## 2023 IPU Advanced Regulatory Studies Program - Utility Asset Depreciation

Dane A. Watson, PE, CDP

Alliance Consulting Group (214) 473 - 6771
dwatson@alliancecg.net

## Goal

To better understand depreciation theory and practice and better evaluate a depreciation study

- Did the study follow accepted principles?
- How thorough was the study?
- Was the appropriate information considered?
- Are the results reasonable in light of those considerations?


## Topics

- Basic Utility Asset Depreciation
- Why is Depreciation Important?
- Depreciation Definition
- Depreciation Analysis Review
- Evaluating Depreciation Studies
- Appendix - Examples of "pitfalls" in analysis


## FERC Chart of Accounts

## PLANT

- FERC Account
- 101...Electric plant in service

RESERVE
FERC Account
108...Accumulated provision for
depreciation of electric utility plant

## Example of Capital Recovery

- Assume that a vehicle used in a utility's business costs $\$ 21,000$, and the vehicle will last 7 years.
- For ratemaking purposes, the total cost is not allowed in the year spent. Instead, it is "capitalized" and spread out over the life of the asset.
- Thus, $\$ 3,000$ ( $\$ 21,000$ divided by 7 years) is charged to depreciation expense each year.
- And is allowed as an expense for ratemaking purposes.


## Example of Capital Recovery contd

- Assume further that the vehicle will have salvage (resale) value of $\$ 1,400$ at the end of it's 7 -year life.
- Now, the annual depreciation expense is reduced to provide capital recovery of only $\$ 19,600$ since $\$ 1,400$ will be paid by a third party as part of the sale.
- The annual depreciation now is $\$ 2,800$ ( $\$ 21,000-\$ 1,400$ $=\$ 19,600$ divided by $7=\$ 2,800$ )


## Bookkeeping Entries?

- 1. Purchase the vehicle:
- Debit Plant in Service.......... \$21,000
- Credit Accounts Payable.................. \$21,000
- 2. Pay the invoice:
- Debit Accounts Payable....... \$21,000
- Credit Cash
\$21,000
- These are called "journal entries" which are then posted to the ledger


## Bookkeeping Entries Cont'd

- 3. First Year's Annual Depreciation Accrual:
- Debit Depreciation Expense...... $\$ 2,800$
- Credit Accumulated provision for Depreciation \$2,800
- 4. Each Subsequent year's annual Accrual:
- Debit Depreciation Expense...... $\$ 2,800$
- Credit Accumulated Provision for Depreciation
\$2,800


## Bookkeeping Entries Cont'd

- 5. Retirement of Vehicle:
- Debit Accumulated Provision for Depreciation...................... $\$ 21,000$
- Credit Plant in Service.................... $\$ 21,000$
- 6. Sale of Vehicle:
- Debit Cash (or Accounts Receivable)........................ \$1,400
- Credit Accumulated Provision for Depreciation.................................. 1,400
- Why Is Depreciation Important?


## What Is Depreciation and What Does An Analyst Define?

Simply put, depreciation is the allocation of the cost of an asset (including the cost to remove the asset) over the useful life of the asset.

- Depreciation Analysts will define the life (including the pattern of retirement of the group) and the net salvage in a deprecation study.
- After those two parameters are defined, the rest (calculating depreciation expense and depreciation rates) is simply a mathematical exercise.


## Why Is Depreciation Important?

- GAAP requirement to record depreciation expense
- Although non-cash, depreciation creates cash flow in regulated entities
- Large component of Revenue Requirements given capital intensive nature of industry
- Return on undepreciated investment attracts investors
- Required by regulators
- Intended to allocate cost of plant investment to generation of customers who benefit from use of the plant (i.e., intergenerational equity)


## What's all the "fuss" over Depreciation?

- Capital Recovery is only accomplished through a revenue stream for a regulated entity that is included in their tariffs.
Depreciation expense is a large item in a company's cost of service.
- It is complicated and differences of opinion can exist. Many times, the study results will be contested.


## Depreciation Definition

## Definitions of Depreciation

- Federal Energy Regulatory

Commission (FERC)

- American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA)
- Accounting Profession Definition


## What is Depreciation? (FERC Definition)

The FERC in its Uniform System of Accounts defines depreciation as:
...the loss in service value not restored by current maintenance, incurred in connection with the consumption or prospective retirement of plant in the course of service from causes which are known to be in current operation and against which the utility is not protected by insurance. Among the causes to be given consideration are wear and tear, decay, action of the elements, inadequacy, obsolescence, changes in the art, changes in demand and requirements of public authorities, and in the case of gas companies, the exhaustion of natural resources.

## What is Depreciation? (AICPA Definition)

The AICPA in its Accounting Research and Terminology Bulletin \#1 defines depreciation accounting as:
...a system of accounting which aims to distribute the cost or other basic value of tangible capital assets, less salvage (if any), over the estimated useful life of the unit (which may be a group of assets) in a systematic and rational manner. It is a process of allocation, not valuation. Depreciation for the year is the portion of the total charge under such a system that is allocated to the year. Although the allocation may properly take into account occurrences during the year, it is not intended to be a measurement of the effect of all such occurrences.

## What is Depreciation? (Accounting Professional Definition)

The process of allocating the cost of a plant asset to expense over its service (useful) life in a rational and systematic manner.

## Depreciation Analysis Review

## Data Analysis (Life) What Are We Trying To Estimate?

EXPERIENCE






## Data Analysis (Life) Life Analysis Methods

- Actuarial
- Experience Bands
- Placement Bands
- Semi-Actuarial
- Simulated Plant Record (SPR) Calculations
- Life Span/Forecast Calculations


## Data Analysis (Life) Actuarial Analysis

- Actuarial Analysis - models the life of historical retirements (people generally use analysis called the "retirement rate")
- Uses "aged" data (e.g. in-service dates and retirement dates for asset retirements)


## Data Analysis (Life) Unaged Data

## UNAGED DATA

## END-OF-YEAR BALANCES

```
VINT INSTS 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988
    1983 220
    1984250
    1985270
    1986 285
    1987 300
    1988320
    1989350
    1990}37
    1991 390
    1992405
    1993450
    1994480
    1995500
    BALANCE 220 470 740 1,025 1,325 1,643 1,986 2,347 2,708 3,061 3,434 3,801 4,150
```


