

# IPR2 Follow Up: BPA's Proposed Approach

Revised as of 4/14/15



# Context

- BPA is facing significant pressure on its long-term cost structure.
- BPA needs to take actions now while also looking into future actions including:
  - refining its long-term service delivery model for Power Services
  - developing a strategic financing plan
  - developing our approach to cost management
- BPA sees this as a major opportunity to avoid future borrowing for Energy Efficiency while still upholding our commitment to interim Energy Efficiency targets for FY'16-17.

# What we heard from constituents and customers

- Constituents opposed a transition to expense and expressed concern about any reductions to EE funding levels.
- Some customers support transitioning EE to expense with no BP-16 rate impact.
- Some customers expressed interest in a two rate period transition that offsets any rate impacts through additional spending cuts.

# Proposed Approach

- Transition the full EE Capital Program to expense in BP-16
- Offset \$20 million per year of the rate impact through reductions to spending levels.
- Eliminate the remainder of the BP-16 rate impact associated with the EE capital to expense transition and smooth the remaining transition with debt management.

# Ongoing Engagement

BPA is committed to ongoing discussions with customers and constituents as BPA works to develop a sustainable long-term cost structure.

This will include engagement on:

- Power program delivery models (including EE)
- Enhanced budgeting
- Long-term rate forecasting
- Sustainable financing plans

# Expected Outcomes

- **Short-Term (BP-16 to BP-18)**
  - EE program transitioned in FY'16
  - IPR and EE Capital costs that are 1.3% lower than in BP-14
  - Ongoing IPR cost savings
  - No incremental Power rate impact in BP-16 or forecast for BP-18
- **Mid-Term (BP-20 to BP-22)**
  - **Higher costs:** Compared to the IPR2 base case, this transition is expected to increase rates by about 2% in BP-20 and in BP-22.
  - **Smooth rate impacts:** Compared to the prior rate period, this proposal is expected to increase BP-20 rates by about 1% and then cause rates to go down slightly in BP-22.
- **Long-Term (2028)**
  - All EE debt off the books
  - Avoid \$1.3 billion of potential EE debt
  - Ongoing amortization and interest savings

# Annual Average Proposed Spending Reductions & Interest Savings

- \$20 million per year in program reductions:
  - \$9.9 million per year from staffing lags and increased risk to Power Services
  - \$2.7 million per year from staffing lags and increased risk to Agency Services
  - \$7.4 million per year from lags in BPA managed programs and from acquiring 3 aMW per year from the Energy Smart Reserve Power program instead of the EEI budget.
  
- In addition, BPA expects \$1.5 million per year in interest savings from debt management

	FY'16-17 Average
<i><b>Power Programs and Internal Costs</b></i>	
Staffing	\$ (0.2)
Undistributed Reductions	\$ (9.7)
<i><b>Agency Services Internal Costs</b></i>	
Undistributed Reductions (including Staffing)	\$ (2.7)
<i><b>Energy Efficiency (Capital)</b></i>	
BPA Managed	\$ (2.4)
Energy Efficiency Incentives	\$ (5.0)
<b>Total Budget Reductions</b>	<b>\$ (20.0)</b>
Interest savings	\$ (1.5)
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ (21.5)</b>

# Debt Management

- Refinance \$757 million of Energy Northwest bonds not previously included in the refinancing of Regional Cooperation Debt.
  - Use \$260 million of the amount freed up in the BPA Fund as a result of the extension to smooth the rate transition to expense in FY'16-18.
  - Use the remainder of the freed up funds (\$497 million) to pay off high interest federal debt earlier than expected for a savings of nearly \$21 million (\$1.5 million per year in BP-16).
  
- Compared to the IPR2 base case scenario, this avoids \$1.3 billion of potential debt related to EE.

# Why Debt Management for EE

- Using debt management to transition the EE budget to expense is estimated to save nearly \$500 million compared to paying off additional high interest appropriations earlier than planned.

	All for Accelerated Savings	IPR2 Proposed Scenario
Use of DSR Refinancing for Accelerated Savings	\$ 757	\$ 497
Use of DSR Refinancing for EE Transition	\$ 0	\$ 260
<b>From 2016-2031:</b>		
Foregone Accelerated Savings from EE Transition:		~(\$ 0.5 million)
Additional Interest cost related to DSR extension:		(\$ 124.4 million)
Interest savings from avoiding issuance of EE debt:		\$ 615.9 million
Net:		~\$ 491.0 million

# Benefits to Energy Efficiency

- Benefits to expensing EE
  - It creates rate impact parity between savings acquired through expense programs and those funded with BPA Managed “capital” dollars.
  - Expense funding provides more flexibility to design 3<sup>rd</sup> party programs without needing to design around capitalization requirements.
- A one rate-period transition benefits EE by:
  - Avoiding the implementation challenges of 3<sup>rd</sup> party financing or billing credits.
  - Avoiding the implementation challenges of a blended Energy Efficiency Incentive budget such as:
    - systems changes to support multiple funding sources.
    - potential inability to support program features such as bilateral budget transfers between utilities with different funding sources.
- Proposal’s budget reductions are consistent with BPA’s plans for achieving the interim Energy Efficiency targets in FY’16-17.

## Next Steps

- April 6<sup>th</sup> – 22<sup>nd</sup>
  - Outreach to customers, constituents and the Northwest Power and Conservation Council
  - Energy Northwest PRB meeting
- April 23<sup>rd</sup>
  - Energy Northwest Executive Board Meeting
- Early May-
  - Final Decision
  - Quarterly Business Review

# Financial Disclosure

- This information has been made publicly available by BPA on April 14, 2015 and contains information not reported in agency financial statements.