1	BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION		
2	OF OREGON		
3	UE 210		
4	In the Matter of		
5	PACIFICORP, dba PACIFIC POWER	STAFF PROPOSED INFORMATION	
6	Request for a General Rate Revision	REQUESTS	
7			
8	I. INTRODUCTION		
9	Pursuant to the schedule adopted in this proceeding, the Public Utility Commission of		
10	Oregon Staff ("Staff") submits its proposed information requests. PacifiCorp's UE 210 filing		
11	lacks testimony and exhibits which should have been included with its original filing in order to		
12	enable a complete review of the case. In order to create a more comprehensive evidentiary		
13	record, Staff requests that the presiding Administrative Law Judges order PacifiCorp to provide		
14	supplemental testimony and exhibits on the items listed in this information request.		
15	The filing of proposed information requests is a new process in this rate case. This		
16	request for supplemental testimony should not interfere with timely responses to Staff's data		
17	requests. Due to the short amount of time until Staff's opening testimony is due, Staff		
18	respectfully requests that the ALJs include in their ruling clarification that PacifiCorp is required		
19	to adhere to the data response time frames as outlined in the prehearing conference memo with		
20	the understanding that supplemental testimony is not a substitute for data responses, and that data		
21	responses are not a substitute for the requested testimony.		
22	Proposed Information Requests		
23	A. Jurisdictional Allocation Factors		
24	PacifiCorp should be required to include a discussion of how retail sales have changed or		
25	are forecasted to change for each jurisdiction (state) from calendar year 2005 through calendar		
26	year 2010 (test year). This discussion should include a comparison of annual sale changes by		

1	jurisdiction. If the rates of change in sales materially differ among the jurisdictions, which we		
2	would expect to be the case, the discussion should explain the key factors causing such		
3	differences, for both actual $(2005 - 2008)$ and forecasted $(2009 \text{ and } 2010)$ levels.		
4	PacifiCorp should be required to include a discussion of how monthly coincidental peak		
5	loads (12 CP) have changed or are forecasted to change by jurisdiction from calendar year 2005		
6	through calendar year 2010. This should include a comparison of annual changes in coincidental		
7	peak by jurisdiction. If the rates of change in monthly coincidental peak loads materially differ		
8	among the jurisdictions, which we again would expect to be the case, this discussion should		
9	explain the key factors causing such differences, for both actual $(2005 - 2008)$ and forecasted		
10	(2009 and 2010) levels.		
11	PacifiCorp should be required to include a discussion of how the adoption of the 20 year		
12	weather data set (1988 through 2007) changes the forecasted energy and peak allocation factors		
13	for calendar year 2010, relative to the previous 30 year NOAA data set (1971 through 2000).		
14	PacifiCorp should also be required to include the following:		
15 16	A discussion of the methods used to adjust sales for temperature.		
17	 A discussion of the methods used to forecast sales, coincident peak loads, and customer numbers by jurisdiction. 		
18 19	 A discussion of how sales estimates are converted into energy deliveries by 		
20	jurisdiction.		
21	B. Load Forecast Data/Studies		
22	PacifiCorp should include a discussion of and data illustrating energy volumes delivered		
23	for each calendar year of the period 2005 through 2008 by both (a) customer class for each		
24			
25			
26			
Page	2 - STAFF PROPOSED INFORMATION REQUESTS		

1404791-v1

1	In addition, PacifiCorp should be required to provide a discussion of:		
2			
3	•	The above requested information in a combination of actual plus forecast for 2009.	
4	•	The above requested information as forecast for the 2010 test year, including,	
5	•	by rate schedule, peak and off-peak periods; i.e, by month by rate schedule by peak and off-peak.	
6		peak and on-peak.	
7	•	A discussion of price elasticities, whether they are used in the load forecasts,	
8		their derivation (studies utilized by the company) and level, and their impact on test year 2010 energy volumes.	
9			
10	•	A discussion of and data related to volume changes for each of the years 2005 through 2009 related to energy efficiency measures for each jurisdiction.	
11			
12	•	A discussion of the statistical models used by PacifiCorp in developing the 2010 test year load forecast, for each jurisdiction; including theoretical bases,	
13		mathematical forms, and relevant statistics.	
14	A discussion of how such st	A discussion of how such statistical models were developed; e.g., a discussion	
15		of any process involving step-wise regression.	
16	•	A discussion of forecasts of or trends in the independent variables used in such	
17		statistical models, including the source of any such forecasts.	
18	•	A discussion of any non-statistical models used by PacifiCorp in developing the	
19		2010 test year load forecast, for each jurisdiction; including theoretical bases	
20		and, if applicable, mathematical forms.	
21	•	A discussion of how these models differ from those used in PacifiCorp's last	
22		Oregon general rate case for forecasting test year energy deliveries in each	
23		jurisdiction.	
24	•	A discussion of the risks and uncertainties associated with the 2010 test year	
25	load forecasts, for each jurisdiction.		
26			