## Data Analysis (Life) Aged Data

## AGED DATA

END-OF-YEAR BALANCES
VINT INSTS 1983198419851986198719881989199019911992199319941995
$\left.\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}1983 & 220 & 220 & 220 & 220 & 220 & 220 & 218 & 213 & 207 & 194 & 174 & 152 & 125\end{array}\right) 95$
$1984250 \quad 250$
$1985270 \quad 270270 \quad 270$
$1986285 \quad 285 \quad 285 \quad 285 \quad 285$
1987300
1988320
1989350
1990375
1991390
1992405
1993450
1994480

| 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 300 | 297 | 291 | 282 | 264 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{lllllllll}320 & 320 & 320 & 320 & 320 & 317 & 310 & 301\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllll}350 & 350 & 350 & 350 & 350 & 347 & 340\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}375 & 375 & 375 & 375 & 375 & 371\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}390 & 390 & 390 & 390 & 390\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}405 & 405 & 405 & 405\end{array}$
$450 \quad 450 \quad 450$
480480
500
BALANCE 220470740 1,025 1,325 1,643 1,986 2,347 2,708 3,061 3,434 3,801 4,150
A/C 812

| Year of Activity | Plant Installed | Retirements |  |  | Account Balance End of Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Year } \\ & \text { Installed } \end{aligned}$ | Age |  |
| 1921 | \$32,740 | $\frac{\$ 620}{620}$ | 1991 | 0 | \$32,120 |
| 1992 | 37,500 |  |  |  | 69,620 |
| 1993 | 64,970 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,800 \\ 1,020 \\ 410 \\ 3,230 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 911 \\ 1992 \\ 1993 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 131,360 |
| 1994 | 132,840 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,120 \\ 1,860 \\ 8,0 \\ 5,850 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} 1992 \\ 1993 \\ 1994 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 258,350 |
| 1995 | 89,490 | $\begin{array}{r} 600 \\ 870 \\ 4,770 \\ \hline 6,210 \\ \hline 12,390 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1991 \\ & 1992 \\ & 1993 \\ & 1994 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \\ & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 335,450 |
| 1996 | 325,070 | $\begin{array}{r} 1,080 \\ 1,970 \\ 17,400 \\ 4.870 \\ 25,320 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1991 \\ & 1993 \\ & 1994 \\ & 1995 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | 635,200 |
| 4997 | 284,920 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,090 \\ 1,940 \\ 2,070 \\ 2,370 \\ 6,840 \\ 8,400 \\ 780 \\ \hline 24,490 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1991 \\ & 1992 \\ & 1993 \\ & 1994 \\ & 1995 \\ & 1996 \\ & 1997 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 5 \\ & 4 \\ & 4 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 895,630 |
| 1998 | \$197,650 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 2,780 \\ 3,400 \\ 2,740 \\ 4,740 \\ 4,160 \\ 12,810 \\ 7,930 \\ \hline 690 \\ \hline 69180 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1991 \\ & 1992 \\ & 1993 \\ & 1994 \\ & 1995 \\ & 1996 \\ & 1997 \\ & 1998 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 6 \\ & 5 \\ & 4 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | \$1,054,100 |

TABLE NO. 7: ABC ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY
PLANT ACCOUNT ACTIVITY (Page 2 of 2)

| Year of Activity | Plant Installed | Retirements |  |  | Account <br> Balance <br> End of Year |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cost | Year Installed | Age |  |
| 1999 | \$287,710 | \$1,490 | 1991 | 8 |  |
|  |  | 2,030 | 1992 | 7 |  |
|  |  | 1,850 | 1993 | 6 |  |
|  |  | 19,610 | 1994 | 5 |  |
|  |  | 6,890 | 1996 | 3 |  |
|  |  | 8,970 | 1997 | 2 |  |
|  |  | 6,250 | 1998 | 1 |  |
|  |  | 1,910 | 1999 | 0 | 1,292,810 |
|  |  | 49,000 |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 291,820 | 3,380 | 1991 | 9 |  |
|  |  | 1,960 | 1992 | 8 |  |
|  |  | 2,730 | 1993 | 7 |  |
|  |  | 2,960 | 1994 | 6 |  |
|  |  | 640 | 1995 | 5 |  |
|  |  | 6,660 | 1996 | 4 |  |
|  |  | 9,730 | 1997 | 3 |  |
|  |  | 14,820 | 1998 | 2 |  |
|  |  | 6,930 | 1999 | 1 |  |
|  |  | 680 | 2000 | 0 | 1,534,140 |
|  |  | 50,490 |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 219,880 | 4,050 | 1991 | 10 |  |
|  |  | 2,950 | 1992 | 9 |  |
|  |  | 2,360 | 1993 | 8 |  |
|  |  | 3,460 | 1994 | 7 |  |
|  |  | 2,740 | 1995 | 6 |  |
|  |  | 7,820 | 1996 | 5 |  |
|  |  | 16,720 | 1997 | 4 |  |
|  |  | 17,890 | 1998 | 3 |  |
|  |  | 21,080 | 1999 | 2 |  |
|  |  | 3,830 | 2000 | 1 | 1,671,120 |
|  |  | 82,900 |  |  |  |

Age Intervals

| Year | Additions | 0-1/2 | 1/2-11/2 | 11/2-21/2 | 21/2-31/2 | 31/2-4 1/2 | 41/2-5 1/2 | 51/2-61/2 | 61/2-71/2 | 71/2-81/2 | 81/2-91/2 | 91/2-101/2 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | \$32,740 | $\left.\begin{array}{r} 32,740 \\ (620) \end{array}\right\}$ | $32,1207$ | $\} \begin{array}{l} 32,120 \\ (1,800) \end{array}\right\}$ | \} 30,320 | $\begin{array}{r} 30,320 \\ (600) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29,720 \\ & (1,080) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28,640 \\ & (2,090) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26,550 \\ & (2,780) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23,770 \\ & (1,490) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2,280 \\ (3,380) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18,900 \\ & (4,050) \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 1992 | 37,500 | 37,500 | $\begin{aligned} & 37,500 \\ & (1,020) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36,480 \\ & (3,120) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33,360 \\ (870) \end{array}$ | 32,490 | $\begin{gathered} 32,490 \\ (1,940) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30,550 \\ & (3,400) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27,150 \\ & (2,030) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25,120 \\ & (1,960) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23,160 \\ & (2,950) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 1993 | 64,970 | $\begin{array}{r} 64,970 \\ (410) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64,560 \\ & (1,860) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62,700 \\ & (4,710) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 57,990 \\ & (1,970) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56,020 \\ & (2,070) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53,950 \\ & (2,740) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51,210 \\ & (1,850) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49,360 \\ & (2,730) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46,630 \\ & (2,360) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 132,840 | $\begin{array}{r} 132,840 \\ (870) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 131,970 \\ (6,210) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 125,760 \\ & (17,400) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 108,360 \\ (2,370) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 105,990 \\ (4,740) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 101,250 \\ & (19,610) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81,640 \\ & (2,960) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 78,680 \\ & (3,460) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 89,490 | 89,490 | $\begin{aligned} & 89,490 \\ & (4,870) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 84,620 \\ & (6,840) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77,780 \\ & (4,160) \end{aligned}$ | 73,620 | $\begin{array}{r} 73,620 \\ (640) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 72,980 \\ & (2,740) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 325,070 | 325,070 | $\begin{array}{r} 325,070 \\ (8,400) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 316,670 \\ & (12,810) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 303,860 \\ (6,890) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 296,970 \\ (6,660) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 290,310 \\ (7,820) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1997 | 284,920 | $\begin{array}{r} 284,920 \\ (780) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 284,140 \\ (7,930) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 276,210 \\ (8,970) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 267,240 \\ (9,730) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 257,510 \\ & (16,720) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1998 | 197,650 | $\begin{array}{r} 197,650 \\ (620) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 197,030 \\ (6,250) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 190,780 \\ & (14,820) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 175,960 \\ & (17,890) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 | 287,710 | $\begin{array}{r} 287,710 \\ (1,910) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 285,800 \\ (6,930) \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 278,870 \\ & (21,080) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 | 291,820 | $\begin{array}{r} 291,820 \\ (680) \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 291,140 \\ (3,830) \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2001 | 219,880 | 219,880 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | posures | \$1,964,590 | \$1,738,820 | \$1,404,210 | \$1,054,870 | \$852,920 | \$581,340 | \$265,020 | \$181,740 | \$95,520 | \$45,440 | \$18,900 | \$8,203,370 |
| Total | tirements | $(5,890)$ | $(47,300)$ | $(91,550)$ | $(43,880)$ | $(30,790)$ | $(33,830)$ | $(13,040)$ | $(11,000)$ | $(5,810)$ | $(6,330)$ | $(4,050)$ | $(293,470)$ |

