

**BEFORE THE  
WYOMING PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
DIRECT TESTIMONY  
OF  
C. CURTIS MOCK  
POWDER RIVER ENERGY CORPORATION**

**Docket No. 10014-168-CR-16**

1 **Q. Please state your name and address.**

2 A. My name is Curtis Mock and my business address is Powder River Energy  
3 Corporation, P.O. Box 930, Sundance, WY 82729.

4 **Q. What is your present occupation?**

5 A. I am employed as Chief Financial and Administrative Officer of Powder  
6 River Energy Corporation ("PRECorp" or "the Cooperative").

7 **Q. What are your duties as Chief Financial and Administrative Officer of**  
8 **Powder River Energy Corporation?**

9 A. My duties are to manage the corporate accounting, finance and  
10 administrative functions of the Cooperative. The administrative duties  
11 include management of fleet, facilities and procurement. I also have the  
12 responsibility of ensuring the Cooperative's rates and margins are sufficient  
13 to maintain a sound financial position, and that we have adequate short and  
14 long-term financing available.

15 **Q. Please state your educational background and professional**  
16 **qualifications.**

17 A. I have a BA degree from Florida State University, a JD degree from Stetson  
18 University College of Law, and a LL.M. degree in Taxation from the  
19 University of Florida. I am also a graduate of the Cooperative Financial  
20 Professional program offered by the National Rural Electric Cooperative  
21 Association at the Fluno Center for Executive Education at the University of  
22 Wisconsin, Madison. I was accepted to the Florida Bar in 1996, but have  
23 not maintained that license. I have been employed in the utility field with  
24 PRECorp since 2007. I was originally hired as a Financial Analyst, then  
25 accepted the position of Manager of Financial Planning, and took over as  
26 Chief Financial and Administrative Officer in 2014. Before coming to  
27 PRECorp I worked in various tax and accounting positions, including five  
28 years with PricewaterhouseCoopers in Houston, Texas.

29 **Q. Does Exhibit CM-1 accurately reflect your professional background**  
30 **and qualifications?**

31 A. Yes.

32 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

33 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide background information on  
34 certain financial measurements that PRECorp must consider when  
35 determining whether its margins and rates are adequate.

36 **Q. Please explain how financial measurements are used to determine**  
37 **whether PRECorp's rates and margins are adequate.**

38 A. The federal government, through the Rural Utility Service (RUS) and the  
39 Federal Financing Bank, is PRECorp's principle source of borrowing for  
40 capital expenditures. There are several provisions in the loan contracts

41 PRECorp executes with the government that impose minimum financial  
42 conditions. The relevant provisions of PRECorp's current RUS Loan  
43 Contract are attached as Exhibit CM-2.

44 **Q. Please describe those provisions.**

45 A. The first relevant provision is the "Prospective Requirement." This section  
46 provides that PRECorp "shall design and implement rates for utility service  
47 furnished by it to provide sufficient revenue (along with other revenue  
48 available to the Borrower in the case of TIER and DSC) (i) to pay all fixed  
49 and variable expenses when and as due, (ii) to provide and maintain  
50 reasonable working capital, and (iii) to maintain, on an annual basis, the  
51 Coverage Ratios." Exhibit CM-2 at Section 5.4(a).

52 **Q. What are the Coverage Ratios and what do they measure?**

53 A. The Coverage Ratios are set forth in the "Retrospective Requirement" and  
54 are formulas analyzing the financial condition of a cooperative. The first  
55 Coverage Ratio imposed is TIER, or the Times Interest Earned Ratio, with  
56 a minimum measurement of 1.25. The second ratio is DSC, or Debt Service  
57 Coverage, with a minimum also of 1.25. The third ratio monitored is the  
58 RUS OTIER, or RUS Operating TIER, and the minimum permissible result  
59 of that measurement is 1.10. The final Coverage Ratio is the RUS ODSC,  
60 or RUS Operating DSC, with a minimum measurement also of 1.10. The  
61 TIER and RUS OTIER ratios measure the amount of income an entity has  
62 available to pay the interest expense it incurs annually. The DSC and RUS  
63 ODSC measure an entity's ability to pay its total debt service, both principle  
64 and interest.

