

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
36 EAST SEVENTH STREET
SUITE 1510
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202
TELEPHONE (513) 421-2255
TELECOPIER (513) 421-2764

Via Electronic Mail puc.filingcenter@state.or.us
And Overnight Mail

March 18, 2008

Public Utility Commission of Oregon
550 Capitol Street NE, Suite 215
Salem, Oregon 97310
Attn: Carol Hulse

Re: Case No. UE-197

Dear Ms. Hulse:

Please find enclosed the original Protective Order Signatory Pages on behalf of the Fred Meyers Stores and Quality Food Centers, Divisions Of Kroger Co. in the above referenced matter. Kroger Co. identifies the following persons as qualified under Paragraph 3(e) and Paragraph 10 of the Protective Order:

- Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.
- Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.
- Kevin Higgins
- Neal Townsend

Also enclosed is the information required pursuant to Paragraph 10 for our expert witnesses. I enclose an electronic copy for your files. Copies have been served on all parties of record. Please place this document of file.

Very truly yours,



Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.
Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.
BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

MLKkew
Enclosure
cc: Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that true copy of the foregoing was served via electronic mail (when available) and regular U.S. Mail (unless otherwise noted), this 20th day of March, 2008.

CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON

LOWREY R BROWN (C)
UTILITY ANALYST

610 SW BROADWAY - STE 308
PORTLAND OR 97205
lowrey@oregoncub.org

JASON EISDORFER (C)
ENERGY PROGRAM DIRECTOR

610 SW BROADWAY STE 308
PORTLAND OR 97205
jason@oregoncub.org

ROBERT JENKS (C)

610 SW BROADWAY STE 308
PORTLAND OR 97205
bob@oregoncub.org

DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC

S BRADLEY VAN CLEVE (C)

333 SW TAYLOR - STE 400
PORTLAND OR 97204
mail@dvclaw.com

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

STEPHANIE S ANDRUS (C)
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

REGULATED UTILITY &
BUSINESS SECTION
1162 COURT ST NE
SALEM OR 97301-4096
stephanie.andrus@state.or.us

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC

PATRICK HAGER RATES &
REGULATORY AFFAIRS (C)

121 SW SALMON ST 1WTC0702
PORTLAND OR 97204
pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com


DOUGLAS C TINGEY (C)
ASST GENERAL COUNSEL

121 SW SALMON 1WTC13
PORTLAND OR 97204
doug.tingey@pgn.com

RFI CONSULTING INC

RANDALL J FALKENBERG

PMB 362
8343 ROSWELL RD
SANDY SPRINGS GA 30350
consultrfi@aol.com



Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.
Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

GENERAL PROTECTIVE ORDER
UE 197

Scope of this Order-

1. This order governs the acquisition and use of “Confidential Information” in this proceeding.

Definitions-

2. “Confidential Information” is information that falls within the scope of ORCP 36(C)(7) (“a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information”).

3. A “qualified person” is an individual who is:

- a. An author(s), addressee(s), or originator(s) of the Confidential Information;
- b. A Commissioner or Commission staff;
- c. Counsel of record for a party;
- d. A person employed directly by counsel of record; or
- e. A person qualified pursuant to paragraph 10. This includes parties and their employees.

Designation of Confidential Information-

4. A party providing Confidential Information shall inform other parties that the material has been designated confidential by placing the following legend on the information:

CONFIDENTIAL
SUBJECT TO GENERAL PROTECTIVE ORDER

To the extent practicable, the party shall designate as confidential only those portions of the document that fall within ORCP 36(C)(7).

5. A party may designate as confidential any information previously provided by giving written notice to the other parties. Parties in possession of newly designated Confidential Information shall, when feasible, ensure that all copies of the information bear the above legend to the extent requested by the party desiring confidentiality.

Information Given to the Commission-

6. Confidential Information that is: (a) filed with the Commission or its staff; (b) made an exhibit; (c) incorporated into a transcript; or (d) incorporated into a pleading, brief, or other document, shall be printed on yellow paper, separately bound and placed in a

sealed envelope or other appropriate container. An original and five copies, each separately sealed, shall be provided to the Commission. **Only the portions of a document that fall within ORCP 36(C)(7) shall be placed in the envelope/container.** The envelope/container shall bear the legend:

THIS ENVELOPE IS SEALED PURSUANT TO ORDER NO. _____
AND CONTAINS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION. THE
INFORMATION MAY BE SHOWN ONLY TO QUALIFIED
PERSONS AS DEFINED IN THE ORDER.

7. The Commission's Administrative Hearings Division shall store the Confidential Information in a locked cabinet dedicated to the storage of Confidential Information.

Disclosure of Confidential Information-

8. Parties desiring receipt of Confidential Information shall sign the Consent to be Bound Form attached as Appendix B. This requirement does not apply to the Commission staff. Confidential Information shall not be disclosed to any person other than a "qualified person," as defined in paragraph 3. When feasible, Confidential Information shall be delivered to counsel. In the alternative, Confidential Information may be made available for inspection and review by qualified persons in a place and time agreeable to the parties or as directed by the Administrative Law Judge.