TABLE NO. 9; ABC ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY OBSERVED LIFE TABLE


## Percent Survivor Curve

Chart No. 5 shows the historical survivor curve as ploted from the observed life table. Note that it does not extend to zero percent surviving. This is often the case due to the long lives of utility plant. As implied in the illustrations of the Original-Group method, a curve extending to zero percent surviving is needed to calculate average service life. Also, the historical curve is irregular. This, too, is a common occurrence. Therefore, it must be smoothed as well as extended. This can be done in three ways:

1. By matching the stub historical curve to established sets of survivor curves
2. By using mathematics, and
3. By observation

These procedures will be illustrated in the next example.
The two simplified examples of actuarial methods that have been presented, the Original-Group Method and the Annual-Rate Method, are again used but the data, while hypothetical, are more realistic in that they are representative of the actual property records available to the depreciation analyst. Examination of Tables 7 and 8 discloses that in the band of years that were studied, all data as to additions and retirements were available. However, in actual practice the data available are not so complete.

## Data Analysis (Life) Actuarial Analysis Graph

## Account: 353

Scenario: Oncor Actuarial 2009
4. Actual Data $\quad$ L0.546.00


## Data Analysis (Life) SPR

Simulated Plant - Record Analysis (SPR) - simulated the retirement pattern of historical assets and matches simulated balance against plant balances (or retirements)

- Uses "unaged" data (e.g. gross additions and account balances)


## Data Analysis (Life) Unaged Data

## UNAGED DATA

## END-OF-YEAR BALANCES

```
VINT INSTS 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988
    1983 220
    1984250
    1985270
    1986 285
    1987 300
    1988 320
    1989350
    1990}37
    1991 390
    1992405
    1993450
    1994480
    1995500
    BALANCE 220 470 740 1,025 1,325 1,643 1,986 2,347 2,708 3,061 3,434 3,801 4,150
```


## Life Analysis Simulated Plant Record (SPR)

Only information known are plant balances through time and gross additions and/or retirements

- Generally applies standardized lowa Survivor Curves against gross additions to calculate plant balance in a given year
- Compares multiple-year calculated plant balances against actual balances to determine best fitting life/curve combination


## Simulated Plant Record (SPR) Ranking Curves

- SPR ranks curves based on the closeness of simulated to actual balances (retirements)
- Closeness is determined by the Sum of the Squared Differences (SSD) between simulated and actual balances (retirements)


## Simulated Plant Record (SPR) Conformance Index (CI)

SSD
MSD = SSD /n
CI = Avg. Bal / SQRT (MSD)

- Bauhan's Scale:
over 75 excellent
50 to 75 good
25 to 50 fair
under 25 poor


## Simulated Plant Record (SPR) Retirement Experience Index (REI)

- Percent retired from the oldest vintage at the end of the most recent year in the experience band according to the specified lowa curve
- Bauhan's Scale:
over 75 excellent
50 to 75 good
33 to 50 fair
17 to 33 poor
under 17 valueless


## Simulated Plant Record (SPR) Retirement Experience Index (REI)

REI indicates account maturity according to the specified survivor curve

- REI $=100 \%$ means the oldest vintage has been through a full life cycle
- REI $<100 \%$ indicates a stub survivor curve
- E.g., a $40 \%$ REI indicates that only $40 \%$ of the oldest vintage has retired


## Data Analysis (Life) SPR Table Example

Simulated Plant Record Analysis<br>Oncor Electric Delivery

| Account: 364 <br> Version: Oncor SPR data 2009 <br> Method: Simulated Balances |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Test Points: | 30 | Intervat: 0 |  | On Band: 198 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Avg } \\ & \text { Service } \\ & \text { Hife } \end{aligned}$ | Sum of <br> Squared <br> Ditferences | Index of Variation | Contormance <br> Index | Retirement <br> Experience <br> Index |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R0. 5 | 44.2 | $1.44 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 29.5858 | 33.80 | 96.88 |
| Lo | 48.4 | 1.72E+16 | 32.3555 | 30.91 | ${ }^{85.82}$ |
| R1 | 39.7 | 1.76E+16 | 32.6995 | 30.58 | 100.00 |
| 10.5 | 43.8 | $2.07 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 35.4655 | 28.20 | 92.28 |
| R1. 5 | 37.0 | 2,15E+16 | 36.1828 | 27.64 | 100.00 |
| so | 39.2 | $2.25 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 36.9537 | 27.06 | 100.00 |
| L1 | 40.3 | $2.56 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 39.4323 | 25.36 | 96.76 |
| s0.5 | 36.8 | $2.63 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 39.9997 | 25.00 | 100.00 |
| R2 | 34.8 | $2.67 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 40.2528 | 24.84 | 100.00 |
| 11.5 | 37.9 | $2.91 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 42.0798 | 23.76 | 98.77 |
| R2.5 | 33.2 | 3.03E+16 | 42.8939 | 23.31 | 100.00 |
| S1 | 34.8 | 3.14E+16 | 43.7146 | 22.88 | 100.00 |
| L2 | 35.7 | $3.41 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 45.5516 | 21.95 | 99.80 |
| S1.5 | 33.6 | $3.45 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 45.7723 | 21.85 | 100.00 |
| R3 | 31.8 | $3.45 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 45.8087 | 21.83 | 100.00 |
| L2.5 | 34.1 | 3.63E+16 | 46.9877 | 21.28 | 99.95 |
| S2 | 32.5 | 3.82E+16 | 48.1861 | 20.75 | 100.00 |
| S6 | 29.2 | $3.86 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 48.4584 | 20.64 | 100.00 |
| R4 | 30.6 | $3.91 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 48.7361 | 20.52 | 100.00 |
| L3 | 32.9 | $3.95 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 49.0198 | 20.40 | 100.00 |
| S2.5 | 32.0 | 3.96E+16 | 49.0622 | 20.38 | 100.00 |
| S5 | 29.3 | $4.04 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 49.5539 | 20.18 | 100.00 |
| R5 | 29.6 | $4.06 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 49.7022 | 20.12 | 100.00 |
| S3 | 31.2 | 4.14E+16 | 50.1418 | 19.94 | 100.00 |
| L5 | 30.0 | 4.15E+16 | 50.2068 | 19.92 | 100.00 |
| 14 | 31.0 | 4.15E+16 | 50.2120 | 19.92 | 100.00 |
| S4 | 30.1 | 4.19E+16 | 50.4905 | 19.81 | 100.00 |
| so | 31.2 | $5.74 \mathrm{E}+16$ | 59.0770 | 16.93 | 100.00 |

