

1 **BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**
2 **OF OREGON**

3 **DR 38**

4 In the Matter of

5 PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER &
6 LIGHT COMPANY, and

7 HCA MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC

8 Joint Petition for Declaratory Ruling

STAFF'S OPENING BRIEF

9 **I. INTRODUCTION**

10 Petitioners, PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power & Light Company ("Pacific Power") and HCA
11 Management Company, LLC, operator of the Myra Lynne Mobile Home Park ("Myra Lynne"),
12 have requested that the Commission resolve a potential conflict between ORS 90.532 and Pacific
13 Power's General Service rate schedules and its Rule 2, Section O, on the one hand, and
14 ORS 90.536. Staff of the Public Utility Commission of Oregon ("Staff") files its opening brief
15 pursuant to the May 11, 2007, Prehearing Report.

16 **II. DISCUSSION**

17 **Issue 1. Prior to the time HB 2247 became effective, was Myra Lynne Mobile Home**
18 **Park, which was receiving service under Schedule 48¹ from Pacific Power,**
19 **required as a condition of service to bill each of its sub-metered² tenants for**
electricity at the Pacific Power, Schedule 4³ rate, in accordance with Pacific
Power's Schedule 48 Special Conditions and Rule 2, Section O?

20 Pacific Power's General Service rate schedules, as approved by the Commission,
21 constitute its filed rates for purposes of ORS 757.225, which provides:

22 No public utility shall charge, demand, collect or receive a greater or less
23 compensation for any service performed by it within the state, or for any service in
24 connection therewith, than is specified in printed rate schedules as may at the time
be in force or demand, collect, or receive any rate not specified in such schedule.

25 ¹ Schedule 48 is Pacific Power's general schedule for nonresidential service.

26 ² Sub-meters owned by Myra Lynne Mobile Home Park

³ Schedule 4 is Pacific Power's schedule for residential service.

1 The rates named therein are the lawful rates until they are changed as provided in
2 ORS 757.210 to 757.220.

3 Prior to January 2, 2006, the date that HB 2247 became effective, Myra Lynne received utility
4 service under Pacific Power's Schedule 48, the general schedule for nonresidential service.
5 Myra Lynne would then bill each of its sub-metered tenants for electricity under Pacific Power's
6 Schedule 4, the schedule for residential service.

7 Each of Pacific Power's general service rate schedules, approved and on file with the
8 Commission, contains the following provision:

9 **Special Conditions**

10 The Consumer shall not resell electric service received from the Company under
11 provisions of this Schedule to any person, except by written permission of the
12 Company and where the Consumer meters and bills any of his tenants at the
13 Company's regular tariff rate for the type of service which such tenant may actually
14 receive.

15 Section "O" of Pacific Power's Rule 2, which is approved and on file with the Commission,
16 imposes the same requirement on the "Consumer":

17 **Resale of Service**

18 Resale of service shall be limited to Consumer's tenants using such service entirely
19 within property described in the written agreement. Service resold to tenants shall
20 be metered and billed to each tenant at Company's regular tariff rate schedule
21 applicable to the type of service actually furnished the tenant. Consumer shall
22 indemnify Company for any and all liabilities, actions or claims for an injury, loss
23 or damage to persons or property arising from the results of service by Consumer.

24 These provisions require Myra Lynne, as reseller of service measured through a submeter, to bill
25 its tenants at the Pacific Power Residential Rate, Schedule 4, as a condition of service under the
26 General Service Rate. Pacific Power Rate Schedule 4 is the "Company's regular tariff rate
27 schedule applicable to the type of service actually furnished the tenant."

