

Exhibit No.:  
Issues: KCP&L – GMO MEEIA  
Application  
Witness: Steve W. Chriss  
Sponsoring Party: Walmart  
Type of Exhibit: Rebuttal Testimony  
File No.: EO-2012-0009  
Date of Testimony: March 20, 2012

**MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

**CASE NO. EO-2012-0009**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**

**OF**

**STEVE W. CHRISS**

**ON BEHALF OF**

**WAL-MART STORES EAST, L.P. AND  
SAM'S EAST, INC.**

March 20, 2012

1     **Q.     PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND**  
2     **OCCUPATION.**

3     A.     My name is Steve W. Chriss. My business address is 2001 SE 10th St.,  
4           Bentonville, AR 72716-0550. My title is Senior Manager, Energy  
5           Regulatory Analysis, for Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

6     **Q.     ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS CASE?**

7     A.     I am testifying on behalf of Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc.  
8           (collectively "Walmart").

9     **Q.     PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE.**

10    A.     In 2001, I completed a Master of Science in Agricultural Economics at  
11           Louisiana State University. From 2001 to 2003, I was an Analyst and later  
12           a Senior Analyst at the Houston office of Econ One Research, Inc., a Los  
13           Angeles-based consulting firm. My duties included research and analysis  
14           on domestic and international energy and regulatory issues. From 2003 to  
15           2007, I was an Economist and later a Senior Utility Analyst at the Public  
16           Utility Commission of Oregon in Salem, Oregon. My duties included  
17           appearing as a witness for PUC Staff in electric, natural gas, and  
18           telecommunications dockets. I joined the energy department at Walmart  
19           in July 2007 as Manager, State Rate Proceedings, and was promoted to  
20           my current position in June 2011. My Witness Qualifications Statement is  
21           found on Exhibit SWC-1.

1       **Q.    HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE THE**  
2       **MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ("THE COMMISSION")?**

3       A.    Yes. I testified in Case No. ER-2010-0036.

4       **Q.    HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED TESTIMONY BEFORE OTHER**  
5       **STATE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS?**

6       A.    Yes. I have submitted testimony in over 60 proceedings before 29 other  
7       utility regulatory commissions and before the Missouri House Committee  
8       on Utilities and the Missouri Senate Veterans' Affairs, Emerging Issues,  
9       Pensions, and Urban Affairs Committee. My testimony has addressed  
10      topics including cost of service and rate design, ratemaking policy,  
11      qualifying facility rates, telecommunications deregulation, resource  
12      certification, energy efficiency/demand side management, fuel cost  
13      adjustment mechanisms, decoupling, and the collection of cash earnings  
14      on construction work in progress.

15      **Q.    HAVE YOU PREPARED EXHIBITS?**

16      A.    Yes, I have prepared Exhibit SWC-1.

17      **Q.    WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

18      A.    The purpose of my testimony is to address aspects of KCP&L Greater  
19      Missouri Operations Company's ("GMO" or "the Company") proposed  
20      Demand-Side Programs Investment Mechanism ("DSIM"), responding  
21      specifically to the direct testimonies and exhibits of Allen D. Dennis and  
22      Tim M. Rush. Walmart is also sponsoring the testimony of Kenneth E.



1 Baker, Senior Manager for Sustainable Regulation, who will address  
2 issues regarding GMO's proposed demand response program.

3 **Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR RECOMMENDATIONS.**

4 A. My recommendations are as follows:

- 5 1. The DSIM revenue requirement and resulting rates should be set in a  
6 manner similar to GMO's program design, such that separate revenue  
7 requirements and rates are calculated for residential customers and the  
8 composite of commercial and industrial customers.
- 9 2. The Commission should consider, when setting the return on equity  
10 ("ROE") for GMO in ER-2012-0175, the impact of the level of revenue and  
11 earnings assurance provided to the Company by the DSIM approved in  
12 this case.

13 The fact that an issue is not addressed should not be construed  
14 as an endorsement of any filed position.

15  
16 ***Cost Recovery***

17 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED**  
18 **DSIM?**

19 A. My understanding is that the proposed DSIM is a new rider intended to be  
20 charged to all of GMO's customers, with the exception on Lighting  
21 Schedules as well as customers who qualify for the opt out per 4 CSR  
22 240-20.094(6). See Schedule TMR-1.

