1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION **OF OREGON** 2 UM 3 In the Matter of the Application of PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT (d/b/a PacifiCorp) for a PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR Deferred Accounting Order Regarding DEFERRED ACCOUNTING Certain Tax Expenses 6 I. INTRODUCTION 7 On September 28, 2005, the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (the 8 "Commission") issued its final rate order in Docket UE 170, Order No.05-1050 ("the Order"). The Order included a \$26.6 million revenue requirement reduction based upon the provisions of Senate Bill 408 ("SB 408" or the "Act"). Concurrent with the filing of this Application for Deferred Accounting, PacifiCorp has filed an Application for Reconsideration and Rehearing of the Order pursuant to ORS 756.561 and OAR 860-014-0095. See In re PacifiCorp, UE 170, Application for Reconsideration or Rehearing (filed Oct. 28, 2005) ("Application for Reconsideration"). In the Application, PacifiCorp requests that the Commission reconsider and eliminate 16 the \$26.6 million adjustment by calculating PacifiCorp's tax expense using the stand-alone ratemaking rules and practices in effect throughout the pendency of that case. In the alternative, PacifiCorp requests that the Commission grant rehearing and allow PacifiCorp to present evidence demonstrating the factual inaccuracy, as well as the financial impact, of the tax expense adjustment. Such evidence demonstrates that, even under the rationale applied by the Commission in the Order, the adjustment should be no more than \$2.3 million. Under ORS 757.259 and OAR 860-027-0300, PacifiCorp applies to the Commission 23 for an order authorizing the Company to defer from the date of this application forward the revenue shortfall related to the tax expenses disallowed in the Order. PacifiCorp seeks 26 deferral of this shortfall in order to accurately track and preserve such costs for later

Page 1 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

1	incorporation in rates through an amortization sc	chedule. PacifiCorp requests that the deferral	
2	continue until the Commission resolves PacifiCorp's concurrently filed Application for		
3	Reconsideration, but in no event longer than twelve months from the date of this filing. If		
4	the Commission grants the Application for Reconsideration, deferred accounting is necessary		
5	for PacifiCorp to receive meaningful relief. In the meantime, no harm will inure to		
6	ratepayers from the deferred account because, presumably, the Commission will not permit		
7	amortization of the deferred account until PacifiCorp receives a final ruling eliminating or		
8	reducing the tax adjustment.		
9	II. NOTICE		
10	Communications regarding this Application should be addressed to:		
11	emisty emendies	Katherine A. McDowell	
12	700 5 11 Intil 11 venue, Suite 200		
13	1 of thanks, of 1 / 2/22		
14	I main kamedo wen e stoeneom		
15	E-mail: christy.omohundro@pacificorp.c	com	
16	In addition, PacifiCorp respectfully requests that all data requests regarding this		
17	7 matter be addressed to:		
18	By email (preferred)	datarequest@pacificorp.com	
19	By regular mail	Data Request Response Center	
20		PacifiCorp 825 NE Multnomah, Suite 800	
21		Portland, OR 97232	
22	By facsimile (503) 813-6060		
23	III. DEFERRED ACCOUNTING RULE REQUIREMENTS		
24	The following information is provided pursuant to the requirements set forth in OAR		

Page 2 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

25 860-027-0300(3).