## Data Analysis (Life)Benefits of Actuarial analysis

More information available for analysis

- Able to look at different periods of experience
Easier to understand results
- However, more information is needed for the analysis - some companies do not capture that level of detail in their fixed asset system


## Data Analysis (Life)Benefits of SPR analysis

- Less information is needed for the analysis companies with only Form 1 type of information available can still perform statistical life analysis
- Less complex calculations
- However, it is harder to understand the results
- And there is less ability to independently study at different periods


## Data Analysis (Life)Life Span Calculation

- The following tables demonstrate the basic and fully implemented life span calculation for a generating unit.
- The first table demonstrates the basic recovery of the initial cost over the life of the unit
- The second table demonstrates all costs that will be incurred over the life of the unit and its recovery.
- Not all of the conceptually appropriate pieces of the calculation are generally accepted by commissions (e.g. interim additions - although conceptually correct - are not widely accepted)

** A.G.A./EEI DEPRECIATION ACCOUNTING COURSE ** LIFE SPAN PROPERTY

| [1] | [2] | [3] | [4] | [5] | [6] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Interim | Interim Net | Terminal | Terminal Net | Interim |
| Year | Retirements | Salvage | Retirements | Salvage | Additions |
|  | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ | \$ |

1999 0 0

| 2000 | 0 | - | 0 | 0 | 100,000,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | 750,000 | $(150,000)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,250,000 |
| 2002 | 761,250 | $(152,250)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,283,750 |
| 2003 | 772,669 | $(154,534)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,318,006 |
| 2004 | 784,259 | $(156,852)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,352,776 |
| 2005 | 796,023 | $(159,205)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,388,068 |
| 2006 | 807,963 | $(161,593)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,423,889 |
| 2007 | 820,082 | $(164,016)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,460,247 |
| 2008 | 832,384 | $(166,477)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,497,151 |
| 2009 | 844,869 | $(168,974)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,534,608 |
| 2010 | 857,542 | $(171,508)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,572,627 |
| 2011 | 870,406 | $(174,081)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,611,217 |
| 2012 | 883,462 | $(176,692)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,650,385 |
| 2013 | 896,714 | $(179,343)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,690,141 |
| 2014 | 910,164 | $(182,033)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,730,493 |
| 2015 | 923,817 | $(184,763)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,771,450 |
| 2016 | 937,674 | $(187,535)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,813,022 |
| 2017 | 951,739 | $(190,348)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,855,217 |
| 2018 | 966,015 | $(193,203)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,898,046 |
| 2019 | 980,505 | $(196,101)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,941,516 |
| 2020 | 995,213 | $(199,043)$ | 0 | 0 | 2,985,639 |
| 2021 | 1,010,141 | $(202,028)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,030,424 |
| 2022 | 1,025,293 | $(205,059)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,075,880 |
| 2023 | 1,040,673 | $(208,135)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,122,018 |
| 2024 | 1,056,283 | $(211,257)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,168,849 |
| 2025 | 1,072,127 | $(214,425)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,216,381 |
| 2026 | 1,088,209 | $(217,642)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,264,627 |
| 2027 | 1,104,532 | $(220,906)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,313,596 |
| 2028 | 1,121,100 | $(224,220)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,363,300 |
| 2029 | 1,137,917 | $(227,583)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,413,750 |
| 2030 | 1,154,985 | $(230,997)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,464,956 |
| 2031 | 1,172,310 | $(234,462)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,516,930 |
| 2032 | 1,189,895 | $(237,979)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,569,684 |
| 2033 | 1,207,743 | $(241,549)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,623,230 |
| 2034 | 1,225,859 | $(245,172)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,677,578 |
| 2035 | 1,244,247 | $(248,849)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,732,742 |
| 2036 | 1,262,911 | $(252,582)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,788,733 |
| 2037 | 1,281,855 | $(256,371)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,845,564 |
| 2038 | 1,301,082 | $(260,216)$ | 0 | 0 | 3,903,247 |
| 2039 | 1,320,599 | $(264,120)$ | 0 | - | 3,961,796 |
| 2040 | 0 | - | 178,721,025 | $(17,872,103)$ | 0 |


| Interim Net Salvage $=$ | $\mathbf{- 2 0 . 0 \%}$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Terminal Net Salvage $=$ | $-\mathbf{1 0 . 0 \%}$ |
| Average Net Salvage $=$ | $-11.8 \%$ |
| Interim Retirement Rate $=$ | $0.7500 \%$ |
| Interim Addition Factor $=$ | 3.0 |
| Depreciation Rate = | $4.493 \%$ |

$39,360,513(7,872,103) \quad 178,721,025(17,872,103) \quad 218,081,538$
5,426,789,391

## Data Analysis (NS) Salvage \& Cost Of Removal Analysis

- Net salvage is analyzed by comparing the original cost of assets at their in-service dates with the removal cost of those assets at the end of their lives.
- The assumption is that the same relationship between the cost at in-service and removal cost at retirement will exist for assets that are still in service.
- Rolling bands and shrinking bands are normally used to smooth the pattern of retirement and timing differences between the recording of gross salvage, removal cost and retirements.