28 ///

29 ///

30 ///

31 ///

1 **Issue 2. In enacting HB 2247, the legislature added ORS 90.532 and ORS 90.536 to**
2 **the Manufactured Dwelling and Floating Home section, ORS 90.505 to**
3 **90.840, of the Residential Landlord Tenant Act. See ORS Chapter 90.**

4 **a. Under ORS 90.532 and ORS 90.536, may Myrna Lynne Mobile Home**
5 **Park, as a Schedule 48 customer of Pacific Power, bill each of its sub-metered**
6 **tenants for electricity at the Schedule 4 Residential Rate, as a condition of**
7 **service under Schedule 48, and Rule 2, Section O; or**

8 **b. Under ORS 90.532 and ORS 90.536, must Myra Lynne Mobile Home**
9 **Park, as a Schedule 48 customer of Pacific Power, also bill each of its sub-**
10 **metered tenants at the same Schedule 48 rate it is billed by Pacific Power?**

11 Our goal in interpreting a statute is to determine the intent of the legislature. *PGE v.*
12 *Bureau of Labor and Industries (PGE)*, 317 Or 606, 610, 859 P2d 1143 (1993); ORS 174.020.

13 We start by examining a statute’s text and context, with text being the better evidence of
14 legislative intent. In interpreting text, we consider statutory and judicially developed rules of
15 construction that “bear directly on how to read the text,” such as “not to insert what has been
16 omitted or to omit what has been inserted,” and to give words of common usage their “plain,
17 natural and ordinary meaning.” *PGE*, at 611; ORS 174.010. The context of a statute includes
18 other provisions of the same statute, prior versions of the statute and other related statutes, as
19 well as case law interpreting those statutes. *PGE*, at 610; *SAIF Corporation v. Walker*, 330 Or
20 102, 108, 996 P2d 979 (2000). If a statute’s text and context unambiguously disclose the
21 legislature’s intent, the inquiry ends there. *PGE*, at 610-11. Only if the legislative intent is not
22 clear from the text and context are we to take account of legislative history to attempt to discern
23 the intent. *PGE*, at 611-12. If after considering text, context and legislative history, the intent of
24 the legislature remains unclear, we may resort to general maxims of statutory construction to
25 resolve any remaining uncertainty as to the meaning of the statute. *PGE*, at 612.

26 ///

///

///

///

1 ORS 90.532 enumerates the acceptable methods by which a landlord may provide or
2 account for utility or service charges to tenants.⁴ ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C) states in relevant part:

3 (1) Subject to the policies of the utility or service provider, a landlord may
4 provide for utilities or services to tenants by one or more of the following
5 billing methods:

6 * * * * *

7 (c) A relationship between the landlord, tenant and utility or service
8 provider in which:

9 * * * * *

10 (C) The landlord uses a submeter to measure the utility or
11 service actually provided to the space and bills the tenant for a
12 utility or service charge for the amount provided. [Emphasis
13 supplied].

14 ORS 90.532(1) begins with the phrase “[s]ubject to the policies of the utility or service
15 provider.” The noun “subject” means “**1**: one that is placed under the authority, dominion,
16 control, or influence of someone or something: **a**: one bound in allegiance or service to a feudal
17 superior: VASSAL **b** (1): one subject to a monarch or ruler and governed by his law.”
18 WEBSTER’S THIRD NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY (unabridged 1993) at 2275.
19 The phrase “subject to” means “governed or affected by.” *Northwest Forest Resources Council*
20 *v. Glickam*, 82 F.3d 825, 833 (9th Cir. 1996); *see also U.S. ex rel. Tottten v. Bombadier Corp.*,
21 286 F.3d 542, 547 (D. C. Cir. 2002) (“[A]n entity is ‘subject to’ a particular legal regime when it
22 is regulated by, or made answerable under, that regime.”); *Texaco Inc. v. Duhe*, 274 F.3d 911,
23 918-19, (5th Cir. 2001)(holding that natural gas became “‘subject to’ an existing contract” within
24 the meaning of the Natural Gas Policy Act when it was “governed by” terms of that contract);
25 *Michelin Tires (Canada) Ltd. v. First Nat’l Bank of Boston*, 666 F.2d 673, 677 (1st Cir. 1981)
26 (“The words ‘subject to,’ used in the ordinary sense, mean ‘subordinate to,’ ‘subservient to,’ or
‘limited by.’”); *Burgess Const. Co. v. M. Morrin & Son Co.*, 526 F.2d 108, 113 (10th Cir. 1975).

⁴ “Utility or service” charges includes charges for electricity. *See* ORS 90.531(2); ORS 90.315.

