Case UE 180 Exhibit COP/COG/100

Witnesses: Richard Gray, John Harris, Lon L. Peters

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON

CITY OF PORTLAND (COP) CITY OF GRESHAM (COG)

Direct Testimony of Richard Gray, John Harris, and Lon L. Peters

on

**Customer Impact Offset** 

August 2006

### Q. PLEASE IDENTIFY YOURSELVES.

A. (by Mr. Gray) My name is Richard Gray. I am currently employed as a Contract Administrator and Senior Management Analyst with the Office of Transportation for the City of Portland ("PDOT"). My business address is 1120 S.W. 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 800, Portland, Oregon 97204. My qualifications are listed in COP/305.

(by Mr. Harris) My name is John S. Harris. I am employed as the Transportation and Streetlighting Superintendent for the City of Gresham, Department of Environmental Services. My business address is 2123 SE Hogan Road, Gresham, Oregon 97080. My qualifications are listed in COP/COG/LOC/201.

(by Mr. Peters) My name is Lon L. Peters. My business address is 607 S.E. Manchester Place, Portland, Oregon 97202. I am the President of Northwest Economic Research, Inc. My qualifications are listed in COP/303.

### Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU SPONSORING THIS TESTIMONY?

A. This is jointly sponsored by the City of Portland ("Portland") and the City of Gresham ("Gresham").

### Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS TESTIMONY?

A. In this testimony we address one issue: Customer Impact Offset ("CIO"). We review PGE's proposed limit on rate increases for certain schedules to two times the average rate increase. This is known as the Customer Impact Offset. We conclude that the CIO should be reduced to 1.5.

### Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE PGE'S IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CIO.

A. The calculations in the marginal cost analysis and the streetlight cost study lead, not surprisingly, to different rate increases for different rate schedules. It is theoretically

possible for one customer class (defined by rate schedule) to face a rate increase that is significantly different from the average increase, and different from the rate increases faced by other customer classes.

In this case, PGE has proposed a CIO of 2.0. This means that no one customer class (i.e., rate schedule) will face a rate increase greater than two times the average rate increase. The calculation of the CIO is shown in PGE/1304, p. 10. As proposed by PGE, this CIO shifts costs from Schedules 47, 49, 91, 92 and 93 to the other rate schedules, in the total amount of \$3.88 million, or about 0.25 percent of total expected revenues.

#### Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE CIO?

A. Our understanding of the CIO is to avoid the "rate shock" that could result from changes in rate design over time. See PGE/1300, p. 21.

### Q. IS THE CIO A PRECISE TOOL TO ACHIEVE THIS TARGET?

A. No. As we have noted in other testimony (see COP/COG/LOC/200), there are several questionable assumptions in PGE's streetlight cost study. These questionable assumptions, in part, drive a rate increase for Schedule 91 that would be 18.9 percent absent the CIO. See PGE/1304, p. 10. The choice of 2.0 for the CIO threshold may be just as arbitrary as some of the assumptions that went into the calculation of streetlight rates.

## Q. WHAT DID PACIFICORP PROPOSE FOR THE EQUIVALENT OF CIO IN UE 179?

A. PacifiCorp proposed 1.5 for the equivalent of the CIO, although that is moot in light of the settlement agreement filed in UE 179. PacifiCorp refers to this as the "Rate Mitigation Adjustment", Schedule 299. See PPL/1100, Griffith/4 in UE 179.

### Q. WHAT WOULD THE IMPACT BE OF REDUCING THE CIO TO 1.5?

A. According to PGE's calculations, this would increase the cost to the other rate schedules from \$3.88 million to \$4.56 million, or about \$680,000 per year in total. Relative to the total size of the annual revenue requirement, this higher CIO would be four one-hundred-thousandths of one percent. See COP/COG/101.

#### Q. WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE IN THIS CASE?

A. PGE should reduce the CIO to 1.5. This would be consistent with the proposal in PacifiCorp's filing, would reduce the disparity among customer classes in the proposed rate increases, and would mitigate any erroneous assumptions that drive calculations of charges in Schedule 91.

# Q. HOW WILL THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT REGARDING REVENUE REQUIREMENTS IN THIS CASE AFFECT THE REDUCTION OF THE CIO FROM 2.0 TO 1.5?

