PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ADVISORY<br>AND COMPLIANCE DIVISION

RESOLNTION G-2838
December 19, 1988


RESOLUTION E-3116, AUTHORIZING PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPAHY (PG\&E) TO IHCREASE ITS GAS BASE RATES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ATTRITION RATE ADJUSTHENT (ARA) MECHANISM AMD FOR OTHER FACTORS, EFFECTIVE JAKUARY 1, 1989; BY ADVICE LETTER 1499-G, FILED OCTOBER 3, 1988 AND SUPPLEMENTED NOVEMBER 3, 1988 AND NOVEMBER 18, 1988.

## SUMMARY

1. By Advice Letter 1499-G filed October 3, 1988, and supplemental Advice Letters 1499-G-A and 1499-G-B filed Novenber 3, 1988 and November 18, 1988 respectively, PG\&E requests authorization to increase its gas Base Revenue Amount by $\$ 39,588,000$ and concurrently revise its gas rates to reflect this increase. PG\&E requests this increase to compensate for operational and capital-related attrition as provided for in Decision (D.) 66-12-095 and for the inpacts of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 (TRA 1986), 1988 expense reductions and a voluntary reduction to reflect 1988 rate base true-up, reduced capital expenditures and increased working capital in 1989.
2. Ordering paragraph 4 of $D, 68-12-094$ requires that the adopted 1989 cost of capital be used in conjuction with PG\&E's advice letter filing. By this Resolution, PG\&E is authorized an increase in its Base Revenue Arount of $\$ 37,183,000$. Adopted revenue allocation and rate tables are attached to this Resolution.

## BACKGROUND

1. D. 86-12-095 authorized PG\&E to revise gas base rates to compensate for 1989 operational and capital-related attrition.
2. operational attrition is a decrease in a utility's net operating income due to increases in operation and maintenance expenses attributable to inflation between general rate case test years.
3. Capital-related attrition is a change in a utility's net operating income due to changes in rate base and cost of capital between general rate case test years.
4. PG\&E's presently authorized capital structure and its requested 1989 capital structure are shown in Attachment A to this Resolution.