65 **Q. Please describe the formulas for the TIER and RUS OTIER.**

66 A. The TIER and RUS OTIER look to the financial results of the Cooperative  
67 an annual basis. In the TIER, the Patronage Capital or Margins (Line 29)  
68 from the annual RUS financial statement are added to the total interest  
69 expense for the year. The total of those two numbers is divided by the  
70 interest expense. The result creates a ratio that shows how much of the  
71 earnings are left after interest expense is paid. A Cooperative with a TIER  
72 1.00 would necessarily have Patronage Capital or Margins of zero. In other  
73 words, after interest expense is satisfied, the Cooperative has no earnings.  
74 RUS OTIER is similar except that it uses Patronage Capital and Operating  
75 Margins (Line 21) from the annual RUS financial statement instead of  
76 Patronage Capital or Margins (Line 29). This measure is more conservative  
77 because it does not give credit for allocations of capital credits, without  
78 retirements of the same. It does, however, add back in cash received from  
79 actual retirements because the retirements represent funds available to pay  
80 interest expenses.

81 **Q. Please describe the formulas for the DSC and RUS DSC.**

82 A. While the TIER ratios focus on interest, the DSC and RUS DSC analyze the  
83 Cooperative's ability not just to pay interest on long term debt, but also to  
84 pay the principal due on those loans. The DSC sums Patronage Capital or  
85 Margins (Line 29), depreciation and amortization, and interest expense, and  
86 divides the total by annual interest expense and principal. Depreciation and  
87 amortization, as non-cash items, are included in this calculation. Again, the  
88 RUS DSC modifies that calculation by using Patronage Capital and

89 Operating Margins (Line 21), and allowing the use of cash from actual cash  
90 retirements made to the Cooperative in order to determine the ability to  
91 satisfy these obligations.

92 **Q. When the ratios are applied to the adjusted test year results in the**  
93 **Cost of Service Study that is the basis of this filing, what are the**  
94 **results?**

95 A. The rate case is based on a comprehensive Cost of Service Study (COSS)  
96 for the test year ending December 31, 2014. The COSS created an  
97 adjusted test year operating margin that demonstrated an \$8,330,430  
98 negative margin. The negative operating margin that results fails the  
99 minimum requirements of three of the measurements, the TIER, the OTIER,  
100 and the ODSC. Only the minimum requirement of the DSC ratio would be  
101 met absent a revenue increase.

102 **Q. What immediate impact would failing to achieve these minimum ratio**  
103 **requirements have on the Cooperative?**

104 A. As discussed earlier, we are required by our borrowing contract to meet all  
105 four ratio requirements. The test is applied as a best out of three years  
106 standard, meaning that the best two of the three most recent years must  
107 meet the requirement. Each year the Cooperative ratios are reported to  
108 RUS through the annual report filed with the United States Department of  
109 Agriculture, titled "Financial and Operating Report Electric Distribution,"  
110 formerly known as the Form 7. If the Cooperative fails a ratio, it is required  
111 to notify RUS of that fact in writing. The Cooperative must then develop a  
112 Corrective Plan to the satisfaction of RUS that describes the actions the

113 Cooperative is taking to reach minimum requirements in a timely manner.  
114 Failing to design and implement rates that pass the ratios test, and failing  
115 to provide an acceptable Corrective Plan thereafter, constitutes a default of  
116 the borrowing agreement. An additional consequence of not meeting the  
117 ratios is that the Cooperative may not lower its rates in the year following a  
118 year in which ratios were not met.

119 **Q. What consequences could the Cooperative face if the Coverage Ratios**  
120 **were not met two years in a row?**

121 A. That would place PRECorp in default of its loan contract with RUS. In  
122 addition to its rights as a mortgagor, in the event of default, the contract  
123 allows RUS to limit the Cooperative's operational authority and activities in  
124 several ways. For example, the Cooperative cannot make capital credit  
125 distributions while in default. The Cooperative may not incur additional debt  
126 from other lenders, and RUS has the discretion to suspend advances from  
127 the agreement in default. While in default RUS may request the termination  
128 of the general manager, and the Cooperative cannot hire a general  
129 manager without first securing RUS' approval of the candidate.