A. Because the total size of the rate increase will be lower with the proposed settlement, the impact on all customer classes of reducing the CIO from 2.0 to 1.5 will fall. Thus, the total impact on all other customers of reducing the CIO threshold will be less than \$680,000 annually.

# Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY ON THIS SUBJECT?

A. Yes.

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC CONSUMER IMPACT OFFSET

Grouping	Cycle MWH	Revenues at 2006 Prices (\$000)	2007 Allocated Costs (\$000)	Percent Change	Maximum Change	Impact Offset	Impact Offset MWH	CIO mills/kWh	CIO	Estimated Percent Change
Schedule 7	7,524,421	\$718.963	\$759.707	5.7%	9 5%	0	c	0.24	6.1 806	,00 H
Schedule 15	23,496	\$4,196	\$4,446	6.0%	9.5%	9	0 0	0.24	oo, -	0.9% 6.4%
Schedule 32	1,503,045	\$131,132	\$142,112	8.4%	9.5%	9	o C	0.24	8361	% - % 8 %
Schedule 38	105,829	\$9,057	\$10,094	11.4%	9.5%	8	0	000	- C&	11.4%
Schedule 47	22,922	\$1,917	\$3,007	26.9%	9.5%	(\$308)	22.922	(39.63)	(\$908)	%5.6
Schedule 49	67,951	\$4,341	\$6,992	61.1%	6.5%	(\$2.239)	67,951	(32.95)	(\$2,239)	0.5%
Schedule 83	5,701,441	\$392,155	\$417,802	6.5%	9.5%	80	0	0.24	\$1.368	%0.0 %0.0
Schedule 89	4,519,963	\$268,403	\$281,027	4.7%	9.5%	80	0	0.24	\$1,085	2. c.
Schedule 91	908'26	\$14,551	\$17,300	18.9%	9.5%	(\$1,367)	97.806	(13.98)	(\$1.367)	0.5% 2.5%
Schedule 92	5,939	\$391	\$458	17.2%	9.5%	(\$30)	5,939	(5.09)	(\$30)	9.5%
Schedule 93	565	\$80	26\$	21.4%	9.5%	(6\$)	565	(16.71)	(89)	9.5%
COS TOTALS	19,573,378	\$1,545,185	\$1,643,042	6.3%	9.5%	(\$4,555)	195,183			
NON-COS Energy Total Cycle Energy	84,259 19,657,637							0.24	\$20	
TOTAL CIO REVENUES									\$91	

Cap on Rate Change

1.5 times change from 2006 prices

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I served a copy of the foregoing CITY OF PORTLAND/CITY OF GRESHAM – DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD GRAY, JOHN HARRIS, AND LON L. PETERS ON CUSTOMER IMPACT OFFSET on the individuals on the attached Service List by electronic mail and, for those individuals who have not waived paper service, by First Class Mail with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope with postage paid, and deposited in the post office at Portland, Oregon on said day.

DATED this 9<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2006

Benjamin Walters, OSB #85354

Senior Deputy City Attorney Of Attorneys for City of Portland

## **UE 180 - SERVICE LIST**

KURT J BOEHM MICHAEL L KURTZ BOEHM KURTZ & LOWRY 36 E 7 <sup>TH</sup> ST STE 1510 CINCINATTI OH 45202 kboehm@bkllawfirm.com mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com	JAMES T SELECKY BRUBAKER & ASSOCIATES, INC. 1215 FERN RIDGE PKWY STE 208 ST LOUIS MO 63141 jtselecky@consultbai.com
LOWREY R BROWN JASON EISDORFER CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON 610 SW BROADWAY STE 308 PORTLAND OR 97205 lowrey@oregoncub.org dockets@oregoncub.org	JIM ABRAHAMSON COMMUNITY ACTION DIRECTORS OF OREGON PO BOX 7964 SALEM OR 97303 jim@cado-oregon.org
S BRADLEY VAN CLEVE DAVISON VAN CLEVE 333 SW TAYLOR STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97204 mail@dvclaw.com	STEPHANIE S ANDRUS ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE REGULATED UTILITY & BUSINESS SECT. 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301 stephanie.andrus@state.or.us
KARL HANS TANNER, PRESIDENT OREGON ENERGY COORDINATORS ASSN 2448 W HARVARD BLVD ROSEBURG OR 97470 karl.tanner@ucancap.org	LAURA BEANE, MGR-REGULATION PACIFICORP 825 MULTNOMAH STE 800 PORTLAND OR 97232 laura.beane@pacificorp.com
DOUGLAS C. TINGEY RATES & REGULATORY AFFAIRS PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC 121 SW SALMON 1WTC13 PORTLAND OR 97204 doug.tingy@pgn.com pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com	GEOFFREY M KRONICK LC7 CRAIG SMITH BONNEVILLE POWER ADMIN. PO BOX 3621—L7 PORTLAND OR 97208 gmkronick@bpa.gov cmsmith@bpa.gov