## DISCUSSION

1. In accordance with the Attrition Rate Adjustment (ARA) mechanisn, PG\&E requests an attrition increase of $\$ 46,454,000$. The staff of the comission Advisory and Compliance Division (CACD) recalculated the appropriate increase to be $\$ 43,942,000$ at the rate of return adopted in D.88-12-094. This is a decrease of $\$ 2,512,000$ from PG\&E's request. This and other revenue changes are shown in Attachment $B$. The adopted rate of return is shown in Attachment A.
2. PG\&E has also requested an increase of $\$ 13,479,000$ to compensate for the effects of TRA 1986. PG\&E's request is granted.
3. In Resolution G-2755 dated Decenber 17, 1987 the Conraission adopted a 1988 revenue reduction of $\$ 17,168,000$ for PG\&E's Voluntary Retirenent Incentive and Severence Horkforce Reduction prograns. For 1989, PG\&E requests a further reduction of $\$ 868,000$ to reflect the impact of 1989 operational attrition on the 1988 revenue reduction. PGGE's request is granted.
4. In Resolution $G-2755$ the Commission also adopted a 1988 revenue reduction of $\$ 15,593,000$ for PG\&E's Attrition Workforce Reduction. For 1989, PG\&E requests a further reduction of $\$ 788,000$ to reflect the impact of 1989 operational attrition on the 1988 revenue reduction. PG\&E's request is granted.
5. In D.87-12-039, the Comission ordered PG\&E to renove the Pacific Gas Transmission (PGT) transport costs from base rates and to recover these costs through the Annual cost Allocation Proceeding (ACAP). PG\&E requests a revenue reduction of $\$ 3,178,000$ to reflect the impact of 1989 operational attrition on the removal of PGT transport costs from base rates. PG\&'s request is granted.
6. In Resolution G-2755 the Comaission adopted a 1988 revenue reduction of $\$ 23,110,000$ for PG\&E's expected reduction in rate base fron the level that was authorized in PG\&E's general rate case (GRC) proceeding in D.86-12-095. In its Advice Letter filing for attrition year 1988, Advice Letter 1431-G, PG\&E indicated that it had decided against certain capital projects and therefore did not expect to achieve the 1988 authorized rate base level that was adopted in D.86-12-095. No protests here received regarding Advice Letter 1431-G, and Resolution G-2755 granted PG\&E's request. PG\&E now expects its 1988 rate base to be even lower than the level that was adopted in Resolution G-2755. PG\&E now requests a revenue decrease of $\$ 12,543,000$ to compensate for the difference betseen its latest expectation of 1988 rate base and that which was adopted in Resolution G-2755.
7. PGGE also expects its 1989 rate base level to be lower than that which was authorized in its GRC proceeding, D.86-12-095. PG\&E seeks a revenue decrease of $\$ 6,873,000$ to compensate for this reduction in rate base. The CACD notes that the revenue decrease of $\$ 6,873,000$ is the net of the effects of a decrease in 1989 plant, an increase in 1989 working capital and other changes. The effect of the decrease in 1989 plant and other changes is a revenue decrease of $\$ 10,205,000$ and the effect of the increase in 1989 working capital is a revenue increase of $\$ 3,332,000$ for a net revenue decrease of $\$ 6,873,000$.
8. PG\&E also requests a decrease of $\$ 78,000$ to corpensate for the cost of capital adjustment related to rate base changes discussed in paragraphs 12 and 13 above. The CACD has recalculated the adjustment to be an increase of $\$ 29,000$ at rates of return adopted in D.88-12-094.
9. PGGE, in its Supplemental Filing dated November 18 , 1988, has characterized its request for rate base changes and related cost of capital adjustrent as discussed in paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 above as "voluntary". PG\&E indicates that the method used to develop the net reduction is not intended by PG\&E to set a precedent for future attrition filings.
10. On llovenber 28, 1988, the Connission's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) filed conments (a) objecting to PG\&E's characterization of its reduction request as "voluntary", and (b) recomnending that PG\&E be denied attrition relief for increases in working capital in accordance with D.85-12-076.
11. In D.83-12-068, the Commission adopted ratemaking estimates for PG\&E's test year 1984 and attrition year 1985. At the end of 1984 , PG\&E filed for an attrition increase for
12. The DRA (then the Public Staff Division) made a notion to deny PG\&E's request for an attrition increase for 1985 on grounds that at the end of 1984, PG\&E was earning a rate of return in excess of its authorized level for 1984. D.84-12-062 required PG\&E to provide a detailed comparison of 1984 authorized vs. recorded operations and granted PG\&E the attrition increase for 1985 subject to refund. D.85-12071 addressed the reasonableness of ratemaking estimates for 1985 which were adopted by the Commission in D.83-12-068 and discussed PG\&E's recorded operations for 1984. In conclusion of Law 1 in D. 85-12-071, the commission noted that it should consider adjustments to attrition year increases for accounts which are overearning, in cases where overearnings do not result from management efficiency or increased productivity. In Conclusion of Law 3 in the same decision, the comrission noted that because of PG\&E?s actions which delayed plant construction, ratepayers should be protected from the risk of PG\&E not achieving the rate base adopted in rates for 1985. Thereupon, the commission affirmed PG\&E'S 1985 attrition increase that it had granted in D.84-12-062 with the exception that PG\&E had to refund any shortfall due to recorded 1985 rate base.
13. In PGE's last GRC decision for test year 1987, D.86-12095, the Commission presented attrition tables for 1988 and 1989. In conclusion of Lak 24, the commission noted that the attrition anounts and factors set forth in the attrition tables should be used for calculating any increase for attrition which nay be granted in 1988 and 1989.
14. The CACD finds that Conclusion of Law 24 in D.86-12-095 supersedes Conclusions of Law 1 and 3 in D.85-12-071 which were specific to 1985. PG\&E's request, after adjustnent for the rate of return adopted in D.88-12-094, for a revenue reduction of $\$ 19,387,000$ is granted.
15. Although DRA's comments on unrealized rate base additions in attrition years are well taken, PG\&E's request is in compliance with D.86-12-095 and DRA's protest is denied.
16. The Comission, in granting PGGE's request in paragraph 13 above, does not in any way approve or endorse the revenue components that lead to PG\&E's revenue reduction request. The CACD also notes that Southern California Edison Conpany (Edison) did not adjust its 1989 rate base to reflect its latest rate base estinate which is lower than that adopted in its recent GRC A. 86-12-047, D.87-12-066. We will require that PG\&E file testinony on unrealized attrition year rate base in its test year 1990 GRC A.88-12-005. We urge the DRA and other energy utilities to participate in any litigation of this issue.
17. The attrition revenue anounts shown in Attachment $B$ do not include the California Corporation Franchise Tax (CCFT) tax timing adjustment. This issue is the subject of a pending supplemental proceeding in PG\&E's 1987 GRC (D.86-12095 in A. 85-12-050).
18. Coincident with its attrition increase, PG\&E also seeks a rate increase to recover $\$ 3,983,000$ previously authorized in Resolution E-3105. That request is granted.
19. Public notification of this filing has been made by nailing copies of each filing to other utilities, governmental agencies and to all interested parties who requested such notification.

