

1 **STATE OF ALASKA**

2 **THE REGULATORY COMMISSION OF ALASKA**

3 Before Commissioners:

Robert Mr. Pickett, Chair  
Kate Giard  
Paul F. Lisanke  
T.W. Patch  
Janis W. Wilson

4  
5  
6  
7 In the matter of the Tariff Revision, Designated as )  
8 TA381-1, Filed ALASKA ELECTRIC LIGHT )  
9 AND POWER COMPANY For Interim and )  
10 Permanent Rate Increases )

TA 381-1  
U-10-\_\_

11 **PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIMOTHY D. McLEOD**

12 **Q1. Will you please state your name, position, address, and background?**

13 A1. My name is Timothy D. McLeod. I am the President and General Manager of Alaska  
14 Electric Light and Power ("AELP"). My business address is 5601 Tongard Court,  
15 Juneau, Alaska 99801.

16  
17  
18 I began work in the electric utility sector in 1971, when I took a position with a firm  
19 doing land surveying and power line design and inspections. In 1973, I joined the  
20 engineering department of Mountain Parks Electric, Inc., an electric cooperative in  
21 Granby, Colorado. During that time I also continued my academic studies in electrical  
22 engineering, and eventually became the manager of the engineering department.

23  
24  
25 In 1983, I joined AELP as the Assistant Transmission and Distribution Engineer. In  
26 1987, I became the manager of that department. During that time I also studied  
27 accounting and business management at the University of Alaska Southeast in Juneau.  
28

LAW OFFICES OF  
KEMPEL, HUFFMAN AND ELLIS  
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
255 E. FIREWEED LANE, SUITE 200  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503-2025  
(907) 277-1604

1 In 2000 I transferred to the position of Secretary-Treasurer to oversee the company's  
2 financial operations. In 2001, I became the Assistant General Manager, and in August  
3 2002 I assumed my present position as AELP's President and General Manager.  
4

5  
6 **Q2. What is your role in this proceeding and what other witnesses will AELP present?**

7 A2 As President and General Manager, I am responsible for AELP's overall policies and  
8 ratemaking decisions, and will testify with respect to those matters. Constance  
9 S. Hulbert, AELP's Secretary-Treasurer, has primary responsibility for the revenue  
10 requirement study and supporting information and her testimony deals primarily with  
11 those matters. Thomas M. Zepp, with Utility Resources, Inc., will present testimony  
12 regarding AELP's cost of capital. David A. Gray, with CH2MHill, will present  
13 testimony on the cost of service study.  
14

15  
16 **Q3. What matters will you discuss as the AELP policy witness?**

17 A3. I will comment on AELP's policy objectives, the Juneau economy, and other background  
18 matters related to this rate proceeding.  
19

20  
21 **Q4. What are AELP's corporate goals?**

22 A4. AELP has three main corporate policy goals. They are to:  
23  
24 1. Provide safe and reliable service from electric energy generated from renewable  
25 resources;  
26  
27 2. Provide among the lowest average electric rates of major regulated utilities in  
28 Alaska, over the long run while maintaining financial integrity; and

1           3.       Utilize electric resources efficiently.

2           The corporate goals were first adopted in 1983; since then they have been modified  
3           several times and are reevaluated periodically. We believe we are doing a good job  
4           meeting these goals. However, as my testimony and that of AELP's other witnesses will  
5           show, in the absence of the rate increase we have requested, the utility will be unable to  
6           meet one key part of these goals: maintaining financial integrity. In the long run, failure  
7           to maintain financial integrity hinders the company's ability to sustain the first and third  
8           goals.  
9

10  
11       **Q5.    Please summarize Juneau's economic situation and outlook.**

12       **A5.**   Juneau's economy is primarily dependent on the state and federal governments, with  
13       mining and tourism being the largest other source of employment. The Hecla Greens  
14       Creek Mining Company ("HGCMC") mine on Admiralty Island began operations in  
15       1989, and has approximately 330 employees, making it one of the largest individual  
16       private employers in Southeast Alaska. The outlook for the mine is positive due to high  
17       mineral prices and because the operator continues to identify additional mineral reserves.  
18