1 The phrase “subject to the policies of the utility or service provider” in ORS 90.532(1)
2 means that a landlord’s method of billing tenants for utility or service charges is governed by,
3 and is subordinate to, the policies of the utility or service provider. Applied here,
4 ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C) requires that, in submetering its tenants for their electrical usage, Myra
5 Lynne must comply with Pacific Power’s Large General Service Schedule 48 and its Rule 2,
6 Section O, by billing those tenants at the Residential Schedule 4 rate with the Schedule 98 credits
7 associated with the Residential Exchange Program (REP) of the Bonneville Power
8 Administration (BPA).⁵

9 However, ORS 90.536, which was also enacted as part of HB 2247, may conflict with
10 that interpretation of ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C). ORS 90.536 states:

11 (1) If a written rental agreement so provides, a landlord using the billing
12 method described in ORS 90.532 (1)(c) may require a tenant to pay to the
13 landlord a utility or service charge that has been billed by a utility or service
14 provider to the landlord for utility or service provided directly to the
15 tenant’s space as measured by a submeter.

16 (2) A utility or service charge to be assessed to a tenant under this section
17 may consist of:

- 18 (a) The cost of the utility or service provided to the tenant’s space
19 and under the tenant’s control, as measured by the submeter,
20 at a rate no greater than the average rate billed to the landlord
21 by the utility or service provider, not including any base or
22 service charge;
- 23 (b) ***; and
- 24 (c) A pro rata portion of any base or service charge billed to the
25 landlord by the utility or service provider, including but not
26 limited to any tax passed through by the provider.

(3) A utility or service charge to be assessed to a tenant under this section
may not include:

- (a) Any additional charge, including any costs of the landlord, for
the installation, maintenance or operation of the utility or
service system or any profit for the landlord; or

⁵ Pacific Power’s Schedule 98 credit was suspended as of June 1, 2007 after BPA suspended the REP following a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling finding that BPA exceeded its authority by entering into settlement agreements related to the REP. *See Golden Northwest Aluminum, Inc. v. Bonneville Power Administration*, 2007 WL 1289539 (9th Cir. 2007) and *Portland General Electric Company v. Bonneville Power Administration*, 2007 WL 1288786 (9th Cir. 2007).

1 (b) Any costs to provide a utility or service to common areas of
the facility.

2 Pacific Power provides electric utility service to Myra Lynne. Myra Lynne provides
3 electric utility service, measured by submeter, to its tenants per a written rental agreement and
4 bills its tenants in accordance with ORS 90.532(1)(c). Thus, ORS 90.536 applies to Myra
5 Lynne.

6 ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C) directs that Myra Lynne, in submetering its tenants for their
7 electrical usage, must comply with Pacific Power's Large General Service Schedule 48 and its
8 Rule 2, Section O, by billing those tenants at the Residential Schedule 4 rate with the Schedule
9 98 credits associated with the REP. But if ORS 90.536(2)(a) is followed, Myra Lynne would be
10 required to bill its tenants based on the Schedule 48 general service rate at which it is billed by
11 Pacific Power -- plus the pro rata adders permitted by ORS 90.536(2)(c), not the Schedule 4
12 residential rate. Use of the word "may" in ORS 90.536(2) suggests that the language is
13 permissive rather than mandatory. If ORS 90.536(2)(a) is read as permissive it would not
14 conflict with ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C). But if ORS 90.536(2) is read as mandatory it conflicts with
15 ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C).

16 ORS 90.536(3)(a) states that a "utility or service charge to be assessed to a tenant under
17 this section may not include * * * [a]ny additional charge, including any costs of the landlord for
18 the installation, maintenance or operation of the utility or service system or any profit for the
19 landlord..." Myra Lynne, in billing its tenants based on the Schedule 4 residential rate, is clearly
20 not "including any additional charge * * * for the installation, maintenance or operation of the
21 utility or service system..." But the statute's clause regarding "profit for the landlord" presents a
22 closer question. It may be argued that Myra Lynne, in billing its tenants based on the Schedule 4
23 residential rate, as directed by Pacific Power's tariff under ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C), while it is
24 receiving the power at the lower Schedule 48 rate, is getting a profit for the landlord. But Myra
25 Lynne is merely billing the tenants at the Schedule 4 residential rate, as directed by Pacific

1 Power’s tariff under ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C), and has not “included any additional charge” for
2 profit.