## Salvage \& Cost Of Removal Analysis

- Calculation:

$$
\text { Net Salvage } \%=\frac{\$ \text { Gross Salvage }-\$ \text { Removal Cost }}{\text { \$Retirements }}
$$

- Ratio allows application to different plant levels
- Components reflect different price levels
- Numerator: retirement-year dollars
- Denominator: installation-year dollars
- Net salvage ratio used to calculate depreciation expense (Remaining Life formula shown).

$$
\text { Depr. } \operatorname{Exp}=\frac{\text { Plant }-(\text { Plant } \times \text { Net Salvage \% })-\text { Depr Reserve }}{\text { Average RemainingLife }}
$$

## Salvage \& Cost Of Removal Analysis

- Assume the asset cost is $\$ 100$ and there is a $5 \%$ gross salvage value and $10 \%$ removal cost. The depreciable life is five years; net salvage accrual is $\$ 1$ per year thus the depreciation expense per year is $\$ 21$. At the end of the fifth year the asset would be retired, bringing both the plant balance and the accumulated depreciation to zero.

Net Salvage $\%=((\$ 5-\$ 10)) / \$ 100=((\$ 5)) / \$ 100=-5 \%$
Net Salvage $($ Annual $)=(\$ 100(-5 \%)) / 5=((\$ 5)) / 5=\$ 1$
Plant $=\$ 100 / 5=\$ 20$
Plant plus Net Salvage accrual $=\$ 20+\$ 1=\$ 21$

# Data Analysis (NS) Example of Shrinking and Rolling Bands 

| ABC ELECTRIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NET SALVAGE ACTIVITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FERC | Activity |  | Gross | Removal | Net | Gross | Removal | Net | 3- Yr Net | 4- Yr Net | 5- Yr Net | 6- Yr Net | 7- Yr Net | 8- Yr Net | 9- Yr Net | 10- Yr Net |
| Account | Year | Retirements | Salvage | Cost | Salvage | Salvage \% | Cost \% | Salvage \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% |
| (a) | (b) | (c) | (d) | (e) | (f)=(d)-(e) | (g) $=$ (d)/(c) | (h)=(e)/(c) | (i)=(f)/(c) | (j)* | (k)* | (I)* | (m)* | (n)* | (0)* | (p)* | (q)* |
| 364 | 1992 | 1,573,652 | 558,113 | 800,269 | $(242,156)$ | 35.47\% | 50.85\% | -15.39\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 364 | 1993 | 806,257 | 316,671 | 469,111 | $(152,440)$ | 39.28\% | 58.18\% | -18.91\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 364 | 1994 | 641,472 | 290,008 | 412,413 | $(122,405)$ | 45.21\% | 64.29\% | -19.08\% | -17.11\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 364 | 1995 | 539,845 | 223,377 | 305,407 | $(82,030)$ | 41.38\% | 56.57\% | -15.20\% | -17.96\% | -16.82\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 364 | 1996 | 402,962 | 185,098 | 277,754 | $(92,656)$ | 45.93\% | 68.93\% | -22.99\% | -18.75\% | -18.80\% | -17.45\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 364 | 1997 | 916,484 | 385,559 | 541,113 | $(155,554)$ | 42.07\% | 59.04\% | -16.97\% | -17.76\% | -18.10\% | -18.30\% | -17.36\% |  |  |  |  |
| 364 | 1998 | 380,396 | 130,002 | 198,223 | $(68,221)$ | 34.18\% | 52.11\% | -17.93\% | -18.62\% | -17.79\% | -18.08\% | -18.26\% | -17.40\% |  |  |  |
| 364 | 1999 | 312,886 | 100,271 | 179,266 | $(78,995)$ | 32.05\% | 57.29\% | -25.25\% | -18.81\% | -19.65\% | -18.70\% | -18.78\% | -18.81\% | -17.84\% |  |  |
| 364 | 2000 | 1,272,713 | 137,709 | 410,717 | $(273,008)$ | 10.82\% | 32.27\% | -21.45\% | -21.37\% | -19.98\% | -20.35\% | -19.62\% | -19.54\% | -19.44\% | -18.51\% |  |
| 364 | 2001 | 385,649 | 68,840 | 264,530 | $(195,690)$ | 17.85\% | 68.59\% | -50.74\% | -27.78\% | -26.19\% | -23.61\% | -23.54\% | -22.47\% | -22.02\% | -21.58\% | -20.23\% |
| 364 | 2002 | 619,695 | 111,918 | 266,921 | $(155,003)$ | 18.06\% | 43.07\% | -25.01\% | -27.38\% | -27.12\% | -25.95\% | -23.83\% | -23.75\% | -22.80\% | -22.36\% | -21.92\% |
| 364 | 2003 | 1,394,795 | 149,822 | 385,783 | $(235,961)$ | 10.74\% | 27.66\% | -16.92\% | -24.44\% | -23.41\% | -23.55\% | -23.06\% | -22.00\% | -22.07\% | -21.48\% | -21.25\% |
| 364 | 2004 | 875,785 | 123,820 | 592,737 | $(468,917)$ | 14.14\% | 67.68\% | -53.54\% | -29.75\% | -32.22\% | -29.21\% | -28.95\% | -28.15\% | -26.49\% | -26.28\% | -25.43\% |
| 364 | 2005 | 487,067 | 90,346 | 247,802 | $(157,456)$ | 18.55\% | 50.88\% | -32.33\% | -31.27\% | -30.12\% | -32.24\% | -29.51\% | -29.26\% | -28.51\% | -26.92\% | -26.69\% |
| 364 | 2006 | 585,872 | 89,075 | 268,387 | $(179,312)$ | 15.20\% | 45.81\% | -30.61\% | -41.34\% | -31.15\% | -30.19\% | -32.02\% | -29.62\% | -29.39\% | -28.70\% | -27.22\% |
| 364 | 2007 | 818,696 | 108,779 | 387,731 | $(278,952)$ | 13.29\% | 47.36\% | -34.07\% | -32.55\% | -39.19\% | -31.73\% | -30.86\% | -32.34\% | -30.19\% | -29.96\% | -29.32\% |
| 364 | 2008 | 1,483,141 | 140,965 | 435,118 | $(294,153)$ | 9.50\% | 29.34\% | -19.83\% | -26.06\% | -26.96\% | -32.44\% | -28.60\% | -28.25\% | -29.55\% | -28.25\% | -28.14\% |
| 364 | 2009 | 1,043,838 | 165,556 | 552,266 | $(386,710)$ | 15.86\% | 52.91\% | -37.05\% | -28.69\% | -28.97\% | -29.34\% | -33.35\% | -29.92\% | -29.50\% | -30.57\% | -29.27\% |
| 364 | 2010 | 554,501 | 200,785 | 420,235 | $(219,450)$ | 36.21\% | 75.79\% | -39.58\% | -29.22\% | -30.24\% | -30.28\% | -30.48\% | -33.94\% | -30.66\% | -30.21\% | -31.17\% |
| 364 | 2011 | 964,573 | 124,805 | 516,482 | $(391,677)$ | 12.94\% | 53.55\% | -40.61\% | -38.93\% | -31.93\% | -32.29\% | -32.11\% | -32.13\% | -34.88\% | -31.83\% | -31.35\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total 1992-2011 |  | 16,060,277 | 3,701,519 | 7,932,265 | $(4,230,746)$ | 23.05\% | 49.39\% | -26.34\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Data Analysis (NS) Salvage \& Cost Of Removal Analysis

Analyze Historical Gross Salvage \& Cost of Removal (COR).

