

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

**IN THE MATTER OF SOUTHWESTERN
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY'S
APPLICATION FOR: (1) REVISION OF ITS
RETAIL RATES UNDER ADVICE NOTICE
NO. 282; (2) AUTHORIZATION AND
APPROVAL TO SHORTEN THE SERVICE
LIFE AND ABANDON ITS TOLK
GENERATING STATION UNITS AND (3)
OTHER RELATED RELIEF**

CASE NO. 19-00170-UT

**TESTIMONY OF DEVI GLICK IN SUPPORT OF UNCONTESTED
COMPREHENSIVE STIPULATION
ON BEHALF OF SIERRA CLUB**

January 21, 2019

1 **1. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q Please state your name and occupation.**

3 **A** My name is Devi Glick. I am a Senior Associate at Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. My
4 business address is 485 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 3, Cambridge, Massachusetts
5 02139.

6 **Q Please describe Synapse Energy Economics.**

7 **A** Synapse is a research and consulting firm specializing in energy and environmental
8 issues, including electric generation, transmission and distribution system reliability,
9 ratemaking and rate design, electric industry restructuring and market power, electricity
10 market prices, stranded costs, efficiency, renewable energy, environmental quality, and
11 nuclear power.

12 Synapse's clients include state consumer advocates, public utilities commission staff,
13 attorneys general, environmental organizations, federal government agencies, and
14 utilities.

15 **Q Please summarize your work experience and educational background.**

16 **A** At Synapse, I conduct economic analysis and write testimony and publications that focus
17 on a variety of issues related to electric utilities. These issues include, non-exhaustively,
18 power plant economics, utility resource planning practices, valuation of distributed
19 energy resources, and utility handling of coal combustion residuals waste. I have
20 submitted expert testimony on plant economics, utility resource needs, and solar
21 valuation in the states of Connecticut, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and
22 Florida. I authored a report on replacement analysis for the San Juan Generating Station
23 in northwestern New Mexico. In the course of my work, I develop in-house models and
24 perform analysis using industry-standard models.

1 Prior to joining Synapse, I worked at Rocky Mountain Institute, focusing on a wide range
2 of energy and electricity issues. I have a master's degree in public policy and a master's
3 degree in environmental science from the University of Michigan, as well as a bachelor's
4 degree in environmental studies from Middlebury College. I have more than seven years
5 of professional experience as a consultant, researcher, and analyst. A copy of my current
6 resume is attached as Exhibit DG-1 to my Direct Testimony in this proceeding.

7 **Q On whose behalf are you submitting this testimony?**

8 **A** I am testifying on behalf of Sierra Club.

9 **Q Who is Sierra Club?**

10 Founded in 1892, Sierra Club is the nation's oldest grassroots environmental advocacy
11 organization, with more than 778,000 members nationwide, including more than 9,000
12 members in New Mexico and 27,000 in Texas, some of whom reside within Southwest
13 Public Service Company's ("SPS") service territory. One of Sierra Club's priority
14 national conservation campaigns involves promoting cost-effective renewable energy
15 generation resources as alternatives to increasingly expensive fossil-fuel generation
16 sources that emit harmful pollutants into the air and water. To that end, Sierra Club
17 regularly participates in federal, state, and administrative and public utility commission
18 proceedings across the country, including New Mexico, to advocate for energy and public
19 utility commission policies and outcomes that encourage economic renewable energy and
20 energy efficiency investments that will produce safe and sustainable jobs, while also
21 reducing electric system costs for both utilities and ratepayers and reducing emissions
22 from fossil fuel energy sources.

1 **2. RECOMMENDATION IN SUPPORT OF UNANIMOUS STIPULATION**

2 **Q What is the purpose of this testimony?**

3 **A** I submit this testimony in support of the Uncontested Comprehensive Stipulation
4 (“Comprehensive Stipulation”) filed in this case on January 15, 2020—in particular
5 Section II, which focuses on the Tolk Generating Station.

6 **Q Are you addressing any other aspects of the Comprehensive Stipulation in this**
7 **testimony?**

8 **A** No.

9 **Q Please describe SPS’s request in its rate case application regarding the Tolk**
10 **Generating Station.**

11 **A** SPS’s application sought approval to retire and abandon both units at Tolk Generating
12 Station in 2032, and to modify the depreciation dates for those units accordingly. The
13 application also described SPS’s plan to operate the Tolk units on a seasonal basis
14 (approximately June through September) starting in 2020,¹ and to install synchronous
15 condensers at the facility for voltage support during the non-peak period of the year.