9. Qualified persons may disclose Confidential Information to any other qualified person, unless the party desiring confidentiality protests as provided in Section 11.

10. To become a qualified person under paragraph 3(e), a person must:

- a. Read a copy of this General Protective Order;
- b. Execute a statement acknowledging that the order has been read and agreeing to be bound by the terms of the order;
- c. Date the statement;
- d. Provide a name, address, employer, and job title; and
- e. If the person is a consultant or advisor for a party, provide a description of the nature of the person's consulting or advising practice, including the identity of his/her current, past, and expected clients.

Counsel shall deliver a copy of the signed statement including the information in (d) and (e) above to the party desiring confidentiality and to all parties of record. Such notification may be made via e-mail or facsimile. A person qualified under paragraph 3(e) shall not have access to Confidential Information sooner than five (5) business days after receipt of a copy of the signed statement including the information in (d) and (e) above by the party desiring confidentiality.

11. All qualified persons shall have access to Confidential Information, unless the party desiring confidentiality protests as provided in this paragraph. The party desiring to restrict the qualified person(s) from accessing specific Confidential Information must provide written notice to the qualified person(s) and counsel for the party associated with the qualified person(s) as soon as the party becomes aware of reasons to restrict access. The parties must promptly confer and attempt to resolve any dispute over access to Confidential Information on an informal basis before filing a motion with the Administrative Law Judge. If the dispute cannot be resolved informally, either party may file a motion with the Administrative Law Judge for resolution. Either party may also file a motion if the other party does not respond within five days to a request to resolve the dispute. A motion must describe in detail the intermediate measures, including selected redaction, explored by the parties and explain why such measures do not resolve the dispute. After receipt of the written notice as required in this paragraph, the specific Confidential Information shall not be disclosed to the qualified person(s) until the issue is resolved.

Preservation of Confidentiality-

12. All persons who are given access to Confidential Information by reason of this order shall not use or disclose the Confidential Information for any purpose other than the purposes of preparation for and conduct of this proceeding, and shall take all reasonable precautions to keep the Confidential Information secure. Disclosure of Confidential Information for purposes of business competition is strictly prohibited.

Qualified persons may copy, microfilm, microfiche, or otherwise reproduce Confidential Information to the extent necessary for the preparation and conduct of this proceeding. Qualified persons may disclose Confidential Information only to other qualified persons associated with the same party.

Duration of Protection-

13. The Commission shall preserve the confidentiality of Confidential Information for a period of five years from the date of the final order in this docket, unless extended by the Commission at the request of the party desiring confidentiality. The Commission shall notify the party desiring confidentiality at least two weeks prior to the release of Confidential Information.

Destruction After Proceeding-

14. Counsel of record may retain memoranda, pleadings, testimony, discovery, or other documents containing Confidential Information to the extent reasonably necessary to maintain a file of this proceeding or to comply with requirements imposed by another governmental agency or court order. The information retained may not be disclosed to any person. Any other person retaining Confidential Information or documents containing such Confidential Information must destroy or return it to the party desiring confidentiality within 90 days after final resolution of this proceeding unless the party desiring confidentiality

consents, in writing, to retention of the Confidential Information or documents containing such Confidential Information. This paragraph does not apply to the Commission or its Staff.

Appeal to the Presiding Officer-

15. If a party disagrees with the designation of information as confidential, the party shall contact the designating party and attempt to resolve the dispute on an informal basis. If the parties are unable to resolve the dispute, the party desiring to use the information may move for exclusion of the information from the protection conferred by this order. The motion shall:

- a. Specifically identify the contested information; and
- b. Assert that the information does not fall within ORCP 36(C)(7) and state the reasons therefor.

The party resisting disclosure has the burden of showing that the challenged information falls within ORCP 36(C)(7). If the party resisting disclosure does not respond to the motion within ten (10) calendar days, the challenged information shall be removed from the protection of this order.

The information shall not be disclosed pending a ruling by the Administrative Law Judge on the motion.

Additional Protection-

16. The party desiring additional protection may move for any of the remedies set forth in ORCP 36(C). The motion shall state:

- a. The parties and persons involved;
- b. The exact nature of the information involved;
- c. The exact nature of the relief requested;
- d. The specific reasons the requested relief is necessary; and
- e. A detailed description of the intermediate measures, including selected redaction, explored by the parties and why such measures do not resolve the dispute.

The information need not be released and, if released, shall not be disclosed pending the Commission's ruling on the motion.

SIGNATORY PAGE
UE 197

I. Consent to be Bound-

This General Protective Order governs the use of "Confidential Information" in this proceeding.

Kroger Co. (Party) agrees to be bound by its terms of this General Protective Order.

By: *Michael C. Kurtz*
Signature & Printed

3/18/08 Michael C. Kurtz
Date

II. Persons Qualified pursuant to Paragraphs 3(a) through 3(d)

_____ (Party) identifies the following person(s) automatically qualified under paragraph 3(a) through (d).

Michael C. Kurtz
Printed

3/18/08
Date

Kurt Boehm
Printed

3/18/08
Date

Printed

Date

Printed

Date

Printed

Date

Printed

Date

SIGNATORY PAGE
UE 197

III. Persons Qualified pursuant to Paragraph 3(e) and Paragraph 10.

I have read the General Protective Order, agree to be bound by the terms of the order, and will provide the information identified in paragraph 10.