Adjust data for unusual (not representative) events.
Estimate Future Salvage \& COR.
Combine Historical and Future Salvage estimates (if using whole life) - Use Future Salvage estimate if using Remaining life technique.

Adjust estimate as Needed for Expected Future Occurrences.

## Data Analysis (NS) Age Sensitivity

Gross salvage may decrease with age Generally, cost of removal increases with age (due to inflation, additional work rules, etc.)

- Therefore, the later an asset retires, the more "negative" the net salvage (i.e. Gross salvage decreases and cost of removal increases - net salvage is gross salvage minus cost of removal).


## Data Analysis (NS) Unusual Transactions

Third-Party Reimbursements

- Sales
- Atypical events ("Outliers")
- Changing systems, work processes, or environmental conditions
- Special programs (e.g. AMR meters)


## Life and NS Evaluation

The end result of this step are life, curve and net salvage recommendations.

- All factors gathered during the preceding steps are put together and judgment is used to select the final recommendations.
This is where the experience of the analyst is most needed.


## Life and NS Evaluation

While the actual experience of the utility being analyzed is the basis for recommendations, an analyst can ask the following questions in order to determine if more research is necessary to validate the selections.

- Are selections reasonable based on the analyst's experience?
- Are selections reasonable based on industry norms?
- Are changes in recommendations from approved lives and net salvage understandable based on changing conditions at the utility?


## Choices in Depreciation - the Depreciation "System"

## Choosing a "Depreciation System"

Methods of Allocation for Group Application Procedures for Group Application
Techniques for Group Application

## Depreciation Methods, Procedures And Techniques



## Methods

Methods refers to the pattern of depreciation in relation to the accounting periods

- Straight-line
- Accelerated
- Deferred
- Miscellaneous


## Procedures

Procedures refers to the grouping of assets or the form of the depreciable base

- Item or Unit
- Broad Group (also known as ALG or Average Life Group)
- Vintage Group
- Equal Life Group


## Techniques

Techniques refers to the portion of the average service life used in depreciation calculation

- Whole Life (Location or Total Life Basis)
- Remaining Life (Location or Total Life Basis)


## To Summarize Depreciation Methods, Procedures And Technique

- Methods refers to the pattern of depreciation in relation to the accounting periods
- Procedures refers to the grouping of assets or the form of the depreciable base

Techniques refers to the portion of the average service life used in depreciation calculation

## ALG versus ELG Example

Two Assets - \$10 each
One lasts 2 years, the other 8 years

- Average life of 5 years
- ALG rate of $20 \%$



## Depreciation Calculations

- The calculations are very straight-forward
- The prior decision on the depreciation system is necessary for the appropriate calculations to be made.
- Care must be taken to have appropriate quality controls to ensure accurate data, analysis and calculations.
- Calculations should be made at the end of the process to keep the results from driving the selections.


## Depreciation Rate Formula

- Whole Life

Rate, $\%=\frac{\mathrm{PB}-\mathrm{S}}{\mathrm{ASL}}$

## Remaining Life

$$
\text { Rate, } \%=\frac{\mathrm{PB}-\mathrm{S}}{\mathrm{ASL}}-\frac{\mathrm{BR}-\mathrm{CTR}}{\mathrm{ARL}}
$$

$$
\text { Rate, } \%=\frac{P B-S-B R}{A R L}
$$

Where PB is Depreciable Plant Balance, \%
$S$ is Net Salvage, \%
ASL is Average Service Life, Years
BR is Depreciation Book Reserve, \%
CTR is Calculated Theoretical Reserve, \%
ARL is Average Remaining Life, Years

## Depreciation Rate Formula

Annual depreciation accrual rate using the Whole-Life Technique:

Original Cost of Plant (i.e. 100\%) - Salvage\% + Removal Cost\%
Average Service Life (years)

Annual depreciation accrual rate using the Remaining-Life Technique:

Original Cost of Plant (i.e. 100\%) - Salvage $\%$ + Removal Cost $\%$ - Reserve $\%$
Average Remaining-Life in years

## The Depreciation Formulas

Whole Life Annual Expense
Annual Depreciation Expense $=\underline{\text { Original Cost of Plant }--(\text { Salvage }- \text { Removal Cost })}$ Average service life

Remaining Life Annual Expense

Annual Depreciation Expense $=\underline{\text { Original Cost of Plant }-(\text { Salvage }- \text { Removal Cost })-\text { Reserve }}$
Average Remaining Life

## The Depreciation Formulas Examples

Whole-Life Technique:
Data available (hypothetical):
1996 - Number of units installed this year 100,000 units
1996 - Plant cost of units installed \$ 100,000 or 100\%
1996 - Estimated salvage \$ 13,000 or 13\%
1996 - Estimated cost of removal \$3,000 or 3\%
1996 - Estimated average service life 12 years
The factors in the equation are expressed in percent of plant cost

$$
(100 \%-13 \%+3 \%)=90 \% / 12 \text { years }=7.5 \% \text { per year }
$$

## The Depreciation Formulas Examples

Remaining-Life Technique (continuing with previous Whole-Life technique data):
Data available (hypothetical):
2001 - Attained age of surviving plant 6 years (1996-2001)
1996-2001 - Number of units retired 25,000
2001 — Plant balance $\$ 75,000$ or $100 \%$
2001 - Estimated salvage \$ 9,750 or 13\%
2001 - Estimated cost of removal \$ 2,250 or 3\%
2001 - Accumulated Depreciation Reserve Balance in the account
\$ 16,875 or 22.5\% (\$16,875/\$75,000)
2001 - Estimated average Remaining-Life 9 years
$(100 \%-13 \%+3 \%-22.5 \%)=67.5 \% / 9$ years $=7.5 \%$ per year

## The Depreciation Formulas Examples

Using the Remaining-Life formula:
If the book accumulated depreciation reserve were $27 \%$ instead of $22.5 \%$ then the annual depreciation accrual rate would be $7.0 \%$ per year, instead of $7.5 \%$.

$$
(100 \%-13 \%+3 \%-27 \%)=63.0 \% / 9 \text { years }=7.0 \% \text { per year }
$$