1 A. Description of Utility Expense.

- 2 As a normal and integral part of its operation as a public utility, PacifiCorp incurs
- 3 expenses for state and federal income taxes. On November 12, 2004, in compliance with the
- 4 Commission's stand-alone ratemaking rules and practices, PacifiCorp filed a general rate
- 5 case with the Commission, which included an income tax cost component calculated on a
- 6 stand-alone basis. As explained in PacifiCorp's Application for Reconsideration, which is
- 7 incorporated by reference herein, those stand-alone rules and practices remained in place
- 8 throughout the UE 170 general rate proceeding. Despite this fact, on September 28, 2005,
- 9 the Commission issued an order that disallowed \$16 million of PacifiCorp's stand-alone tax
- 10 expense on the basis that PacifiCorp's direct parent, PacifiCorp Holdings, Inc. ("PHI"), made
- 11 tax deductible interest payments totaling approximately \$160 million in fiscal year 2005. In
- 12 re PacifiCorp, UE 170, Order No. 05-1050 at 14, 19.
- PacifiCorp contends that the disallowance of tax costs in the Order is unlawful for
- 14 various reasons, which are described in detail in PacifiCorp's Application for
- 15 Reconsideration. The impact of this adjustment on PacifiCorp is approximately
- 16 \$2.22 million per month. The Company proposes to defer the revenue shortfall due to its
- 17 disallowed tax expense at this rate until resolution of PacifiCorp's Application for
- 18 Reconsideration, but in no event longer than twelve months from the date of this filing.

19 B. Reasons for Deferral.

- 20 Pursuant to ORS 757.259(2)(e), PacifiCorp proposes to defer the revenue shortfall
- 21 related to the disputed tax expense adjustment commencing as of the date of this filing for
- 22 later recovery in rates. ORS 757.259(2)(e) allows the deferral of utility expenses or revenues
- 23 where necessary to minimize the frequency of rate changes or the fluctuation of rate levels or
- 24 to match appropriately the costs borne by and benefits received by ratepayers.
- The revenue shortfall for which PacifiCorp seeks deferral meets the requirement of
- 26 subsection (2)(e). The use of identifiable tax expenses, calculated according to the stand-

Page 3 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

- 1 alone method required by Commission precedent and rule, see OAR 860-027-0048, produces
- 2 an appropriate match between costs borne by and benefits received by customers, because
- 3 customers will be charged rates based on the stand-alone tax costs that PacifiCorp will incur
- 4 in providing its regulated service. Thus, deferral of the revenue shortfall caused by the
- 5 inability to recover the disputed tax costs is necessary to match appropriately the costs borne
- 6 by and benefits received by ratepayers.
- 7 Moreover, deferral will allow the Commission to address the uncertainties presented
- 8 by SB 408 in an orderly manner without prejudicing PacifiCorp's right to recover its
- 9 prudently incurred costs. See In re PacifiCorp, UE 170, Staff's Post-Hearing Reply Brief at
- 10 6 (filed Aug. 12 2005) (arguing that Commission should establish deferred account for
- 11 PacifiCorp's tax expense so that it could address SB 408 in an orderly manner).) Otherwise,
- 12 even if PacifiCorp prevails on its Application for Reconsideration, it will be unduly
- 13 prejudiced by the Commission's premature and improper application of SB 408, because the
- 14 rule against retroactive ratemaking prevents PacifiCorp from charging ratepayers for past
- 15 under collections. Consequently, in the absence of a deferral, the magnitude of the harm that
- 16 PacifiCorp faces would require it to seek other regulatory relief, which could increase the
- 17 frequency or fluctuations in rate levels.
- This deferral is appropriate because PacifiCorp should not bear the risk for
- 19 nonrecovery of the disallowed tax costs, the magnitude of which would significantly impact
- 20 PacifiCorp's financial stability as discussed in PacifiCorp's Application for Reconsideration.
- 21 See Application for Reconsideration at 1-2; In re PacifiCorp, UE 170, Supplemental
- 22 Testimony of Bruce Williams at 1 (filed Oct. 28, 2005). Therefore, the Commission should
- 23 exercise its discretion under ORS 757.259(2) to authorize a deferred account in this instance.
- 24 See In re Investigation into Deferred Accounting, UM 1147, Order No. 05-1070 at 7 (Pub
- 25 Util Comm'n Oct. 5, 2005) (Commission should look at facts of each case and allow deferred