3 If Myra Lynne billing its tenants at the higher Schedule 4 residential rate is viewed as an
4 “additional charge” under ORS 90.536(3)(a), then compliance with both ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C)
5 and ORS 90.536(2) is impossible. We are able to give effect to a consistent legislative policy
6 only if we read ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C) as mandatory and ORS 90.536(2)(a) as permissive. In
7 enacting ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C), the legislature explicitly directed that billing methods followed
8 by landlords are “[s]ubject to the policies of the utility or service provider.” This language
9 indicates that the legislature intended that landlords comply with the utility provider’s policies.
10 The legislature certainly knows how to make a statute mandatory. In contrast with the explicit
11 directive of ORS 90.532(1), the legislature chose to use the word “may” in ORS 90.536(2)(a).
12 This indicates that the legislature intended ORS 90.536(2) to be permissive. Under Staff’s
13 construction, ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C) is mandatory and controls. ORS 90.536(2)(a) would be
14 treated as permissive and would apply where it does not conflict with ORS 90.532, such as when
15 the utility provider policies do not govern the rate that tenants are charged by the landlords.

16 **Legislative History of HB 2247**

17 Staff believes that under first level analysis the better interpretation of ORS
18 90.532(1)(c)(C) and ORS 90.536(2) is that Myra Lynne should bill its tenants under the directive
19 of ORS 90.532. However, because there is some ambiguity, we may look at the legislative
20 history of HB 2247 to see if the legislature’s intent can be clarified.

21 Exhibit D is a document entitled “COMMENTS ON HOUSE BILL 2247 WITH DASH 1
22 AMENDMENTS, Testimony Before the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Civil Law.” John
23 VanLandingham, attorney for the Lane County Law and Advocacy Center, prepared the
24 testimony and delivered it on June 13, 2005. The testimony provides a section-by-section
25 analysis of the bill that enacted ORS 90.532 and ORS 90.536. Mr. VanLandingham noted in his
26 testimony that the bill was the result of negotiations among a broad array of trade associations

1 and other groups interested in landlord-tenant law. *Id.* at 1-2. He also notes the involvement of
2 the Commission in making recommendations regarding the language of relevant provisions of
3 the bill. *Id.* at 6, 8, 9, and 10.

4 Regarding Section 6 of HB 2247, which became ORS 90.532, Mr. VanLandingham
5 provided the following explanation:

6 “One over-riding general principal (sic) is that the landlord must comply with the
7 policies of the utility provider concerned with that utility service. For regulated
8 utilities, that necessarily implicates state policies as well. Examples include utility
9 rates and requirements for utility hookup procedures.”

10 Exhibit D at 7.

11 In his testimony on the purpose of Section 8 of HB 2247, which became ORS 90.536,
12 Mr. VanLandingham described that new statutory provision as follows:

13 “With regard to the cost of the service, as a result of PUC recommendations this
14 section refers to the average rate billed to the landlord by the provider, since there
15 may be a range of rates charged, based on the amount of the service consumed. In
16 addition, the “no greater than” phrase reflects that utility provider policies might
17 require a landlord to charge the tenant a rate that is lower than the rate the provider
18 uses to bill the landlord -- a residential rate instead of a commercial rate, for
19 example.

20 The sub meter utility charge may not include service to common areas (although
21 the landlord could use the master meter method, if the rental agreement so
22 provides). And it may not include any additional charge, for example profit, or the
23 landlord’s costs to install, maintain, or operate the system, for example, the cost of
24 hiring a company to read the submeters. These costs should be treated as operating
25 expenses, which, as with any operating expense, are normally recovered in the
26 rent.” [Emphasis supplied.]