THEODORE E ROBERTS TAMARA FAUCETTE LINDA WRAZEN CHAD M STOKES SEMPRA GLOBAL CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT 1001 SW 5<sup>TH</sup> STE 2000 101 ASH ST HQ 13D & HQ 8C SAN DIEGO CA 92101 PORTLAND OR 97204 troberts@sempra.com tfaucette@chbh.com lwrazen@sempraglobal.com cstokes@chbh.com KATHERINE A MCDOWELL ROBERT VALDEZ MCDOWELL & ASSOCIATES PC PO BOX 2148 520 SW SIXTH AVE, SUITE 830 SALEM OR 97308-2148 PORTLAND OR 97204 bob.valdez@state.or.us katherine@mcd-law.com LON L PETERS JIM DEASON NORTHWEST ECONOMIC RESEARCH 521 SW CLAY ST, SUITE 107 INC. PORTLAND OR 97201-5407 607 SE MANCHESTER PLACE jimdeason@comcast.net PORTLAND OR 97202 lpeters@pacificer.com ANN L. FISHER WILLIAM H. CHEN AF LEGAL & CONSULTING SERVICES CONSTELLATION NEWENERGY INC. 2005 SW 71<sup>ST</sup> AVE 2175 N CALIFORNIA BLVD, SUITE 300 PORTLAND OR 97225 WALNUT CREEK CA 94596 energlaw@aol.com bill.chen@constellation.com DANIEL W. MEEK LORNE WHITTLES ATTORNEY AT LAW EPCOR MERCHANT & CAPITAL INC. 10949 SW 4<sup>TH</sup> AVE 1161 W RIVER ST., SUITE 250 PORTLAND OR 97219 BOISE ID. 83702 dan@meek.net lwhittles@epcor.ca LINDA K. WILLIAMS ANDREA FOGUE KAFOURY & MACDOUGAL LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES 10266 SW LANCASTER RD PO BOX 928 PORTLAND OR 97219-6305 1201 COURT ST, NE, SUITE 200 linda@lindawilliams.net **SALEM OR 97308** afogue@orcities.org

SCOTT H. DEBROFF ELISA M. LARSON SMIGEL, ANDERSON & SACKS ALEX MILLER RIVER CHASE OFFICE CENTER NORTHWEST NATURAL 4431 NORTH FRONT ST. 220 NW 2<sup>ND</sup> AVE HARRISBURG PA 17110 PORTLAND OR 97209 sdebroff@saslip.com elisa.larson@nwnatural.com alex.miller@nwnatural.com RICHARD GRAY DAVID TOOZE CITY OF PORTLAND OFFICE OF CITY OF PORTLAND ENERGY OFFICE TRANSPORTATION  $721 \text{ NW } 9^{\text{TH}} \text{ AVE, SUITE } 350$ 1120 SW 5<sup>th</sup> AVE, RM 800 PORTLAND OR 97209-3447 PORTLAND OR 97204 dtooze@ci.portland.or.us richard.gray@pdxtrans.org HARVARD P SPIGAL DAVID R. RIS PRESTON GATES ELLIS LLP SENIOR ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY 222 SW COLUMBIA ST, SUITE 1400 CITY OF GRESHAM PORTLAND OR 97201-6632 GRESHAM CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE hspigal@prestongates.com 1333 NW EASTMAN PARKWAY GRESHAM OR 97030 david.ris@ci.gresham.or.us JOHN HARRIS CITY OF GRESHAM 1333 NW EASTMAN PARKWAY GRESHAM OR 97030 john.harris@ci.gresham.or.us