

Direct Testimony and Schedules
Gregory J. Robinson

Before the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission
State of Minnesota

In the Matter of the Application of Northern States Power Company
for Authority to Increase Rates for Electric Service in Minnesota

Docket No. E002/GR-19-564
Exhibit __ (GJR-1)

Budgeting

November 1, 2019

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Budgeting and Budget Governance Process	2
A.	Overview	3
B.	Groups Overseeing Budget Processes	9
C.	Budgeting Process for O&M and Capital Expenditures	14
1.	Financial Planning and Guidance Development	15
2.	Business Area Budget Development	18
3.	Financial Council and Operating Company Review and Approval	22
4.	XEI and NSPM Boards of Directors Approval	24
D.	Financial Systems	25
E.	Ongoing Financial Governance	29
F.	Summary	31
III.	Capital and O&M Budget Analyses	32
A.	Capital Budget Analysis	34
B.	O&M Budget Analyses	35
1.	Budget to Actual Costs for Previous Three Years (2016-2018)	35
2.	Test Year Budget to Most Recent Year of Actuals (201 to 2020)	36
3.	Test Year Budget to Current Year Forecast (2019 Forecast to 2020)	39
IV.	Conclusion	41

Schedules

Statement of Qualifications

Schedule 1

Audit Trail Map

Schedule 2

2020 Budget to 2019 Forecast Comparison by FERC Account

Schedule 3

(Please note, due to size, the full Schedule 2 is provided on a CD in Volume 3)

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2
3 Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND OCCUPATION.

4 A. My name is Gregory J. Robinson. I am the Director of Financial Performance
5 and Reporting for Xcel Energy Services Inc. (XES or the Service Company),
6 which provides services to the Xcel Energy operating companies including
7 Northern States Power Company – Minnesota (NSPM or the Company).

8
9 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE.

10 A. I have nearly twenty years of experience in various finance and accounting
11 roles at large corporations. I have been employed by XES since 2011. In my
12 current role, I am responsible for oversight and management of the corporate
13 operation and maintenance (O&M) and capital budget and forecast processes,
14 and for internal reporting and financial statement analysis for Xcel Energy Inc.
15 (XEI or Xcel Energy) and its subsidiaries. I am also responsible for providing
16 O&M and capital budget finance support for the business areas.
17 Exhibit___(GJR-1), Schedule 1 summarizes my qualifications and experience.

18
19 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

20 A. In my testimony, I:

- 21 • Describe Xcel Energy’s budget governance processes that ensure the
22 budgets for Northern States Power Company – Minnesota represent
23 reasonable, representative and accurate forecasts of the costs necessary
24 to provide safe and reliable service to our customers.
- 25 • Discuss how our budgeting and ongoing review and oversight
26 processes are rigorous and provide necessary flexibility that allows the
27 Company to reprioritize projects and spending as appropriate to

1 respond to changing circumstances. I also include information on the
2 financial systems that support this process.

- 3 • Provide various analyses that compare actual operations and
4 maintenance (O&M) expense and capital spending to the budgets of
5 historical periods, which demonstrates that our overall budgets have
6 been reasonable and accurate representations of our costs over time. I
7 also provide analyses that compare our overall 2020 test year O&M
8 budget to historical costs, to help explain the key drivers of variances.

9
10 Q. HOW IS YOUR TESTIMONY ORGANIZED?

11 A. I present the remainder of my testimony in the following sections:

- 12 • Section II, *Budgeting and the Budget Governance Process*, explains our
13 budgeting process for O&M costs and capital expenditures. The
14 discussion identifies who is responsible for creation and approval of the
15 budgets, details the steps in process, describes the financial systems that
16 support this process, and explains the ongoing review and governance
17 after budgets are established.
- 18 • Section III, *Capital and O&M Budget Analyses*, presents the results of
19 various analyses that compare actual to budget O&M and capital
20 results, and that compare the 2020 O&M budget to prior years.
- 21 • Section IV, *Conclusion*.

22 23 **II. BUDGETING AND BUDGET GOVERNANCE PROCESS**

24
25 Q. WHAT WILL THIS SECTION OF YOUR TESTIMONY ADDRESS?

26 A. In this section I:

- 1 • Provide an overview of our budgeting and budget governance process
2 and identify roles and responsibilities;
- 3 • Describe Xcel Energy's O&M and capital budgeting process in detail,
4 and discuss additional oversight required for certain capital projects.
- 5 • Explain the financial systems in place for our budgeting process,
6 including information on our 2016 transition from the JD Edwards
7 (JDE) General Ledger (GL) system to the SAP GL system.
- 8 • Discuss our ongoing financial review and oversight process once
9 budgets are established.

10
11 **A. Overview**

12 Q. FOR WHAT PERIOD DOES XEI DEVELOP ITS BUDGETS?

13 A. Electric and gas utilities are long-term, capital intensive businesses. Every
14 year, we prepare a five-year financial forecast that is used to anticipate the
15 financial needs of each of the XEI operating utility subsidiaries, including
16 NSPM. The five-year forecast provides the information necessary to make
17 strategic and financial decisions to address these needs, and to develop
18 supportable and attainable financial plans for each operating utility subsidiary
19 and for XEI overall. Key components of the five-year financial forecast are
20 the O&M and capital expenditure five-year budgets for each of XEI's
21 operating utility subsidiaries, including NSPM, as well as ongoing monthly
22 total budget reviews and quarterly review of particularly large capital projects
23 included in the five-year budgets. My testimony describes the process to
24 develop NSPM's O&M and capital expenditure budgets and our ongoing
25 review and governance of expenditures after budgets are finalized.

1 Q. IF THE COMPANY DEVELOPS A FIVE-YEAR BUDGET EVERY YEAR, DOES THAT
2 MEAN THAT BUDGETS FOR THE LATER YEARS IN THE PERIOD WILL EVOLVE
3 OVER TIME?

4 A. Yes. When a five-year budget is created and approved, the first year budget is
5 essentially locked in. However, budgets for the subsequent years 2-5 will be
6 reevaluated in the next budgeting cycle, and will necessarily change in
7 response to new developments and as business requirements change. As we
8 get closer to when spending will occur, our forecasts become more refined,
9 based on more relevant information for the upcoming period, and forecasted
10 expenditures are adjusted accordingly.

11

12 Q. IS THE BUDGETING AND BUDGET GOVERNANCE PROCESS THE SAME FOR O&M
13 AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURES?

14 A. To a large extent, yes. Overall, the O&M and capital budgeting and review
15 processes are the same, and unless specified otherwise, the process I describe
16 in my testimony applies to both O&M and capital expenditures. However,
17 there are certain additional considerations for capital project budgeting and
18 oversight.

19

20 Q. CAN YOU PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE ADDITIONAL
21 CONSIDERATIONS THAT FACTOR INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIVE-YEAR
22 CAPITAL EXPENDITURE BUDGET AS COMPARED TO THE O&M BUDGET?

23 A. Yes. The capital expenditure budget is a listing of specific projects and
24 routine project construction work. Many large projects in the business areas
25 are planned and completed over multiple calendar years. To capture total
26 budgeted capital expenditures for these multi-year projects, each business area
27 develops the capital budget for each project from a starting Construction

1 Work In Progress (CWIP) balance, where applicable, and forecasts future
2 capital expenditures for the current “bridge” year (the remainder of the
3 current year in which the budget is prepared) and for the next five years.

4
5 Capital expenditure budgets also identify specific in-service dates or, in the
6 case of routine projects, apply a defined closing pattern, such as those
7 included in the electric distribution budget, which defines and applies in-
8 service dates. Once the five-year capital expenditure budget has been
9 approved by the Financial Council (as described below), the Company
10 performs all of the plant-related accounting activities needed to develop the
11 cost of service analysis for the test year. This information includes moving
12 capital expenditures from CWIP to Plant In-Service as projects are completed,
13 calculating deferred taxes and depreciation expense, and other related costs.
14 Company witness Ms. Laurie Wold describes this process in more detail in her
15 Direct Testimony.

16
17 Q. CAN YOU EXPLAIN MORE ABOUT ROUTINE PROJECTS AND HOW THEIR
18 OVERSIGHT IS HANDLED?

19 A. Routine projects are defined as those that are part of the normal course of
20 business and occur each year. Examples of routine projects in the electric
21 distribution area include the purchase of meters and transformers, and
22 replacement of poles, or annual refresh projects in Business Systems that
23 replace computing devices on a planned schedule. These types of transactions
24 occur each year, with the only variables typically being the number and cost of
25 units being purchased or replaced.

1 These routine project categories are then included as part of the annual capital
2 budget review process and the monthly forecast review process discussed in
3 the following sections of my testimony. Variances in planned purchase or
4 activity levels are reviewed and approved as part of that process.

5
6 Q. ARE THERE DIFFERENT CAPITAL EXPENDITURE THRESHOLDS FOR PROJECTS
7 THAT DICTATE THE GOVERNANCE REVIEW FOR THOSE PROPOSED CAPITAL
8 EXPENDITURES?

9 A. Yes. There are different governance processes for projects at the greater than
10 \$10 million, \$20 million, and \$50 million thresholds.

11
12 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE, AT A HIGH LEVEL, THE ADDITIONAL GOVERNANCE PROCESS
13 FOR LARGE CAPITAL PROJECTS.

14 A. The capital budget process requires additional reviews for new capital projects
15 with expenditures over \$10 million. Likewise, new capital projects with
16 expenditures over \$20 million require further reviews, and projects over \$50
17 million require the greatest number of reviews. I discuss these additional
18 review and approval requirements in the next section of my testimony.

