

# Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board

## Board Members:

Gene Merry, Chair  
Randy Brown, Vice-Chair  
Carol I. Faucher, Member  
Laura L. McClure, Member  
A.W. Dirks, Member



**State of Kansas**

*Kathleen Sebelius, Governor*

David Springe, Consumer Counsel  
1500 S.W. Arrowhead Road  
Topeka, Kansas 66604-4027  
Phone: (785) 271-3200  
Fax: (785) 271-3116  
<http://curb.kansas.gov>

## SENATE UTILITIES COMMITTEE H.B. 2632

Testimony on Behalf of the Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board  
By David Springe, Consumer Counsel  
March 5, 2008

Chairman Emler and members of the committee:

Thank you for this opportunity to offer testimony on H.B. 2632. The Citizens' Utility Ratepayer Board is opposed to this bill for the following reasons:

Currently the Kansas Corporation Commission (KCC) has a docket open on this very issue. Comments and reply comments have been filed by interested parties. This bill is simply and end-run around the KCC process. The Committee should not act on this bill at this time. Rather, the KCC policy process should be allowed to finish.

While CURB supports increasing the availability of energy conservation and energy efficiency resources, this bill as drafted is bad for consumers. By dictating that "investments in and expenditure for" energy conservation programs shall, at the option of the utility, be included in rate base, this bill eliminates KCC discretion to evaluate the specific facts of an individual case and sets an unprecedented accounting standard. Only long-term capital investments (generation plants, poles, meters, transmission lines) are included in rate base, depreciated over their respective useful lives and allowed a return for shareholders. With few exceptions, day-to-day expenses (advertising, labor) that are not long term capital investments are simply expensed annually as incurred. Expenses are not placed in ratebase and shareholders do not earn a return on expenses.

The majority of expenditures on energy conservation programs are short-lived expenses rather than long-lived assets. By legislating that these short-lived expenditures be given rate base treatment, this bill will increase the long-term cost to consumers for utility sponsored energy conservation programs. CURB is at a loss as to why we would encourage this expensive accounting treatment when we can achieve the same level of energy conservation for less cost to consumers with traditional accounting methods.

In a recently published report entitled "Aligning Utility Incentives with Investment in Energy Efficiency"<sup>1</sup> by the National Action Plan for Energy Efficiency, a project facilitated by the U.S. Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency, it is noted that

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.epa.gov/cleanenergy/documents/incentives.pdf>

“Capitalization currently is not a common approach to energy efficiency program cost recovery” although the method was used by some states during the last major cycle of utility energy efficiency investment during the late 1980’s and early 1990’s. The report goes on to note that even in those states that at some point used this method of cost recovery, “With very few exceptions, capitalization is no longer the method of choice for energy efficiency cost recovery in these states,” and this “in part because the total costs associated with recovery (given the cost of the return on investment) were rising rapidly”

If the Committee believes that this type of accounting legislation is necessary to put energy conservation investments and expenditures on the same footing with traditional generation facilities, then CURB has two additional suggestions.

First, if the utilities have an incentive problem then perhaps the utilities are not the right entity to be providing energy conservation and energy efficiency. The Committee should investigate whether there are other more effective and less expensive methods to deliver energy conservation to Kansas consumers. For example, Colorado uses a non-profit entity, Energy Outreach Colorado, to provide both low income energy assistance and energy conservation programs. Utility customers still provide the funding, but the non-profit has only one objective; to provide energy conservation, and so does not have the incentive problem that the utilities claim to have. Also, since the non-profit does not have to pay profits (taxed up) to shareholders, all of the money provided by consumers, less some administration expense, goes to providing energy conservation to consumers. The non-profit is also not constrained by pre-set territories like the utilities. Cost effective programs can be offered across different utility territories.

Second, the legislature should also require Integrated Resource Planning (IRP) by utilities. IRP puts energy conservation on the same footing as energy supply option and requires that the utility provide the least cost resource to meet future needs. IRP was considered in Kansas in the early 1990’s, but no rules were ever adopted. Without a robust IRP process, we won’t truly know whether the energy conservation resources at issue are cost effective, or whether any generation resources are being avoided.

CURB urges the committee to not pass this bill. This bill serves only to increase the cost to consumers of providing energy conservation and energy efficiency. CURB does not believe that Kansas consumers want policymakers to dictate an accounting methodology, as in this bill, that encourages energy conservation in the most expensive way possible. It should be the goal of the legislature to set policies that reduce costs for consumers, not set policy that artificially inflates costs to consumers.

One final note, Kansas City Power and Light is in the middle of a five year \$2.5 billion resource expansion plan. KCPL’s rates have increased more than 20% in the last two years and two more rate cases are planned in the next two years. Westar Energy reports that it will spend \$2.3 billion in capital expenditures alone during 2007-2009. Shareholders will have plenty of long term capital to put in rate base. Consumer rates will most certainly increase substantially to pay for that long term capital as well as to pay for increases in operations, maintenance, administrative and fuel expenses. Energy conservation can help consumers. However, this bill will result in additional unnecessary rate increases.