By: Michael C. Kirtz 3/12/08
Signature & Printed Date

By: K. Boehm 3/12/08
Signature & Printed Date
Kurt Boehm

By: _____
Signature & Printed Date

By: _____
Signature & Printed Date

SIGNATORY PAGE
UE 197

III. Persons Qualified pursuant to Paragraph 3(e) and Paragraph 10.

I have read the General Protective Order, agree to be bound by the terms of the order, and will provide the information identified in paragraph 10.

By: [Signature] 3-19-08
Signature & Printed Date

KEVIN S. HIGGINS
By: [Signature] 3/19/08
Signature & Printed Date

NEAL TOWNSEND

By: _____
Signature & Printed Date

By: _____
Signature & Printed Date

NEAL TOWNSEND

Senior Consultant, Energy Strategies, L.L.C.
215 S. State Street, Suite 200
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 355-4365

Vitae

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Senior Consultant, Energy Strategies, L.L.C., Salt Lake City, Utah, January 2003 to present. Responsible for conducting investigations and analyses to support energy-related economic and policy analysis, regulatory intervention, and strategic negotiation on behalf of industrial, commercial, public sector interests, and independent power producers. Previously Consultant, May 2001 to December 2002.

Rate Analyst, Utah Division of Public Utilities, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1997 to 2001. Responsible for providing written and oral testimony before the Utah Public Service Commission, analyzing and operating of computer models used in utility proceedings, participating in settlement negotiations among parties in various utility proceedings, providing technical and engineering expertise and analysis of utility issues, and assisting legal counsel in reviewing issues and case preparation.

Graduate/Research Assistant, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1995 to 1996. Responsible for designing spreadsheets to evaluate accounting data in the electric power generation, health care, and service industries.

Systems Engineer, Morton Thiokol, Inc., Brigham City, Utah, 1985 to 1989. Responsible for developing process control procedures used during inspection, evaluation, and improvement of NASA's Redesigned Space Shuttle Rocket hardware, preparing preliminary design data, reports and presentations to support corporate marketing efforts, providing technical expertise as a member of Space Shuttle Challenger Failure Investigation Team, and developing computer models to simulate actual Space Shuttle and other rocket ascent performance.

Assistant Engineer, Schafer Engineering, Dallas, Texas, Summer 1982, 1983, 1984 and Spring/Summer 1985. Responsible for gathering oil and gas well exploration and production data, performing exploration and production performance calculations, and preparing information for economic analysis of producing wells and drilling prospects.

EDUCATION

Masters of Business Administration, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1996. GPA 4.0. Concentration: Management of Technology.

Weber State University, Ogden, Utah, 1994.

Texas Tech University, School of Law, Lubbock, Texas, 1989-1990.

Bachelors of Science in Mechanical Engineering, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, 1984. GPA 3.5. Honors Graduate. Technical Option: Energy and Fluid Systems Analysis.

AFFILIATIONS AND HONORS

Morton Thiokol Employee Pro Award, Tau Beta Pi Engineering Honor Society, Pi Tau Sigma Engineering Fraternity, Phi Eta Sigma Honor Society, Golden Key Honor Society, and several scholarships

EXPERT TESTIMONY

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for Approval of an IRP Based Avoided Cost Methodology for QF Projects Larger than 1 Megawatt”, Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 04-035-14. Direct Testimony filed July 29, 2005. Surrebuttal Testimony filed September 19, 2005.

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for Approval of its Proposed Electric Rate Schedules and Electric Service Regulations”, Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 04-035-42. Direct Testimony filed December 3, 2004.

“In the Matter of the Application of Questar Gas Company for an Increase In Rates and Charges”, Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 01-035-01. Direct Testimony filed April 19, 2000.

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for Approval of its Proposed Electric Rate Schedules and Electric Service Regulations”, Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 99-035-10. Direct Testimony filed February 4, 2000 and February 8, 2000. Surrebuttal Exhibits filed April 7, 2000.

“In the Matter of the Application of Questar Gas Company for Approval of a Natural Gas Processing Agreement”, Utah Public Service Commission, Docket No. 98-057-12. Direct Testimony filed April 1, 1999.

REGULATORY INVESTIGATIONS AND ANALYSES

“Nevada Power Company’s 2006 General Rate Case”, Public Utilities Commission of **Nevada**, Docket Nos. 06-11022, and 06-11023.

“In the Matter of the Application of Entergy Arkansas, Inc. for Approval of Changes in Rates for Retail Electric Service”, **Arkansas** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 06-101-U.

“Monongahela Power Company and The Potomac Edison Company, both d/b/a Allegheny Power – Rule 42T Application to Increase Electric Rates and Charges”, Public Service Commission of **West Virginia**, Case No. 06-0960-E-42T; “Monongahela Power Company and The Potomac Edison Company, both d/b/a Allegheny Power – Information Required for Change of Depreciation Rates Pursuant to Rule 20”, Case No. 06-1426-E-D.