19
20 Q. ARE THE BUDGETING AND GOVERNANCE PROCESSES YOU DESCRIBE IN THIS
21 TESTIMONY LARGELY THE SAME PROCESSES USED IN YOUR MOST RECENT RATE
22 CASE?

23 A. Yes, it is the same general process with some noteworthy refinements. Since
24 filing the last case, we have continued to refine our process so that there is an
25 enhanced focus on O&M in general, and on the connection between capital
26 investment and O&M expenses. We have further refined our review
27 processes around larger projects, including by enhancing our focus on how to

1 fund key strategic priorities and keep base operations reliable while minimizing
2 the impact on customer rates. Finally, we have enhanced communications and
3 guidance to business areas around budget development.

4
5 Q. CAN YOU FURTHER DISCUSS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAPITAL AND
6 O&M?

7 A. Capital investments are a key driver of O&M for the Company. For example,
8 when Business Systems made a capital investment in its new SAP General
9 Ledger, it also changed the ongoing licensing and operations and maintenance
10 costs to maintain the new system. Another example would be our investment
11 in wind farms. Once the wind farms are constructed and commissioned, the
12 Company commits to on-going costs to operate and maintain them, which
13 increase O&M budgets for our wind resources. At the same time, some
14 capital investments can reduce O&M costs over the long term, as the
15 Company has seen in its nuclear operations area, discussed by Company
16 witness Mr. Timothy J. O'Connor in his Direct Testimony. Understanding
17 this relationship between capital investments and O&M expense is critical in
18 controlling overall costs that will be passed on to customers.

19
20 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE COMPANY HAS APPROACHED THE FUNDING OF
21 KEY STRATEGIC PRIORITIES WHILE MAINTAINING BASE OPERATIONS AND
22 MINIMIZING THE IMPACT ON CUSTOMER RATES.

23 A. As has always been the case, the capital planning process involves a bottom-
24 up analysis of needs and priorities on the part of the business areas as they
25 develop capital budgets for review and approval. In this process, achieving
26 the balance of funding key strategic priorities, maintaining base operations,
27 and minimizing impacts on customer rates is important. Once proposed

1 project expenditures are identified and developed – both capital and O&M –
2 they are then reviewed in the context of the Company’s overall resources and
3 discussed at planning meetings to determine how projects should be
4 prioritized and which are ultimately included in an approved budget. We also
5 assess overall cost levels in relation to inflation, which provides a helpful
6 benchmark for reasonable increases. This allows us to ensure the most
7 important priorities are met while keeping overall costs at reasonable levels.

8
9 Q. HOW HAS THE COMPANY ENHANCED COMMUNICATIONS ABOUT THE BUDGET
10 PROCESS WITH BUSINESS AREAS?

11 A. Rather than focusing on form budget instructions, we have developed a more
12 responsive and interactive process of weekly meetings and ongoing
13 discussions with business areas while they develop their budgets, to help
14 address individualized questions and issues as they arise but also to ensure
15 consistency in the process across business areas.

16
17 Q. IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE TO HIGHLIGHT RELATED TO THE
18 COMPANY’S OVERALL BUDGETING AND FINANCIAL GOVERNANCE PROCESS
19 AND YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?

20 A. Yes. Like the last case we are requesting approval of a multi-year rate plan
21 (MYRP). Accordingly, my testimony in this case provides additional detail on
22 how we make decisions at the overall corporate level about business area
23 budgets and how we manage overall Company expenditures on an ongoing
24 basis once budgets are set.

25
26 The business area witnesses in this case discuss in detail how they prioritize
27 projects, develop budgets, and manage ongoing spending. They describe how

1 they review and assess priorities and make necessary expenditure changes
2 through trade-offs in spending – both within individual departments and
3 between departments within their own business area on an ongoing basis. In
4 my testimony, I discuss how this assessment and prioritization occurs at the
5 corporate level between business areas, where there are generally more
6 projects and work to be done than the Company has the capacity to fund.
7 This overall prioritizing and balancing between business areas occurs both
8 during the budgeting process and as ongoing monthly discussions. I describe
9 the flexible and iterative nature of this process, as budgets are reviewed,
10 refined, and reprioritized to meet overall operating company and customer
11 needs, and respond to changing circumstances. This flexibility is necessary to
12 manage our business, and is particularly critical under a multi-year rate plan
13 construct.

14
15 **B. Groups Overseeing Budget Processes**

16 Q. BEFORE MOVING ON TO DESCRIBE THE BUDGETING PROCESS IN DETAIL, CAN
17 YOU PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION ON WHICH GROUPS WITHIN XCEL ENERGY
18 HAVE A ROLE IN THE COMPANY’S BUDGETING AND BUDGET GOVERNANCE
19 PROCESSES.

20 A. My group, Financial Performance and Reporting (FP&R), various groups
21 within each business area, and leadership at the operating company and
22 corporate levels all play a role in the budgeting and budget governance process
23 at Xcel Energy. At the corporate level, Xcel Energy’s Investment Review
24 Committee (IRC), Financial Council, and Board of Directors are responsible
25 for various levels of review and approval of the business area budgets. In
26 addition, the leadership and Boards of Directors for the operating companies

1 – including NSPM – also play a role in review and approval of the business
2 area budgets.

3
4 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE AT A HIGH LEVEL THE ROLE OF THE FP&R GROUP IN THE
5 BUDGETING AND BUDGET GOVERNANCE PROCESS.

6 A. FP&R oversees and manages the creation of the five-year O&M budget and
7 capital expenditure budget that flow into Xcel Energy's five-year financial
8 forecast. FP&R facilitates Xcel Energy's capital and O&M budget
9 development process and provides guidance and training to business areas as
10 they develop their budgets. We also manage the process of rolling up the
11 individual business area budgets for review and approval at the operating
12 company and corporate levels. Once budgets are approved and finalized, we
13 facilitate monthly budget variance reviews.

14
15 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE AT A HIGH LEVEL THE ROLE OF BUSINESS AREA PERSONNEL
16 IN THE BUDGETING AND BUDGET GOVERNANCE PROCESS.

17 A. Each business area has a dedicated finance team to facilitate budget
18 development and ongoing review. These finance teams work with the project
19 teams and leadership within each business area to develop budgets consistent
20 with the corporate guidance provided by FP&R. Each business area witness
21 in this case provides testimony discussing the specific budgeting and
22 governance processes at the business area level and describes in detail how
23 they prioritize work and projects for their business area. In my testimony, I
24 discuss how the individual business area budgets develop, roll up, and are
25 reviewed, prioritized, and approved at the corporate level.

1 Q. WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE INVESTMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE
2 IN THE BUDGETING AND BUDGET GOVERNANCE PROCESS?

3 A. The XEI IRC is responsible for reviewing any new capital projects having
4 capital expenditures greater than \$10 million. The primary objectives of the
5 IRC review are to:

- 6 • develop potential risk management and hedging strategies for large
7 projects and assess alternatives;
- 8 • ensure optimal investment timing consistent with regulatory plans;
- 9 • evaluate cash flow returns relative to the cost of capital;
- 10 • assess key modeling and analysis assumptions and ensure that the
11 business area has evaluated the associated operational risks;
- 12 • coordinate specific accounting and tax research;
- 13 • identify regulatory recovery paths; and
- 14 • determine financing requirements and balance sheet impacts.

15
16 Q. WHAT IS THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE IRC?

17 A. Members of the IRC include:

- 18 • Karen Hyde, Vice President, Chief Risk and Audit Officer;
- 19 • Brian Van Abel, Senior Vice President, Finance and Corporate
20 Development;
- 21 • Teresa Mogenson, Senior Vice President of Energy Supply;
- 22 • Sarah Soong, Vice President and Treasurer
- 23 • Christopher Haworth, Associate Vice President of Revenue
24 Requirements.
- 25 • Jonathan Adelman, Associate Vice President of Strategic Resource and
26 Business Planning

1 Q. HAS THIS IRC AND FINANCIAL COUNCIL REVIEW PROCESS CHANGED AT ALL
2 SINCE THE COMPANY'S LAST RATE CASE ?

3 A. Yes, somewhat. As of filing our last rate case in 2015, the IRC reviewed new
4 capital projects with capital expenditures greater than \$10 million and then
5 those projects were either sent back to the business area for more information
6 or presented to the Financial Council. Since that time, however, the process
7 changed somewhat so that the Financial Council only reviews projects of
8 more than \$20 million. This change was made to ensure that the review
9 process is more iterative and helps focus more of the Financial Council's time
10 on the larger projects. As discussed below, the IRC continues to review the
11 projects above \$10 million and approve or send back to the business areas,
12 ensuring consistent review and oversight.

13

14 Q. WHAT OCCURS IN THE COMPANY'S BUDGETING PROCESS AFTER REVIEW OF A
15 PROJECT BY THE IRC?

16 A. For projects having capital expenditures greater than \$10 million but less than
17 \$20 million, the IRC may approve the project, seek more information, or
18 request that the business area re-evaluate certain assumptions before the
19 project is included in the Company's budget. For example, the IRC may
20 request additional information regarding such questions as how the business
21 area is optimizing spending and in-service plans, how proposals compare to
22 business area priorities, seeking more information about alternatives, how
23 proposals are consistent with overall business strategy, and risk issues. For
24 projects having capital expenditures greater than \$20 million, after review by
25 the IRC, a project will either be recommended for presentation to the
26 Financial Council for approval or the business area will be asked to re-evaluate
27 various assumptions before proceeding in the budget governance process. In

1 addition, the IRC reviews projects with variances of more than 10 percent or
2 15 percent (depending on the size of the project) from their original approval.