16 **Q How does the Comprehensive Stipulation address SPS’s request?**

17 **A** The Comprehensive Stipulation includes three elements associated with the end of life for
18 the Tolk units. First, it establishes that the date of abandonment and retirement for
19 generating purposes will be December 31, 2032.

20 Second, SPS must submit, by June 2021, a robust retirement analysis that identifies the
21 optimal retirement date for the Tolk units and potential means of replacement (the “Tolk
22 Analysis”). This analysis will be reviewed by an independent evaluator and incorporated

¹ *E.g.*, Direct Testimony of W. Grant on Behalf of SPS at 8.

1 in SPS’s 2021 Integrated Resource Plan (“IRP”). The Tolk Analysis will evaluate
2 replacement resources priced based on a request for proposal (“RFP”) or request for
3 information (“RFI”) process, and the value of reselling the water rights. In addition, SPS
4 shall hold two technical conferences to solicit feedback on the basic parameters of its
5 analysis and the preliminary conclusions of its analysis, respectively. SPS also commits
6 to running at least one scenario in its 2021 IRP in which all of SPS’s coal-burning units,
7 including those of the Harrington Generating Station, are retired or replaced before 2030.
8 Moreover, nothing in the agreement precludes Sierra Club or other parties from seeking
9 an earlier retirement date for Tolk (or any of SPS’s coal-burning units) in future
10 proceedings based on the Tolk Analysis or other facts.

11 Third and finally, for the purposes of SPS’s current rate change, Tolk’s depreciation rates
12 will be made consistent with a December 31, 2032, retirement date, in a two-step process.
13 In the current rate case, Tolk depreciation will be calculated based on a remaining useful
14 life through December 31, 2037, which constitutes approximately half of the increase in
15 depreciation rates. All signatories to the Comprehensive Stipulation have agreed not to
16 oppose the full application of depreciation rates associated with the 2032 abandonment
17 date in SPS’s next base rate case.

18 *i. Tolk Retirement and Abandonment*

19 **Q Is the Comprehensive Stipulation, including its December 31, 2032, date for**
20 **abandonment and retirement for generating purposes of Tolk, in the public**
21 **interest?**

22 Yes. As discussed below, the Company’s own modeling demonstrates that it is not
23 feasible to operate Tolk beyond 2032 because of the plant’s limited water supply.
24 Establishing December 31, 2032 as the plant retirement date in this case serves the public
25 interest by making it clear for capital investment and resource planning purposes that the
26 Tolk Plant cannot operate past that date.

27 We believe any new retirement date in advance of the Tolk units’ respective current dates
28 of 2042 and 2045 are improvements that will save ratepayers money, while also lessening

1 impacts on public health and the environment. Therefore, we find that the Comprehensive
2 Stipulation is in the public interest, as it significantly accelerates the retirement date of
3 the Tolk units; requires robust additional future analysis of retirement scenarios of SPS's
4 coal-burning fleet that could later lead to earlier retirement/replacement of Tolk and/or
5 Harrington; and achieves these results as a product of negotiation, compromise,
6 settlement and accommodation among the parties to avoid continued litigation.

7 **Q Are there reasons that SPS's current assumed life for Tolk is unrealistic?**

8 **A** Yes. SPS cannot economically procure enough water to operate Tolk through the units'
9 current respective retirement dates of 2042 and 2045. Tolk relies exclusively on
10 groundwater from Ogallala Aquifer for generation cooling. However, as SPS's own
11 testimony in this case emphasizes, the aquifer is in serious and irreversible decline.²

12 **Q If the Comprehensive Stipulation does not require a retirement date even earlier**
13 **than 2032, why does Sierra Club support it?**

14 **A** We feel that advancing the units' dates from 2042 and 2045, respectively, to 2032, will
15 provide value to ratepayers, in addition to reducing impacts on public health and the
16 environment. While Sierra Club continues to believe that a retirement date prior to 2032
17 would be in the best interest of ratepayers, we find that the stipulated retirement date is an
18 incremental improvement and reasonable outcome. As described below, in the
19 Comprehensive Stipulation, the Company has committed to conducting a full, robust
20 retirement analysis for Tolk between this case and the 2021 IRP, which could lead to a
21 later decision to retire Tolk earlier if shown to be prudent. Thus, the stipulation is
22 consistent with the recommendations in my Direct Testimony.