1       **Q.    DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE ANY EXCEPTIONS TO THE OPT**  
2       **OUT IN ITS PROPOSED DSIM?**

3       A.    Yes. The Company proposes to charge the DSIM to any customer who  
4       has participated in demand side management ("DSM") programs after  
5       August 1, 2009 for three years following the last date when the customer  
6       received an incentive. *Id.* The inclusion of these customers is allowed per  
7       4 CSR 240-20.094(6)(I).

8       **Q.    WHAT COMPONENTS DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE TO INCLUDE**  
9       **IN THE DSIM REVENUE REQUIREMENT?**

10      A.    GMO's proposed DSIM revenue requirement is made up of the  
11      Company's prospective and trued-up demand side management ("DSM")  
12      program costs, the prospective and true-up shared benefits incentive, the  
13      retrospective performance incentive, and retrospective lost revenues.  
14      Retrospective components are included in the DSIM for recovery only  
15      after evaluation, measurement, and verification of the Company's  
16      programs. Additionally, GMO would only receive lost revenue recovery to  
17      the extent the Company's DSM programs cause a drop in retail kWh sold  
18      below the levels used to set rates in the last general rate case. *Id.*

19      **Q.    WHAT IS THE LOST REVENUES COMPONENT INTENDED TO**  
20      **COLLECT?**



1 A. The lost revenues component is intended to collect fixed costs that are not  
2 recovered as established in the Company's last rate case. See Direct  
3 Testimony of Tim M. Rush, page 21, line 8 to line 10.

4 **Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY PROPOSE TO CHARGE CUSTOMERS**  
5 **UNDER THE DSIM?**

6 A. The Company proposes to charge customers on an equal cents per kWh  
7 basis. The proposed rate for all rate classes in this proceeding is  
8 \$0.0022/kWh, which represents a rate increase of 2.7 percent. See Direct  
9 Testimony of Tim M. Rush, page 5, line 19 to page 6, line 2 and Schedule  
10 TMR-1.

11 **Q. DOES THE COMPANY INDICATE IF EACH CUSTOMER CLASS**  
12 **WOULD BE CHARGED A DSIM RATE THAT REFLECTS THE**  
13 **CUSTOMER-CLASS SPECIFIC DSIM REVENUE REQUIREMENT FOR**  
14 **EACH CUSTOMER CLASS?**

15 A. No. It is not clear whether GMO would calculate customer-class specific  
16 DSM revenue requirements. More specifically, GMO does not indicate if  
17 the calculation of the DSIM revenue requirement allocates the program  
18 costs, incentives, and lost revenues for each customer class only to that  
19 customer class, or more broadly, allocating the DSIM component costs for  
20 residential customers to only residential customers, and the DSIM  
21 component costs for commercial and Industrial customers only to  
22 commercial and industrial customers.

1       **Q.   DO YOU HAVE CONCERNS WITH THE PROPOSED DSIM?**

2       A.   Yes. I have several concerns regarding an allocation methodology that  
3       does not allocate DSIM component costs to the appropriate customer  
4       classes per cost causation principles and the proposed DSIM rate design.

5       **Q.   WHAT IS YOUR FIRST CONCERN?**

6       A.   My first concern is that, generally, the DSIM component costs should be  
7       allocated, and approved DSIM rates, like all utility rates, should be set  
8       based upon the Company's underlying cost of service. Setting rates  
9       based on cost of service produces equitable rates that reflect cost  
10      causation, send proper price signals, and minimize price distortions.

11      **Q.   DOES GMO SEGMENT THE PROPOSED DSM PROGRAMS BY**  
12      **CUSTOMER CLASS SERVED?**

13      A.   Yes. GMO has proposed to segment their proposed DSM programs by  
14      customer class served, such that there are two sets of programs: 1)  
15      residential and 2) the composite of commercial and industrial customer  
16      classes. See Direct Testimony of Allen D. Dennis, page 19, line 1.

17      **Q.   WHY IS COST ALLOCATION A CONCERN?**

18      A.   Cost allocation is a concern because cost responsibility for DSM programs  
19      provided for a particular customer class, and the related DSIM component  
20      costs, should be borne by that customer class and not allocated, in part, to  
21      another customer class. For example, commercial and industrial  
22      programs should be paid for by the commercial and industrial customers



1 who have not opted out, not by residential customers, who cannot  
2 participate in commercial and industrial programs.