3
4 Q. WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FINANCIAL COUNCIL IN THE
5 BUDGETING AND BUDGET GOVERNANCE PROCESS?

6 A. The Financial Council is responsible for reviewing the overall five-year O&M
7 Budget and Capital Expenditure Budget for each of the operating utility
8 subsidiaries. The Financial Council is also responsible for determining
9 whether to approve proposed projects having capital expenditures greater than
10 \$20 million and including them in the five-year capital budget. Projects having
11 capital expenditures greater than \$50 million must be presented to the XEI
12 and NSPM Boards of Directors after approval by the Financial Council.

13
14 After budgets are established, the Financial Council is involved in the monthly
15 O&M and capital expenditure reviews of current year spending and in
16 monitoring the financial performance of NSPM (and the other XEI utility
17 operating subsidiaries) and XEI during the course of the year.

18
19 Q. WHO ARE THE MEMBERS OF THE FINANCIAL COUNCIL?

20 A. The Financial Council is chaired by Robert Frenzel, Executive Vice President
21 and Chief Financial Officer, and consists of the following senior executives:

- 22 • Ben Fowke, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer of XEI;
- 23 • Brett Carter, Executive Vice President and Chief Customer and
24 Innovation Officer;
- 25 • David Eves, Executive Vice President, Group President – Utilities;
- 26 • Kent Larson, Executive Vice President and Group President of
27 Operations;

- 1 • Judy Pofert, Senior Vice President and Corporate Secretary;
- 2 • Scott Wilensky, Executive Vice President and General Counsel;
- 3 • Darla Figoli, Senior Vice President and Chief Human Resources
- 4 Officer
- 5 • Alice Jackson, President and Chief Executive Officer, Public Service
- 6 Company of Colorado;
- 7 • Mark Stoering, President and Chief Executive Officer, Northern States
- 8 Power Company-Wisconsin;
- 9 • David Hudson, President and Chief Executive Officer, Southwestern
- 10 Public Service Company;
- 11 • Timothy O'Connor, Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer;
- 12 and
- 13 • Christopher Clark, President and Chief Executive Officer Northern
- 14 States Power Company – Minnesota.

15
16 Q. WHAT ARE THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE XEI AND NSPM BOARDS OF
17 DIRECTORS?

18 A. The XEI and NSPM Boards of Directors are responsible for reviewing the
19 five-year capital budget and approving the first year of that budget. They are
20 also responsible for reviewing and approving all capital projects with total
21 forecasted spend greater than \$50 million.

22
23 **C. Budgeting Process for O&M and Capital Expenditures**

24 Q. WHAT ARE THE MAJOR STEPS OF THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL BUDGET PROCESS?

25 A. While I have separated the budgeting process into discrete steps for discussion
26 purposes, I note that each of the first four steps encompasses multiple

1 activities. The work completed during these phases is fluid and the process is
2 iterative, involving as much back-and-forth discussion as necessary – between
3 FP&R, business area personnel, and corporate and operating company
4 leadership – to ensure that the final approved O&M and capital budgets
5 provide a reasonable estimate of the costs that will be incurred to provide
6 customers with clean, safe, and reliable electric service. The steps in the
7 process are:

- 8 1) Financial Planning and Guidance Development;
- 9 2) Business Area Budget Development;
- 10 3) Financial Council and Operating Company Review and Approval; and
- 11 4) XEI and NSPM Boards of Directors Approval.

12
13 *1. Financial Planning and Guidance Development*

14 Q. WHAT IS THE COMPANY’S PROCESS TO DEVELOP EACH BUSINESS AREA’S
15 PROPOSED CAPITAL AND O&M SPEND?

16 A. The Company’s process to understand each business area’s proposed capital
17 and O&M spend is initiated by asking each business area to provide its
18 proposed spend for subsequent years. A business area’s proposed spend is
19 based on their bottom-up review of business needs and requirements,
20 information from the prior year’s overall budgeting process, and information
21 learned during the ongoing reviews that have occurred during the year since
22 the last budget was approved. These proposals are then rolled up for a subset
23 of the Financial Council to examine in the context of other factors such as
24 broader business priorities, credit metrics, customer affordability, and the like,
25 to help develop spending guidance for each business area.

1 Q. WHY DOES THE FINANCIAL COUNCIL DEVELOP SPENDING GUIDANCE FOR
2 EACH BUSINESS AREA?

3 A. In any budget process, there is typically more demand for O&M and capital
4 budget dollars than there is financial capacity to fund. Therefore, the
5 Company provides financial guidance to the business areas to set expectations
6 for that area, making it clear that they will be expected to justify and explain
7 any significant deviations from the guidance as part of the review and
8 approval process.

9

10 Q. HOW IS THE FINANCIAL GUIDANCE DEVELOPED?

11 A. The starting point for developing the financial guidance is the most recent
12 five-year financial forecast. Specifically, for the 2020 - 2024 budgets, the
13 starting point is the most recent five-year (2019 - 2023) forecast. Beginning
14 each February, the Financial Council reviews this information, considering
15 Xcel Energy's business plans and a number of other factors. Of particular
16 importance in this review are the five-year capital spending levels, which will
17 drive the amount of financing needs, and a review of five-year capital
18 additions. After considering this information and emergent business area
19 needs, the Financial Council establishes financial guidance for the new five-
20 year O&M and capital budgets.

21

22 Q. WHAT ELSE DOES THE FINANCIAL COUNCIL FACTOR IN WHEN DETERMINING
23 INITIAL BUSINESS AREA FINANCIAL GUIDANCE?

24 A. The Financial Council also looks at any new legislation or regulatory
25 requirements that may impact spending in the next five years. They assess the
26 current portfolio of projects and how any expected changes will impact
27 customer rates. In addition to reviewing changes related to new requirements

1 or that are necessary to maintain or improve reliability, safety, and satisfaction
2 of regulatory requirements, the Financial Council assesses where there may be
3 opportunities to mitigate risk or to work toward meeting state policy goals or
4 advance priorities our customers or regulators have communicated.

5
6 Q. HOW DO BUSINESS AREAS KNOW HOW TO PLAN FOR THE WORK THEY WILL
7 COMPLETE IN THE YEARS AHEAD?

8 A While the Company previously provided formulaic corporate budget
9 instructions, since the last case, we re-assessed the value of Corporate Budget
10 Instructions and determined that a more effective communication strategy is a
11 series of weekly discussions between FP&R and business area finance
12 representatives. These discussions cover topics such as the timing and
13 expectations for business areas to develop draft and final budgets, problem-
14 solving, and emerging issues. The results are spending guidance and other
15 instructions such as corporate allocations, policy directions, and the like
16 provided to the business areas via these ongoing communications that allow
17 the business areas to incorporate this guidance when developing their work
18 plans.

19
20 Q. IS THE SPENDING GUIDANCE THE ONLY INFORMATION THE BUSINESS AREAS
21 USE IN DEVELOPING THEIR BUDGETS?

22 A. No. Because it is necessary for the business areas to factor their own strategic
23 priorities and annual plans into their budgets, each business area may also
24 provide additional instructions, guidance, or information specific to its
25 organization. Business areas then review their current five-year forecast and
26 re-evaluate spending priorities. This requires them to gather detailed

1 information on budget assumptions, support new assumptions, and in some
2 cases perform additional detailed analyses.

3
4 *2. Business Area Budget Development*

5 Q. HOW DOES THE COMPANY ENSURE THAT EACH BUSINESS AREA FOLLOWS
6 SIMILAR PROCEDURES TO DEVELOP A BUDGET?

7 A. Each five-year budgeting cycle is initiated with a two-day meeting where
8 business areas, operating companies, and finance collaborate to align on
9 initiatives and priorities that should be included in the next budget.

10
11 Q. HOW DO THE ATTENDEES INTERACT TO CREATE CONSISTENCY IN THE
12 BUDGETING PROCESSES?

13 A. The meeting includes discussions on corporate strategy and other key
14 initiatives in addition to a financial overview to guide the planning and
15 budgeting process. Business areas and the operating companies are
16 encouraged to share with the broad group specific priorities, unique
17 opportunities, or challenges they are facing. Then, each business area and
18 operating company meets to discuss the financial information, challenges,
19 opportunities, and priorities in detail. Finance then begins its work with each
20 business area to build a budget that takes the outcomes of these discussions
21 into consideration.

22
23 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT OCCURS DURING THE BUSINESS AREA BUDGET
24 DEVELOPMENT PHASE.

25 A. Managers within each business area, in conjunction with managers from
26 business area finance, develop their budgets for each of the next five years.
27 The schedule during this phase is designed to provide sufficient time for

1 building the O&M and capital budgets, as well as allowing for internal reviews
2 and checkpoints before the budgets are submitted for senior management
3 review. During this phase, each business area assesses its operating needs and
4 identifies potential capital projects. The scope, cost, and timing of these
5 projects are evaluated and prioritized within the business area by operating
6 company, resulting in an aggregate projection of recommended capital
7 expenditures for each of the next five years. At the same time, the business
8 areas forecast their labor, material, equipment, and other needs to build a
9 projection of the O&M levels needed to support their area over the next five
10 years. The business area's O&M and capital budgets are then consolidated by
11 the corporate finance team along with preliminary information necessary to
12 estimate the overall financial forecast and all this information is presented for
13 internal review prior to the presentation to the Financial Council later in the
14 fall.

15
16 Q. WHAT REVIEWS OR DISCUSSIONS ARE COMPLETED DURING THE INTERNAL
17 REVIEW?