19  
20       The Kensington Mine, located approximately 35 miles north of Juneau, recently received  
21       final permitting, is nearing completion of necessary facilities, and plans to begin mining  
22       operations in July of this year. When full operation is achieved, the Kensington mine is  
23       expected to employ approximately 200 people. AELP is not electrically connected to the  
24       Kensington Mine, so the mine's initial impact on AELP will consist of induced load  
25       growth from the jobs and other local economic activity the mine creates.  
26  
27

28       PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIMOTHY D. McLEOD

Tariff Advice No. 381-1

Page 3 of 13

fs\AELP\TY09RateCase\Test\5-3-10\

1  
2 Tourism employment had experienced many years of continuous growth until 2009. In  
3 2009, there was a small reduction in the number of ship visits to Juneau, and even fewer  
4 visits are committed in 2010. The cruise ship lines have reduced voyages to Alaska due  
5 to weak demand from the lower 48 states and in part because of the \$50 head tax passed  
6 by Statewide Initiative in 2008. On April 25, 2010, the Alaska Legislature voted to  
7 overturn the head tax initiative and passed a bill that will reduce the head tax to \$19.50  
8 for cruise ship voyages to Juneau.  
9

10  
11 In general, the Juneau area economy is stable, with new mining jobs offsetting a slight  
12 downturn in tourism, but remains vulnerable because of its lack of diversity. Tourism  
13 can be affected by a variety of unexpected events, such as a flu epidemic and the  
14 economic climate in the Lower 48. Mining operations depend on mineral prices, along  
15 with other factors beyond the control of the operators. Juneau's economic vulnerabilities  
16 also include the potential relocation of the Capital to a location in Alaska's Railbelt (a  
17 possibility we do not currently expect will materialize) as well as the further migration  
18 and/or relocation of state jobs to the Anchorage area.  
19  
20

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
LAW OFFICES OF  
KEMPEL, HUFFMAN AND ELLIS  
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
255 E. FIREWEED LANE, SUITE 200  
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99503-2025  
(907) 277-1604

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Q6. Please describe AELP's power generation resources.**

A6. Attached as Exhibit TDM-1 is a diagram of the hydroelectric facilities and associated transmission lines that supply power to AELP. Before the recently constructed Phase 1 of the Lake Dorothy Hydroelectric Project ("Lake Dorothy") was completed, AELP owned three small hydroelectric generation facilities: the Annex Creek, Salmon Creek, and Gold Creek projects.

In 1998, the State of Alaska, through the Alaska Energy Authority ("AEA") and the Alaska Industrial Development & Export Authority ("AIDEA"), purchased the Snettisham Hydroelectric Project ("Snettisham") from the federal government, including the project's transmission line and submarine cables as well as its power generation facilities. Snettisham had already supplied most of AELP's power for many years. When the State purchased the project, AELP entered into a "take or pay" agreement for all of the Snettisham energy, obligating AELP to pay debt service costs of about \$6 million annually, a contribution to the Renewal and Replacement fund, plus all of the project's operating and maintenance costs.

In addition to hydro facilities, AELP has the capacity to supply the entirety of Juneau's firm loads with diesel generating units. Because of the cost of fuel, and also because of permit restrictions on air emissions, AELP uses its diesel generation only for emergencies, such as during transmission line outages or to supplement available hydro power during periods of water deficiencies, and to periodically exercise the diesel generation units.

1 After over 14 years of planning, permitting, and construction, Phase 1 of Lake Dorothy  
2 was completed and commenced commercial operation on August 31, 2009. Phase 1 of  
3 Lake Dorothy is capable of producing approximately 63 million kWhs during a dry water  
4 year and an average of about 75 million kWhs annually, incrementally adding  
5 approximately 20 percent of additional hydroelectric energy to AELP's grid.  
6

7  
8 Except during dry water years or hydroelectric supply or transmission outages, AELP  
9 will be able to supply all of its current firm loads with hydroelectric power. In addition,  
10 until load growth prevents it, AELP will also be able to sell hydroelectric energy to  
11 AELP's interruptible customers to help keep firm service rates low.  
12