“In the Matter of the Tariffs of Aquila, Inc., d/b/a Aquila Networks-MPS and Aquila Networks-L&P Increasing Electric Rates for the Services Provided to Customers in the Aquila Networks-MPS and Aquila Networks-L&P Missouri Service Areas”, **Missouri** Public Service Commission, Case No. ER-2007-0004.

“In the Matter of the Filing by Tucson Electric Power Company to Amend Decision No. 62103”, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01933A-05-0650.

“In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Company’s Missouri Service Area”, **Missouri** Public Service Commission, Case No. ER-2007-0002.

“In the Matter of Application of The Union Light, Heat and Power Company d/b/a Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. for an Adjustment of Electric Rates”, **Kentucky** Public Service Commission, Case No. 2006-00172.

“In the Matter of Appalachian Power Company’s Application for Increase in Electric Rates”, **Virginia** State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE-2006-00065.

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of the Utility Property for Ratemaking Purposes, to Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, To Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return, and to Amend Decision No. 67744”, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-05-0816.

“Re: The Tariff Sheets Filed by Public Service Company of Colorado with Advice Letter No. 1454 – Electric”, **Colorado** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 06S-234EG.

“Portland General Electric General Rate Case Filing”, Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE-180.

“2006 Puget Sound Energy General Rate Case”, **Washington** Utilities and Transportation Commission, Docket Nos. UE-060266 and UG-060267.

“In the Matter of PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power & Light Company, Request for a General Rate Increase in the Company’s Oregon Annual Revenues”, Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE-179.

“Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company for Approval of a Rate Transition Plan”, **Pennsylvania** Public Utilities Commission, Docket Nos. P-00062213 and R-00061366; “Petition of Pennsylvania Electric Company for Approval of a Rate Transition Plan”, Docket Nos. P-0062214 and R-00061367; Merger Savings Remand Proceeding, Docket Nos. A-110300F0095 and A-110400F0040.

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for approval of its Proposed Electric Rate Schedules & Electric Service Regulations”, **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 06-035-21.

“Joint Application of Questar Gas Company, the Division of Public Utilities, and Utah Clean Energy for the Approval of the Conservation Enabling Tariff Adjustment Option and Accounting Orders”, **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 05-057-T01.

“Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO, Central Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS, Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenIP, Proposed General Increase in Rates for Delivery Service (Tariffs Filed December 27, 2005)”, **Illinois** Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 06-0070, 06-0071, 06-0072.

“In the Matter of Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company, both dba American Electric Power”, Public Service Commission of **West Virginia**, Case No. 05-1278-E-PC-PW-42T.

“In the Matter of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for Authority to Increase Rates for Electric Service in Minnesota”, **Minnesota** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. G-002/GR-05-1428.

“In the Matter of the Application of Idaho Power Company for Authority to Increase Its Rates and Charges for Electric Service to its Customers in the State of Idaho”, **Idaho** Public Utilities Commission, Case No. IPC-E-05-28.

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for an Emergency Interim Rate Increase and for an Interim Amendment to Decision No. 67744”, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-06-0009.

“In the Matter of the Applications of Westar Energy, Inc. and Kansas Gas and Electric Company for Approval to Make Certain Changes in Their Charges for Electric Service”, State Corporation Commission of **Kansas**, Case No. 05-WSEE-981-RTS.

“In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Recover Costs Associated with the Construction and Ultimate Operation of an Integrated Combined Cycle Electric Generating Facility”, Public Utilities Commission of **Ohio**,” Case No. 05-376-EL-UNC.

“In the Matter of the Filing of General Rate Case Information by Tucson Electric Power Company Pursuant to Decision No. 62103”, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01933A-04-0408.

“In the Matter of Application of The Detroit Edison Company to Unbundle and Realign Its Rate Schedules for Jurisdictional Retail Sales of Electricity”, **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-14399.

“In the Matter of the Application of Consumers Energy Company for Authority to Increase Its Rates for the Generation and Distribution of Electricity and Other Relief”, **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-14347.

“In the Matter of Pacific Power & Light, Request for a General Rate Increase in the Company’s Oregon Annual Revenues”, Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE 170.

“In the Matter of the Application of Trico Electric Cooperative, Inc. for a Rate Increase”, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01461A-04-0607.

“In the Matter of the Application by Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc., for Authority to Implement Simplified Rate Filing Procedures and Adjust Rates”, Regulatory Commission of **Alaska**, Docket No. U-4-33.

“Advice Letter No. 1411 - Public Service Company of Colorado Electric Phase II General Rate Case”, **Colorado** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 04S-164E.

“In the Matter of Georgia Power Company’s 2004 Rate Case”, **Georgia** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 18300-U.

“2004 Puget Sound Energy General Rate Case”, **Washington** Utilities and Transportation Commission, Docket Nos. UE-040641 and UG-040640.

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for an Investigation of Interjurisdictional Issues”, **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 02-035-04.

“In the Matter of an Adjustment of the Gas and Electric Rates, Terms and Conditions of Kentucky Utilities Company”, **Kentucky** Public Service Commission, Case No. 2003-00434.