18 A. The internal review includes a meeting of the business areas, operating
19 companies, and finance to review each business area's preliminary O&M and
20 capital budgets. Through an iterative process, further discussions are held that
21 focus on ensuring the key priorities and opportunities discussed at the prior
22 meetings have been adequately addressed, that spending levels align with the
23 Company's ability to fund, and that any associated customer rate increases that
24 result from the budgets are reasonable and necessary. This process allows
25 Company leaders an opportunity to provide feedback to the business areas
26 and finance for additional review, revisions, or optimization in mid- to late-

1 summer before the budgets are finalized and presented to the Financial
2 Council later in the fall.

3
4 Q. WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PREPARING THE O&M AND CAPITAL EXPENDITURE
5 BUDGETS FOR EACH BUSINESS AREA?

6 A. Because each business area is different, each business area defines the scope of
7 participation in, and the individuals responsible for, the development of O&M
8 and capital expenditure budgets.

9
10 The assigned business area finance representative works with the designated
11 employees in each business area compiling the budget, including gathering the
12 required data and development of supporting assumptions. The information
13 is consolidated and reviewed at various levels within the functional areas, and
14 then reviewed and approved by the senior business area executive. After
15 review and approval by the business area executive, the O&M and capital
16 budgets are presented to the operating company Presidents and ultimately, the
17 Financial Council.

18
19 Q. ARE THE BUSINESS AREA BUDGETS BASED ON ANALYSIS OF THE COSTS OF
20 INDIVIDUAL ELEMENTS OR ON TOTAL PRIOR YEAR COSTS PLUS INFLATION?

21 A. Each business area determines the most accurate method for developing the
22 budget amounts by category; and the budget is built from the bottom up by
23 individual components, such as employee labor, contract labor, consulting
24 costs, and materials expense while also considering, along the way, the
25 spending guidance I previously discussed. In the example of labor, current
26 salary and headcount data is fed from our payroll system to our budgeting
27 system. Planned headcount additions or reductions over the five year period

1 are incorporated into the budget system based on current workforce plans;
2 projected merit increases are applied by the corporate budgeting group based
3 on assumptions provided and approved by Human Resources. In a separate
4 example of materials, a business area may decide that the best way to
5 accurately assess likely future spend is to apply an inflationary assumption to
6 the trending of prior years' spend. Thus business areas are able to use
7 judgment to determine the most appropriate means for developing budgets
8 for each category of spend.

9
10 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE BUSINESS AREA REVIEW PROCESS AND HOW IT RELATES
11 TO THE OVERALL BUDGETING PROCESS.

12 A. Business area management reviews the developing budgets several times
13 during the budget cycle. These reviews may consider:

- 14 • the analysis of long-term trends;
- 15 • discussion of what costs should be reduced based on process
16 efficiencies or changing business requirements;
- 17 • identification of cost pressures and business risks;
- 18 • emerging regulatory requirements; and
- 19 • alignment with strategic objectives.

20
21 Each business area completes iterative reviews of its budget prior to finalizing
22 the budget that is submitted to the Financial Council in late September. These
23 reviews are intended to ensure that the budget is a reasonable and
24 representative forecast of costs for the budget period and that cost
25 components are well understood in preparation for the review meetings with
26 the Financial Council. During this process, the business area meets on an as-
27 needed basis with the operating company presidents, senior financial

1 executives, and senior operations leadership to discuss the preliminary
2 budgets. The purpose of these meetings is to help prioritize projects within
3 the area, as well as across the Company, and to understand how these
4 preliminary budgets compare to the financial and spending guidance I
5 previously discussed. Emergent cost pressures are discussed, along with how
6 these preliminary budgets align with the regulatory priorities of each operating
7 company and the Company's ability to finance the work. This process is
8 designed to be iterative, giving each group ample opportunity to provide input
9 into the budgets that are proposed to the Operating Company Presidents and
10 the Financial Council.

11
12 *3. Financial Council and Operating Company Review and Approval*

13 Q. DO THE OPERATING COMPANY PRESIDENTS ALSO REVIEW THE PROPOSED
14 BUDGETS AS THEY ARE BEING DEVELOPED?

15 A. Yes. As I mention above, business areas meet on an as-needed basis with
16 operating company presidents and others to discuss preliminary budgets.
17 Additionally, after the business areas have finalized their proposed budgets,
18 business area leadership meets with the operating company president to
19 present their finalized recommendations for the pending budget cycle. Each
20 operating company president is responsible for reviewing the budgets for his
21 or her operating company across all business areas and has the opportunity to
22 recommend changes to the budgets before they are presented to Financial
23 Council.

24
25 Because budget guidance is also developed on an operating company basis,
26 the operating company president has a foundation on which to evaluate
27 business area budgets that are either above or below the budget guidance, and

1 can evaluate the reasons for each business area coming in over or under this
2 guidance. Based on needs within the operating company, its president may
3 request changes either within a business area budget or across the business
4 areas.

5
6 Q. WHAT FACTORS DO THE OPERATING COMPANY PRESIDENTS AND LATER THE
7 FINANCIAL COUNCIL CONSIDER AS THEY ARE REVIEWING THE PROPOSED
8 BUDGETS?

9 A. These reviews take into consideration rate and customer impacts, cost
10 pressures, emergent issues, priorities presented by the business areas, and
11 areas of strategic and business risk to our stakeholders. They also consider
12 regulatory requirements and operational needs at the state level, the financial
13 position of the operating company, and key strategic decisions that need to be
14 made in the near future. These overall reviews of expenditures at the
15 corporate level are conducted to balance needs across business areas and
16 develop and approve budgets necessary to support an appropriate portfolio of
17 projects from an operating company perspective, and the work necessary to
18 continue to provide safe reliable service to customers.

19
20 Q. WHAT OCCURS AFTER THE OPERATING COMPANY PRESIDENTS REVIEW THE
21 BUDGETS?

22 A. After incorporating any modifications by the operating company presidents,
23 the O&M and capital expenditure budgets are presented to the Financial
24 Council. The same iterative process used up to this point is repeated at the
25 Financial Council, meaning additional research and analysis may be required
26 and/or budget adjustments made. The FP&R group continues the cross-
27 functional review process. Additional review sessions are held with the

1 business areas, and information necessary for the Financial Council review is
2 gathered and summarized for presentation. At the conclusion of the Financial
3 Council review sessions, the business areas make any resulting adjustments,
4 the budgets are considered final, and the final budgets are presented to the
5 Boards of Directors for approval.

6
7 *4. XEI and NSPM Boards of Directors Approval*

8 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE APPROVAL OF BUDGETS BY THE XEI AND NSPM
9 BOARDS OF DIRECTORS.

10 A. After Financial Council review and approval, the five-year capital budget is
11 presented to the Xcel Energy Board of Directors. This review is focused
12 around the upcoming year, as well as major changes compared to the previous
13 year's five-year budget. The Board of Directors also reviews and determines
14 whether to approve any new projects with total project spend in excess of \$50
15 million, and any previously-approved project that is seeking re-approval
16 because of significant changes to overall spend.

17
18 As part of a separate process, the NSPM Board of Directors approves the
19 upcoming year's total capital budget, all new projects greater than \$50 million,
20 and the upcoming year's O&M budget. Because NSPM's Board of Directors
21 also hold seats on the Financial Council as well, they also review and approve
22 the full five-year O&M and capital budgets as part of that separate process.
23 Thus the NSPM Board of Directors has multiple opportunities to review,
24 question, and ultimately approve the Company's budget.

1 **D. Financial Systems**

2 Q. HAS THE COMPANY MADE ANY CHANGES TO ITS FINANCIAL SYSTEMS SINCE ITS
3 LAST RATE CASE?

4 A. Yes. The Company has made changes to its financial systems through the
5 implementation of our Productivity Through Technology (PTT) initiative.
6 The PTT initiative included replacement of the Company's GL system and
7 implementation of a new Work and Asset Management (WAM) system, both
8 of which were discussed in depth in our last rate case. The new SAP GL
9 system was placed in service at the end of 2015, shortly after the Company
10 filed its last rate case. The GL serves as a foundation for implementation of
11 the WAM system, which was placed in service in phases through the fourth
12 quarter of 2017.

13
14 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE OTHER FINANCIAL SYSTEMS USED BY XCEL ENERGY TO
15 DEVELOP ITS BUDGETS AND FORECASTS.

16 A. Xcel Energy uses several financial systems as part of its budgeting and
17 forecasting process. O&M and capital budget data is initially input into FMS.
18 This allows budget managers in every business area to enter projected monthly
19 capital expenditures for the next five-year period.

20
21 Monthly capital budget data in FMS is then loaded into our PowerPlan system.
22 PowerPlan is used by Capital Asset Accounting to maintain actual and budget
23 capital expenditure data along with actual and budget in-service dates for
24 determining plant in-service. Allowance for Funds Used During Construction
25 (AFUDC) and depreciation expense associated with all budgeted capital
26 project work orders are calculated within PowerPlan. PowerPlan is then used

1 to generate the projected plant and CWIP balances for the thirteen-month roll
2 forward for each year of a multi-year rate plan.

3
4 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THE SAP GL SYSTEM ACCOMPLISHES UTILITY
5 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

6 A. The majority of all business costs are either incurred directly by the Company
7 or billed to the Company from XES. Regardless of the transaction
8 origination, each transaction is coded and posted to the SAP GL system with
9 the information necessary to identify the operating company or affiliate that
10 incurred the cost, as well as the operating company or affiliate that is
11 responsible for the cost. Additionally, each transaction is identified with the
12 utility, the functional group, and the type of cost. The SAP GL system uses
13 these transaction details to report the information by FERC account, as
14 required by state and federal regulators.