19 Exhibit D at 7-8.

20 Thus, HB 2247’s legislative history indicates that the legislature’s “over-riding general
21 princip[le]” was to require landlords to comply with the utility provider’s policies, including its
22 policies regarding rates. This indicates that Myra Lynne should follow Pacific Power’s tariffs
23 and schedules, i.e. that Myra Lynne should follow Schedule 48 requirements and Rule 2, Section
24 O, which require Myra Lynne to bill its tenants under Residential Schedule 4 and apply the
25 Schedule 98 credits that Myra Lynne is receiving.

1 Mr. VanLandingham testified that, under what is now ORS 90.536, a landlord “may not
2 include any additional charge, for example profit, or the landlord’s costs to install, maintain, or
3 operate the system...” But the landlord following the billing rate imposed by the service
4 provider is not “including an additional charge ...for profit.” Myra Lynne billing the tenants at
5 the Schedule 4 residential rate as directed by Pacific Power’s tariff under ORS 90.532(1) (c) (C),
6 even if the Schedule 4 rate is higher than the Schedule 48 general rate, is not an additional charge
7 for profit.

8 The view that ORS 90.532 should control is also supported Mr. VanLandingham’s
9 testimony involving a hypothetical in which the utility bills the landlord at a commercial rate
10 higher than its residential rate. In that circumstance, Mr. VanLandingham suggests “the no
11 greater than” phrase reflects that utility provider policies might require a landlord to charge the
12 tenant a rate that is lower than the rate the provider uses to bill the landlord – a residential rate
13 instead of a commercial rate, for example.” Thus, in Mr. VanLandingham’s view, the utility
14 provider policies in force under ORS 90.532 control and would require a landlord to bill the
15 tenants at a rate that is *lower* than the rate that the provider uses to bill the landlord.

16 Legislative history supports the conclusion that the legislature, in enacting ORS
17 90.532(1)(c)(C) and ORS 90.536(2), intended that landlords comply with the utility provider’s
18 policies, including its policies regarding rates. Myra Lynne should bill its tenants under the
19 directive of ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C).

20 **General Maxims**

21 If after considering text, context and legislative history, the intent of the legislature
22 remains unclear, we may resort to general maxims of statutory construction to resolve any
23 remaining uncertainty as to the meaning of the statute. *PGE*, at 612.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

1 It has been said of “rules” or “maxims” of statutory construction that:

2 “Each of these common sense approaches fits some cases but not others,
3 each has “exceptions” and opposite-and-equal counterparts, and each causes more
4 harm than it is worth if it is not cheerfully ignored whenever it is an obstacle to
5 understanding what the legislature enacted. “References to “rules,” “maxims” or
6 “aids” to statutory construction might pass as merely a difference in the style of
7 opinions, which is a personal matter, if it were not for the risk that they will be
mistaken by courts and counsel as directives for how to argue and decide statutory
questions.’ * * * *Davis v. Wasco IBD*, 286 Or 261, 274-75, 593 P2d 1152 (1979)
(Linde, J. concurring).” *Whipple v. Howser*, 291 Or 475, 482, 632 P2d 782
(1981).

8 Rather than choosing between competing maxims, we look to the touchstone of statutory
9 analysis: legislative intent. As the Oregon Supreme Court has emphasized, “when construing
10 any statutory provision the duty of this court [and this office] is to ‘discern and declare the intent
11 of the legislature.’ *Fifth Ave. Corp. v. Washington Co.*, 282 Or 591, 596, 581 P2d 50 (1978); see
12 also ORS 174.020.” *Whipple v. Howser*, supra, 291 Or at 479.

13 Legislative intent is gleaned primarily from the statutory language. ORS 174.010. As we
14 have already discussed, in enacting ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C), the legislature explicitly directed that
15 billing methods followed by landlords are “[s]ubject to the policies of the utility or service
16 provider.” Similarly, legislative history indicates that the legislature’s central “over-riding
17 general princip[le]” was to require landlords to comply with the utility provider’s policies,
18 including its policies regarding rates. In contrast with the explicit directive ORS 90.532(1), the
19 legislature chose to use the word “may” in ORS 90.536(2)(a). One maxim that would apply here
20 is that the legislature is presumed to know of existing law when enacting legislation.