² Direct Testimony of M. Lytal on Behalf of SPS, at 53.

1 ii. *The Analysis of the Tolk and Harrington Power Plants*

2 **Q Please describe the Comprehensive Stipulation’s requirement related to future**
3 **analysis of Tolk and SPS’s other coal generation assets.**

4 **A** As noted, SPS has agreed to submit, by June 2021, a robust analysis of the economically
5 optimal retirement date for the retirement of Tolk and potential means of replacement
6 (the “Tolk Analysis”), which will be reviewed by an independent evaluator and
7 incorporated in SPS’s 2021 IRP. The Tolk Analysis will evaluate replacement resources
8 priced based on an RFP or RFI process, and include the value of reselling the water
9 rights. In addition, SPS shall hold two technical conferences to solicit feedback on the
10 basic parameters of its analysis and the preliminary conclusions of its analysis,
11 respectively. SPS also commits to running at least one scenario in which all of SPS’s
12 coal-burning units are retired or replaced before 2030. Moreover, nothing in the
13 Comprehensive Stipulation precludes Sierra Club or other parties from seeking an earlier
14 retirement date for any of SPS’s coal units, including the Harrington units, in future
15 proceedings.

16 The Tolk Analysis that SPS commits to perform as part of the 2021 IRP will include
17 robust evaluation of a range of retirement dates and alternative resource options. That
18 modeling, if performed correctly, could answer the questions (or at least provide
19 meaningful insight into the answer to the questions) of what is the least-cost set of
20 resources to meet system and ratepayer needs from among the current portfolio of new
21 and existing resources, and what is the least-cost manner of running and operating these
22 resources.

23 **Q How are the provisions of the Tolk Analysis beneficial?**

24 **A** First, the Comprehensive Stipulation requires SPS to utilize an RFP or RFI process to
25 obtain prices for potential replacement resources from developers interested in supplying
26 such resources to SPS. The costs for solar, wind, and battery storage have been declining,
27 and are to some extent location-dependent. While third-party reports and studies can be
28 useful for understanding the range of pricing in the market, they can overstate the pricing

1 for what is actually available in specific regions. An RFP or RFI process, while limited in
2 other ways, can be useful in obtaining pricing that reflects realistic and accurate current
3 pricing for specific opportunities available to SPS.

4 Next, the requirement for an independent evaluator will help ensure that the analysis
5 process is designed to answer the right questions, evaluate a reasonable range of
6 retirement and replacement scenarios, and fairly assess alternatives.

7 The thorough Tolk Analysis will ensure timely acquisition of adequate, cost-effective,
8 and reliable replacement resources.

9 **Q Are there other reasons why it is in the public interest to conduct a further analysis**
10 **of Tolk and Harrington?**

11 **A** There have been large shifts in electricity markets since 2014–2015. These changes
12 include the persistence of low natural gas prices, declining costs of renewables and
13 storage, and minimal growth in electricity demand. The status of environmental
14 regulations that could require large capital expenditures to comply has also changed.
15 Additionally, the planned operational constraints at Tolk change the economics of
16 operating the plant. Finally, neither Tolk nor Harrington is locked into a long-term coal
17 contract that would pose a challenge to early retirement.³

18 **Q Please summarize your recommendation with respect to the Tolk Analysis.**

19 **A** It is in the public interest for SPS to conduct an updated and more comprehensive
20 retirement analysis for both Tolk as part of the next IRP, as the Comprehensive
21 Stipulation provides for in the Tolk Analysis. It is also in the public interest for SPS to
22 thoroughly analyze and consider a scenario in which all of its coal-fired resources,
23 including both Tolk and Harrington, are retired or replaced before 2030, which the
24 Comprehensive Stipulation also secures.

³ Direct Testimony of H.C.Romer on Behalf of SPS at 20.

1 This analysis should include updated peak demand and load forecasts, alternative
2 resource costs based on an RFI or RFP process, and alternative operational options,
3 specifically the possibility of seasonal operation of Harrington too. Further, it should
4 incorporate sensitivities around the cost of all likely future additional environmental
5 regulations. Additionally, the retirement analysis for Tolk should include scenarios that
6 incorporate capacity de-rating based on future water availability constraints, and the
7 potential revenue from selling the water to other parties.

