#### BEFORE THE MINNESOTA OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS 600 North Robert Street St. Paul, MN 55101

#### FOR THE MINNESOTA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 121 7<sup>th</sup> Place East, Suite 350 St. Paul, MN 55101-2147

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY D/B/A XCEL ENERGY FOR APPROVAL OF COMPETITIVE RESOURCE ACQUISITION PROPOSAL AND CERTIFICATE OF NEED Docket No. E002/CN-12-1240 OAH Docket No. 8-2500-30760

#### **REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF SACHIN SHAH**

#### **ON BEHALF OF**

## THE DIVISION OF ENERGY RESOURCES OF THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

**OCTOBER 18, 2013** 

#### REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF SACHIN SHAH IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY D/B/A XCEL ENERGY FOR APPROVAL OF COMPETITIVE RESOURCE ACQUISITION PROPOSAL AND CERTIFICATE OF NEED

MPUC Docket No. E002/CN-12-1240 OAH Docket No. 8-2500-30760

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

#### Section

Page

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	PURPOSE	1
III.	CONCLUSIONS	4

1	<b>I.</b>	INTRODUCTION							
2	Q.	Please state your name.							
3	A.	My name is Sachin Shah.							
4									
5	Q.	Are you the same Sachin Shah who previously submitted testimony in this							
6		proceeding on behalf of the Minnesota Department of Commerce, Division of							
7		Energy Resources, Energy Regulation and Planning unit (Department or DOC)?							
8	A.	Yes.							
9									
10	II.	PURPOSE							
11	Q.	What is the purpose of your Rebuttal Testimony?							
12	A.	My Rebuttal Testimony responds to the testimony of Mr. Steven W. Wishart of Northern							
13		States Power Company, a Minnesota Corporation d/b/a Xcel Energy (Xcel) related to the							
14		reasonableness of the sales forecast used by Xcel in this proceeding.							
15									
16	Q.	What does Mr. Wishart state regarding the sales forecast he used?							
17	А.	Mr. Wishart explains that Xcel used the spring 2013 forecast as a starting point in its base							
18		model. I set forth several statements of Mr. Wishart in this regard. At page 2 of his							
19		Direct Testimony, beginning at line 5, Mr. Wishart states the following:							
20		Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY.							
21 22 23 24 25 26 27		<ul> <li>A. I first review the Company's resource need assessment presented in our April 15, 2013 proposal filing, and then I present an assessment based on updated information regarding load and available resources. This update shows we have a capacity need of 93 MW in 2017 that grows to 307 MW by 2019. However, we note that changes in</li> </ul>							

1 2 3 4 5 6		MISO's reserve margin sta only 26 MW by 2019. recommend that after the through this process, the que project timing be revisited information becomes available	Given this uncertaint least cost projects are sele estion of total capacity need in 2014 and in 2015 as 1	y, I ected and			
7							
8		7 through 8, beginning at lin					
9	comparing the	capacity need forecasted in	its most recent Commission	-approved resource			
10	plan docket with the spring 2013 forecast, states the following:						
11	Q.	SINCE THE COMMISSIO	ON'S MARCH 2013 ORE	DER,			
12	HAS THE COMPANY REASSESSED ITS CAPACITY						
13		NEED FORECAST?					
14							
15	А.	Yes. As part of our regular	business process we update	eour			
16	capacity need assessment as new information becomes						
17	available. Our most current capacity assessment –						
18	September 2013 Update- is presented below in Table 2.						
19	Table 2 shows a comparison between the September 2013						
20	Update and the assessment used in the Resource Plan						
21	Docket.						
22							
23		Table 2 – September 201	3 – Resource Need Assess	ment			
24							
		Resource Plan Docket	September 2013 Update	Change			