Page 4 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

1	account if statutory requirements are satisfied and type and magnitude of event warrant		
2	deferred account).		
3	C. Proposed Accounting.		
4	During the period of deferral, PacifiCorp proposes to account for the tax adjustment		
5	revenue requirement reduction for regulatory purposes in the following manner: The		
6	additional revenues related to the disallowed tax expense, grossed-up to approximately		
7	\$26.6 million on an annual revenue requirement basis, will be credited to Account 400,		
8	Operating Revenue, in a monthly amount of approximately \$2.22 million, and debited to		
9	Account 182.3. The amortization of the balance would be accomplished by crediting		
10	Account 182.3 and debiting Account 400. PacifiCorp requests that in accordance with		
11	ORS 757.259(3), it be allowed to accrue interest on the unamortized balance at a rate equal to		
12	2 its weighted average cost of capital most recently approved by the Commission in Docket		
13	3 No. UE 170, Order No. 05-1050.		
14	D. Estimate of Amounts.		
1415	D. Estimate of Amounts.As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006,		
	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006,		
15	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for		
15 16	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month		
15 16 17 18	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month		
15 16 17 18	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application.		
15 16 17 18 19	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice.		
15 16 17 18 19 20	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice. A copy of the Notice of Application and a list of persons served with the Notice are		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice. A copy of the Notice of Application and a list of persons served with the Notice are		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice. A copy of the Notice of Application and a list of persons served with the Notice are		
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice. A copy of the Notice of Application and a list of persons served with the Notice are		

Page 6 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING



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

KATHERINE A. McDowell *Direct (503) 294-9602* kamcdowell@stoel.com

October 28, 2005

ELECTRONIC FILING

PUC Filing Center Oregon Public Utility Commission PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97301-2148

Re: PacifiCorp's Application for Deferred Accounting

Enclosed for filing is one copy of PacifiCorp's Application for a Deferred Accounting Order Regarding Certain Tax Expenses. A hard copy was served on all parties of record from PacifiCorp's last general rate case, Docket No. UE 170, as indicated on the attached certificate of service.

Very truly yours,

Katherine A. McDowell

KAM:jlf Enclosure

cc: Service List

1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON 2 UM 3 In the Matter of the Application of PACIFIC PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR POWER & LIGHT (d/b/a PacifiCorp) for a Deferred Accounting Order Regarding DEFERRED ACCOUNTING Certain Tax Expenses 6 I. INTRODUCTION 7 On September 28, 2005, the Public Utility Commission of Oregon (the 8 "Commission") issued its final rate order in Docket UE 170, Order No.05-1050 ("the Order"). The Order included a \$26.6 million revenue requirement reduction based upon the provisions of Senate Bill 408 ("SB 408" or the "Act"). Concurrent with the filing of this Application for Deferred Accounting, PacifiCorp has filed an Application for 12 Reconsideration and Rehearing of the Order pursuant to ORS 756.561 and OAR 860-014-13 0095. See In re PacifiCorp, UE 170, Application for Reconsideration or Rehearing (filed Oct. 28, 2005) ("Application for Reconsideration"). In the Application, PacifiCorp requests that the Commission reconsider and eliminate 16 the \$26.6 million adjustment by calculating PacifiCorp's tax expense using the stand-alone ratemaking rules and practices in effect throughout the pendency of that case. In the alternative, PacifiCorp requests that the Commission grant rehearing and allow PacifiCorp to present evidence demonstrating the factual inaccuracy, as well as the financial impact, of the tax expense adjustment. Such evidence demonstrates that, even under the rationale applied by the Commission in the Order, the adjustment should be no more than \$2.3 million. 22 Under ORS 757.259 and OAR 860-027-0300, PacifiCorp applies to the Commission 23 for an order authorizing the Company to defer from the date of this application forward the revenue shortfall related to the tax expenses disallowed in the Order. PacifiCorp seeks deferral of this shortfall in order to accurately track and preserve such costs for later

