### STATE OF INDIANA

### INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

VERIFIED PETITION OF INDIANA MICHIGAN	)
POWER COMPANY (I&M), AN INDIANA	)
CORPORATION, FOR APPROVAL OF A CLEAN	)
ENERGY PROJECT AND QUALIFIED POLLUTION	)
CONTROL PROPERTY AND FOR ISSUANCE OF	)
CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND	)
NECESSITY FOR USE OF CLEAN COAL	
TECHNOLOGY; FOR ONGOING REVIEW; FOR	)
APPROVAL OF ACCOUNTING AND RATEMAKING,	)
INCLUDING THE TIMELY RECOVERY OF COSTS	)
INCURRED DURING CONSTRUCTION AND	)
OPERATION OF SUCH PROJECT THROUGH I&M'S	) CAUSE NO. 44871
CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY RIDER; FOR	) CAUSE NO. 448/1
APPROVAL OF DEPRECIATION PROPOSAL FOR	)
SUCH PROJECT; AND FOR AUTHORITY TO DEFER	)
COSTS INCURRED DURING CONSTRUCTION AND	)
OPERATION, INCLUDING CARRYING COSTS,	)
DEPRECIATION, TAXES, OPERATION AND	)
MAINTENANCE AND ALLOCATED COSTS, UNTIL	)
SUCH COSTS ARE REFLECTED IN THE CLEAN	)
COAL TECHNOLOGY RIDER OR OTHERWISE	)
REFLECTED IN I&M'S BASIC RATES AND	)
CHARGES.	)

### **OUCC PREFILED TESTIMONY**

OF

WES R. BLAKLEY – PUBLIC'S EXHIBIT NO. 3

ON BEHALF OF THE

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

Respectfully Submitted,

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

Lorraine Hitz-Bradley, Atty. No. 18006-29 Deputy Consumer Counselor

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing *Office of Utility Consumer Counselor Prefiled Testimony of Wes R. Blakley* has been served upon the following counsel of record in the captioned proceeding by electronic service on February 3, 2017.

Teresa Morton Nyhart Jeffrey M. Peabody BARNES & THORNBURG, LLP 11 S. Meridian St. Indianapolis, IN 46204

Email: teresa.nyhart@btlaw.com

Jeffrey.peabody@btlaw.com

Jennifer W. Terry **LEWIS KAPPES, P.C.** 

One American Square, Suite 2500 Indianapolis, Indiana 46282-0003 Email: JTerry@Lewis-Kappes.com Jennifer A. Washburn
CITIZENS ACTION COALITION

603 East Washington Street, Suite 502 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204 Email: jwashburn@citact.org

Lorraine Hitz-Bradley
Deputy Consumer Counselor

### INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

115 West Washington Street Suite 1500 South Indianapolis, IN 46204 kkrohn@oucc.in.gov infomgt@oucc.in.gov 317-233-3235 - Office 317/232-2494 - Phone 317/232-5923 - Facsimile

# TESTIMONY OF OUCC WITNESS WES R. BLAKLEY CAUSE NO. 44871 INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY

## I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

1	Q:	Please state your name and business address.
2	A:	My name is Wes R. Blakley and my business address is 115 W.
3		Washington St., Suite 1500 South, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.
4	Q:	By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
5	A:	I am a Senior Utility Analyst for the Office of Utility Consumer Counselor
6		("OUCC").
7	Q:	What is the purpose of your testimony?
8	A:	The purpose of my testimony is to review and make comments concerning
9		Indiana Michigan Power Company's ("I&M") request for accounting and
10		ratemaking treatment of the costs associated with I&M's Ownership Share
11		of Selective Catalytic Reduction ("SCR") technology to be installed at
12		Rockport Unit 2. As I&M witness Andrew Williamson explains on page 3
13		of his testimony,
14		The sale leaseback financing arrangement regarding Rockport
15		Unit 2 allows I&M and American Electric Power Generating
16		Company (AEG) to invest in Rockport Unit 2 as necessary to
17		comply with environmental regulations by installing
18		environmental control equipment and systems. I&M and AEG
19		jointly own any modifications made to Rockport Unit 2. The
20		Project costs associated with I&M's 50% Ownership Share are
21		recognized as plant-in-service by I&M, no different than
22		project costs associated with Rockport 1.

