BEFORE THE NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Otter Tail Power Company

2023 Electric Rate Increase, Application, Case No. PU-23-342

OF Adam Renfandt

ON BEHALF OF THE NORTH DAKOTA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADVOCACY STAFF

December 16, 2024

132 PU-23-342 Filed 12/18/2024 Pages: 3 Exhibit PSC-6 - Adam Renfandt Prefiled Direct Testimony

Hope Hogan, ALJ - Office of Administrative Hearings



- 1 Q: Provide your name and qualifications.
- 2 A: My name is Adam Renfandt. I am a Public Utilities Analyst for the North Dakota
- 3 Public Service Commission (Commission), and the Commission has appointed
- 4 me Advocacy Staff (Staff) in this proceeding. I have been an analyst on other
- 5 rate cases, and advance determination of prudence and integrated resource
- 6 reviews.

10

17

23

28

- 7 Q: What is the purpose of your testimony?
- 8 A: I will provide the Commission with my recommendation concerning the
- 9 settlement agreement (Settlement) submitted on December 11, 2024.
- 11 Q: Please summarize the settlement.
- 12 A. The Settlement provides for a 2024 revenue requirement of \$225.6 Million (M),
- a return on equity (ROE) of 10.1%, an average rate base of \$701.6M,
- 14 adjustments to various other items, and other agreements reached between
- the parties. Ultimately, the Settlement results in net new revenue of \$13.1M,
- which is approximately \$8.5M less than OTP's request in its rebuttal testimony.
- 18 Q: What does the Settlement provide for the components of the cost of capital?
- 19 A: The Settlement provides a 10.1% return on equity (ROE) on a capital structure
- that is 53.5% common equity. The capital structure also consists of 2.98%
- short-term debt at a cost of 6.35% and 43.52% long-term debt at a cost of
- 4.45%. The overall rate of return is 7.53%.
- 24 Q: What impact did the ROE reduction have on OTP's test year revenue
- 25 requirement?
- 26 A: The ROE reduction from OTP's requested 10.6% to the settlement of 10.1%
- 27 reduces the test year revenue requirement by \$2.49M.
- 29 Q: Does the Settlement include an earnings sharing component?

| 1 | A : | Yes. The Settlement contains an earnings sharing mechanism whereby OTP |
|----|------------|---|
| 2 | | will refund to customers 70% of earnings over 10.2%. This will provide refunds |
| 3 | | to ratepayers if there are overearnings and still afford the company with an |
| 4 | | incentive to be efficient. |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | Q: | What revenue requirement adjustments were included in the Settlement? |
| 7 | | The Settlement has a 100% disallowance of Executive Survivor and |
| 8 | | Supplemental Retirement Plan (ESSRP), Executive Restoration Plan Plus |
| 9 | | (ERPP), Non-Employee Director Restricted Stock, Employee Gifts and |
| 10 | | Recognition, and stock-based Long-Term Incentives. Furthermore, a 50% |
| 11 | | disallowance was made for other compensation programs such as People |
| 12 | | Leaders, Management Plan, and the President Plan. Staff believes this is a fair |
| 13 | | balance between interests of shareholders and ratepayers. The 100% and |
| 14 | | 50% reductions to the revenue requirement amounted to \$2.5M. |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | Q: | Were there any other adjustments to the revenue requirement as part of the |
| 17 | | Settlement? |
| 18 | A: | Yes. Investor relations were reduced by 50%, or \$102k, and the rate case |
| 19 | | expenses were amortized over a 5-year period, which reduced the requirement |
| 20 | | by \$144k. |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | Q: | Were there any other changes as part of the Settlement? |
| 23 | A: | Yes, there were other changes, and they are detailed in the Settlement. |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | Q: | Is the revenue allocation just and reasonable? |
| 26 | A: | Yes. Staff finds the revenue allocation to be just and reasonable without undue |
| 27 | | discrimination. |
| 28 | | |
| 29 | Q: | Does this conclude your testimony? |
| 30 | A: | Yes. Staff requests the Commission adopt the Settlement. |
| | | |