1 incorporation in rates through an amortization schedule. PacifiCorp requests that the deferral 2 continue until the Commission resolves PacifiCorp's concurrently filed Application for 3 Reconsideration, but in no event longer than twelve months from the date of this filing. If 4 the Commission grants the Application for Reconsideration, deferred accounting is necessary 5 for PacifiCorp to receive meaningful relief. In the meantime, no harm will inure to 6 ratepayers from the deferred account because, presumably, the Commission will not permit 7 amortization of the deferred account until PacifiCorp receives a final ruling eliminating or 8 reducing the tax adjustment. II. NOTICE 9 Communications regarding this Application should be addressed to: 10 11 Christy Omohundro Katherine A. McDowell Managing Director Stoel Rives LLP 12 **PacifiCorp** 900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600 825 NE Multnomah, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204-1268 13 Telephone: (503) 294-9602 Portland, OR 97232 Telephone: (503) 813-6092 Facsimile: (503) 220-2480 14 E-mail: kamcdowell@stoel.com Fax: (503) 813-6060 E-mail: christy.omohundro@pacificorp.com 15 16 In addition, PacifiCorp respectfully requests that all data requests regarding this 17 matter be addressed to: 18 datarequest@pacificorp.com By email (preferred) 19 By regular mail Data Request Response Center PacifiCorp 20 825 NE Multnomah, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97232 21 By facsimile (503) 813-6060 22 23 III. DEFERRED ACCOUNTING RULE REQUIREMENTS 24 The following information is provided pursuant to the requirements set forth in OAR 25 860-027-0300(3).

Page 2 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

1 A. Description of Utility Expense.

- 2 As a normal and integral part of its operation as a public utility, PacifiCorp incurs
- 3 expenses for state and federal income taxes. On November 12, 2004, in compliance with the
- 4 Commission's stand-alone ratemaking rules and practices, PacifiCorp filed a general rate
- 5 case with the Commission, which included an income tax cost component calculated on a
- 6 stand-alone basis. As explained in PacifiCorp's Application for Reconsideration, which is
- 7 incorporated by reference herein, those stand-alone rules and practices remained in place
- 8 throughout the UE 170 general rate proceeding. Despite this fact, on September 28, 2005,
- 9 the Commission issued an order that disallowed \$16 million of PacifiCorp's stand-alone tax
- 10 expense on the basis that PacifiCorp's direct parent, PacifiCorp Holdings, Inc. ("PHI"), made
- 11 tax deductible interest payments totaling approximately \$160 million in fiscal year 2005. In
- 12 re PacifiCorp, UE 170, Order No. 05-1050 at 14, 19.
- PacifiCorp contends that the disallowance of tax costs in the Order is unlawful for
- 14 various reasons, which are described in detail in PacifiCorp's Application for
- 15 Reconsideration. The impact of this adjustment on PacifiCorp is approximately
- 16 \$2.22 million per month. The Company proposes to defer the revenue shortfall due to its
- 17 disallowed tax expense at this rate until resolution of PacifiCorp's Application for
- 18 Reconsideration, but in no event longer than twelve months from the date of this filing.

19 B. Reasons for Deferral.

- 20 Pursuant to ORS 757.259(2)(e), PacifiCorp proposes to defer the revenue shortfall
- 21 related to the disputed tax expense adjustment commencing as of the date of this filing for
- 22 later recovery in rates. ORS 757.259(2)(e) allows the deferral of utility expenses or revenues
- 23 where necessary to minimize the frequency of rate changes or the fluctuation of rate levels or
- 24 to match appropriately the costs borne by and benefits received by ratepayers.
- 25 The revenue shortfall for which PacifiCorp seeks deferral meets the requirement of
- 26 subsection (2)(e). The use of identifiable tax expenses, calculated according to the stand-