## PROTESTS BY DRA

1. On December 7, 1988 the DRA protested PG\&E's supplenental Advice Letter $1499-G-B$, for two reasons. First, $D R A$ argues that for revenue allocation and rate design purposes PG\&E should allocate 1989 attrition revenues on the equal percentage nethod proposed by Toward utility Rate Normalization (TURN) in its protest to PG\&E Advice Letter 1453-G. Therein TURN argued that Commission attrition procedures do not provide enough tire to review detailed allocations of attrition revenues to gas cost-ofservice categories. In Resolution G-2787 issued April 13 , 1988 the Conraission addressed the issue squarely and denied TURN's protest. Such attrition allocations are pernitted.
2. DRA argues that the language in Resolution G-2787 on attrition revenue allocation is permissive, and that the Commission should non adopt the TURN allocation nethod. Although PGGE's allocation nethod is permissive, it is documented and within the authority granted in Resolution G2787. CACD reconnends that the commission not change its mind on this issue. Vie agree with CACD that PG\&E has complied with Resolution G-2787, and we will accept the PG\&E methodology in this case. However, the continuing complaints about the burdensome nature of this nethod convince us that we should reconsider that resolution. PG\&E should attenpt to develop a simpler method. This issue should be considered in PG\&E's current ACAP proceeding, A.88-09-032.
3. DRA's second protest concerns revenue shortfall resulting from discounted contract sales to approxinately 60 noncore custoners. The shortfall is related to the requested attrition increase only, not all of PG\&E's contract revenues. DPA clains the amount at issue is $\$ 1.2$ million annually. PG\&E responded to DRA's protests by
letter dated December 15, 1988, claiming that the disputed amount is $\$ 470,000$.
4. PGEE requests that any such contract revenue shortfall be recovered from noncore customers on standard service contracts under tariff schedules G-P2B and G-IND. DRA argues that the shortfall should be assigned to PG\&E's shareholders, not other customers. DRA believes that because PG\&E elected not to include attrition escalation terms in its negotiated contracts, other ratepayers should be exempt from making up the shortfall. DRA further argues that if the shortfall is recovered in rates, the shortfall revenues should at least be placed in a memorandum account for possible return to ratepayers following a reasonableness review.
5. CACD staff agrees with DRA's reasoning. Under the Commission's recently adopted gas regulatory program PG\&E and its noncore customers are free to negotiate mutually agreeable contracts. If PGGE is concerned about contract revenue shortfalls following revenue requirenent changes then it is equally free to negotiate appropriate escalation terms into its contracts. If this has been an oversight by PG\&E the Comnission should not be obliged to nake PG\&E whole. DRA's protest on this issue is upheld. Because PGGE will not be authorized to recover the shortfall in rates, DRA's requested memorandun account is unecessary.