	Reso	ource Plan Do	ocket	Septer	nber 2013 U	J <b>pdate</b>		Change	
	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019	2017	2018	2019
Peak	9,613	9,708	9,799	9,500	9,590	9,676	-112MW	-112MW	-123MW
<u>RM%</u>	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total Obligation	9,977	10,076	10,170	9,860	9,953	10,042	-117MW	-123MW	-128MW
Resources									
Coal	2,331	2,331	2,331	2,367	2,367	2,367	36	36	36
Nuclear	1,610	1,610	1,610	1,623	1,623	1,623	12	12	12
Gas	3,437	3,424	3,424	3,427	3,416	3,416	(9)	(8)	(8)
Wind, Hydro, Bio	1,280	1,229	1,202	1,238	1,189	1,162	(42)	(40)	(40)
Solar	9	10	11	49	66	83	40	56	72
Load Management	1,157	1,153	1,149	1,063	1,074	1,085	(95	(79)	(65)
Total Resources	9,824	9,758	9,728	9,768	9,735	9,735	(57)	(23)	8
Long (Short)	(153)	(318)	(443)	(93)	(218)	(307)	+60MW	+100MW	+136MW

25

1 2 3	The September 2013 Update indicates a generating capacity deficit of 93 MW starting in 2017, which grows to 307 MW by 2019. The update includes;
4	1) New spring 2013 load forecast
5	2) Updated unit capacity ratings
6	3) Minnesota Solar Mandate
7	4) Updated forecast of load management resources
8	
9	Table 2 does not include MISO's new reserve margin
10	requirements or calculation methodology that was
11	introduced for use in 2013. Instead our updated resource
12	need assessment uses the same reserve margin that was
13	used in the Resource Plan.
14	
15	Finally, at page 21, beginning at line 10, of his Direct Testimony, Mr. Wishart states the
16	following:
17	Q. WHAT ARE SOME OF THE SPECIFIC INPUT
18	ASSUMPTIONS USED IN THE STRATEGIST
19	ANALYSIS?
20	
21	A. We started with the same base model that we used in our
22	recent wind RFP analysis. That Strategist model included
23	the following important input assumptions:
24	
25	1. Load Forecast – The load forecast used in this model
26	was developed in the spring of 2013 and reflects our
27	most current assessment of the impacts of conservation
28	(DSM) on total customer demand. The forecasted peak
29	demand during the resource acquisition period is 9,500
30	MW in 2017, 9,590 MW in 2018, and 9,676 MW in
31	2019.
32	
33	2. Load Management Forecast – The forecast of load
34	management or direct load control programs was
35	developed in spring of 2013. Total load management is
36	985 MW in 2013 and grows at an average rate of 1%
37	annually through 2020 reaching 1056 MW in that year.
38	2 December $M_{\rm eff}$ $T_{\rm eff}$ (1.1.1)
39 40	3. Reserve Margin – To set reliability standards, the model uses a meanin of $2.8\%$ as established in
40	model uses a reserve margin of 3.8% as established in
41	MISO's November 2011 loss of load expectation
42	(LOLE) report.

0.

# Do you agree with Mr. Wishart that it was reasonable for Xcel to use of the spring 2013 forecast as a starting point in Xcel's base model?

A. No. For all the reasons set forth in my Direct Testimony, which I will not repeat here, I conclude that the fundamental goal in certificate of need and resource planning proceedings is not to establish a plan that is least-cost under a single forecast but for the plan to be least-cost across a wide range of forecasts. Given that goal, the concerns I discussed in my Direct Testimony, the Commission's decision not to require continual updating of forecasts in the 2010 IRP (i.e. that the need was based on using the fall 2011 forecast), and the fact that the spring 2013 forecast was within the 5 percent contingency modeled, I conclude that Department Witness Dr. Steve Rakow's use of the fall 2011 forecast as a starting point to begin his analysis of assessing the bids is reasonable. See pages 3 through 14 of my Direct Testimony DOC Ex. \_\_\_\_ at 3-14 (Shah Direct) for more discussion.

#### III. CONCLUSIONS

#### **Q.** Please provide your conclusions at this time.

A. From my limited review, as explained in my Direct Testimony, I continue to conclude,
first, that Xcel's spring 2013 forecast is within the range of forecasts that Department
Witness Dr. Steve Rakow uses in his analysis. Second, I continue to conclude that Dr.
Rakow's use of the Company's fall 2011 forecast provided in Xcel's 2010 IRP that was
relevant to the Commission's determination of need in this present docket is the
appropriate forecast to use to evaluate the bids provided in this proceeding for all of the
reasons discussed in my Direct Testimony.

### Q. Does this conclude your Rebuttal Testimony?

2 A. Yes.

1