A discussion of and information related to reconciliation of the 2010 test year 1 load forecast with levels of billing determinants as used in the pricing testimony 2 (PPL/1000 through PPL/1003) for Oregon. 3 C. Pricing/Costing 4 For the following requests, Staff has provided a reference to initial testimony that 5 requires supplementation: 6 Reference: Tab 17.4 of Exhibit/907 17. Customer Data. The table lists the System, Feeder, and Transformer "12 Month Average Peak Load Factors" without any backup 7 support – quantitative or verbal. Such would be highly valuable, particularly in light 8 of the counter-intuitively high residential system load factor indicated as 78.75%. 9 Reference: Exhibit PPL/1000 (Griffith/5, Lines 17-23). The testimony 10 indicates a connection between the functionalized costs developed by Mr. Paice and the rates developed in Exhibit PPL/1003. In practice that connection may 11 be tenuous at best. Example: For residential Schedule No. 4 (Exhibit 12 PPL/1003, Griffith/1), Transmission and Ancillary Services Charge is shown to collect \$20.9 million in revenue, whereas Exhibit PPL/905, Paice/1 shows those 13 costs to add up to \$37.5 million. When there are large discrepancies between 14 the underlying costs and the recommended price, PacifiCorp should be required to provide justification and support. 15 16 Reference: Exhibit PPL/1000 (Griffith/6 & 7). PacifiCorp describes the creation of a new Schedule (201) which removes Net Power Costs from the 17 existing Schedule 200. The values in the existing Schedule 200 reflect the 18 differences among schedules in production fixed cost allocations attributed to relative contributions to the annual system/jurisdictional coincident peak. 19 PacifiCorp's Schedule 201 proposal would preserve in the schedule the same 20 rate blocks and ratios as are contained in the existing Schedule 200. But by doing such, the net power cost cost-causative basis that one would expect to 21 underlie the Schedule 201 rates is diluted. PacifiCorp should be required to 22 better explain why it has chosen to depart from developing rates that would better reflect each Schedule's respective Net Power Costs causation. 23 /// 24

///

///

25

26

1	D. UE 199 Proceeding		
2	The UE 199 parties may reach a settlement that provides, among other things, that certain		
3	issues will be litigated within this general rate case docket. If such a UE 199 agreement is		
4	finalized, PacifiCorp should file supplemental testimony on those agreed-upon issues.		
5	II. CONCLUSION		
6	For the foregoing reasons, Staff respectfully requests that PacifiCorp be required to		
7	provide the requested information. Staff also requests that the ALJs' ruling clarify that		
8	supplemental testimony does not release PacifiCorp from their data response obligations.		
9	DATED this 12 th day of May 2009.		
10	Respectfully submitted,		
11			
12	JOHN R. KROGER Attorney General		
13			
14	s/Jason W. Jones Jason W. Jones, #00059		
15	Assistant Attorney General		
16	Of Attorneys for the Public Utility Commission of Oregon		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			

Page 5 - STAFF PROPOSED INFORMATION REQUESTS 1404791-v1

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE		
2	I certify that on May 12, 2009 I served the foregoing Staff Proposed Information		
3	Requests upon the parties in this proceeding by electronic mail and by sending a true, exact and		
4	full copy by regular mail, postage prepaid, or by hand-delivery/shuttle, to the parties accepting		
5	paper service.		
6	CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT ET AL J LAURENCE CABLE	W MCDOWELL & RACKNER PC	
7	1001 SW 5TH AVE STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97204-1136	KATHERINE A MCDOWELL ATTORNEY	
8	lcable@chbh.com CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT ET AL	520 SW SIXTH AVE - SUITE 830 PORTLAND OR 97204 katherine@mcd-law.com	
9	RICHARD LORENZ 1001 SW FIFTH AVE - STE 2000	W	
10	PORTLAND OR 97204-1136 rlorenz@cablehuston.com	PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT JOELLE STEWARD REGULATORY MANAGER	
11	W CITIZEN'S UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON	825 NE MULTNOMAH STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97232	
12	G. CATRIONA MCCRACKEN - CONFIDENTIAL LEGAL COUNSEL/STAFF ATTY	joelle.steward@pacificorp.com	
13	610 SW BROADWAY - STE 308 PORTLAND OR 97205 catriona@oregoncub.org	JORDAN A WHITE SENIOR COUNSEL 825 NE MULTNOMAH STE 1800	
14	W	PORTLAND OR 97232 jordan.white@pacificorp.com	
15	CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON GORDON FEIGHNER ENERGY ANALYSIS	W DACTETOORD DRA DACTETO DOWER	
16	ENERGY ANALYST 610 SW BROADWAY, SUITE 308 PORTLAND OR 97205	PACIFICORP, DBA PACIFIC POWER PACIFIC POWER OREGON DOCKETS 825 NE MULTNOMAH STREET, STE 2000	
17	gordon@oregoncub.org	PORTLAND OR 97232 oregondockets@pacificorp.com	
18 19	ROBERT JENKS - CONFIDENTIAL 610 SW BROADWAY STE 308 PORTLAND OR 97205	W PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC	
20	bob@oregoncub.org	RANDALL DAHLGREN RATES & REGULATORY AFFAIRS	
21	DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC MELINDA J DAVISON - CONFIDENTIAL 333 SW TAYLOR - STE 400	121 SW SALMON ST 1WTC 0702 PORTLAND OR 97204 pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com	
22	PORTLAND OR 97204 mail@dvclaw.com	DOUGLAS C TINGEY	
23	w	ASST GENERAL COUNSEL 121 SW SALMON 1WTC13	
24	MCDOWELL & RACKNER PC AMIE JAMIESON ATTORNEY	PORTLAND OR 97204 doug.tingey@pgn.com	
25	520 SW SIXTH AVE - STE 830 PORTLAND OR 97204	PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION JUDY JOHNSON - CONFIDENTIAL	
26	amie@mcd-law.com	PO BOX 2148 SALEM OR 97308-2148 judy.johnson@state.or.us	

1	RFI CONSULTING INC RANDALL J FALKENBERG - CONFIDENTIAL	
2	PMB 362 8343 ROSWELL RD	
3	SANDY SPRINGS GA 30350 consultrfi@aol.com	
4		Deomadane
5		Neoma Lane
6		Legal Secretary Department of Justice
7		Regulated Utility & Business Section
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	•	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		•
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

Page 2 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE – UE 210