13  
14 **Q7. Please summarize the key factors that led AELP to constructing Lake Dorothy.**

15 A7. As an initial matter, adding hydroelectric generation is much different from adding a  
16 single diesel or natural gas generating unit. First, the required lead time to plan for,  
17 permit, and construct a hydroelectric project like Lake Dorothy is usually much longer  
18 than for adding a thermal unit to an existing generation plant. Second, the capacity of a  
19 hydroelectric project is limited by the physical characteristics of the stream flow,  
20 drainage area and reservoir.  
21

22  
23 In the case of Lake Dorothy, it was identified many years ago as the most favorable  
24 resource for meeting Juneau's electric requirements. Investigation activities for the  
25 permitting and construction of Phase 1 of the project began in 1995, and the Federal  
26 Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") license for that phase was granted in  
27

28 PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIMOTHY D. McLEOD

Tariff Advice No. 381-1

Page 6 of 13

fs\AELP\TY09RateCase\Test\5-3-10\

1 December 2003. AELP was on the verge of using all of its available hydro energy in an  
2 average water year, with the chance of needing significant amounts of diesel in a dry  
3 water year.  
4

5 Four key factors made Lake Dorothy particularly favorable as a new resource:  
6

- 7 1. The Lake Dorothy reservoir topography allowed for two phases of development:  
8 Phase 1 was cheaper and would provide less energy per year, which was ideal for  
9 initial construction, and Phase 2 could be constructed later to meet the additional  
10 energy needs of the community. Phase 1 takes water through a penstock from  
11 Bart Lake, which is located downstream of Lake Dorothy. Lake Dorothy was  
12 tapped 120 feet below the surface with a control valve to regulate the stream flow  
13 from Lake Dorothy into Bart Lake. The Bart Lake project was the least expensive  
14 option and best met AELP's current and projected resource needs. Phase 2 of the  
15 project will use water from the Lake Dorothy tap to power additional generators,  
16 more than doubling the total project output. With permitting and construction of  
17 Phase 1 completed, permitting and construction of the second phase in the future  
18 is expected to be less time consuming and could be completed in as little as four  
19 to five years.  
20
- 21 2. AELP and HGCMC reached an agreement for the mine to purchase interruptible  
22 energy, which meant that now there was a large buyer immediately available to  
23 pay for a significant portion of the additional energy when the project came  
24 online. Because the mine is an interruptible customer, energy deliveries to it can  
25 be interrupted when and as needed to serve AELP's firm customers.  
26  
27

- 1           3.     Federal grant funds paid for the majority of the infrastructure needed to enable  
2           energy delivery to the mine.
- 3           4.     Lake Dorothy diversifies the availability of hydro energy to Juneau and therefore  
4           reduces the potential need to generate with diesel in the event of the loss of  
5           energy from the other hydro projects. For example, prior to the completion of  
6           Lake Dorothy, Snettisham provided roughly 85 percent of the community's  
7           energy. With Phase 1 of Lake Dorothy online, that percentage drops to 70  
8           percent. In the event that energy deliveries from Snettisham are interrupted due to  
9           generation or transmission outages, Phase 1 of Lake Dorothy energy will reduce  
10          generation or transmission outages, Phase 1 of Lake Dorothy energy will reduce  
11          diesel generation by roughly 40 percent of what would otherwise be needed.  
12          Related to that, Lake Dorothy is much closer to Juneau than is Snettisham and  
13          Lake Dorothy's transmission line is not as vulnerable to avalanche damage as is  
14          the Snettisham transmission line. *See* Exhibit TDM-1. For example, in 2008 and  
15          early 2009, avalanches damaged the Snettisham line, which required AELP to  
16          produce power from diesel generation for extended periods of time while the line  
17          was repaired. As a result, AELP's customers faced significant temporary rate  
18          increases for the cost of diesel fuel through AELP's emergency cost of power  
19          adjustment ("ECOPA"). During the 2008 avalanche, AELP burned 2.3 million  
20          gallons of fuel at a cost of \$8.9 million, resulting in an ECOPA charge of  
21          42.9 cents per kWh (in addition to base rates). During the 2009 avalanche,  
22          AEL&P burned 1.5 million gallons at a cost of \$3.8 million, resulting in an  
23          ECOPA of 14.4 cents per kWh. If Phase 1 of Lake Dorothy had been in operation  
24          during those times, it would have allowed AELP to reduce its diesel generation by