Using the Remaining-Life formula: If the book accumulated depreciation reserve were $18 \%$ instead of $22.5 \%$ then the annual depreciation accrual rate would be $8.0 \%$ per year, instead of $7.5 \%$.

$$
(100 \%-13 \%+3 \%-18 \%)=72.0 \% / 9 \text { years }=8.0 \% \text { per year }
$$

## What Is A Theoretical Reserve?

Basically, it is a calculation of the amount you "should" have in your depreciation reserve

## "Simplified" Formula for Calculated Theoretical Reserve

For each vintage of plant, a theoretical reserve ratio, or calculated accrued depreciation ratio (CADR) can be calculated from these parameters:

$$
C A D R=1-\frac{R L}{A S L}
$$

- The theoretical reserve for each vintage of plant can then be calculated as:

$$
\begin{gathered}
C A D=\text { Original Cost } \times(1-N S \%) \times C A D R \\
C A D=\text { Original Cost } \times(1-N S \%) \times\left(1-\frac{R L}{A S L}\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

## Evaluating Depreciation Studies

## Depreciation Study Process



Source: Introduction to Depreciation for Public Utilities and Other Industries, AGA EEI, 2013
*Although not specifically noted, the mathematical analysis may need some level of input from other sources (for example, to determine analysis bands for life and adjustments to data used in all analysis)

## Initial Review

- How Conducted
- How Long Since Last Study
- Level of Expertise
- Magnitude of Change in Depreciation Rates
- Issues in Regulatory Proceedings


## Regulatory Considerations

- History Can Mislead
- Evaluation Can Surface Issues
- Types \& Treatment of Salvage and Cost of Removal
- Impact of Depreciation Changes on Ratepayers (should not be a focus)


## Information and Data

- Accounting Practices
- Property Details
- Addition, Retirement, Cost of Removal and Salvage processes
- How Equipment is Designed and Operated
Discussions with Office \& Field Personnel


## Data Considerations Accounting Concepts to Understand

1. Account numbering systems
2. Retirement unit definitions
3. Depreciation property groups
4. Depreciation provision calculations
5. Methods of in-service dating and of pricing retirements
6. The process of determining and recording removal cost from projects
7. The method of pricing reused material
8. The method and recording sale of scrap
9. How the removal cost component of depreciation rates is segregated (if applicable)
10.Policy or practice related to third party reimbursements
11.Transfers and adjustments
12.Sales and purchases
13.Treatment of Asset Retirement Obligations for regulatory purposes

## Data Considerations Understanding Causes Of Retirement

- PHYSICAL
- Wear and tear
- Decay

QUANTIFIABLE

- Action of the elements
- NON-PHYSICAL
- Inadequacy
- Obsolescence
- Changes in the art

NON-QUANTIFIABLE

- Changes in demand
- Requirements of public authorities


## Data Considerations Policy

Plant accounting capitalization policies and work flow

- Operations policies
- Accounting policies
- Aging and Pricing Policies
- Retirements
- Salvage
- Cost of removal segregation


## Accounting Practices

Retirement Unit Definitions
Dating \& Pricing Retirements
Removal Labor Segregation

- Third-Party Reimbursements
- Pricing Reused Materials
- Sale of Scrap \& Used Equipment
- Other


## Significance of Accounting Practices

Study Measures Flow of Amounts Through Accounting Records

- Quality of Field Reporting
- Attributes of the Accounting System

Retirement Unit Definitions (level and changes over time)

## Property Details - Examples

- Types of Transmission Poles
- Insulator Material
- Gas Main and Service Material
- Extent of Electronic Meters
- Office Furniture \& Equipment Types
- Stores \& Communications Equipment Types


## Account Content

- Life Differences within an Account Technology Change
- Lease/Buy Decisions


## Sales \& Reimbursements

Sales are Generally Rare

- Where are Reimbursements Recorded on the Books (Against Plant or Reserve)


## SME Interviews

- Subject Matter Expert ("SME") opinions and experience is an important part of a study
- Changes in operations or property types may not be readily evident in the data analysis
- Future plans that may impact the life of the assets will not be seen in the historical data


## Uniqueness of Entities

Physical Conditions

- Operation \& Maintenance Practices
- Accounting Practices
- Management Policy
- Regulatory Policy


## Technological Improvements

Street Lighting

- Meters
- UG Cable


## Sensitivity to Age of Retirements

- Net Salvage Factors Reflect Cost Escalation Depending on Age
${ }^{\circ}$ Current, Age of Survivors
- Past, Age of Past Retirements
- Average, Age Equal to Average Service Life
- Future, Age Equal to Probable Life

Escalation Rate \& Time

- Progression of Material Types
- General Purpose Buildings


## Life Analysis Methods

- Identification \& Explanation of Trends
- Strengths and weaknesses of Actuarial and SPR Methods Influence of Sporadic Additions \& Retirements


# Appendix Examples of "pitfalls" in analysis 

## Example 1 - Not enough Data

# Client only had 11 years of actuarial data - Current approved life is a 37 L2 

Account: 364.0
Scenario: Example Utility


Account: 364.0
Scenario: Example Utility

- Actual Data $\quad$ R2 47.00



## Full SPR Dataset



## Example 2 - Non Homogeneous Assets

## Sometimes lives of different

 assets interact with each other in an analysis and could cause less than appropriate results.Here's an example.