15
16 Company witness Ms. Melissa Schmidt discusses further how the transition to
17 SAP accounting and reporting is reflected in the Company's Cost Assignment
18 and Allocation Manual (CAAM).

19
20 Q. HOW HAS THE SAP GL AND WAM IMPLEMENTATION CHANGED THE WAY
21 THE COMPANY IS PRESENTING FINANCIAL BUDGETING DATA?

22 A. There are two main ways the SAP GL system is different from the JDE GL
23 system. First, the SAP GL system replaces the old JDE Generally Accepted
24 Accounting Principles (GAAP)-based "object accounts" with GAAP-based
25 "cost elements." Second, with WAM implemented, we have an additional
26 dimension that can be used to track and analyze data, known as Work
27 Breakdown Structures (WBS). This second change provides the Company

1 with an additional way to analyze data that provides insight into the types of
2 activities that each business area in the Company undertakes.

3
4 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE CHANGE FROM “OBJECT ACCOUNTS” TO GAAP-BASED
5 “COST ELEMENTS.”

6 A. The primary difference is that GAAP O&M and capital accounts were
7 referred to as “object accounts” in the JDE GL system, whereas they are
8 referred to as “cost elements” in the SAP GL system. Some of the cost
9 elements are comparable, but most are different or new when compared to
10 the JDE GL. This is largely a function of changing to a more streamlined and
11 simplified chart of accounts.

12
13 Under the old JDE GL system, there were also separate sets of object
14 accounts for O&M and capital costs. Within the SAP GL system, O&M and
15 capital share the same cost elements and the type of cost is distinguished using
16 other reporting attributes. This does change how our cost elements are
17 mapped to FERC accounts, as I describe below.

18
19 Q. HAVE THERE BEEN ANY CHANGES IN THE WAY THE COMPANY PRESENTS ITS
20 FINANCIAL DATA WITH RESPECT TO THE NEW WBSs THAT ARE PART OF THE
21 SAP GL SYSTEM?

22 A. Yes. The SAP GL system facilitates the tracking of work activities using WBS
23 to drive productivity improvements. Through the WBSs in SAP, we are able
24 to budget, track, and analyze financial data by various activities such as
25 “Electric Locates” in addition to being able to analyze data using FERC
26 accounts, GAAP-based cost elements, and business areas within the

1 Company's organizational hierarchy. This additional way of analyzing data
2 helps support cost-management efforts of the Company.

3
4 Q. WITH THIS CHANGE IN FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, IS THE COMPANY ABLE TO
5 PROVIDE AN AUDIT TRAIL MAP?

6 A. Yes. With my testimony, I am providing the Audit Trail map that allows
7 review of expenses and tracking from "cost element" to FERC account as
8 Exhibit____(GJR-1), Schedule 2 to my Direct Testimony.

9
10 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE AUDIT TRAIL MAP.

11 A. The Audit Trail map provides a breakdown of 2020 O&M costs by cost
12 category and GAAP cost element. It also includes the information by FERC
13 account and grouping. Finally, it provides the business area, sub-area, and
14 cost center where the cost originated, along with the applicable business area
15 witness to support that cost. Along with this information, the Audit Trail map
16 includes summaries showing the following:

- 17 • Total 2020 O&M by FERC account
- 18 • Total 2020 O&M by GAAP cost element
- 19 • 2020 FERC O&M by Company witness
- 20 • 2020 GAAP-based cost element O&M by Company witness

21
22 These data can then be filtered, and also support the expenses presented in
23 Company witness Benjamin C. Halama's revenue requirements study. The
24 data by business areas on the audit trail map may be slightly different than data
25 shown in witness testimony. This is primarily due to minor differences in the
26 way that costs are assigned to a business area in GAAP and FERC reporting.
27 In total across all business areas, there is no difference.

1 Q. HAS THE MOVE TO THE SAP GL IMPACTED ANY OTHER BUDGET
2 DOCUMENTATION THAT THE COMPANY PROVIDES IN ITS RATE CASES?

3 A. To a certain extent, yes. The outputs of the SAP GL in Volumes 5 and 6 of
4 this case are slightly different in appearance from the JDE GL, which was
5 used to provide the Company's budget documentation in Volumes 5, 6A, and
6 6B in our last rate case (Docket No. E002/GR-15-826). While we continued
7 to utilize JDE alongside SAP in 2016 (because our 2016 budget was loaded in
8 JDE), our first full year of budgeting and tracking in SAP in 2017 required
9 additional mapping work. In our current case, the Company has worked to
10 provide all budget documentation that parties have previously found helpful,
11 including some that is no longer required, although the reports themselves will
12 appear somewhat different than in prior cases given this systems change.

13

14 **E. Ongoing Financial Governance**

15 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE MORE FULLY THE COMPANY'S ONGOING FINANCIAL
16 GOVERNANCE PROCESS.

17 A. The financial governance process consists of a monthly financial forecast
18 process and the processes to monitor Xcel Energy's and the operating
19 companies' performance in comparison to the budget. Once the Financial
20 Council approves the five-year budget for each of the utility operating
21 companies, it is locked down to prevent further changes. This facilitates the
22 monitoring and update processes during the first budget year (the year
23 following the year in which the budget is prepared) to reflect changes in
24 business conditions and operations that were not anticipated at the time the
25 budget was approved.

1 Once the final O&M and capital budgets are established, and the financial year
2 begins, the monthly forecast process also begins. Financial Performance and
3 Reporting compares actual results to the O&M and capital budgets by
4 business area and by Operating Company, and requires the business areas to
5 explain variances and update their forecasts as appropriate. This monthly
6 variance analysis and forecast updating process is an integral part of our
7 overall budget governance.

8
9 This ongoing financial governance process allows us to adjust, on a continuing
10 basis, our business plans and financial forecasts. For example, a business area
11 may face cost increases or new projects not anticipated at the time the budget
12 was created, or may need to reduce, delay, or accelerate spending in response
13 to unforeseen or changed circumstances. The monthly forecasting process
14 allows us to evaluate whether an increase above original budget levels for a
15 business area is needed, to consider such changes in the context of overall
16 Company needs and demands, and then to properly reflect any necessary and
17 appropriate changes in our business plans and forecasts.

18
19 Q. HOW DO THE OPERATING COMPANIES USE THIS ONGOING MONITORING AND
20 REVIEW PROCESS?

21 A. Updated O&M and capital forecasts are reviewed at monthly Financial
22 Performance Team meetings led by the FP&R group. Each business area
23 finance representative discusses variances between actual and budgeted
24 expenditures and whether the variances are timing-related. The business area
25 representative will also discuss any unplanned items that have arisen and
26 whether they can be absorbed, or if they will require an adjustment to the
27 year-end forecast. Each business area is responsible for managing to their

1 original budget as approved, so when unforeseen costs occur, the business
2 area makes every attempt to absorb these within their budget by reprioritizing
3 other work. If they are unable to do so, the business area can request to
4 increase their forecast. Variances and updated forecasts are reviewed monthly
5 with the Financial Council.

6
7 **F. Summary**

8 Q. OVERALL, WHY DOES XCEL ENERGY PLACE SUCH AN EMPHASIS ON BUDGET
9 ACCURACY?

10 A. The budgeting process must produce a reasonable and representative
11 reflection of the O&M and capital expenditures we expect to make because
12 we use the resulting budgets both for financial management purposes and for
13 development of test year costs. As a result, our budgets are essential to
14 maintaining the utility operating companies' credibility with customers,
15 regulators, and the investment community. That, in turn, requires each of the
16 utility Operating Companies, including NSPM, to have in place a budget
17 process that is transparent, understandable, and that reasonably reflects O&M
18 and capital expenditures during the budget period.

19
20 Q. DOES BUDGET ACCURACY MEAN THAT ACTUAL RESULTS WILL ALWAYS MATCH
21 BUDGETS?

22 A. No. The O&M and capital budgets are intended to reflect a reasonable and
23 representative prediction of costs to be incurred by each business area to allow
24 the utility Operating Companies to deliver services to their customers. Budget
25 accuracy does not mean that every budgeted dollar is spent in exactly the same
26 way that it was forecast to be spent, because circumstances will inevitably arise
27 that will require deviations, both upward and downward, from planned levels.

1 Likewise, it is not uncommon for actual capital expenditures to deviate from
2 their budgeted levels for individual projects. Deviations from budget such as
3 these do not mean that the budget was not reasonable and accurate.

4
5 What is important is that, overall, the budgets reflect a reasonable and
6 representative prediction of costs to be incurred and that will allow the utility
7 operating companies to deliver services to their customers. The ongoing
8 monitoring of actual expenditures and analysis of variances to budgeted levels
9 discussed previously, help maintain an appropriate business area focus on
10 expenditures, and facilitate any necessary adjustments to respond to changing
11 circumstances.

12 13 **III. CAPITAL AND O&M BUDGET ANALYSES**

14
15 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE BUDGET ANALYSES THE COMPANY HAS COMPLETED TO
16 SUPPORT ITS MULTI-YEAR RATE PLAN REQUEST.