1 approximately 40 percent and would have saved AELP's customers over  
2 \$5 million in diesel generation costs.  
3

4 **Q8. What advantage do interruptible customers provide to the construction of new**  
5 **hydro projects?**  
6

7 **A8.** Hydroelectric projects provide the lowest cost per kWh to consumers when operated at  
8 full capacity. Once hydro resources are fully loaded by firm loads, capacity to serve new  
9 load growth is provided by diesel generation or the construction of new hydroelectric  
10 resources. Interruptible customers make it possible to sustain optimal loading and the  
11 resulting lower rates to firm customers over a period of time. Interruptible customers  
12 reduce the cost per kilowatt hour and provide room for firm load growth from existing  
13 hydroelectric resources. By serving interruptible loads such as dual fuel heating systems,  
14 cruise ships, and the HGCMC mine, AELP has gained the ability to shed, if necessary,  
15 loads equal to nearly twenty percent of AELP's total annual energy sales requirements.  
16 In addition, while connected, the interruptible loads make a helpful revenue contribution  
17 to further reduce costs that would otherwise be borne solely by AELP's firm customers.  
18 For these reasons, AELP offers interruptible service to HGCMC and interruptible shore  
19 power to Princess Cruise Lines under Commission-approved power sales agreements.  
20 Special interruptible tariff rates are also available to other customers, such as the Juneau  
21 Federal Building, the University Library, and multiple residential customers with dual  
22 fuel heating systems.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **Q9. Beyond interruptible rates, what other innovative rates are offered by AELP?**

2 A9: AELP is proud to offer alternative rate structures to stimulate consumer investment in  
3 energy efficiency. AELP's tariff includes special incentive rates for residential off-peak  
4 heat storage systems and air to air or ground source heat pumps. In addition, AELP is  
5 preparing submittal of two new innovative rates for the Commission's review:  
6

- 7 1. An incentive rate for the use of Light Emitting Diode ("LED") street lights to  
8 promote conservation.
- 9 2. An incentive experimental rate to promote the use of plug-in electric vehicles,  
10 which will reduce oil consumption. AELP will then collect load research  
11 information related to this new type of rate.  
12

13  
14 **Q10. AELP is proposing to annualize the rate base and depreciation expense associated**  
15 **with Lake Dorothy. Please explain why.**

16 A10. Ms. Hulbert also addresses that in her testimony. From my perspective, that treatment is  
17 entirely reasonable for the following reasons. First, Lake Dorothy went into service and  
18 began serving AELP customers on August 31 of the test year, long before AELP's  
19 proposed new rates will go into effect.<sup>1</sup> Second, the adjustment is known and  
20 measurable. Third, Lake Dorothy is an extraordinary single project addition that  
21 constitutes a significant portion of AELP's net plant in service. Fourth, Lake Dorothy  
22 unquestionably provides benefits to AELP's customers through increased reliability,  
23

24 <sup>1</sup> Currently, AELP is storing water in the Lake Dorothy reservoir while supplemental  
25 impermeable membrane is being extended in the Bart Lake reservoir to minimize underground  
26 seepage. Work related to reducing seepage will continue into July, but the hydroelectric  
27 production potential is being preserved through storage of the water in the Lake Dorothy  
28 reservoir.