## REVEHUE ALLOCATION AND RATES

1. The attrition revenue allocation and gas rates reflecting the terms of this Resolution are shown in Attachment C .

## FINDINGS

1. For the reasons stated above a gas revenue requirenent increase of $\$ 37,183,000$ is just and reasonable.
2. Attrition revenue requirenents due to $\operatorname{CCFT}$ should not be granted by this Resolution.
3. PG\&E's nethod complies with Resolution G-2787, and DRA's request to use an equal percentage nethod should be denied. However, we find that PGEE's nethod is overly burdensone, and DRA's concern that a simpler nethod be found is justifiable.
4. DRA's protest and request that contract revenue shortfall related to attrition revenues not be recovered from other customers are reasonable and should be granted. The requested nemorandum account is not necessary.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDFRED, that:

1. Pacific Gas and Electric Company is authorized to increase its gas Base Revenue Amount by $\$ 37,183,000$ and to increase rates to recover that amount in revenues, effective January 1,1989 as shown in Attachment B.
2. On or before Decenber 28, 1988, Pacific Gas and Electric Company is authorized to file revised tariffs reflecting the effect of revenue changes adopted by this Resolution, as shown on Attachnent $C$.
3. Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall not recover in rates from other customers any attrition revenue shortfall due to discounted contract sales:
4. The attrition revenue increase shall be applied to default or standard service tariffs as if all customers on tariff Schedules G-2PB and G-IND are standard service customers.
5. The tariff sheets shall be marked to show that they were authorized for filing by Comission Resolution G-2838 and that the Base Revenue Anount and rates are effective January 1, 1989.
6. Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall file testinony on the issue of unrealized test year and attrition year rate base in its test year 1990 general rate case.
7. The developnent of a simpler gas attrition methodology shall be an issue in Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Annual Cost Allocation Proceeding, Application 88-09-032.
8. This Resolution is effective today.

I certify that this Resolution was adopted by the Public Utilities Connission at its regular neeting of December 19, 1988. The following Comissioners approved it:

STANLEY W. HUIETT
President
DONALD VIal. PREDERICK R DUDA G. MITCHELL WHLK JOHN L OHANIAN Commissioners


Executive Director

# Padific Gas and Electric Company Gas Department 1989 Attrition Allowance 

## Present Authorized Capital Structure

 (Attrition Year 1988)Component
Long Term Debt
Preferred Stock
Connon Equity

Total
Rate of Return
Capital Ratio cost Factor Weighted cost

| $45.50 \%$ | $9.34 \%$ | $4.25 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.50 | 8.80 | 0.75 |
| 46.00 | 13.10 | 6.03 |
| $100.00 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  | $11.02 \%$ |

$\frac{\text { Requested Capital structure }}{\text { (Attrition Year 1989) }}$
Capital Ratio cost Factor Heighted cost

| $45.25 \%$ | $9.41 \%$ | $4.26 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.00 | 8.79 | 0.70 |
| 46.75 | 13.10 | 6.12 |

total
$100.00 \%$
Rate of Return $11.08 \%$

## Adopted Captial Structure <br> (Attrition Year 1989)

Component
Long Term Debt
Preferred Stock
Common Equity
TOTAL
Rate of Return

Capital Ratio cost Factor Feighted cost
$46.25 \%$
7.00
9.39\%
4.34\%
46.75
13.00
0.62
100.00\%
$11.04 \%$