21 Accordingly, it knew that Pacific Power’s General Services rate schedules, as approved by the
22 Commission, constitute its filed rates. There is no indication that the legislature intended to
23 disturb Pacific Power’s filed rates and rules that require that Myra Lynne, as a condition of
24 service, to bill its tenants under Pacific Power’s Residential Rate Schedule 4, the “Company’s
25 regular tariff rate schedule applicable to the type of service actually furnished the tenant.”

26

1 **Issue 3. If Myra Lynne Mobile Home Park is required to bill each of its sub-metered**
2 **tenants at the Schedule 48 nonresidential rate rather than the Schedule 4**
3 **residential rate, are the Myra Lynne Mobile Home Park tenants still eligible**
4 **for the residential credit generally available to residential consumers under**
5 **Pacific Power’s Schedule 98?**

6 As described above, the legislature, in enacting ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C) and ORS 90.536(2),
7 intended that landlords comply with the utility provider’s policies, including its policies
8 regarding rates. Myra Lynne should bill its tenants under the directive of ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C).
9 However, if it is determined that Myra Lynne residents should be billed at the Schedule 48
10 nonresidential commercial rate, are the tenants still entitled to the REP rate credit?

11 Exhibit F is a copy of a June 2002 document prepared by the BPA entitled “Customer
12 Load Eligibility Guidelines For the Investor Owned Utilities’ Residential Exchange Program
13 Settlement Agreements. (“BPA Guidelines”).” BPA indicates the following in the introduction
14 of this document:

15 “The purpose of this document is to provide a set of guidelines that will
16 assist utilities in determining whether or not a load meets the definition of
17 residential and small farm use under the Northwest Power Act. Customer loads
18 that meet the definition are eligible for REP Settlement Benefits provided the
19 customer is served under a rate schedule listed on Exhibit A to the REP Settlement
20 Agreement.”

21 Thus, the BPA Guidelines suggest a two-part test: (1) the load must meet the definition of
22 residential or small farm use under the Northwest Power Act; and (2) the customer must be
23 served under a rate schedule listed on Exhibit A to the REP Settlement Agreement.

24 Section 3(18) of the Northwest Power Act defines “residential use” or “residential load”
25 as “all usual residential, apartment, seasonal dwelling and farm electrical loads or uses, but only
26 the first four hundred horsepower during any monthly billing period of farm irrigation and
27 pumping from any farm.” Moreover, the BPA Guidelines specifically list “Trailer Park/Mobile
28 Home Park” as “[e]ligible – if residents stay longer than 30 days, otherwise ineligible.” *Id.* at 11.
29 The Myra Lynne residents fit within Northwest Power Act definition of customer loads eligible
30 for REP Settlement Benefits.

1 Under the REP Settlement Agreement between BPA and Pacific Power, “Residential
2 Load’ means the load eligible to receive benefits under this Agreement, as such load is defined in
3 Exhibit B,” which provides that “Residential Load means the sum of the loads within the Pacific
4 Northwest eligible for the Resident Exchange Program under the tariff schedules described
5 below.” Schedule 48 is not a tariff schedule that is listed in the Residential Load definition.
6 Accordingly, if it is determined that Myra Lynne tenants should be billed at the Schedule 48 rate,
7 those tenants do not appear to be eligible to receive the rate credit associated with the REP under
8 the BPA Guidelines.

9 The Myra Lynne residents fit within the Northwest Power Act’s definition of customer
10 loads eligible for REP Settlement Benefits. But Schedule 48 is not a listed on Exhibit B of the
11 REP Settlement Agreement. Pacific Power may request BPA to revise Exhibit B to include
12 Schedule 48 within the “Residential Load” definition for the amount of electricity delivered
13 under Schedule 48 that is consumed by end-users that meet the definition of residential
14 customers under the REP.⁶