130 **Q: What is the primary Coverage Ratio used in this filing to determine the**  
131 **adequacy of the rates requested?**

132 A: The focus is on the RUS OTIER in the instant case. The focus is on the  
133 RUS OTIER because it is the most vulnerable ratio of the four ratios RUS  
134 uses. Unlike the TIER, the RUS OTIER calculation does not take into  
135 account non-operating items such as interest income or capital credit  
136 allocations the Cooperative receives. This means the numerator is smaller

137 in the RUS OTIER, while the denominator remains the same in both  
138 Coverage Ratios. The COSS results in a negative RUS OTIER for the  
139 Cooperative. A rate increase of \$11,506,749 is designed to provide  
140 sufficient revenue to achieve an RUS OTIER of 1.50. An RUS OTIER of  
141 1.50 provides an operating margin of \$3,176,319 in the proposed test year,  
142 and sufficient results in the other Coverage Ratios. This is an overview and  
143 David Hedrick will explain this in greater detail in his testimony. The  
144 calculation of the RUS Coverage Ratios after the revenue increase is  
145 attached hereto as Exhibit CM-3.

146 **Q: Has the Cooperative failed any of these ratios in recent years?**

147 A: No, however in 2013, the Cooperative used \$4.5 million in revenues from  
148 its Revenue Deferral Plan in order to establish positive operating margins  
149 of \$330,000 and an RUS OTIER of 1.10. Absent the Revenue Deferral  
150 Plan, more fully described in the testimony of CEO Mike Easley, the  
151 Cooperative would not have met the ratio. The 2014 Operating Budget also  
152 anticipated a revenue short fall and was supported by an estimated \$1.8  
153 million from the Plan in order to meet the respective Coverage Ratios.  
154 Ultimately it was not necessary to use the Plan in 2014, because the  
155 Cooperative made a one-time accounting change in the way it recognizes  
156 revenues, which resulted in revenues accruing in 2014 which were sufficient  
157 to provide positive year end margins and adequate Coverage Ratios.  
158 Finally, the 2015 Operating Budget also relied on the Revenue Deferral Plan  
159 as well, as it was supported by revenues of \$2.35 million from the Plan. A  
160 schedule is attached as Exhibit CM-4 which shows the operating results that

161 would have occurred since 2012 if PRECorp did not have the Revenue  
162 Deferral Plan available and did not make the accounting change described  
163 in 2014. It demonstrates that the Cooperative has been operating at a  
164 deficit and will continue to do so absent a rate increase.

165 **Q: Is the Cooperative currently at risk of failing any Coverage Ratios?**

166 A. Yes. While the financial results of 2015 have not yet closed, and the exact  
167 ratios are not yet known, we anticipate the need to utilize our Revenue  
168 Deferral Plan in order to restore sufficient margins and pass the Coverage  
169 Ratios this year. PRECorp has seen a significant reduction in sales in the  
170 last several years due in part to the general state of the economy and to the  
171 particular pressures on our two largest member groups. Sales to the  
172 combined Coal Bed Methane (CBM) customer classes in 2014 totaled  
173 612,035,627 kWh, which was a 9.7% reduction in sales compared to  
174 2013. Budgeted sales for 2015 for the same group are 541,058,800 kWh,  
175 an 11.6% reduction from 2014. Year to date November 2015, the actual  
176 decline is in line with budget at 10.6% and falling. The Large Power  
177 Transmission - Coal customers purchased 1,244,870,031 kWh in 2014, a  
178 1.9% increase from 2013. Budgeted sales to the coal mines in 2015 are  
179 1,236,965,095 kWh, or a 0.6% reduction over 2014, and year to date  
180 November 2015 actual sales results are a 3.7% reduction compared to the  
181 same period in 2014. As a result of the decline in sales, the Cooperative's  
182 2015 operating budget projects a revenue short-fall of \$1,692,823, which is  
183 offset by revenues from the Cooperative's Revenue Deferral Plan. Further,



184 the Cooperatives' 2016 operating budget also projects negative margins  
185 and an operating loss.

186 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

187 **A.** Yes, it does.