“In the Matter of an Adjustment of the Gas and Electric Rates, Terms and Conditions of Louisville Gas and Electric Company”, **Kentucky** Public Service Commission, Case No. 2003-00433.

“In the Matter of the Application of Idaho Power Company for Authority to Increase Its Interim and Base Rates and Charges for Electric Service”, **Idaho** Public Utilities Commission, Case No. IPC-E-03-13.

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of the Utility Property of the Company for Ratemaking Purposes, To Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, To Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return, and For Approval of Purchased Power Contract”, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-03-0437.

“In the Matter of Application of the Detroit Edison Company to Increase Rates, Amend Its Rate Schedules Governing the Distribution and Supply of Electric Energy, etc.”, **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-13808.

“In the Matter of PacifiCorp’s Filing of Revised Tariff Schedules”, Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE-147.

“Petition of PSI Energy, Inc. for Authority to Increase Its Rates and Charges for Electric Service, etc.”, **Indiana** Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 42359.

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for Approval of Adjustment Mechanisms”, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-02-0403.

“Re: The Investigation and Suspension of Tariff Sheets Filed by Public Service Company of Colorado, Advice Letter No. 1373 – Electric, Advice Letter No. 593 – Gas, Advice Letter No. 80 – Steam”, **Colorado** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 02S-315 EG.

“In the Matter of the Application of The Detroit Edison Company to Implement the Commission’s Stranded Cost Recovery Procedure and for Approval of Net Stranded Cost Recovery Charges”, **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-13350.

“Application of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company: Adjustments in the Company’s Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs”, Public Service Commission of **South Carolina**, Docket No. 2002-223-E.

“In the Matter of the Application of Questar Gas Company for a General Increase in Rates and Charges”, **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 02-057-02.

“In the Matter of the Application of Consumers Energy Company for Determination of Net Stranded Costs and for Approval of Net Stranded Cost Recovery Charges”, **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-13380.

“2001 Puget Sound Energy Interim Rate Case”, **Washington** Utilities and Transportation Commission, Docket Nos. UE-011570 and UE-011571.

“In the Matter of Georgia Power Company’s 2001 Rate Case”, **Georgia** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 14000-U.

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for Approval of Its Proposed Electric Rate Schedules and Electric Service Regulations”, **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 01-35-01.

“In the Matter of Service Quality Complaints Against PacifiCorp and PacifiCorp’s Service Quality since the 1988 Merger of UP&L and PP&L”, **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No.99-2035-01

“Application of Hildale City and Intermountain MunicipalGas Association for an Order Granting Access for Transportation Of Interstate Natural Gas over the Pipelines of Questar Gas Company for Hildale, Utah”, **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 98-057-01.

“In the Matter of the Investigation into the Reasonableness of Rates and Charges of PacifiCorp, dba Utah Power and Light”, **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 97-035-01.

KEVIN C. HIGGINS
Principal, Energy Strategies, L.L.C.
215 South State St., Suite 200, Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Vitae

EXPERT TESTIMONY

“Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO Proposed General Increase in Electric Delivery Service Rates, Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS Proposed General Increase in Electric Delivery Service Rates, Illinois Power Company d/b/a/ AmerenIP Proposed General Increase in Electric Delivery Service Rates, Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO, Proposed General Increase in Gas Delivery Service Rates, Central Illinois Public Service Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS Proposed General Increase in Gas Delivery Service Rates, Illinois Power Company d/b/a/ AmerenIP Proposed General Increase in Gas Delivery Service Rates, **Illinois** Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 07-0585, 07-0586, 07-0587, 07-0588, 07-0589, 07-0590. Direct testimony submitted March 14, 2008. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of Colorado for Authority to Implement an Enhanced Demand Side Management Cost Adjustment Mechanism to Include Current Recovery and Incentives,” **Colorado** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 07A-420E. Direct testimony submitted March 10, 2008. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“An Investigation of the Energy and Regulatory Issues in Section 50 of Kentucky’s 2007 Energy Act,” **Kentucky** Public Service Commission, Administrative Case No. 2007-00477. Direct testimony submitted February 29, 2008. Sponsor: Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers

In the Matter of the Application of Tucson Electric Power Company for the Establishment of Just and Reasonable Rates and Charges Designed to Realize a Reasonable Rate of Return on the Fair Value of Its Operations throughout the State of Arizona, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01933A-07-0402. Direct testimony submitted February 29, 2008 (revenue requirement) and March 14, 2008 (rate design). Sponsor: Phelps Dodge and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“Commonwealth Edison Company Proposed General Increase in Electric Rates,” **Illinois** Commerce Commission, Docket No. 07-0566. Direct testimony submitted February 11, 2008. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Questar Gas Company to File a General Rate Case,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 07-057-13, Direct testimony submitted January 28, 2008 (test period). Cross examined February 8, 2008 (test period). Sponsor: Utah Association of

Energy Users

“In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Increase its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Utah and for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations, Consisting of a General Rate Increase of Approximately \$161.2 Million Per Year, and for Approval of a New Large Load Surcharge,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 07-035-93. Direct testimony submitted January 25, 2008 (test period). Cross examined February 7, 2008 (test period). Sponsor: Utah Association of Energy Users