8 **iii. Tolk Depreciation**

9 **Q Was the depreciation schedule at Tolk within the scope of SPS's application in this**
10 **proceeding?**

11 **A** Yes. Depreciation schedules for existing plant balances are always at issue in rate cases
12 because depreciation expense is part of the revenue requirement. SPS requested an
13 adjustment of the depreciation schedule to align with the period during which Tolk would
14 be used and useful. It is important to note that the 2037 retirement date suggested by the
15 stipulated depreciation schedule relates to recovery of depreciation expenses, not
16 operational retirement, and is distinct from the stipulation to retire generation operations
17 in 2032.

18 **Q How does the Comprehensive Stipulation address the depreciation issues?**

19 **A** As noted above, Tolk's depreciation rates will be made consistent with a December 31,
20 2032, retirement date, in a two-step process. First, for the purposes of rates resulting from
21 this case, Tolk depreciation will be calculated based on a remaining useful life through
22 December 31, 2037, which constitutes approximately half of the increase in depreciation
23 rates. Second, all signatories to the Comprehensive Stipulation have agreed not to oppose
24 the full application of depreciation rates associated with the 2032 abandonment date in
25 SPS's next base rate case.

26 It is important to align the depreciation schedule with a more realistic retirement date to
27 appropriately balance ratepayer and shareholder interests. Given that Tolk is now

1 scheduled to retire in 2032—sooner than its current depreciation schedule—re-setting
2 depreciation does several things: (1) protects the interests of utility shareholders by
3 allowing recovery of plant assets during the useful life of the plant; (2) protects
4 ratepayers by minimizing the risk of intertemporal cost shifting between current
5 ratepayers who are continuing to receive power from the plant, and future ratepayers who
6 would (absent the change in depreciation dates) be required to pay off undepreciated
7 assets after the plant has stopped providing power; (3) protects ratepayers by diminishing
8 the aggregate amount of return on ratebase that will be recovered through rates for the
9 assets through the end of their lives.

10 That said, Sierra Club recognizes that immediately modifying the depreciation dates for
11 Tolk Units 1 and 2 from 2042 and 2045, respectively, to 2032, and compressing the time
12 period over which the plant balance is collected, may result in rate shock (an immediate
13 and unexpected increase in rates). Rate shock can disproportionately affect lower-income
14 customers and small businesses, who will see increased electricity bills. The
15 Comprehensive Stipulation mitigates that potential rate shock with a phased
16 implementation that seeks to balance the public's interest in avoiding rate shock and
17 intertemporal inequity with the interest of shareholders in recovering the remaining
18 balance at Tolk.

19 **Q Does Sierra Club believe that the Comprehensive Stipulation, as a whole, is in the**
20 **public interest?**

21 **A** Yes. The Comprehensive Stipulation moves up the retirement date of Tolk to December
22 31, 2032, and requires robust retirement and alternatives modeling (that could lead to an
23 even sooner retirement date). This will reduce costs to ratepayers and mitigate impacts on
24 public health and the environment relative to the status quo. For these reasons, Sierra
25 Club finds that the Comprehensive Stipulation, as a whole, is in the public interest.

26 **Q Does this conclude your testimony?**

27 Yes.

BEFORE THE NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF SOUTHWESTERN)	
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY'S)	
APPLICATION FOR: (1) REVISION OF)	
ITS RETAIL RATES UNDER ADVICE)	
NOTICE NO. 282; (2) AUTHORIZATION)	
AND APPROVAL TO SHORTEN THE)	
SERVICE LIFE OF AND ABANDON ITS)	Case No. 19-00170-UT
TOLK GENERATING STATION UNITS;)	
AND (3) OTHER RELATED RELIEF,)	
)	
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE)	
COMPANY,)	
)	
APPLICANT.)	

VERIFICATION

STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS	}	
	}	ss.
COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX	}	

Devi Glick, first being sworn on her oath, states:

I am the witness identified in the preceding Direct Testimony in Support of the Uncontested Comprehensive Stipulation. I am the author of the testimony and am familiar with the contents. Based upon my personal knowledge, the facts stated in the testimony are true. In addition, in my judgment and based upon my professional experience, the opinions and conclusions stated in the testimony are true, valid, and accurate.

Devi Glick
 Devi Glick

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me on this 15 day of January 2020 by Devi Glick.

Jennifer Marusiak
 Notary Public

My commission expires: 4/29/2022