17 A. As for our capital investments, the Company has compared its actual to
18 budget capital performance for 2016 through 2018. For O&M, we have
19 compared actual to budget performance for a three-year period, and
20 completed analyses comparing our overall 2020 test year O&M budget to
21 actual and forecasted costs for various periods. As shown below in Table 1,
22 these analyses and their supporting details can be found in this Application
23 and my testimony as follows:

1 **Table 1**

2

Testimony Section	Analysis	Other Information
III.A	NSPM Total Company capital budget expenditures to actual costs for the previous three years, including the most recent fiscal year forecast (2016-2018).	Table 2 below.
III.B.1	NSPM Total Company and NSPM Electric O&M budget to actual costs for the previous three years, including the most recent fiscal year forecast (2016 - 2018).	Tables 3 and 4 below; Volume 6, Budget Documentation, Supplemental Reports Tab.
III.B.2	NSPM Electric 2020 test year O&M budget to 2018 actuals.	Volume 5, Budget Summary, Summary Reports Tab; Volume 6, Budget Documentation, Variance Explanations Tab
III.B.3	NSPM Electric 2020 test year O&M budget to 2019 forecast.	Exhibit__(GJR-1), Schedule 3

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF YOUR CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE 2020 TEST
15 YEAR BUDGET, BASED ON THESE ANALYSES.

16 A. We believe that these analyses show that our 2020 test year budget is a
17 reasonable and representative estimate of the costs to be incurred to provide
18 our customers with reliable electric service. Although we work to manage
19 within our budgets, we exceed these budgets when investments are needed or
20 work is required to provide reliable service to our customers, even when we
21 are not able to re-prioritize initiatives to absorb unforeseen cost increases.
22 Where budgets exceed actuals and such deviation is within the Company's
23 control, we learn and adjust to better-prepare our budgets for the following
24 year. In addition, through the various period-to-period analyses that we have
25 completed, we provide a clear illustration of the major cost drivers in the 2020
26 test year budget. Company witnesses Mr. Halama will further discuss how

1 our budget information supports our multi-year rate plan request, from a
2 revenue requirement perspective.

3
4 Q. DOES THE COMPANY PROVIDE ANY OTHER ANALYSES WITH ADDITIONAL
5 INFORMATION IN THIS RATE CASE?

6 A. Yes. Volume 6, Budget Documentation provides a comparison of NSPM
7 2018 actuals to the 2020 budget by FERC account with variance explanations.
8 I also note that Company witness Ms. Benjamin C. Halama discusses the
9 drivers between the 2016 and 2020 test years. In Volume 3, Required
10 Information, we provide various historical comparisons of our FERC Form 1
11 and general ledger accounts.

12
13 **A. Capital Budget Analysis**

14 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE 2020 TEST YEAR CAPITAL
15 BUDGET, BASED ON YOUR ANALYSIS.

16 A. Table 2 below shows that on average over the past three years, our actual
17 capital spending has trailed budgets by approximately (5.4) percent for the
18 total NSPM Company. This variance average has been driven primarily by a
19 wind resource-related outlier year (2017) in our budgeting process, the reasons
20 for which have been beyond the Company's control. If that outlier year is
21 removed, the Company's actual spending has only varied from the budgets by
22 approximately (1.6) percent. This demonstrates that our capital budgets are a
23 reasonable estimate of the capital spending necessary to provide our
24 customers with reliable electric service.

Table 2

NSPM Total Company Actual versus Budget Capital Expenditures (\$millions)

Year	Budget Amount	Actual Amount	\$ Variance	% Variance
2018	\$1,373.8	\$1,333.5	(\$40.2)	(2.9%)
2017	\$1,104.7	\$946.2	(\$158.5)	(14.3%)
2016	\$1,184.1	\$1,184.2	\$0.1	0.0%
2016-2018 Total	\$3,662.5	\$3,463.9	(\$198.6)	(5.4%)

Q. CAN YOU PROVIDE ADDITIONAL EXPLANATION FOR THE VARIANCE IN 2017?

A. Yes. Approximately \$157 million of the \$158.5 million underrun was the result of the timing of spend on wind farms. The original budget assumed that wind projects that used safe harbor turbines would take possession of them upon approval of the projects. However, possession of the turbines was taken upon delivery, which resulted in a shift of costs from 2017 into later years. These costs were ultimately paid by the Company, and were not part of our base rates in any event; they were addressed in the RES rider.

B. O&M Budget Analyses

1. Budget to Actual Costs for Previous Three Years (2016-2018)

Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE COMPANY'S O&M BUDGETS OVER THE LAST THREE FISCAL YEARS, BASED ON YOUR ANALYSES.

A. Our analyses demonstrate that our O&M budgets, which over the past three years have been nearly equal to actual results on average for the Total NSPM Company (and only 1.2) percent below budget for the NSPM Electric Utility), are a reasonable estimate of the costs to be incurred to provide our customers with reliable electric service. These conclusions are borne out by Tables 3 and 4, below:

1 **Table 3**

2 **NSPM Total Company Actual versus Budget O&M (\$millions)**

3

Year	Budget Amount	Actual Amount	\$ Variance	% Variance
2018	\$1,204.9	\$1,223.3	\$18.4	1.5%
2017	\$1,209.0	\$1,213.1	\$4.1	0.3%
2016	\$1,268.4	\$1,247.0	(\$21.4)	(1.7%)
Three-Year Total	\$3,682.3	\$3,683.4	\$1.1	0.0%

4
5
6
7
8

9

10 **Table 4**

11 **NSPM Electric Utility Actual versus Budget O&M (\$millions)**

12

Year	Budget Amount	Actual Amount	\$ Variance	% Variance
2018	\$1,117.2	\$1,115.4	(\$1.8)	(0.2%)
2017	\$1,119.7	\$1,113.5	(\$6.2)	(0.6%)
2016	\$1,172.3	\$1,140.0	(\$32.3)	(2.8%)
Three-Year Total	\$3,409.2	\$3,368.9	(\$40.3)	(1.2%)

13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *2. Test Year Budget to Most Recent Year of Actuals (2018 to 2020)*

20 Q. WHERE DO YOU PROVIDE AN ANALYSIS OF 2018 ACTUALS TO THE 2020 TEST
21 YEAR BUDGET?

22 A. This analysis is contained in the Variances Explanations tab in Volume 6 of
23 this filing. We provide this analysis in each rate case filing, including the
24 current case.

1 Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE PURPOSE OF THIS ANALYSIS.

2 A. This analysis provides additional information regarding year to year FERC
3 account variances similar to that identified in Order Point 47 of the
4 Commission's September 3, 2013 Order in our 2013 rate case (Docket No.
5 E002/GR-12-961) and provided in Volume 3, Required Information. This
6 information is part of the analysis the Financial Performance and Reporting
7 group performs in its review of the preliminary budgets. The analysis
8 compares NSPM electric utility's O&M cost structure between the most
9 recent complete fiscal year (2018) and the 2020 test year budget on a FERC
10 account basis. It also provides explanations of the major drivers of the cost
11 increases / decreases for those areas that are changing by +/- 5 percent and +
12 /- \$500,000.00.

13

14 Q. WHAT ARE THE RESULTS OF THIS ANALYSIS?

15 A. This analysis shows that NSPM electric utility's costs increase by \$39.5 million,
16 or 3.5 percent, between 2018 and the 2020 budget. This works out to an
17 annual increase of approximately 1.75 percent. The largest driver of this
18 increase is Transmission, accounting for \$30.4 million, or approximately 75
19 percent of the increase, and can be found in FERC Account 565. NSPM and
20 NSP Wisconsin (NSPW) share production and transmission costs across the
21 NSP system, and the transmission portion of these shared costs are included
22 as part of operating and maintenance costs. While other costs are increasing
23 as well, there are also offsetting cost reductions.

1 Q. PLEASE PROVIDE MORE INFORMATION ABOUT THE VARIANCES BETWEEN 2018
2 AND 2020.

3 A. The Transmission cost increase is driven by the completion and in-servicing
4 of Wisconsin's \$175 million share of the La Crosse – Madison transmission
5 line in December 2018, which resulted in increased depreciation and increased
6 Interchange Agreement billings from NSPW to NSPM when the line was in
7 service for full years in 2019 and 2020.

8

9 The second largest driver of the cost increase is in Administrative and General
10 Expenses, which is increasing by \$27.3 million or 10.2 percent over the two
11 year period. Approximately \$21 million of this increase is driven by Business
12 Systems spending to replace aging infrastructure, to address cyber security
13 threats and requirements, to enhance the capabilities of the business and its
14 ability to serve customers, and to address emergent technology demands
15 (addressed in the Direct Testimony of Company witness Mr. David
16 Harkness). This can be seen in FERC Accounts 920, 921, 922, 923 and 931.
17 An additional \$5 million of this increase is driven by investment in customer
18 initiatives (referenced in the Direct Testimony of Mr. Harkness, Ms. Kelly
19 Bloch, and Mr. Michael Gersack). This increase impacts FERC Account 923.

20

21 Further, property insurance costs are also increasing by \$5.9 million (FERC
22 Account 924). Other drivers of the increase include two years of employee
23 compensation merit increases, which flow through a number of different
24 FERC accounts. Company witness Ms. Ruth Lowenthal discusses employee
25 compensation in detail in her Direct Testimony.

1 These increases are partially offset by a \$10.8 million decrease in Nuclear
2 (FERC Accounts 517 to 532), which is primarily driven by lower non-outage
3 costs that are resulting from site improvement projects and other cost savings
4 initiatives. Company witness Mr. Timothy O'Connor discusses these changes
5 in greater detail in his Direct Testimony. Finally, costs in the Production and
6 Power Supply Expense area (other than Nuclear) are decreasing by
7 approximately \$5.7 million, driven by reductions in labor, contractors and
8 materials expense at the Minnesota coal plants; partially offset by increased
9 O&M expense for the wind farms and for the Mankato Energy Center (which
10 has been removed from the cost of service, but is still part of the Company's
11 budget documentation). These reductions are referenced in the Direct
12 Testimony of Company witness Mr. Randy Capra.