3 **Q. DOES THE PROPOSED DSIM RECOGNIZE THIS PRINCIPLE WITH**  
4 **THE COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL OPT OUT?**

5 A. Yes. Commercial and industrial customers who opt out and do not pay  
6 the DSIM forego all participation and benefit from GMO's DSM programs.  
7 See Schedule TMR-1.

8 **Q. DOES THE INCLUSION OF LOST REVENUES IN THE DSIM REVENUE**  
9 **REQUIREMENT CREATE A POTENTIAL COST RESPONSIBILITY**  
10 **ISSUE IF COSTS ARE NOT ALLOCATED BY CUSTOMER CLASS?**

11 A. Yes. If costs are not allocated by customer class, the inclusion of lost  
12 revenues creates a potential cost responsibility issue as customer class  
13 fixed cost-related revenue responsibilities are potentially intermingled,  
14 which can exacerbate the inter-class revenue responsibility issues  
15 typically found in general rate proceedings. This issue is compounded by  
16 the existence of customer classes that currently pay rates above GMO's  
17 cost to serve and, as such, currently over-recover the fixed costs incurred  
18 to serve them. See Schedule PMN-2A, Schedule 1, Page 1, Case No.  
19 ER-2012-0175.<sup>1</sup> Failure to allocate DSIM component costs by customer  
20 class could attach additional fixed cost recovery burden to customer

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, GMO's proposed cost of service schedules filed in their ongoing rate case indicate that even within the composite commercial and industrial group, there are differences in the level of recovery relative to cost of service for the individual commercial and industrial customer classes.



1 classes that, as a matter of general ratemaking, should have their fixed  
2 cost recovery burden decreased, not increased.

3 **Q. ARE THERE ANY OTHER FACTORS THE COMMISSION SHOULD**  
4 **CONSIDER?**

5 A. Yes. For commercial and industrial customers who qualify for the opt out,  
6 the DSIM serves as the price signal that will be used by those customers  
7 in determining whether participation in GMO's programs is economic  
8 versus opting out. Failing to allocate costs in a manner consistent with  
9 cost causation could result in a rate higher than would otherwise be  
10 charged to commercial and industrial customers under a cost of service-  
11 based DSIM rate. This would provide an economic disincentive to  
12 commercial and industrial customer participation in GMO's DSM  
13 programs.

14 **Q. WHAT IS YOUR RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMISSION ON THE**  
15 **ISSUE OF COST RECOVERY?**

16 A. The DSIM revenue requirement and resulting rates should be set in a  
17 manner similar to GMO's program design, such that separate revenue  
18 requirements and rates are calculated for residential customers and the  
19 composite of commercial and industrial customers.

20 **Q. DOES THIS RECOMMENDATION FULLY ADDRESS THE LOST**  
21 **REVENUE ISSUE WITHIN THE COMPOSITE COMMERCIAL AND**  
22 **INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMER GROUP?**

1 A. No. However, for the purposes of this docket and administrative  
2 efficiency, I am not advocating that a DSIM revenue requirement be set for  
3 individual commercial and industrial customer classes.  
4

5 ***Lost Revenues***

6 **Q. FROM A POLICY PERSPECTIVE, WHAT IS YOUR UNDERSTANDING**  
7 **OF THE ROLE OF LOST REVENUE MECHANISMS?**

8 A. Lost revenue mechanisms are essentially regulatory risk management  
9 tools employed to encourage a utility to promote energy efficiency when  
10 doing so may have the potential to compromise the utility's ability to earn  
11 an authorized rate of return on investments. Utility-implemented  
12 measures to improve energy efficiency, mandated through legislation or  
13 the regulatory process, if effective, reduce energy consumption and thus  
14 reduce energy sales, potentially lowering a utility's revenues and earnings.

15 **Q. DOES 4 CSR 240-20.093(2) ALLOW THE COMMISSION TO CONSIDER**  
16 **CHANGES IN THE UTILITY'S BUSINESS RISK FROM THE DSIM IN**  
17 **SETTING THE COMPANY'S RETURN ON EQUITY IN GENERAL RATE**  
18 **PROCEEDINGS?**

19 A. Yes.

20 **Q. HAS GMO INDICATED IN THEIR FILING THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF**  
21 **THE PROPOSED DSIM WILL CHANGE THEIR BUSINESS RISK?**



1 A. Yes. GMO witness Rush indicates that the earnings analysis provided in  
2 Schedule TMR-5 demonstrates that the proposed mechanism "essentially  
3 keeps the Company whole compared to the current recovery mechanism."  
4 See Direct Testimony of Tim M. Rush, page 29, line 1 to line 3.

