

900 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600 Portland, Oregon 97204 main 503.224.3380 fax 503.220.2480 www.stoel.com

May 20, 2005

SARAH J. ADAMS LIEN Direct (503) 294-9896 sjadamslien@stoel.com

## VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

PUC Filing Center Public Utility Commission of Oregon PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97308-2148

Re: PacifiCorp's Reply to ICNU's Response in Opposition to PacifiCorp's Application Docket UE 173

Enclosed for filing is PacifiCorp's Reply to the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities' Response in Opposition to PacifiCorp's Application in the above-referenced docket. A copy of this filing was served on all parties to this proceeding as indicated on the attached service list.

Very truly yours,

Sarah J. Adams Lien

SJL:knp Enclosure

cc: Service List

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION 1 OF OREGON 2 **UE 173** 3 4 In the Matter of PACIFICORP (d/b/a Pacific PACIFICORP'S REPLY TO Power & Light) Application for Approval of THE INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism. OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO 6 PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION 7 8 Pursuant to OAR § 860-013-0035, PacifiCorp (or the "Company") hereby replies to The Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities' ("ICNU") Response in Opposition to 10 PacifiCorp's Application ("Response in Opposition"), filed May 12, 2005. 11 While disayowing any intent to substantively respond to PacifiCorp's Application in this Docket, ICNU's Response in Opposition seems to wish to make the following points: 12 13 1. There is something insidious about the Company's decision to seek to 14 implement a Power Cost Adjustment ("PCAM") in a proceeding separate 15 from its general rate case filing. 2. 16 ICNU remains concerned about the Company's proposal to consolidate this 17 Docket with its hydro-deferral application in Docket UM 1193. 18 3. The proposed PCAM should not be considered until after PacifiCorp's 19 ongoing general rate case in Docket UE 170 is resolved. 20 The Commission should conduct hearings in respect to the proposed 4. 21 PCAM. 22 PacifiCorp replies as follows to these concerns: 23 <sup>1</sup> ICNU's "Response," and hence this Reply, are something of a procedural oddity. The Response was purportedly filed pursuant to OAR § 860-013-0025 which is the Commission rule pertaining to answers to complaints. Accordingly, PacifiCorp's Reply is being filed pursuant to OAR 860-013-0035.

Page 1 - PACIFICORP'S REPLY TO INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- 1. PacifiCorp is unaware of any requirement to include all proposed tariff changes in general rate case proceedings. PacifiCorp believed that its PCAM proposal was of sufficient importance as to be best considered in a separate docket and proceeded accordingly.
  - 2. The consolidation of this Docket and Docket UM 1193 will be considered and presumably resolved at the prehearing conference scheduled for May 25, 2005. However, PacifiCorp is perplexed by ICNU's assertion that it "does not believe that there is any relationship between the PCAM and the hydro deferral." ICNU Response in Opposition at 3. The Company believes this assertion is misplaced for two reasons: a) The Commission has already recognized a policy linkage between the two concepts, see In re Portland General Electric, Order 04-108 at 10 (2004); and b) if nothing else, the PCAM and the hydro deferral application have a necessary mechanical relationship. If the Commission approves both the Company's hydro deferral application and the PCAM, the timing of the collection of deferred hydro costs and the PCAM results will have to be reconciled. In light of the other concerns raised in the ICNU Response in Opposition, the Company suspects that had it proposed separate consideration of the PCAM and the hydro deferral, ICNU would have found that to be somehow sneaky and underhanded.
  - 3. While PacifiCorp does not concur with ICNU's suggestion that the PCAM cannot or should not be considered until the general rate case is resolved, PacifiCorp expects this order of consideration will occur in any event. The general rate case order must issue no later than September 12, 2005. PacifiCorp intends to propose that hearings in this Docket not commence until

Page 2 - PACIFICORP'S REPLY TO INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION

1	mid-September so as to adhere to Judge Logan's expectation that this case
2	will be resolved by mid-November.
3	4. The Company has always expected that its PCAM Application would be
4	subject to hearings.
5	DATED: May 20, 2005
6	
7	STOEL RIVES, LLP
8	
9	Katherine A. McDowell for
10	GEORGE M. GALLOWAY
11	ATTORNEY AT LAW
12	
13	
14	George M. Galloway Attorneys for PacifiCorp
15	J I V
16	
17	

Page 3 - PACIFICORP'S REPLY TO INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES' RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 2 I hereby certify that I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing document in 3 Docket UE 173 on the following named person(s) on the date indicated below by email and first-class mail, addressed to said person(s) at his or her last-known address(es) indicated 5 below. 6 Lowrey R Brown Jason Eisdorfer Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon 7 610 SW Broadway, Suite 308 610 SW Broadway Ste 308 Portland OR 97205 Portland OR 97205 8 9 D Douglas Larson Maury Galbraith PacifiCorp **Public Utility Commission** 10 One Utah Center Po Box 2148 201 South Main Street, Suite 2300 Salem OR 97308-2148 11 Salt Lake City UT 84111 DATED: May 20, 2005. 12 13 14 Katherine A. McDowell 15 Of Attorneys for PacifiCorp 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

Page 1 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UE 173)

26