“In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and The Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Increase Rates for Distribution Service, Modify Certain Accounting Practices and for Tariff Approvals,” Public Utilities Commission of **Ohio**, Case Nos. 07-551-EL-AIR, 07-552-EL-ATA, 07-553-EL-AAM, and 07-554-EL-UNC. Direct testimony submitted January 10, 2008. Sponsor: City of Cleveland

“In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Authority to Increase Its Retail Electric Utility Service Rates in Wyoming, Consisting of a General Rate Increase of Approximately \$36.1 Million per Year, and for Approval of a New Renewable Resource Mechanism and Marginal Cost Pricing Tariff,” **Wyoming** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 20000-277-ER-07. Direct testimony submitted January 7, 2008. Cross examined March 6, 2008. Sponsor: Questar Gas Management Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Idaho Power Company for Authority to Increase Its Rates and Charges for Electric Service to Electric Customers in the State of Idaho,” **Idaho** Public Utilities Commission, Case No. IPC-E-07-8. Direct testimony submitted December 10, 2007. Cross examined January 23, 2008. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In The Matter of the Application of Consumers Energy Company for Authority to Increase Its Rates for the Generation and Distribution Of Electricity and Other Relief,” **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-15245. Direct testimony submitted November 6, 2007. Rebuttal testimony submitted November 20, 2007. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., Application for Authority to Establish Increased Rates for Electric Service,” **Montana** Public Service Commission, Docket No. D2007.7.79. Direct testimony submitted October 24, 2007. Sponsor: Encore Acquisition Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of New Mexico for Revision of its Retail Electric Rates Pursuant to Advice Notice No. 334,” **New Mexico** Public Regulation Commission, Case No. 07-0077-UT. Direct testimony submitted October 22, 2007. Rebuttal testimony submitted November 19, 2007. Cross examined December 12, 2007. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In The Matter of Georgia Power Company’s 2007 Rate Case,” **Georgia** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 25060-U. Direct testimony submitted October 22, 2007. Cross examined November 7, 2007. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for an Accounting Order to Defer the Costs Related to the MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company Transaction,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 07-035-04; “In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power, a Division of PacifiCorp, for a Deferred Accounting Order To Defer the Costs of Loans Made to Grid West, the Regional Transmission Organization,” Docket No. 06-035-163; “In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for an Accounting Order for Costs related to the Flooding of the Powerdale Hydro Facility,” Docket No. 07-035-14. Direct testimony submitted September 10, 2007. Surrebuttal testimony submitted October 22, 2007. Cross examined October 30, 2007. Sponsor: Utah Association of Energy Users

“In the Matter of General Adjustment of Electric Rates of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.,” **Kentucky** Public Service Commission, Case No. 2006-00472. Direct testimony submitted July 6, 2007. Supplemental direct testimony submitted March 14, 2008. Sponsor: Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers

“In the Matter of the Application of Sempra Energy Solutions for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for Competitive Retail Electric Service,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-03964A-06-0168. Direct testimony submitted July 3, 2007. Rebuttal testimony submitted January 17, 2008. Sponsor: Air Liquide Industrial US LP

“Application of Public Service Company of Oklahoma for a Determination that Additional Electric Generating Capacity Will Be Used and Useful,” **Oklahoma** Corporation Commission, Cause No. PUD 200500516; “Application of Public Service Company of Oklahoma for a Determination that Additional Baseload Electric Generating Capacity Will Be Used and Useful,” Cause No. PUD 200600030; “In the Matter of the Application of Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company for an Order Granting Pre-Approval to Construct Red Rock Generating Facility and Authorizing a Recovery Rider,” Cause No. PUD200700012. Responsive testimony submitted May 21, 2007. Cross examined July 26, 2007. Sponsor: Wal-Mart Stores East L.P.

“Application of Nevada Power Company for Authority to Increase Its Annual Revenue Requirement for General Rates Charged to All Classes of Electric Customers and for Relief Properly Related Thereto,” Public Utilities Commission of **Nevada**, Docket No. 06-11022. Direct testimony submitted March 14, 2007 (Phase III – revenue requirements) and March 19, 2007 (Phase IV – rate design). Cross examined April 10, 2007 (Phase III – revenue requirements) and April 16, 2007 (Phase IV – rate design). Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Entergy Arkansas, Inc. for Approval of Changes in Rates for Retail Electric Service,” **Arkansas** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 06-101-U. Direct testimony submitted February 5, 2007. Surrebuttal testimony submitted March 26, 2007. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“Monongahela Power Company and The Potomac Edison Company, both d/b/a Allegheny Power – Rule 42T Application to Increase Electric Rates and Charges,” Public Service Commission of **West Virginia**, Case No. 06-0960-E-42T; “Monongahela Power Company and The Potomac Edison Company, both d/b/a Allegheny Power – Information Required for Change of Depreciation Rates Pursuant to Rule 20,” Case No. 06-1426-E-D. Direct and rebuttal testimony submitted January 22, 2007. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Tariffs of Aquila, Inc., d/b/a Aquila Networks-MPS and Aquila Networks-L&P Increasing Electric Rates for the Services Provided to Customers in the Aquila Networks-MPS and Aquila Networks-L&P Missouri Service Areas,” **Missouri** Public Service Commission, Case No. ER-2007-0004. Direct testimony submitted January 18, 2007 (revenue requirements) and January 25, 2007 (revenue apportionment). Supplemental direct testimony submitted February 27, 2007. Sponsor: The Commercial Group