5 **Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT RECOVERY OF FIXED COSTS THROUGH A**  
6 **LOST REVENUE MECHANISM RESULTS IN LOWER RISK THAN**  
7 **TRADITIONAL RECOVERY THROUGH BASE RATES?**

8 A. Yes. It is my understanding that under the proposed DSIM mechanism,  
9 the utility is guaranteed to recover any shortfall in the recovery of fixed  
10 costs that is caused by sales levels, below those approved in the last rate  
11 case, resulting from implementation of the proposed DSM programs. As  
12 such, the utility's risk profile is reduced.

13 **Q. DOES GMO CURRENTLY HAVE A GENERAL RATE PROCEEDING**  
14 **BEFORE THE COMMISSION?**

15 A. Yes, Case No. ER-2012-0175.

16 **Q. DO YOU HAVE A SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATION AS TO AN**  
17 **APPROPRIATE ROE ADJUSTMENT IN THAT CASE UPON**  
18 **APPROVAL OF A DSIM IN THIS CASE?**

19 A. No. I recommend that the Commission should consider, when setting the  
20 ROE for GMO in ER-2012-0175, the impact of the level of revenue and  
21 earnings assurance provided to the Company by the DSIM approved in  
22 this Case.



**Q. HAVE COMMISSIONS IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS MADE ROE  
ADJUSTMENTS DUE TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF REVENUE  
ASSURANCE MECHANISMS?**

A. Yes. Other jurisdictions have made specific ROE adjustments due to the implementation of revenue assurance mechanisms:

- The Maryland Public Service Commission, in approving a Bill Stabilization Adjustment mechanism for Potomac Edison, recognized that the mechanism “reduces risk and therefore reduces the Company’s cost of capital,” and, therefore, reduced the utility’s ROE by 50 basis points.<sup>2</sup>
- The Montana Public Service Commission stated that adoption of NorthWestern Energy’s mechanism will shift risk from the utility to its customers, and reduced the utility’s ROE by 25 basis points.<sup>3</sup>
- The Public Utility Commission of Oregon, in approving a mechanism for Portland General Electric, reduced the utility’s authorized ROE by 10 basis points to “reflect the reduction in the Company’s risk.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See *In the Matter of the Application of Potomac Electric Power Company to Revise its Rates and Charges for Electric Service and for Certain Rate Design Changes*, Maryland Public Service Commission Order No. 81517, July 19, 2007, Case No. 9092, page 81.

<sup>3</sup> See *In the Matter of NorthWestern Energy’s Application for Approval for Authority to Establish Increased Natural Gas and Electric Delivery Service Rates*, Montana Public Service Commission Order No. 7046h, December 7, 2010, Docket No. D2009.9.129, page 60.

<sup>4</sup> See *In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, Request for a general rate revision*, Public Utility Commission of Oregon Order 09-020, January 22, 2009, Docket UE 197, page 29.

1        Additionally, Commissions in other jurisdictions have accounted for  
2        revenue assurance mechanisms in setting an apparently reduced ROE  
3        but did not quantify the specific ROE adjustment attributable to the  
4        revenue assurance mechanism in their orders:

- 5            • The Hawaii Public Utilities took into account the approval of a  
6            decoupling mechanism in their setting of the ROE for Hawaiian  
7            Electric Company.<sup>5</sup>
- 8            • For Western Massachusetts Electric Company, the Massachusetts  
9            Department of Public Utilities found that "the revenue decoupling  
10           mechanism that we have approved in this case will reduce the  
11           variability of the Company's revenues and, accordingly, reduce its  
12           risks and its investors' return requirement" and would "examine the  
13           specific risk profile of the Company and the specific features of the  
14           revenue decoupling proposal we are approving today to arrive at  
15           the appropriate determination of the effect on risk on WMECo's  
16           required ROE."<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> See *In the Matter of the Application of Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. for Approval of Rate Increases and Revised Rate Schedules and Rules*, Hawaii Public Utilities Commission December 29, 2010, Final Decision and Order, Docket No. 2008-0083, page 42. The Hawaii Public Utilities Commission awarded Hawaiian Electric Company a ROE of 10 percent.

