

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

UE 263

In the Matter of

PACIFICORP D/B/A PACIFIC POWER,

Request for a General Rate Revision.

BENCH REQUEST

On July 9, 2013, the parties filed a stipulation proposing to solve all issues in this docket.¹ On August 6, 2013, the parties filed joint testimony in support of the stipulation. In order for the Commission to better understand the proposed stipulation, the stipulating parties are directed to respond to the following questions by close of business **November 27, 2013**.

1. Testimony at PAC/100, Reiten/4 explains that the primary driver of Pacific Power's requested price increase is the revised depreciation rates in docket UM 1647. The testimony further states that the revenue requirement impact associated with the implementation of the revised depreciation rates is reflected in the testimony and exhibits of Mr. Tawwater. In turn, Mr. Tawwater states that the proposed rates in UM 1647 increase Oregon's allocated share of depreciation and amortization expense by \$27.2 million.²

Please point to the specific pre-filed testimony and/or exhibits that would allow the Commission to understand the revenue requirement impact of the revised depreciation rates on both the revenue requirement increase as originally filed and the stipulated revenue requirement increase. Evidence addressing the revenue requirement impact may well be found within the record, but is not explained or readily apparent. Alternatively, the parties are directed to provide supplemental testimony sufficient to allow the Commission to understand the rate impact of the revised depreciation rates.

¹ The parties to the stipulation are: PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power; Public Utility Commission of Oregon Staff; the Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon; the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities; Fred Meyer Stores and Quality Food Centers, divisions of the Kroger Co.; Noble Americas Energy Solutions; and Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.

² See PAC/1000, Tawwater/23.

2. If it is not evident from the answer above, please provide a summary listing the major components of the parties' stipulated \$23.7 million revenue requirement increase. Please see the chart in docket UE 217, Joint Testimony/100, Joint Parties/17, as an example that the Commission would find helpful in analyzing the stipulated amounts.

Dated this 18th day of November, 2013, at Salem, Oregon.



Sarah Rowe
Administrative Law Judge