Page 3 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

- 1 alone method required by Commission precedent and rule, see OAR 860-027-0048, produces
- 2 an appropriate match between costs borne by and benefits received by customers, because
- 3 customers will be charged rates based on the stand-alone tax costs that PacifiCorp will incur
- 4 in providing its regulated service. Thus, deferral of the revenue shortfall caused by the
- 5 inability to recover the disputed tax costs is necessary to match appropriately the costs borne
- 6 by and benefits received by ratepayers.
- 7 Moreover, deferral will allow the Commission to address the uncertainties presented
- 8 by SB 408 in an orderly manner without prejudicing PacifiCorp's right to recover its
- 9 prudently incurred costs. See In re PacifiCorp, UE 170, Staff's Post-Hearing Reply Brief at
- 10 6 (filed Aug. 12 2005) (arguing that Commission should establish deferred account for
- 11 PacifiCorp's tax expense so that it could address SB 408 in an orderly manner).) Otherwise,
- 12 even if PacifiCorp prevails on its Application for Reconsideration, it will be unduly
- 13 prejudiced by the Commission's premature and improper application of SB 408, because the
- 14 rule against retroactive ratemaking prevents PacifiCorp from charging ratepayers for past
- 15 under collections. Consequently, in the absence of a deferral, the magnitude of the harm that
- 16 PacifiCorp faces would require it to seek other regulatory relief, which could increase the
- 17 frequency or fluctuations in rate levels.
- This deferral is appropriate because PacifiCorp should not bear the risk for
- 19 nonrecovery of the disallowed tax costs, the magnitude of which would significantly impact
- 20 PacifiCorp's financial stability as discussed in PacifiCorp's Application for Reconsideration.
- 21 See Application for Reconsideration at 1-2; In re PacifiCorp, UE 170, Supplemental
- 22 Testimony of Bruce Williams at 1 (filed Oct. 28, 2005). Therefore, the Commission should
- 23 exercise its discretion under ORS 757.259(2) to authorize a deferred account in this instance.
- 24 See In re Investigation into Deferred Accounting, UM 1147, Order No. 05-1070 at 7 (Pub
- 25 Util Comm'n Oct. 5, 2005) (Commission should look at facts of each case and allow deferred

Page 4 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

1	account if statutory requirements are satisfied and type and magnitude of event warrant
2	deferred account).
3	C. Proposed Accounting.
4	During the period of deferral, PacifiCorp proposes to account for the tax adjustment
5	revenue requirement reduction for regulatory purposes in the following manner: The
6	additional revenues related to the disallowed tax expense, grossed-up to approximately
7	\$26.6 million on an annual revenue requirement basis, will be credited to Account 400,
8	Operating Revenue, in a monthly amount of approximately \$2.22 million, and debited to
9	Account 182.3. The amortization of the balance would be accomplished by crediting
10	Account 182.3 and debiting Account 400. PacifiCorp requests that in accordance with
11	ORS 757.259(3), it be allowed to accrue interest on the unamortized balance at a rate equal to
12	its weighted average cost of capital most recently approved by the Commission in Docket
13	No. UE 170, Order No. 05-1050.
14	D. Estimate of Amounts.
14 15	D. Estimate of Amounts. As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006,
15	
15 16	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006,
15 16 17	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for
15 16 17 18	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month
15 16 17 18	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application.
15 16 17 18	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice.
15 16 17 18 19 20	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice. A copy of the Notice of Application and a list of persons served with the Notice are
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice. A copy of the Notice of Application and a list of persons served with the Notice are
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice. A copy of the Notice of Application and a list of persons served with the Notice are
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	As explained above, the disputed tax cost is \$16 million for calendar year 2006, which is \$26.6 million on a grossed-up, revenue requirement basis. While this estimate is for calendar year 2006, it functions as a reasonable approximation of costs from a 12-month deferral period beginning October 28, 2005, the date of the filing of this Application. E. Notice. A copy of the Notice of Application and a list of persons served with the Notice are

PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

Page 6 - PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

UM	

In the Matter of the Application of PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT (d/b/a PacifiCorp) for a Deferred Accounting Order Regarding Certain Tax Expenses