<sup>6</sup> See *Petition of Western Massachusetts Electric Company, pursuant to G.L.c. 164, § 94 and 220 C.M.R. §§ 5.00 et seq. for Approval of a General Increase in Electric Distribution Rates and a Revenue Decoupling Mechanism*, Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities January 31, 2011, Order, D.P.U. 10-70, page 283 to 284. The Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities awarded Western Massachusetts Electric Company a ROE of 9.6 percent. *Id.* Page 288.

- 1                   • The Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control stated in its  
2                   final order for the 2008 United Illuminating general rate case that  
3                   “The implementation of a decoupling mechanism further mitigates  
4                   the earnings pressure of the Company having the impact of  
5                   reducing the overall risk profile of UI.”<sup>7</sup>

6           **Q.     DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?**

7           **A.     Yes.**

---

<sup>7</sup> See *Application of the United Illuminating Company to Increase its Rates and Charges*, Connecticut Department of Utility Control February 4, 2009 Decision, Docket No. 08-07-04, page 101. The Connecticut Department of Utility Control (now the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority) awarded United Illuminating a ROE of 8.75 percent. *Id.*, page 103.



## Steve W. Chriss

Senior Manager, Energy Regulatory Analysis

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

Business Address: 2001 SE 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Bentonville, AR, 72716-0550

Business Phone: (479) 204-1594

---

### EXPERIENCE

July 2007 – Present

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., Bentonville, AR

Senior Manager, Energy Regulatory Analysis (June 2011 – Present)

Manager, State Rate Proceedings (July 2007 – June 2011)

June 2003 – July 2007

Public Utility Commission of Oregon, Salem, OR

Senior Utility Analyst (February 2006 – July 2007)

Economist (June 2003 – February 2006)

January 2003 - May 2003

North Harris College, Houston, TX

Adjunct Instructor, Microeconomics

June 2001 - March 2003

Econ One Research, Inc., Houston, TX

Senior Analyst (October 2002 – March 2003)

Analyst (June 2001 – October 2002)

### EDUCATION

2001

Louisiana State University

M.S., Agricultural Economics

1997-1998

University of Florida

Graduate Coursework, Agricultural Education  
and Communication

1997

Texas A&M University

B.S., Agricultural Development

B.S., Horticulture

### TESTIMONY BEFORE REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

2012

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 11AL-947E: In the Matter of Advice Letter No. 1597-Electric Filed by Public Service Company of Colorado to Revise its Colorado PUC No. 7-Electric Tariff to Implement a General Rate Schedule Adjustment and Other Changes Effective December 23, 2011.

Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 11-0721: Commonwealth Edison Company Tariffs and Charges Submitted Pursuant to Section 16-108.5 of the Public Utilities Act.

Public Utility Commission of Texas Docket No. 38951: Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Approval of Competitive Generation Service tariff (Issues Severed from Docket No. 37744).

California Public Utilities Commission Docket No. A.11-06-007: Southern California Edison's General Rate Case, Phase 2.

2011

Arizona Corporation Commission Docket No. E-01345A-11-0224: In the Matter of Arizona Public Service Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of Utility Property of the Company for

Ratemaking Purposes, to Fix and Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, to Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission Cause No. PUD 201100087: In the Matter of the Application of Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company for an Order of the Commission Authorizing Applicant to Modify its Rates, Charges, and Tariffs for Retail Electric Service in Oklahoma.

South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 2011-271-E: Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Authority to Adjust and Increase its Electric Rates and Charges.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission Docket No. P-2011-2256365: Petition of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation for Approval to Implement Reconciliation Rider for Default Supply Service.

North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket No. E-7, Sub 989: In the Matter of Application of Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC for Adjustment of Rates and Charges Applicable to Electric Service in North Carolina.

Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 110138: In Re: Petition for Increase in Rates by Gulf Power Company.

Public Utilities Commission of Nevada Docket No. 11-06006: In the Matter of the Application of Nevada Power Company, filed pursuant to NRS 704.110(3) for authority to increase its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of customers to recover the costs of constructing the Harry Allen Combined Cycle plant and other generating, transmission, and distribution plant additions, to reflect changes in the cost of capital, depreciation rates and cost of service, and for relief properly related thereto.