1		I will discuss I&M's request for tracking costs on its 50% ownership
2		interest share of Rockport Unit 2 SCR. Under this request, the accounting
3		and ratemaking treatment sought by I&M for Rockport Unit 2 SCR does
4		not include costs I&M will incur under the Unit Power Agreement
5		("UPA") related to the project.
6 7	Q:	Please describe the review and analysis you conducted in order to prepare your testimony.
8	A:	I reviewed I&M witnesses' prefiled testimony and exhibits, schedules and
9		work papers in its case-in-chief. I reviewed the Commission's final order
10		in I&M's Cause No. 44523 approved on May 13, 2015, which approved
11		the Rockport pollution control projects. I also discussed issues related to
12		this case with other OUCC employees.
		II. COST RECOVERY
		II. COST RECOVERT
13 14	Q:	Under what statutes and rules has I&M elected to recover costs for its ownership share in this Cause?
	<b>Q:</b> A:	Under what statutes and rules has I&M elected to recover costs for its
14	_	Under what statutes and rules has I&M elected to recover costs for its ownership share in this Cause?
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li></ul>	_	Under what statutes and rules has I&M elected to recover costs for its ownership share in this Cause?  I&M has elected to recover the costs of its ownership share on the
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li><li>16</li></ul>	_	Under what statutes and rules has I&M elected to recover costs for its ownership share in this Cause?  I&M has elected to recover the costs of its ownership share on the Rockport Unit 2 SCR Project in accordance with Ind. Code § 8-1-8.8-11,
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li><li>16</li><li>17</li></ul>	_	Under what statutes and rules has I&M elected to recover costs for its ownership share in this Cause?  I&M has elected to recover the costs of its ownership share on the Rockport Unit 2 SCR Project in accordance with Ind. Code § 8-1-8.8-11, the ratemaking treatment set forth in I.C. §§ 8-1-2-6.1, 6.7, 6.8 and 8.7,
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li><li>16</li><li>17</li><li>18</li></ul>	_	Under what statutes and rules has I&M elected to recover costs for its ownership share in this Cause?  I&M has elected to recover the costs of its ownership share on the Rockport Unit 2 SCR Project in accordance with Ind. Code § 8-1-8.8-11, the ratemaking treatment set forth in I.C. §§ 8-1-2-6.1, 6.7, 6.8 and 8.7, and the rules that govern the recovery of qualified pollution control
<ul><li>14</li><li>15</li><li>16</li><li>17</li><li>18</li><li>19</li><li>20</li></ul>	A:	Under what statutes and rules has I&M elected to recover costs for its ownership share in this Cause?  I&M has elected to recover the costs of its ownership share on the Rockport Unit 2 SCR Project in accordance with Ind. Code § 8-1-8.8-11, the ratemaking treatment set forth in I.C. §§ 8-1-2-6.1, 6.7, 6.8 and 8.7, and the rules that govern the recovery of qualified pollution control property ("QPCP") under 170 Ind. Admin. Code 4-6-1.  What is your overall understanding of I&M's requested cost recovery

1		share through its existing clean coal technology rider ("CCTR"):
2 3 4		• Carrying Costs, including all applicable federal and state income taxes;
5		• Depreciation;
6		• Associated operations and maintenance ("O&M") expense
7		(including consumable expense); and
8		• Associated property tax expense.
9		I&M also requests authority to:
10		• Depreciate I&M's Ownership Share over 10 years once the
11		assets are in-service;
12		
13		<ul> <li>Defer and record as a regulatory asset the associated</li> </ul>
14		depreciation, carrying costs, O&M, consumable and
15		property tax expenses until such time as these costs receive
16		ratemaking treatment through the CCTR or are otherwise
17		reflected in basic rates; and
18		
19 20 21 22		Via the CCTR use traditional over/under recovery accounting for the annual true-up of rider revenues to actual costs consistent with I&M's CCTR tracker reconciliations.
23 24	Q:	Is this the same treatment that I&M was granted in Cause No. 44523 relating to its 50% ownership of Rockport Unit 1?
25	A:	Yes, I&M is requesting the same treatment that was approved for its 50%
26		ownership share of Rockport Unit 1 SCR as was approved in Cause No.
27		44523.
28 29	Q:	I&M testifies about its ratemaking expectations if the project is retired prior to being fully depreciated. Do you have any concerns over its

### explanation?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

A: Yes. I&M witness Andrew Williamson states that if the asset is underdepreciated after retirement, "[a]ny remaining balance, which is represented as a reduction (or debit) to FERC Account 108, will be included in future I&M filings until it has been fully recovered through the ratemaking process." The OUCC does not agree with I&M's proposed ratemaking treatment for any under-depreciated asset that may happen as a result of early lease termination. Any decision regarding recovery of the value of under-depreciated plant should be fully investigated in a base rate 10 case, not in a tracker or other abbreviated proceeding.

11 Q: Is I&M's accounting and rate making treatment request for its 12 Rockport Unit 2 SCR in conformity with applicable rules and statutes?

13 Yes. I&M's request is consistent with the Commission's QPCP rules in A: 14 IAC 170 4-6-1 and the Clean Coal Technology ("CCT") statutes under 15 Indiana Code Section 8. These are the same statutes and rules I&M applies 16 to its current ECR tracker for its Rockport Unit 1 SCR.

17 Q: Does this conclude your testimony?

18 A: Yes.

19

<sup>1</sup> I&M Cause No. 44871 Testimony of Andrew Williamson page 14, line 4.

### **APPENDIX A**

1

2	Q:	Please describe your educational background and experience.
3	A:	I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Business with a major in
4		Accounting from Eastern Illinois University in 1987 and worked for
5		Illinois Consolidated Telephone Company until joining the OUCC in
6		April 1991 as a staff accountant. Since that time I have reviewed and
7		testified in hundreds of tracker, rate cases and other proceedings before the
8		Commission. I have attended the Annual Regulatory Studies Program
9		sponsored by NARUC at Michigan State University in East Lansing,
10		Michigan as well as the Wisconsin Public Utility Institute at the
11		University of Wisconsin-Madison Energy Basics Program

### **AFFIRMATION**

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

Indiana Office of

Utility Consumer Counselor 2/3/2017 Date:/