# Pacifia Gas and Electrio Company Gas Department 1989 Attrition Allowance Revenue Requirements (\$000) 

## Description

|  | Requested | Adopted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operational Attrition |  |  |
| Labor Inflation | \$11,563 | \$11,563 |
| Non-Labor Inflation | 14,358 | 14.358 |
| Capital-Related Attrition Project Amortization | $\begin{gathered} 45,234 \\ (24,701) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 42,722 \\ (24,701) \end{gathered}$ |
| ARA Mechanisn for 1989 | \$46,454 | \$43.942 |
| Tax Reform Act of 1986 | \$13,479 | \$13,479 |
| 1988 Expense Reductions |  |  |
| VRI and Severance | (\$868) | (\$868) |
| Attrition Korkforce Reduction | (788) | (788) |
| PGT Removal | $(3,178)$ | $(3,178)$ |
| Subtotal | \$55,099 | \$52,587 |
| 1989 Voluntary Capital Reductions |  |  |
| 1988 Rate Base True-up | (\$12,543) | (\$12,543) |
| 1989 Reduced Plant and Other Changes | $(10,205)$ | (10,205) |
| 1989 Increased Working Capital | 3,332 | 3,332 |
| Cost of Capital adjustrent | (78) | 29 |
| Subtotal Voluntary Reductions | (\$19,494) | (\$19,387) |
| SUBTOTAL | \$35,605 | \$33,200 |
| Resolution E-3105 | 3,983 | 3,983 |
| TOTAL INCREASE | \$39,588 | \$37,183 |
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| 17,304 | 85,18\% | 11,178 | 39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16,101 | 7,579 | ¢,712 | 219 |
| -24,211 | $-11,6 \leq 0$ | $-17,228$ | -3t3 |
| 85\% | \$57 | 288 | 12 |
| 32,724 | 51,816 | 353 | 15 |
| 615 | 262 | 311 | 8 |
| 3,651 | 1,351 | 2,052 | 31 |
| 358 | 173 | dif | -3 |
| [31,184 | 136835 | 133 | 1-58 |

Percent Charge of Mercia ine liss intrition

| Coran Sisteibeties <br> Temed Related Itaescission lopt that |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  | Lhas Ansetizatios |
|  | Centrs Relates Storie |
|  | Custent Relates |
|  | Cencosity Relates |
|  | 501 Ats |
|  | franchise \& [accllictitles |


| 2.818 | 2.95 | 2.95 | . 01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.21 | 10.21 | 10. 21 | 10.32 |
| -109.04 | -109.01 | -108.61 | -103.0\% |
| I. 51 | 1.51 | 1.51 | 1.14 |
| 7.51 | 2.51 | 7.52 | 7.51 |
| 9.11 | 9.11 | 9.11 | P. 11 |
| 5.83 | 5.21 | 5.21 | 5.25 |
| 4.51 | 5.21 | t.51 | -89.01 |

Allecaticn of lisg Xargla iy functica



| 5232,197 | \$212 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 163,156 |  |
| 24,311 | 11,08 |
| (1,311 | 21,03 |
| 121816 | 128,185 |
| 6,784 | 2,8i? |
| 70,122 | 30,364 |
| 9,345 | 7,316 |
| 1TPP, 64] | 178? |

Nisocote


| 10,653 | 18 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 81,211 | 2,135 |
| 12,878 | 43) |
| 19, 50, | 633 |
| 1,925 | 137 |
| 3, 117 | 85 |
| 37,185 | 53 |
| 1,131 | 12 |
| 1212,318 | 11,538 |
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| Presert | ARPIts |
| :---: | :---: |
| cureses | OHREES |
| (1/P:0) | (1/RS) |
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167, 178, 08
186, 552 , 会
-

| 101123 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |


| Jaspary |  | 12,697,169 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| febreaty | 1,73,144 | 1,617,023 |
| Sarch | $18,480,778$ | 10,397,017 |
| Epril | P, 181, 738 | 9,107,133 |
| Auy | 11,397, 134 |  |
| Prise | 14, 16, 451 | 14,315,191 |
| iuly | 11,535,45 | 18,192,854 |
| Abicst | 17,841,235 | 17, 637,019 |
| Saptmber | 14,260, 331 | 14, 148,83 |
| cetaber | 13,141,323 | 15,854; 149 |
| Morenear | 26,197,758 | 16,252,624 |
| lechiop | 18,121,039 | 17,176,251 |

$168,003, \infty 8$85

3,398
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