North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket Nos. E-2, Sub 998 and E-7, Sub 986: In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Corporation and Progress Energy, Inc., to Engage in a Business Combination Transaction and to Address Regulatory Conditions and Codes of Conduct.

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Case Nos. 11-346-EL-SSO, 11-348-EL-SSO, 11-349-EL-AAM, and 11-350-EL-AAM: In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Establish a Standard Service Offer Pursuant to Section 4928.143, Revised Code, in the Form on an Electric Security Plan and In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Approval of Certain Accounting Authority.

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2011-00037: In the Matter of Appalachian Power Company for a 2011 Biennial Review of the Rates, Terms, and Conditions for the Provision of Generation, Distribution, and Transmission Services Pursuant to § 56-585.1 A of the Code of Virginia.

Illinois Commerce Commission Docket No. 11-0279 and 11-0282 (cons.): Ameren Illinois Company Proposed General Increase in Electric Delivery Service and Ameren Illinois Company Proposed General Increase in Gas Delivery Service.

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2011-00045: Application of Virginia Electric and Power Company to Revise its Fuel Factor Pursuant to § 56-249.6 of the Code of Virginia.

Utah Public Service Commission Docket No. 10-035-124: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations.



Maryland Public Utilities Commission Case No. 9249: In the Matter of the Application of Delmarva Power & Light for an Increase in its Retail Rates for the Distribution of Electric Energy.

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission Docket No. E002/GR-10-971: In the Matter of the Application of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for Authority to Increase Rates for Electric Service in Minnesota.

Michigan Public Service Commission Case No. U-16472: In the Matter of the Detroit Edison Company for Authority to Increase its Rates, Amend its Rate Schedules and Rules Governing the Distribution and Supply of Electric Energy, and for Miscellaneous Accounting Authority.

*2010*

Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Docket No. 10-2586-EL-SSO: In the Matter of the Application of Duke Energy Ohio for Approval of a Market Rate Offer to Conduct a Competitive Bidding Process for Standard Service Offer Electric Generation Supply, Accounting Modifications, and Tariffs for Generation Service.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 10A-554EG: In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of Colorado for Approval of a Number of Strategic Issues Relating to its DSM Plan, Including Long-Term Electric Energy Savings Goals, and Incentives.

Public Service Commission of West Virginia Case No. 10-0699-E-42T: Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company Rule 42T Application to Increase Electric Rates.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission Cause No. PUD 201000050: Application of Public Service Company of Oklahoma, an Oklahoma Corporation, for an Adjustment in its Rates and Charges and Terms and Conditions of Service for Electric Service in the State of Oklahoma.

Georgia Public Service Commission Docket No. 31958-U: In Re: Georgia Power Company's 2010 Rate Case.

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Docket No. 100749: 2010 Pacific Power & Light Company General Rate Case.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 10M-254E: In the Matter of Commission Consideration of Black Hills Energy's Plan in Compliance with House Bill 10-1365, "Clean Air-Clean Jobs Act."

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 10M-245E: In the Matter of Commission Consideration of Public Service Company of Colorado Plan in Compliance with House Bill 10-1365, "Clean Air-Clean Jobs Act."

Public Service Commission of Utah Docket No. 09-035-15 *Phase II*: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of its Proposed Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 217: In the Matter of PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER Request for a General Rate Revision.

Mississippi Public Service Commission Docket No. 2010-AD-57: In Re: Proposal of the Mississippi Public Service Commission to Possibly Amend Certain Rules of Practice and Procedure.



Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Cause No. 43374: Verified Petition of Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. Requesting the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission to Approve an Alternative Regulatory Plan Pursuant to Ind. Code § 8-1-2.5-1, *ET SEQ.*, for the Offering of Energy Efficiency Conservation, Demand Response, and Demand-Side Management Programs and Associated Rate Treatment Including Incentives Pursuant to a Revised Standard Contract Rider No. 66 in Accordance with Ind. Code §§ 8-1-2.5-1 *ET SEQ.* and 8-1-2-42 (a); Authority to Defer Program Costs Associated with its Energy Efficiency Portfolio of Programs; Authority to Implement New and Enhanced Energy Efficiency Programs, Including the Powershare® Program in its Energy Efficiency Portfolio of Programs; and Approval of a Modification of the Fuel Adjustment Clause Earnings and Expense Tests.

