>
<td>95 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Capacity charge</td>
<td>$12.0/kw-yr</td>
<td>$12.3/kw-yr</td>
<td>$12.6/kw-yr</td>
<td>$12.9/kw-yr</td>
<td>$13.2/kw-yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Capacity replacement cost</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
<td>$1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Total cost (line 8+14+19)</td>
<td>$31 M</td>
<td>$29 M</td>
<td>$28 M</td>
<td>$29 M</td>
<td>$31 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Total capacity</td>
<td>185 MW</td>
<td>185 MW</td>
<td>185 MW</td>
<td>185 MW</td>
<td>185 MW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Total energy MWh</td>
<td>994,256</td>
<td>947,548</td>
<td>939,818</td>
<td>932,400</td>
<td>940,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cost $/MWh (line 21 / 24)</td>
<td>$31.3/MWh</td>
<td>$30.8/MWh</td>
<td>$30.0/MWh</td>
<td>$31.3/MWh</td>
<td>$33.3/MWh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Total cost NPV (line 21)</td>
<td>$122 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Cost $/MWh (5-year average)</td>
<td>$31.3/MWh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: In the Matter of the Application of Puget Sound Energy For an Order Authorizing the Sale of All of Puget Sound Energy's Interests in Colstrip Unit 4 and Certain of Puget Sound Energy's Interests in the Colstrip Transmission System; WUTC Docket No. UE-191037; Prefiled Direct Testimony of Cindy L. Song (Redacted) at Exhibit CLS-7, tab “No Hedging.”
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