13
14 *3. Test Year Budget to Current Year Forecast (2019 Forecast to 2020)*

15 Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE PURPOSE OF THE 2019 FORECAST TO 2020 TEST YEAR
16 COMPARISON.

17 A. This analysis provides a comparison of the 2020 budget to forecasted O&M
18 costs for the current year (2019) which shows how costs change between 2019
19 and the 2020 test year and helps identify major incremental cost drivers for the
20 test year. When reviewed in the context of the analysis of 2018 and 2020 test
21 year costs discussed above, this analysis also shows in more detail how much
22 of the 2018 to 2020 test year cost increases occur between 2019 and 2020.
23 Finally, this analysis helps us to see how these cost changes align across the
24 FERC chart of accounts. Exhibit___(GJR-1), Schedule 3 provides further
25 detail.

1 Q. PLEASE DISCUSS THE RESULTS OF THIS ANALYSIS.

2 A. This analysis shows that NSPM electric utility's costs increase by \$42.9 million,
3 or 3.9 percent between 2019 and 2020. As expected, many of the same
4 drivers of the increases between 2018 and the 2020 budget are causing the
5 increase between 2019 and 2020. The largest individual driver of increasing
6 O&M between 2019 and the 2020 budget is the increase in Business Systems
7 costs, which are increasing by approximately \$13 million. Similar to the 2018
8 to 2020 increase, this is driven by investment to replace aging infrastructure,
9 to address cyber security threats and requirements, to enhance the capabilities
10 of the business and its ability to serve customers, to address emergent
11 technology demands (addressed in the Direct Testimony of Mr. David
12 Harkness). The business systems increase is a major driver of spending in
13 FERC Accounts 920, 921, 922, 923 and 931.

14

15 Also driving the year over year increase is higher insurance expense in 2020, as
16 our 2019 insurance forecast assumes one-time insurance proceed distributions
17 that are not expected to recur in 2020. These changes are reflected in FERC
18 Accounts 924 and 925. Higher transmission interchange expense is also
19 anticipated in 2020, and is driving a \$5.4 million year over year increase that is
20 reflected in FERC Account 565. The growth in revenue requirements that is
21 driven by the interchange is discussed in the testimony of Mr. Halama.
22 Annual merit increases, which are reflected in various FERC accounts, are also
23 a driver of part of the year over year increase.

24

25 Finally, the last major driver of year-over-year O&M increases is the
26 Production and Power Supply Expense FERC grouping. Costs in this
27 grouping are increasing \$5.4 million, or 1.1 percent. The increase is driven by

1 O&M spending to support the new wind farms that will go online in 2019 and
2 2020. There is also an increase of approximately \$5 million for O&M at the
3 Mankato Energy Center. These costs have been adjusted out of the rate case
4 cost of service, but are still part of our base budget included in the budget
5 documentation. As with the 2018 to 2020 comparison, these Production and
6 Power Supply increases are partially offset by reduced labor, maintenance, and
7 contractor costs at the King and Sherco coal plants. These overall increases
8 are also partially offset by a \$7 million decrease in the Nuclear FERC
9 Accounts (517 through 532), which is primarily driven by lower non-outage
10 costs resulting from site improvement and other cost reduction initiatives.
11 Mr. O'Connor discusses these changes in greater detail in his testimony.

12 13 **IV. CONCLUSION**

14
15 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR TESTIMONY

16 A. Our budgeting processes are designed to ensure that the Company's capital
17 and O&M budgets provide reasonable and representative forecasts of the
18 costs necessary to provide safe and reliable service to our customers. Our
19 processes emphasize the importance of accuracy, facilitate business area
20 accountability, and ensure executive involvement and oversight. After
21 budgets are established, the Company's ongoing financial governance process
22 allows us to adjust, on a continuing basis, our business plans and financial
23 forecasts. This ongoing monitoring provides flexibility and facilitates any
24 necessary adjustments to spending to respond to changing circumstances.
25 Finally, our budgeting variance analyses demonstrate our robust overall
26 governance and budget management.

1 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

2 A. Yes, it does.

Statement of Qualifications

Gregory J. Robinson

I received my Masters of Business Administration degree in Finance in 2003 from the Carlson School of Management at the University of Minnesota. I also have a Bachelor's Degree in accounting from Gustavus Adolphus College in Saint Peter, Minnesota, and have an Inactive CPA certificate from the State of Minnesota.

My current position with Xcel Energy Services Inc. ("XES") is Director of Financial Performance and Reporting. I am responsible for the internal reporting and financial statement analysis for Xcel Energy Inc., and its subsidiaries. I am also responsible for coordinating the O&M and Capital budgeting and forecasting processes, as well as the monthly analysis of actual results against these budgets and forecasts. I have been employed by XES since April 2011, first as the Manager of O&M and Capital Reporting and Analysis. I was promoted to my current role as Director of Financial Performance and Reporting in August 2013.

Before working at Xcel Energy, I worked as a divisional finance manager at Ecolab, and in various accounting and finance roles at Jostens.

Please note, due to size, the full Schedule 2 is provided
on a CD in Volume 3.

Summary Report 1
2019 July Forecsat cs. 2020 Budget
O and M by FERC
NSP-MN Electric

Electric O&M, Customer & Sales, & A&G Expenses - Summary of 2020 Budget versus 2019 Forecast

	July Forecast 2019	Budget 2020	Change	Change %
Production and Power Supply Expenses	\$ 494,602,879	\$ 500,001,653	\$ 5,398,774	1.1%
Transmission Expenses	\$ 161,927,839	\$ 171,797,121	\$ 9,869,282	6.1%
Distribution Expenses	\$ 129,865,956	\$ 130,995,859	\$ 1,129,903	0.9%
Total Electric Functional O&M	\$ 786,396,673	\$ 802,794,633	\$ 16,397,959	2.1%
Total Customer & Sales Expense	\$ 57,908,031	\$ 58,263,324	\$ 355,293	0.6%
Total Administrative & General Expenses	\$ 267,809,977	\$ 293,928,283	\$ 26,118,306	9.8%
Total Customer & Sales & Administrative & General	\$ 325,718,008	\$ 352,191,607	\$ 26,473,599	8.1%
Total	\$ 1,112,114,681	\$ 1,154,986,240	\$ 42,871,558	3.9%

Summary Report 1
2019 July Forecsat cs. 2020 Budget
O and M by FERC
NSP-MN Electric

FERC-Based Electric O&M Analysis

		<u>July Forecast</u>	<u>Budget 2020</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>% Change</u>
		2019			
Power Production Expenses					
500	Operation Supervision & Engineering	3,441,419	3,769,931	328,512	9.5%
501	Stm Gen Fuel	96,340	89,022	(7,318)	-7.6%
502	Steam Expenses	22,022,103	23,748,015	1,725,911	7.8%
503	Steam from Other Sources	-	-	-	0.0%
504	Steam Transferred-Cr.	-	-	-	0.0%
505	Electric Expenses	2,727,665	1,878,154	(849,510)	-31.1%
506	Misc. Steam Power Expenses	14,284,615	16,764,910	2,480,295	17.4%
507	Rents	3,287,338	3,305,629	18,290	0.6%
508	Steam Oper Supplies & Expense	-	-	-	0.0%
509	Allowances	-	-	-	0.0%
510	Maintenance Supervision & Engineering	4,055,629	1,280,412	(2,775,217)	-68.4%
511	Maintenance of Structures	5,026,960	2,726,892	(2,300,068)	-45.8%
512	Maintenance of Boiler Plant	18,007,767	19,301,110	1,293,343	7.2%
513	Maintenance of Electric Plant	7,232,123	5,149,740	(2,082,382)	-28.8%
514	Maintenance of Misc. Steam Plant	11,921,232	10,452,661	(1,468,571)	-12.3%
515	Steam Maintenance of Steam Prod Plant	-	-	-	0.0%
Total Production & Power Supply Expenses		92,103,192	88,466,477	(3,636,715)	-3.9%
Nuclear					
517	Nuc Oper Super & Eng	56,254,773	49,396,675	(6,858,098)	-12.2%
519	Nuclear coolants & Wtr	8,004,581	8,214,230	209,649	2.6%
520	Nuclear Steam Expense	49,866,516	50,045,225	178,709	0.4%
523	Nuclear Electric Expense	2,913,664	2,646,136	(267,527)	-9.2%
524	Nuclear Power Misc Exp	131,814,965	130,795,216	(1,019,749)	-0.8%
525	Nuclear Gen Rents	12,368,342	12,792,460	424,118	3.4%
528	Nuc Maint Super & Eng	7,400,376	7,853,753	453,378	6.1%
529	Nuc Maint of Structures	24,683	-	(24,683)	-100.0%
530	Nuc Mtc of React Plt Equip	37,452,890	39,731,409	2,278,519	6.1%
531	Nuc Maint of Elect Plant	10,727,803	10,715,163	(12,640)	-0.1%
532	Nuc Mtc of Misc Nuc Plant	27,764,863	25,320,561	(2,444,302)	-8.8%

Summary Report 1
2019 July Forecsat cs. 2020 Budget
O and M by FERC
NSP-MN Electric