Public Utility Commission of Texas Docket No. 37744: Application of Entergy Texas, Inc. for Authority to Change Rates and to Reconcile Fuel Costs.

South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 2009-489-E: Application of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company for Adjustments and Increases in Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs.

Kentucky Public Service Commission Case No. 2009-00459: In the Matter of General Adjustments in Electric Rates of Kentucky Power Company.

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2009-00125: For acquisition of natural gas facilities Pursuant to § 56-265.4:5 B of the Virginia Code.

Arkansas Public Service Commission Docket No. 10-010-U: In the Matter of a Notice of Inquiry Into Energy Efficiency.

Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control Docket No. 09-12-05: Application of the Connecticut Light and Power Company to Amend its Rate Schedules.

Arkansas Public Service Commission Docket No. 09-084-U: In the Matter of the Application of Entergy Arkansas, Inc. For Approval of Changes in Rates for Retail Electric Service.

Missouri Public Service Commission Docket No. ER-2010-0036: In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Company's Missouri Service Area.

Public Service Commission of Delaware Docket No. 09-414: In the Matter of the Application of Delmarva Power & Light Company for an Increase in Electric Base Rates and Miscellaneous Tariff Charges.

2009

Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE-2009-00030: In the Matter of Appalachian Power Company for a Statutory Review of the Rates, Terms, and Conditions for the Provision of Generation, Distribution, and Transmission Services Pursuant to § 56-585.1 A of the Code of Virginia.

Public Service Commission of Utah Docket No. 09-035-15 *Phase I*: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of its Proposed Energy Cost Adjustment Mechanism.

Public Service Commission of Utah Docket No. 09-035-23: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority To Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of Its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations.



Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 09AL-299E: Re: The Tariff Sheets Filed by Public Service Company of Colorado with Advice Letter No. 1535 – Electric.

Arkansas Public Service Commission Docket No. 09-008-U: In the Matter of the Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Approval of a General Change in Rates and Tariffs.

Oklahoma Corporation Commission Docket No. PUD 200800398: In the Matter of the Application of Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company for an Order of the Commission Authorizing Applicant to Modify its Rates, Charges, and Tariffs for Retail Electric Service in Oklahoma.

Public Utilities Commission of Nevada Docket No. 08-12002: In the Matter of the Application by Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy, filed pursuant to NRS §704.110(3) and NRS §704.110(4) for authority to increase its annual revenue requirement for general rates charged to all classes of customers, begin to recover the costs of acquiring the Bighorn Power Plant, constructing the Clark Peakers, Environmental Retrofits and other generating, transmission and distribution plant additions, to reflect changes in cost of service and for relief properly related thereto.

New Mexico Public Regulation Commission Case No. 08-00024-UT: In the Matter of a Rulemaking to Revise NMPRC Rule 17.7.2 NMAC to Implement the Efficient Use of Energy Act.

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Cause No. 43580: Investigation by the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission, of Smart Grid Investments and Smart Grid Information Issues Contained in 111(d) of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. § 2621(d)), as Amended by the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007.

Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-30192 *Phase II (February 2009)*: Ex Parte, Application of Entergy Louisiana, LLC for Approval to Repower Little Gypsy Unit 3 Electric Generating Facility and for Authority to Commence Construction and for Certain Cost Protection and Cost Recovery.

South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 2008-251-E: In the Matter of Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.'s Application For the Establishment of Procedures to Encourage Investment in Energy Efficient Technologies; Energy Conservation Programs; And Incentives and Cost Recovery for Such Programs.

2008

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 08A-366EG: In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of Colorado for approval of its electric and natural gas demand-side management (DSM) plan for calendar years 2009 and 2010 and to change its electric and gas DSM cost adjustment rates effective January 1, 2009, and for related waivers and authorizations.

Public Service Commission of Utah Docket No. 07-035-93: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations, Consisting of a General Rate Increase of Approximately \$161.2 Million Per Year, and for Approval of a New Large Load Surcharge.

Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Cause No. 43374: Petition of Duke Energy Indiana, Inc. Requesting the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Approve an Alternative Regulatory Plan for the Offering of Energy Efficiency, Conservation, Demand Response, and Demand-Side Management.