“In the Matter of the Filing by Tucson Electric Power Company to Amend Decision No. 62103, **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01933A-05-0650. Direct testimony submitted January 8, 2007. Surrebuttal testimony filed February 8, 2007. Cross examined March 8, 2007. Sponsor: Phelps Dodge and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of Union Electric Company d/b/a AmerenUE for Authority to File Tariffs Increasing Rates for Electric Service Provided to Customers in the Company’s Missouri Service Area,” **Missouri** Public Service Commission, Case No. ER-2007-0002. Direct testimony submitted December 15, 2006 (revenue requirements) and December 29, 2006 (fuel adjustment clause/cost-of-service/rate design). Rebuttal testimony submitted February 5, 2007 (cost-of-service). Surrebuttal testimony submitted February 27, 2007. Cross examined March 21, 2007. Sponsor: The Commercial Group

“In the Matter of Application of The Union Light, Heat and Power Company d/b/a Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. for an Adjustment of Electric Rates,” **Kentucky** Public Service Commission, Case No. 2006-00172. Direct testimony submitted September 13, 2006. Sponsor: The Kroger Co. and St. Elizabeth Medical Center.

“In the Matter of Appalachian Power Company’s Application for Increase in Electric Rates,” **Virginia** State Corporation Commission, Case No. PUE-2006-00065. Direct testimony submitted September 1, 2006. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of the Utility Property for Ratemaking Purposes, to Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, To Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return, and to Amend Decision No. 67744, **Arizona** Corporation Commission,” Docket No. E-01345A-05-0816. Direct testimony submitted August 18, 2006 (Revenue Requirements) and September 1, 2006 (Cost-of-Service/Rate Design). Surrebuttal testimony submitted September 27, 2006. Sponsor: Phelps Dodge and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“Re: The Tariff Sheets Filed by Public Service Company of Colorado with Advice Letter No 1454 – Electric,” **Colorado** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 06S-234EG. Answer testimony submitted August 18, 2006. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“Portland General Electric General Rate Case Filing,” Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE-180. Direct testimony submitted August 9, 2006. Joint testimony regarding stipulation submitted August 22, 2006. Sponsor: Fred Meyer Stores

“2006 Puget Sound Energy General Rate Case,” **Washington** Utilities and Transportation Commission, Docket Nos. UE-060266 and UG-060267. Response testimony submitted July 19, 2006. Joint testimony regarding stipulation submitted August 23, 2006. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power & Light Company, Request for a General Rate Increase in the Company’s Oregon Annual Revenues,” Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE-179. Direct testimony submitted July 12, 2006. Joint testimony regarding stipulation submitted August 21, 2006. Sponsor: Fred Meyer Stores

“Petition of Metropolitan Edison Company for Approval of a Rate Transition Plan,” **Pennsylvania** Public Utilities Commission, Docket Nos. P-00062213 and R-00061366; “Petition of Pennsylvania Electric Company for Approval of a Rate Transition Plan,” Docket Nos. P-00062214 and R-00061367; Merger Savings Remand Proceeding, Docket Nos. A-110300F0095 and A-110400F0040. Direct testimony submitted July 10, 2006. Rebuttal testimony submitted August 8, 2006. Surrebuttal testimony submitted August 18, 2006. Cross examined August 30, 2006. Sponsor: The Commercial Group

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for approval of its Proposed Electric Rate Schedules & Electric Service Regulations,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 06-035-21. Direct testimony submitted June 9, 2006 (Test Period). Surrebuttal testimony submitted July 14, 2006. Sponsor: Utah Association of Energy Users

“Joint Application of Questar Gas Company, the Division of Public Utilities, and Utah Clean Energy for the Approval of the Conservation Enabling Tariff Adjustment Option and Accounting Orders,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 05-057-T01. Direct testimony submitted May 15, 2006. Sponsor: Utah Association of Energy Users

“Central Illinois Light Company d/b/a AmerenCILCO, Central Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenCIPS, Illinois Power Company d/b/a AmerenIP, Proposed General Increase in Rates for Delivery Service (Tariffs Filed December 27, 2005),” **Illinois** Commerce Commission, Docket Nos. 06-0070, 06-0071, 06-0072. Direct testimony submitted March 26, 2006. Rebuttal testimony submitted June 27, 2006. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of Appalachian Power Company and Wheeling Power Company, both dba American Electric Power,” Public Service Commission of **West Virginia**, Case No. 05-1278-E-PC-PW-42T. Direct testimony submitted March 8, 2006. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of Northern States Power Company d/b/a Xcel Energy for Authority to Increase Rates for Electric Service in Minnesota,” **Minnesota** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. G-002/GR-05-1428. Direct testimony submitted March 2, 2006. Rebuttal testimony submitted March 30, 2006. Cross examined April 25, 2006. Sponsor: The Commercial Group