FERC-Based Electric O&M Analysis

		July Forecast		Change	% Change
		2019	Budget 2020		
Total Nuclear		344,593,455	337,510,829	(7,082,626)	-2.1%
Hydraulic Power Generation					
535	Operation Supervision & Engineering	55,200	72,857	17,656	32.0%
536	Water for Power	-	-	-	0.0%
537	Hydraulic Expenses	-	-	-	0.0%
538	Electric Expenses	186,934	120,000	(66,934)	-35.8%
539	Misc. Hydraulic Power Generation Expenses	707,006	377,908	(329,097)	-46.5%
540	Rents	68,160	81,367	13,207	19.4%
541	Maintenance of Supervision & Engineering	84,533	173,217	88,684	104.9%
542	Maintenance of Structures	23,582	22,893	(689)	-2.9%
543	Maintenance of Reservoirs, Dams, & Waterways	30,573	-	(30,573)	-100.0%
544	Maintenance of Electric Plant	70,433	-	(70,433)	-100.0%
545	Maintenance of Misc. Hydraulic Plant	86,413	168,126	81,713	94.6%
Other Power Generation					
546	Operation Supervision & Engineering	1,958,960	2,300,012	341,052	17.4%
547	Oth Oper Fuel	25,935	-	(25,935)	-100.0%
548	Generation Expenses	11,721,976	16,146,357	4,424,381	37.7%
549	Misc. Other Power Generation Expenses	9,507,377	16,704,690	7,197,314	75.7%
550	Rents	6,723,095	10,612,216	3,889,120	57.8%
551	Maintenance Supervision & Engineering	1,053,684	827,728	(225,956)	-21.4%
552	Maintenance of Structures	6,053,362	2,641,478	(3,411,884)	-56.4%
553	Maintenance of Generating & Electric Plant	9,468,553	9,949,750	481,196	5.1%
554	Maintenance of Misc. Other Power Generation Plant	4,101,073	9,696,030	5,594,956	136.4%
Other Power Supply Expenses					
556	System Control & Load Dispatching	1,336,472	934,811	(401,661)	-30.1%
557	Other Expenses	4,642,911	3,194,908	(1,448,003)	-31.2%
Total Production & Power Supply Expenses		494,602,879	500,001,653	5,398,774	1.1%
Transmission Expenses					
560	Operation Supervision & Engineering	10,775,086	12,048,700	1,273,614	11.8%
561	Load Dispatching	-	-	-	0.0%
561.1	Load Dispatch-Reliability	-	-	-	0.0%

Summary Report 1
2019 July Forecsat cs. 2020 Budget
O and M by FERC
NSP-MN Electric

FERC-Based Electric O&M Analysis

		July Forecast			
		2019	Budget 2020	Change	% Change
561.2	Load Dispatch-Monitor and Operate Transmission System	4,935,031	5,386,844	451,813	9.2%
561.3	Load Dispatch-Transmission Service & Scheduling	-	-	-	0.0%
561.4	Scheduling, System control & Dispatching Services	-	-	-	0.0%
561.5	Reliability, Planning, and Standard Development	33,451	24,383	(9,067)	-27.1%
561.6	Transmission Service Studies	-	-	-	0.0%
561.7	Generation Interconnection Studies	160,477	208,356	47,879	29.8%
561.8	Rel/Plan/Standards Development Services	2,179,507	2,763,132	583,625	26.8%
562	Station Expenses	1,964,717	3,947,894	1,983,176	100.9%
563	Overhead Lines Expense	385,834	772,239	386,405	100.1%
564	Underground Lines Expense	7,901	-	(7,901)	
565	Transmission of Electricity by Others	117,887,762	123,274,348	5,386,586	4.6%
566	Misc. Transmission Expenses	5,662,323	7,147,525	1,485,202	26.2%
567	Rents	2,204,454	1,884,120	(320,334)	-14.5%
568	Maintenance Supervision & Engineering	36,045	-	(36,045)	-100.0%
569	Maintenance of Structures	-	112,165	112,165	#DIV/0!
570	Maintenance of Station Equipment	7,829,257	5,636,512	(2,192,745)	-28.0%
571	Maintenance of Overhead Lines	7,244,078	7,655,703	411,625	5.7%
572	Maintenance of Underground Lines	20,963	-	(20,963)	-100.0%
573	Maintenance of Misc. Transmission Plant	5,807	-	(5,807)	-100.0%
575.1	Operation Supervision	190,771	227,626	36,856	19.3%
575.2	Day-Ahead & Real-Time Market Admin	258,716	422,887	164,171	63.5%
575.3	Transmission Rights Market Admin	-	-	-	0.0%
575.5	Ancillary Serv Mkt Admin	102,941	211,964	109,022	105.9%
575.6	Mkt Monitoring/Compliance	25,863	53,251	27,388	105.9%
575.7	Market Administration Monitoring & Compl Srvc	-	-	-	0.0%
575.8	Rents	16,854	19,472	2,618	15.5%
	Total Transmission Expenses	161,927,839	171,797,121	9,869,282	6.1%
	Distribution Expenses				
580	Operation Supervision & Engineering	11,968,059	7,175,938	(4,792,120)	-40.0%
581	Load Dispatching	4,381,504	8,158,352	3,776,848	86.2%
582	Station Expenses	3,501,673	4,395,080	893,408	25.5%
583	Overhead Lines Expense	3,829,215	3,092,914	(736,300)	-19.2%
584	Underground Lines Expense	6,366,444	7,008,654	642,210	10.1%

Summary Report 1
2019 July Forecsat cs. 2020 Budget
O and M by FERC
NSP-MN Electric

FERC-Based Electric O&M Analysis

		July Forecast			
		2019	Budget 2020	Change	% Change
585	Street Lighting & Signal System Expenses	1,322,151	1,824,376	502,225	38.0%
586	Meter Expenses	1,619,042	2,633,260	1,014,219	62.6%
587	Customer Installations Expenses	3,526,911	4,302,891	775,980	22.0%
588	Misc. Expenses	21,770,295	24,090,586	2,320,291	10.7%
589	Rents	3,652,755	3,770,732	117,977	3.2%
590	Maintenance Supervision & Engineering	140,580	227,044	86,463	61.5%
591	Maintenance of Structures	0	-	(0)	-100.0%
592	Maintenance of Station Equipment	5,778,008	5,768,058	(9,950)	-0.2%
593	Maintenance of Overhead Lines	49,639,718	43,557,324	(6,082,394)	-12.3%
594	Maintenance of Underground Lines	10,282,039	12,636,298	2,354,259	22.9%
595	Maintenance of Line Transformers	714,186	1,388,545	674,359	94.4%
596	Maintenance of Street Lighting & Signal Systems	1,251,059	1,059,205	(191,854)	-15.3%
597	Maintenance of Meters	94,115	(194,896)	(289,011)	-307.1%
598	Maintenance of Misc. Distribution Plant	28,203	101,498	73,295	259.9%
Total Distribution Expenses		129,865,956	130,995,859	1,129,903	0.9%
Total Electric Functional O&M		786,396,673	802,794,633	16,397,959	2.1%

Summary Report 1
2019 July Forecsat cs. 2020 Budget
O and M by FERC
NSP-MN Electric

FERC-Based Electric O&M Analysis

	<u>July Forecast 2019</u>	<u>Budget 2020</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>% Change</u>	
Customer Accounts Expenses					
901	Supervision 118,170	125,468	7,299	6.2%	
902	Meter Reading Expenses 21,681,600	21,474,187	(207,413)	-1.0%	
903	Customer Records & Collection Expenses 20,483,831	20,893,870	410,040	2.0%	
904	Uncollectible Accounts 11,867,563	12,807,645	940,081	7.9%	
905	Misc. Customer Accounts Expenses (476)	245,067	245,543	-51560.9%	
Customer Service & Informational Expenses					
907	Supervision -	-	-	0.0%	
908	Customer Assistance Expenses 1,686,685	1,297,020	(389,665)	-23.1%	
909	Informational & Instructional Expenses 1,348,472	1,200,785	(147,686)	-11.0%	
910	Misc. Customer Service & Informational Expenses 722,136	219,282	(502,854)	-69.6%	
Sales Expenses					
911	Supervision -	-	-	0.0%	
912	Demonstrating & Selling Expenses 51	-	(51)	-100.0%	
913	Advertising Expenses -	-	-	0.0%	
916	Misc. Sales Expenses -	-	-	0.0%	
	Total Customers & Sales Expenses	57,908,031	58,263,324	355,293	0.6%
A&G Expenses					
920	Administrative & General Salaries 96,877,157	99,986,932	3,109,775	3.2%	
921	Office Supplies & Expenses 50,359,552	59,301,105	8,941,552	17.8%	
922	Administrative Expenses Transferred-Credit (42,297,846)	(47,617,377)	(5,319,531)	12.6%	
923	Outside Services Employed 31,498,059	27,346,575	(4,151,485)	-13.2%	
924	Property Insurance 2,310,539	6,603,484	4,292,945	185.8%	
925	Injuries & Damages 8,071,841	13,535,611	5,463,770	67.7%	
926	Employee Pension & Benefits 73,093,299	76,840,396	3,747,098	5.1%	
927	Franchise Requirements -	-	-	0.0%	
928	Regulatory Commission Expenses 5,725,585	5,721,379	(4,206)	-0.1%	
929	Duplicate Charges-Credit (5,647,455)	(5,327,088)	320,367	-5.7%	
930.1	General Advertising Expenses 3,744,350	3,587,422	(156,928)	-4.2%	
930.2	Misc. General Expenses 3,341,069	3,640,762	299,692	9.0%	
931	Rents 39,956,101	48,825,567	8,869,466	22.2%	
935	Maintenance of General Plant 777,725	1,483,515	705,790	90.8%	
	Total A&G	267,809,977	293,928,283	26,118,306	9.8%
	Total Customers & Sales & A&G	325,718,008	352,191,607	26,473,599	8.1%