Public Utilities Commission of Nevada Docket No. 07-12001: In the Matter of the Application of Sierra Pacific Power Company for authority to increase its general rates charged to all classes of electric customers to reflect an increase in annual revenue requirement and for relief properly related thereto.

Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-30192 *Phase II*: Ex Parte, Application of Entergy Louisiana, LLC for Approval to Repower Little Gypsy Unit 3 Electric Generating Facility and for Authority to Commence Construction and for Certain Cost Protection and Cost Recovery.

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 07A-420E: In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of Colorado For Authority to Implement and Enhanced Demand Side Management Cost Adjustment Mechanism to Include Current Cost Recovery and Incentives.

**2007**

Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-30192: Ex Parte, Application of Entergy Louisiana, LLC for Approval to Repower Little Gypsy Unit 3 Electric Generating Facility and for Authority to Commence Construction and for Certain Cost Protection and Cost Recovery.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UG 173: In the Matter of PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON Staff Request to Open an Investigation into the Earnings of Cascade Natural Gas.

**2006**

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 180/UE 181/UE 184: In the Matter of PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY Request for a General Rate Revision.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UE 179: In the Matter of PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY Request for a general rate increase in the company's Oregon annual revenues.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UM 1129 *Phase II*: Investigation Related to Electric Utility Purchases From Qualifying Facilities.

**2005**

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UM 1129 *Phase I Compliance*: Investigation Related to Electric Utility Purchases From Qualifying Facilities.

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UX 29: In the Matter of QWEST CORPORATION Petition to Exempt from Regulation Qwest's Switched Business Services.

**2004**

Public Utility Commission of Oregon Docket No. UM 1129 *Phase I*: Investigation Related to Electric Utility Purchases From Qualifying Facilities.

**TESTIMONY BEFORE LEGISLATIVE BODIES**

**2012**

Regarding Missouri House Bill 1488: Testimony Before the Missouri House Committee on Utilities, February 7, 2011.

**2011**

Regarding Missouri Senate Bills 50, 321, 359, and 406: Testimony Before the Missouri Senate Veterans' Affairs, Emerging Issues, Pensions, and Urban Affairs Committee, March 9, 2011.



**AFFIDAVITS**

2011

Colorado Public Utilities Commission Docket No. 11M-951E: In the Matter of the Petition of Public Service Company of Colorado Pursuant to C.R.S. § 40-6-111(1)(d) for Interim Rate Relief Effective on or before January 21, 2012.

**ENERGY INDUSTRY PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**

Panelist, Customer Panel, Virginia State Bar 29<sup>th</sup> National Regulatory Conference, Williamsburg, Virginia, May 19, 2011.

Chriss, S. (2006). "Regulatory Incentives and Natural Gas Purchasing – Lessons from the Oregon Natural Gas Procurement Study." Presented at the 19<sup>th</sup> Annual Western Conference, Center for Research in Regulated Industries Advanced Workshop in Regulation and Competition, Monterey, California, June 29, 2006.

Chriss, S. (2005). "Public Utility Commission of Oregon Natural Gas Procurement Study." Public Utility Commission of Oregon, Salem, OR. Report published in June, 2005. Presented to the Public Utility Commission of Oregon at a special public meeting on August 1, 2005.

Chriss, S. and M. Radler (2003). "Report from Houston: Conference on Energy Deregulation and Restructuring." USAEE Dialogue, Vol. 11, No. 1, March, 2003.

Chriss, S., M. Dwyer, and B. Pulliam (2002). "Impacts of Lifting the Ban on ANS Exports on West Coast Crude Oil Prices: A Reconsideration of the Evidence." Presented at the 22nd USAEE/IAEE North American Conference, Vancouver, BC, Canada, October 6-8, 2002.

Contributed to chapter on power marketing: "Power System Operations and Electricity Markets," Fred I. Denny and David E. Dismukes, authors. Published by CRC Press, June 2002.

Contributed to "Moving to the Front Lines: The Economic Impact of the Independent Power Plant Development in Louisiana," David E. Dismukes, author. Published by the Louisiana State University Center for Energy Studies, October 2001.

Dismukes, D.E., D.V. Mesyanzhinov, E.A. Downer, S. Chriss, and J.M. Burke (2001). "Alaska Natural Gas In-State Demand Study." Anchorage: Alaska Department of Natural Resources.