| Account: 369 <br> Version: ABC SPR <br> Method: Simulate | R 369 <br> ed Balanc |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. of Test Points: | 54 | Interval: 0 |  | on Band: 19 |  |
| Dispersion | Avg Service Life | Sum of Squared Diffrennces | Index of Varlation | Contormance Indax | Retirement <br> Experlence Index |
| R0.5 | 43.8 | $3.81 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 29.5808 | 33.81 | 64.17 |
| L0 | 48.1 | $4.19 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 31.0210 | 32.24 | 62.18 |
| R1 | 38.9 | $4.89 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 33.4982 | 29.85 | 77.67 |
| L0.5 | 43.1 | $5.00 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 33.8831 | 29.51 | 69.60 |
| so | 38.0 | $5.73 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 36.2663 | 27.57 | 78.74 |
| L1 | 39.3 | $6.12 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 37.4778 | 26.68 | 76.75 |
| R1.5 | 35.9 | $6.37 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 38.2124 | 26.17 | 89.59 |
| s0.5 | 35.7 | $7.00 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 40.0748 | 24.95 | 87.08 |
| L1.5 | 36.6 | $7.35 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 41.0649 | 24.35 | 83.54 |
| R2 | 33.8 | $8.31 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 43.6730 | 22.90 | 97.33 |
| S1 | 33.6 | $8.59 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 44.3817 | 22.53 | 94.46 |
| L2 | 34.4 | $8.83 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 45.0095 | 22.22 | 89.18 |
| \$1.5 | 32.4 | $9.90 \mathrm{E}+14$ | 47.6607 | 20.98 | 97.73 |
| 12.5 | 32.9 | $1.00 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 47.9914 | 20.84 | 93.51 |
| R2.5 | 32.3 | $1.01 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 48.0385 | 20.82 | 99.49 |
| S2 | 31.3 | 1.13E +15 | 50.9780 | 19.62 | 99.62 |
| 13 | 31.4 | 1.14E+15 | 51.1847 | 19.54 | 97.08 |
| R3 | 30.8 | 1.19E+15 | 52.2288 | 19.15 | 100.00 |
| \$2.5 | 30.8 | $1.24 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 53.2329 | 18.79 | 99.87 |
| \$3 | 30.1 | $1.33 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 55.3298 | 18.07 | 100.00 |
| 14 | 29.7 | $1.39 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 56.4682 | 17.71 | 99.94 |
| R4 | 29.8 | $1.41 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 56.9066 | 17.57 | 100.00 |
| 54 | 29.0 | $1.51 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 58.8640 | 16.99 | 100.00 |
| L5 | 29.1 | $1.55 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 59.6388 | 16.77 | 100.00 |
| R5 | 28.7 | $1.59 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 60.3700 | 16.56 | 100.00 |
| S5 | 28.9 | 1.63E+15 | 61.1628 | 16.35 | 100.00 |
| 56 | 28.4 | 1.72E+15 | 62.7871 | 15.93 | 100.00 |
| sa | 31.0 | $2.80 \mathrm{E}+15$ | 80.0851 | 12.49 | 100.00 |

## What life would you select?

## I created the dataset so I know

 what the actual lives are...
## Example 3 - Lagging Additions or Retirements

# What happens when additions or retirements are not recorded in a timely manner? 

## Base Case

|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2- yr | 3- yr | 4- yr | 5- yr | 6- yr | 7- yr |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Net | Net | Net | Net | Net | Net | Net | Net |
| Fiscal Year | Retirements | Gross Salvage | Removal Cost | Salvage | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% | Salv. \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38000-Serv |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 320,052.53 | 0.00 | 830,112.72 | $(830,112.72)$ | -259.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 3,203,013.70 | 0.00 | 244,202.95 | $(244,202.95)$ | -7.6\% | -30.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 3,669,690.39 | 0.00 | 494,119.17 | $(494,119.17)$ | -13.5\% | -10.7\% | -21.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 5,828,262.84 | 0.00 | 263,967.27 | $(263,967.27)$ | -4.5\% | -8.0\% | -7.9\% | -14.1\% |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 3,705,544.79 | 0.00 | 137,289.95 | $(137,289.95)$ | -3.7\% | -4.2\% | -6.8\% | -6.9\% | -11.8\% |  |  |
| 2010 | 3,944,623.88 | 0.00 | 271,541.40 | (271,541.40) | -6.9\% | -5.3\% | -5.0\% | -6.8\% | -6.9\% | -10.8\% |  |
| 2011 | 4,837,504.69 | 0.00 | 2,804,181.48 | $(2,804,181.48)$ | -58.0\% | -35.0\% | -25.7\% | -19.0\% | -18.1\% | -16.7\% | -19.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Plant Balance | 727,997,634.59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Additions Lag

| 38000-Serv |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | 320,052.53 | 0.00 | 830,112.72 | $(830,112.72)$ | -259.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 3,203,013.70 | 0.00 | 244,202.95 | $(244,202.95)$ | -7.6\% | -30.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 3,669,690.39 | 0.00 | 494,119.17 | $(494,119.17)$ | -13.5\% | -10.7\% | -21.8\% |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 5,828,262.84 | 0.00 | 263,967.27 | $(263,967.27)$ | -4.5\% | -8.0\% | -7.9\% | -14.1\% |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 3,705,544.79 | 0.00 | 137,289.95 | $(137,289.95)$ | -3.7\% | -4.2\% | -6.8\% | -6.9\% | -11.8\% |  |  |
| 2010 | 3,944,623.88 | 0.00 | 271,541.40 | $(271,541.40)$ | -6.9\% | -5.3\% | -5.0\% | -6.8\% | -6.9\% | -10.8\% |  |
| 2011 | 4,837,504.69 | 0.00 | 2,804,181.48 | $(2,804,181.48)$ | -58.0\% | -35.0\% | -25.7\% | -19.0\% | -18.1\% | -16.7\% | -19.8\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | nt balance | 464,995,147.16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Retirement Lag

| 38000-Serv |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | 320,052.53 | 0.00 | 830,112.72 | $(830,112.72)$ | -259.4\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 3,203,013.70 | 0.00 | 244,202.95 | $(244,202.95)$ | -7.6\% | -30.5\% |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 183,484.52 | 0.00 | 494,119.17 | $(494,119.17)$ | -269.3\% | -21.8\% | -42.3\% |  |  |  |  |
| 2008 | 734,164.62 | 0.00 | 263,967.27 | $(263,967.27)$ | -36.0\% | -82.6\% | -24.3\% | -41.3\% |  |  |  |
| 2009 | 1,139,898.88 | 0.00 | 137,289.95 | $(137,289.95)$ | -12.0\% | -21.4\% | -43.5\% | -21.7\% | -35.3\% |  |  |
| 2010 | 535,919.44 | 0.00 | 271,541.40 | $(271,541.40)$ | -50.7\% | -24.4\% | -27.9\% | -45.0\% | -24.3\% | -36.6\% |  |
| 2011 | 493,005.31 | 0.00 | 2,804,181.48 | $(2,804,181.48)$ | -568.8\% | -298.9\% | -148.1\% | -119.8\% | -128.7\% | -67.0\% | -76.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | nt Balance | 786,640,617.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Additions Lag - Approved Curve



## Additions Lag - Best Curve



## Retirement Lag - Approved Curve



## Retirement Lag - Best Curve



# Example 4 - Capital Constraints 

# Account 356 (Transmission Conductor) - Approved Life 50 R2 

## ACCOUNT 356 <br> ADDITIONS AND BALANCES



ADDITIONS $-\infty$ BALANCE

## ACCOUNT 356

REGULAR RETIREMENTS (\% OF ADDITIONS)


■RETIREMENTS (\%)

## Current Actuarial Analysis Results



## When adjusted to normalize the capital redirection

## Narrow Band

Account: 356
Scenario: Example Utility Actuarial Cap Spend @2016

- Actual Data
- R0.5 48.00



## Wide Band

Account: 356
Scenario: Example Utility Actuarial Cap Spend (@) 2016
a Actual Data $\quad$ - R1 55.00


## SPR



## Questions/Comments?