15 Although a strict reading of the BPA Guidelines would require that Exhibit B be revised
16 to add Schedule 48 as an additional qualifying tariff schedule, BPA has not always required such
17 a revision. In Docket No. UE 190, Advice No. 07-03 (April 30, 2007), the Commission
18 approved Idaho Power Company’s request to amend its Schedule 98 to allow certain long-term
19 care facilities to be eligible to receive the Residential and Small Farm energy credit. Qualified
20 long-term care facilities included those taking service under Schedule 7 and 9 who are not
21 providing full medical care to residents and where the average patient stay is 30 days or longer.
22 Idaho Power’s request was supported by a BPA letter which indicated that nursing homes,
23 assisted living facilities, and similar facilities qualify for the REP credit if they are not providing

24 _____

25 ⁶ Exhibit B, Section 7 provides: “This Exhibit B shall be revised to incorporate additional qualifying tariff
26 schedules, subject to BPA’s determination that the loads served under these schedules are qualified under the
Northwest Power Act.”

1 full medical care to residents and have an average patient stay of 30 days or longer. BPA
2 approved Idaho Power extending REP benefits to long-term care facilities even though they
3 receive power under Schedule 7 and Schedule 9, neither of which is listed on Schedule B of
4 Idaho Power's REP Agreement with BPA. *See* Exhibit J.

5 **III. CONCLUSION**

6 Text and context, legislative history, and general maxims of statutory construction all
7 support the conclusion that the legislature, in enacting ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C) and ORS 90.536(2),
8 intended that landlords comply with the utility provider's policies, including its policies
9 regarding rates. Myra Lynne should bill its tenants under the directive of ORS 90.532(1)(c)(C).

10 However, if it is determined that Myra Lynne residents should be billed at the
11 Schedule 48 rate under ORS 90.536(2), a strict reading of the BPA Guidelines suggests that
12 Myra Lynne residents would not be entitled to REP benefits because Schedule 48 is not listed on
13 Exhibit B of the REP Settlement Agreement. But even where a class of residential customers is
14 served under a tariff that this not listed on Schedule B of the utilities' REP Agreement, BPA has
15 approved their receipt of REP benefits where they were clearly entitled to those benefits.
16 Nevertheless, Pacific Power should seek a determination from BPA that the Myra Lynne
17 residents are eligible. Pacific Power should also request that BPA revise Exhibit B to include
18 Schedule 48 within the "Residential Load" definition to the extent that residential customers are
19 served under Schedule 48.

20 DATED this 2nd day of July 2007.

21 Respectfully submitted,
22
23 HARDY MYERS
Attorney General
24 s/David B. Hatton
25 David B. Hatton, #75151
Assistant Attorney General
26 Of Attorneys for Staff of the Public Utility
Commission of Oregon

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2
3 I certify that on July 2, 2007, I served the foregoing upon all parties of record in this
4 proceeding by delivering a copy by electronic mail and by mailing a copy by postage prepaid
5 first class mail or by hand delivery/shuttle mail to the parties accepting paper service.

6 **W**

7 **CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON**

8 LOWREY R BROWN
9 UTILITY ANALYST
610 SW BROADWAY - STE 308
PORTLAND OR 97205
lowrey@oregoncub.org

10 JASON EISDORFER
11 ENERGY PROGRAM DIRECTOR
610 SW BROADWAY STE 308
PORTLAND OR 97205
jason@oregoncub.org

12 ROBERT JENKS
13 610 SW BROADWAY STE 308
PORTLAND OR 97205
bob@oregoncub.org

14 **DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP**
15 JOHN A CAMERON
1300 SW FIFTH AVENUE STE 2300
16 PORTLAND OR 97201
johncameron@dwt.com

PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT

MICHELLE R MISHOE
LEGAL COUNSEL
825 NE MULTNOMAH STE 1800
PORTLAND OR 97232
michelle.mishoe@pacificorp.com

PACIFICORP

OREGON DOCKETS
825 NE MULTNOMAH ST
STE 2000
PORTLAND OR 97232
oregondockets@pacificorp.com

PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

DEBORAH GARCIA
PO BOX 2148
SALEM OR 97308-2148
deborah.garcia@state.or.us

17
18 s/David B. Hatton
19 David B. Hatton
20 Assistant Attorney General
21 Regulated Utility & Business Section
22
23
24
25
26