1 mitigation of diesel costs that would otherwise be charged to firm customers through  
2 AELP's COPA or ECOPA, and revenue credits from interruptible sales. Fifth, I  
3 understand that the Commission has approved this type of adjustment in two relatively  
4 recent rate cases — Order No. U-01-108(26) (allowing Chugach Electric Association,  
5 Inc. to recover annualized depreciation expenses associated with a \$20 million generation  
6 unit repowering project even though parts of the project were not completed until  
7 10 months after the end of the test year), and Order No. U-08-157(10) (allowing  
8 Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility to annualize rate base and depreciation expense  
9 associated with a \$22.2 million redundant water loop project that went into service in  
10 October of the test year). Sixth, if AELP is not allowed to annualize its known and  
11 measurable Lake Dorothy costs, it will preclude AELP from having the opportunity to  
12 earn a reasonable rate of return on investment.  
13  
14  
15

16 **Q11. What has AELP done to mitigate exposure to prolonged outages of the Snettisham**  
17 **line such as those caused by the avalanches of 2008 and 2009?**

18 A11. The 43-mile Snettisham transmission line will always be vulnerable to catastrophic  
19 failure. In light of the recent events and the inherent exposure of the line, AELP believes  
20 it is necessary to build up a cash reserve to assure its ability to comply with the  
21 Snettisham take-or-pay and other debt service obligations, in the event of extended  
22 Snettisham line outages. In addition, AELP recognizes the need to install additional  
23 stand-by diesel generation and is proceeding with the required air quality studies and  
24 permitting. AELP has improved and will continue to improve the reliability of the  
25 Snettisham line and prepare for quick recovery of unavoidable line failures. Completed  
26  
27

1 improvements include: (1) increased hydroelectric diversity with the construction of  
2 Phase 1 of Lake Dorothy; (2) construction of an avalanche diversion structure at tower  
3 4/6, one of the most vulnerable transmission structures; (3) construction of a bypass of  
4 structure 3/5, which was damaged by both the 2008 and 2009 events; and (4) continuous  
5 avalanche monitoring and control work. AELP is also investigating design and funding  
6 of additional transmission line modifications through the avalanche zone. In addition,  
7 AELP is exploring investment options to mitigate other vulnerabilities of the Snettisham  
8 line, including the potential failure of the submarine cable crossing the Taku Inlet and  
9 avalanches in other known high risk zones.  
10

11  
12 **Q12. Do you have any further comments on AELP's proposed rate increase at this time?**

13  
14 A12. AELP's requested rate increase is necessary to help ensure that AELP will have access to  
15 reasonably priced debt capital to fund necessary plant capital improvements. For  
16 example, during the last eight years, AELP had a transmission and distribution capital  
17 budget that averaged \$1.6 million per year. In the next eight years, AELP expects to  
18 have an average transmission and distribution budget of \$3.4 million per year. These  
19 capital improvements will be necessary for AELP to preserve and improve system  
20 reliability, replace inadequate plant, and meet any load growth that may occur. AELP  
21 will need to improve its debt-to-equity ratio, achieved rate of return on equity, and debt  
22 service coverage over the next several years in order to be able to attract the capital, at  
23 reasonable rates, needed to construct future resources.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 AELP can fund necessary capital expenditures with debt or equity. Equity capital is  
2 generally more costly than debt capital, and debt capital is generally more costly for a  
3 borrower with poor or declining financial ratios than it is for a borrower with solid  
4 financial ratios. Thus, as a general matter, inadequate electric rates can lead to poor  
5 financial indicators, which can lead to higher-cost debt or the need to fund capital  
6 improvements only with equity, both of which lead to further pressure to increase electric  
7 rates in the future.  
8

9  
10 In AELP's case, AELP's achieved rate of return on equity and its equity-to-debt ratio  
11 have declined significantly since AELP's last rate case. For example, AELP's 2009  
12 actual achieved rate of return on common equity was 1.59 percent. That puts AELP in a  
13 poor position for financing and constructing needed capital improvements in the near  
14 future. Prompt approval of AELP's requested rate increase will help improve AELP's  
15 financial indicators and allow AELP to access low-cost capital when necessary, which in  
16 the long run will help stabilize AELP's electric rates.  
17

18  
19 **Q13. Does this complete your testimony?**

20 **A13. Yes**  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIMOTHY D. McLEOD  
Tariff Advice No. 381-1

Page 13 of 13

fs\AELPTY09RateCase\Test\5-3-10\

