# Capital Planning Issues - Getting to the Next Level

Presented by Dan O'Neill and Charlie Fijnvandraat O'Neill Management Consulting, LLC

At the <u>Oracle Primavera Utility Roundtable</u> Hosted by ConEdison November 21, 2013



- Auditability is now essential
- Prioritization starts with high-level categorization
- The next level: Not just annual 'rack and stack'
- Prioritization and prudence
- Implementation and integration
- Examples: Load Relief and Reliability
- Questions



### How auditable is your capital planning process?

#### The drivers of the process today:

- Sarbanes-Oxley and Public Service Commissions require deep auditability
  - Not: multiple, de-centralized Excel spreadsheets in various departments
- NERC pushing for INPO-style Documentation
  - "Not documented not done"
- Need: "Decision Basis Documentation" as in:
  - Nuclear-style (like Design Basis)
  - Production-grade database
  - Version "as of xx/xx/2013", etc.



Excel spreadsheets are fine for a pilot proof-of-concept, but that must be replaced by a production-grade, auditable capital planning system

## Prioritization begins with good high-level categorization

#### Typical spending prioritization:

- 'Must Do' value not assigned
  - New connections
  - Public Improvement (road moves)
  - Outage restoration
  - Safety programs
- · Capacity reinforcement (driven by growth)
- Reliability
  - Imminent failure, worst performers
  - First, second-tier maintenance
  - First- tier replacement deferred
- Renewal/modernization deferred
  - Second-tier replacement deferred
- Efficiency deferred



Illustrative, for a million-customer utility

Without high-level categorization of thousands of projects, management can't see the forest for the trees, can't develop directional strategy

# Good prioritization goes beyond an annual 'rack and stack' exercise



Prioritization is an <u>aid</u> to good judgment, not a <u>substitute</u> for it. It helps focus on the important and eliminates the clutter in the decision process.

#### Key points to reinforce relative to prudence:

- Prudence is based on more than prioritization
  - Even if prioritization uses benefit/cost, it is not a test of prudence
  - Prudence is based on the entire process, from rate setting to procurement
- Prioritization is a screening tool
  - One part of the overall process
  - Similar to peer review, a check of assumptions and alternatives
  - Allows management to focus on the exceptions, give them more scrutiny

**Resource Management** 

**Project Management** 

Prioritization

Engineering & Ops

**Design Standards** 

**Rates and Tariffs** 

Utilities must refute the presumption that the result of a rack and stack is the entire basis for doing or not doing projects. It is just a screening tool.

### Implementation success requires integration

#### Some keys to implementation success:

- Executive sponsorship
  - Don't leave home without it
- Enterprise integration
  - How does this fit into the whole?
  - Integrated with finance schedule?
- High-performance team
  - Engineering, Finance, Regulatory, IT
  - Experienced staff/consultant (Have they ever done this before? Well?)
  - Proven software, reliable vendor



To keep all the gears moving in the right direction, the process must be well integrated. A good system can help with that.



# Example: substation load relief must be valued

### Using a number like \$25,000 per Expected MWH of outage avoided

Project: Upgrade existing 69kV/13.2kV 20MVA transformer with a 50MVA transformer and switchgear

- **Reason:** Loss of either existing transformer (20, 25MVA) would result in load loss of 4 MVA (20MVA in 10 years) In addition, by 2018 it reaches normal overload condition
- **Cost:** \$1,560,000 for 1-50MVA transformer, a circuit switcher, and four new breakers

**Benefit:** Avoid a 1% chance of having to shed 4 to 20 MW of load for 20 hours during a summer contingency

**Quick calculation:** Benefit of \$2,100,000, cost of \$1,560,000, ratio = 1.35 (Again, the model has more details)

	Xfrmr	Exposure	MW	Outage	EMWH	Value	Annual	Present
	<u>Failure</u>	<b>Factor</b>	<u>At Risk</u>	<u>Hours</u>	Saved	per MWH	<u>Benefit</u>	<u>Value</u>
1st	4%	25%	12	20	2.4	\$25,000	\$60,000	\$600,000
Normal	N/A	5%	5	24	6.0	\$25,000	\$150,000	\$1,500,000
Total							\$210,000	\$2,100,000

Note: Even the quick calculation reveals some key points -

- Without the normal overload, the benefit would only be \$0.6M. More MW would need to be at risk for \$1.56M of cost
- The transformer failure rate, normally 2%, is doubled here because there are two transformers that could fail
- The model has an option to raise the failure rate of the contingency as the normal overload increases significantly

### Similarly, distribution reliability can use values like \$25 per Cl For example, where worst circuit programs target customer interruptions

Project: Perform remedial work on worst circuits

Reason: Avoid customer interruptions for customers experiencing multiple outages

**Cost:** \$1.5 million for first tier ("worst first")

**Benefit:** Reduce outages and customer interruptions by 20%, saves operating cost and reduces risk

Quick calculation: Benefit of \$3,000,000, cost of \$1,500,000, ratio = 2.0 (At a cost of \$94 per avoided CI per year)

	Feeder	Outs, Cust.	Reduction	Feeders	Outs,Cls	Value per	Annual	Present
	<u>SAIFI</u>	Per Feeder	factor	Remediated	Saved	outage,CI	<u>Benefit</u>	<u>Value</u>
Outages	; -	25	20%	20	100	\$500	\$ 50,000	\$ 333,333
Cl's	4.0	1,000	20%	20	16,000	\$25	\$400,000	2,666,666
Total							\$450,000	3,000,000

Note: Many companies rank distribution projects by cost per CI avoided, at rates from \$50-\$300 per CI

- Effective discount rate is 15% because remediations are assumed to deteriorate at 5% per year

-\$25 per avoided CI is (and should be?) about 20% of the value implied by \$25,000 per MWH (At 5 kWH per CI)

- When this 'macro' model sets the right benefit ratio and value, a 'micro' model can be used to pick circuits
- Other programs modeled similarly are URD replacement, tree trimming, line inspection/repair, etc.

### Reliability event cost parameters facilitate value discussion Values like \$25k per MWH and \$25 per CI help to anchor the discussion

Using \$25k per MWH for major events and \$25 per CI for normal distribution feeder events implies a different value for different types of events, i.e.,

If the typical customer is 4kW, and typical CAIDI is 90 minutes, then \$25k per MWH implies \$150 per CI (and would be \$1.66 per CMI), or 6 times \$25:

$$\frac{25,000}{\text{MWHour}} \times \frac{\text{MW}}{1,000 \text{ kW}} \times \frac{4 \text{ kW}}{\text{Customer}} \times \frac{1.5 \text{ Hours}}{\text{Interruption}} = \frac{100}{\text{Cl}}$$

Starting with values like these, companies may discuss how to vary by:

- Urban versus rural (although usually customer density covers this)
- Visibility or 'front page news' factor (e.g., higher for major events)
- Region or jurisdiction (but try it first at equal values for all)

### **Questions?**

#### Some things to think about when you leave:

- Have your regulators asked for details of your capital planning in rate discovery?
- Is your capital planning process integrated with the rest of the enterprise?
- Are your Board of Directors, external auditors, and internal risk management committees wanting to peel back the covers and look inside the black box that is your capital planning?
- Do you have the right combination of resources focused on the problem?
- Are your people ready to take you to the next level?



Dan O'Neill 404-603-9226 Dan@ONeillMC.com

Charlie Fijnvandraat 781-254-6971 Charlie.Fijnvandraat@gmail.com

Now is a good time to bring your capital planning to the <u>next level</u>. Encourage your team to <u>learn</u> what they need to <u>know</u> to do that.