PACIFICORP'S APPLICATION FOR DEFERRED ACCOUNTING

EXHIBIT A

NOTICE OF APPLICATION
OF PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT (D/B/A PACIFICORP)
FOR A DEFERRED ACCOUNTING ORDER
REGARDING CERTAIN TAX EXPENSES

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION 1 OF OREGON 2 UM 3 In the Matter of the Application of PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT (d/b/a PacifiCorp) for a NOTICE OF APPLICATION Deferred Accounting Order Regarding Certain Tax Expenses 6 7 On October 28, 2005, Applicant PacifiCorp applied to the Public Utility Commission 8 9 of Oregon (the "Commission") for authorization to use deferred accounting. PacifiCorp proposes to defer from the date of the application forward the revenue 10 shortfall related to the tax expenses disallowed in Order 05-1050 in Docket No. UE 170. PacifiCorp seeks deferral of this shortfall, approximately \$2.22 million monthly, in order to 13 accurately track and preserve such costs for later incorporation in rates through an 14 amortization schedule. PacifiCorp requests that the deferral continue until the Commission 15 resolves PacifiCorp's concurrently filed Application for Reconsideration or Rehearing in 16 Docket No. UE 170, but in no event longer than twelve months from the date of this filing. The granting of the Application will not authorize a change in rates, but will permit 17 the Commission to consider allowing such deferred amounts in rates in a subsequent proceeding. Interested persons can obtain a copy of Application by contacting: 20 21 Katherine A. McDowell Stoel Rives LLP 2.2 900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600 Portland, OR 97204 23 Telephone: (503) 294-9602 24 25 26

Page 1 - NOTICE OF APPLICATION

1	Any person may submit to the Commission written comment on the Application, in
2	accordance with procedures prescribed by the Commission. The deadline for comments on
3	the application is November 22, 2005.
4	DATED: October 28, 2005.
5	STOEL RIVES LLP
6	
7	& UK for
8	Katherine A. McDowell Of Attorneys for PacifiCorp
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Page 1 - NOTICE OF APPLICATION

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE			
2	I hereby certify that I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing document on the			
3	parties of record from PacifiCorp's last general rate case, Docket UE 170, on the date			
4	indicated below by email and first-class mail, addressed to said parties at his or her last-			
5	known address(es) indicated below.			
6	Rates & Regulatory Affairs Portland General Electric	Jim Abrahamson Community Action Directors		
7	121 SW Salmon Street, 1WTC0702 Portland, OR 97204	of Oregon 4035 12th Street Cutoff SE, Suite 110		
8	pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com	Salem, OR 97302 jim@cado-oregon.org		
9 10	Greg Addington Klamath Water Users Assoc.	Edward Bartell Klamath Off-Project Water Users, Inc.		
11	2455 Patterson Street, Suite 3 Klamath Falls, OR 97603 greg@cvcwireless.net	30474 Sprague River Road Sprague River, OR 97639		
12				
13	Kurt Boehm Boehm Kurtz & Lowry 36 E. Seventh Street, Suite 1510	Lisa Brown WaterWatch of Oregon 213 SW Ash Street, Suite 208		
14	Cincinnati, OH 45202 <u>kboehm@bkllawfirm.com</u>	Portland, OR 97204 lisa@waterwatch.org		
15	I amount D. Daraman	DLU Commu		
16	Lowrey R. Brown Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon 610 SW Broadway, Suite 308	Phil Carver Oregon Office of Energy 625 Marion Street NE, Suite 1		
17	Portland, OR 97205 lowrey@oregoncub.org	Salem, OR 97301-3742 philip.h.carver@state.or.us		
18	•			
19	John Corbett Yurok Tribe PO Box 1027	Joan Cote Oregon Energy Coordinators Assoc. 2585 State Street NE		
20	Klamath, CA 95548 jcorbett@yuroktribe.nsn.us	Salem, OR 97301 cotej@mwvcaa.org		
21				
22	Melinda J. Davison Davison Van Cleve, PC	John DeVoe WaterWatch of Oregon 212 SW Ash Street Suite 208		
23	333 SW Taylor, Suite 400 Portland, OR 97204 mail@dvclaw.com	213 SW Ash Street, Suite 208 Portland, OR 97204 john@waterwatch.org		
24	man(wavciaw.com	John (13) water water 1.01 g		
25				

Page 1 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UE 170)

	1 2 3 4	Jason Eisdorfer Citizens' Utility Board 610 SW Broadway, Suite 308 Portland, OR 97205 jason@oregoncub.org	Randall J. Falkenberg RFI Consulting PMB 362 8351 Roswell Road Atlanta, GA 30350 consultrfi@aol.com
	5 6 7	Edward Finklea Cable Huston Benedict Haagensen & Lloyd LLP 1001 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Portland, OR 97204 efinklea@chbh.com	David Hatton Department of Justice 1162 Court Street NE Salem, OR 97301-4096 david.hatton@state.or.us
ir 97204 1480	8 9 10	Judy Johnson Public Utility Commission of Oregon PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97308-2148 judy.johnson@state.or.us	Jason W. Jones Department of Justice 1162 Court Street NE Salem, OR 97301-4096 jason.w.jones@state.or.us
STOEL RIVES LLP EVENUE, Suite 2600, Portland, C 1) 224-3380 Fax (503) 220-2	11 12 13	Michael Kurtz Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 E. Seventh Street, Suite 1510 Cincinnati, OH 45202 mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com	Jim McCarthy Oregon Natural Resources Council PO Box 151 Ashland, OR 97520 jm@onrc.org
STOEL RIVES LLP 900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600, Portland, OR 97204 Main (303) 224-3380 Fax (503) 220-2480	14 15 16	Bill McNamee Public Utility Commission of Oregon PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97308-2148 bill.mcnamee@state.or.us	Daniel W Meek Daniel W Meek Attorney at Law 10949 SW 4th Ave Portland OR 97219 dan@meek.net
S 006	17 18 19	Nancy Newell 3917 NE Skidmore Portland OR 97211 ogec2@hotmail.com	Michael W. Orcutt Hoopa Valley Tribe Fisheries Dept. PO Box 417 Hoopa, CA 95546 director@pcweb.net
	202122	Stephen R. Palmer Office of the Regional Solicitor 2800 Cottage Way, Rm. E-1712 Sacramento, CA 95825	Douglas Tingey Portland General Electric 121 SW Salmon, 1WTC13 Portland, OR 97204 doug.tingey@pgn.com
	232425		
	26		

Page 2 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UE 170)

	1	Matthew Perkins	Janet Prewitt
	2	Davison Van Cleve PC 333 SW Taylor, Suite 400	Oregon Department of Justice 1162 Court Street NE
	3	Portland, OR 97204 mwp@dvclaw.com	Salem, OR 97301-4096 janet.prewitt@doj.state.or.us
	4	Thomas P. Schlosser	Glen H. Spain
	5	Morisset, Schlosser, Jozwiak & McGaw	PCFFA PO Box 11170
	6	801 Second Avenue, Suite 1115 Seattle, WA 98104-1509	Eugene, OR 97440-3370 fishlifr@aol.com
	$7 \qquad \qquad \tilde{\underline{t}}$	t.schlosser@msaj.com	
	8	DATED: October 28, 2005.	
90	9		
972,	10		Katherine A. McDowell
VES LLP 600, Portland, OR 9 <i>Fax</i> (503) 220-2480	11		Of Attorneys for PacifiCorp
5 LLP Portla (503)	12		or construction of the con
STOEL RIVES LLP 900 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600, Portland, OR 97204 Main (503) 224-3380 Fax (503) 220-2480	13		
EL R e, Suite -3380	14		
STO Avenu 3) 224	15		
STOEL I SW Fifth Avenue, Suit Main (503) 224-3380	16		
00 SW	17		
6	18		
	19		
	20		
	21		
	22		
	23		
	24		
	25		

Page 3 - CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE (UE 170)