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for an Emergency Interim Rate Increase and for an Interim Amendment to Decision No. 67744,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-06-0009. Direct testimony submitted February 28, 2006. Cross examined March 23, 2006. Sponsor: Phelps Dodge and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of the Applications of Westar Energy, Inc. and Kansas Gas and Electric Company for Approval to Make Certain Changes in Their Charges for Electric Service,” State Corporation Commission of **Kansas**, Case No. 05-WSEE-981-RTS. Direct testimony submitted September 9, 2005. Cross examined October 28, 2005. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company and Ohio Power Company for Authority to Recover Costs Associated with the Construction and Ultimate Operation of an Integrated Combined Cycle Electric Generating Facility,” Public Utilities Commission of **Ohio**,” Case No. 05-376-EL-UNC. Direct testimony submitted July 15, 2005. Cross examined August 12, 2005. Sponsor: Ohio Energy Group

“In the Matter of the Filing of General Rate Case Information by Tucson Electric Power Company Pursuant to Decision No. 62103,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01933A-04-0408. Direct testimony submitted June 24, 2005. Sponsor: Phelps Dodge, Asarco, and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of Application of The Detroit Edison Company to Unbundle and Realign Its Rate Schedules for Jurisdictional Retail Sales of Electricity,” **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-14399. Direct testimony submitted June 9, 2005. Rebuttal testimony submitted July

1, 2005. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Consumers Energy Company for Authority to Increase Its Rates for the Generation and Distribution of Electricity and Other Relief,” **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-14347. Direct testimony submitted June 3, 2005. Rebuttal testimony submitted June 17, 2005. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of Pacific Power & Light, Request for a General Rate Increase in the Company’s Oregon Annual Revenues,” Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE 170. Direct testimony submitted May 9, 2005. Surrebuttal testimony submitted June 27, 2005. Joint testimony regarding partial stipulations submitted June 2005, July 2005, and August 2005. Sponsor: Fred Meyer Stores

“In the Matter of the Application of Trico Electric Cooperative, Inc. for a Rate Increase,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01461A-04-0607. Direct testimony submitted April 13, 2005. Surrebuttal testimony submitted May 16, 2005. Cross examined May 26, 2005. Sponsor: Phelps Dodge Sierrita, Inc.

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for Approval of its Proposed Electric Service Schedules and Electric Service Regulations,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 04-035-42. Direct testimony submitted January 7, 2005. Sponsor: Utah Association of Energy Users

“In the Matter of the Application by Golden Valley Electric Association, Inc., for Authority to Implement Simplified Rate Filing Procedures and Adjust Rates,” Regulatory Commission of **Alaska**, Docket No. U-4-33. Direct testimony submitted November 5, 2004. Cross examined February 8, 2005. Sponsor: Fairbanks Gold Mining, Inc.

“Advice Letter No. 1411 - Public Service Company of Colorado Electric Phase II General Rate Case,” **Colorado** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 04S-164E. Direct testimony submitted October 12, 2004. Cross-answer testimony submitted December 13, 2004. Testimony withdrawn January 18, 2005, following Applicant’s withdrawal of testimony pertaining to TOU rates. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of Georgia Power Company’s 2004 Rate Case,” **Georgia** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 18300-U. Direct testimony submitted October 8, 2004. Cross examined October 27, 2004. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“2004 Puget Sound Energy General Rate Case,” **Washington** Utilities and Transportation Commission, Docket Nos. UE-040641 and UG-040640. Response testimony submitted

September 23, 2004. Cross-answer testimony submitted November 3, 2004. Joint testimony regarding stipulation submitted December 6, 2004. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for an Investigation of Interjurisdictional Issues,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 02-035-04. Direct testimony submitted July 15, 2004. Cross examined July 19, 2004. Sponsor: Utah Association of Energy Users

“In the Matter of an Adjustment of the Gas and Electric Rates, Terms and Conditions of Kentucky Utilities Company,” **Kentucky** Public Service Commission, Case No. 2003-00434. Direct testimony submitted March 23, 2004. Testimony withdrawn pursuant to stipulation entered May 2004. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of an Adjustment of the Gas and Electric Rates, Terms and Conditions of Louisville Gas and Electric Company,” **Kentucky** Public Service Commission, Case No. 2003-00433. Direct testimony submitted March 23, 2004. Testimony withdrawn pursuant to stipulation entered May 2004. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Idaho Power Company for Authority to Increase Its Interim and Base Rates and Charges for Electric Service,” **Idaho** Public Utilities Commission, Case No. IPC-E-03-13. Direct testimony submitted February 20, 2004. Rebuttal testimony submitted March 19, 2004. Cross examined April 1, 2004. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Applications of the Ohio Edison Company, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company and the Toledo Edison Company for Authority to Continue and Modify Certain Regulatory Accounting Practices and Procedures, for Tariff Approvals and to Establish Rates and Other Charges, Including Regulatory Transition Charges Following the Market Development Period,” Public Utilities Commission of **Ohio**, Case No. 03-2144-EL-ATA. Direct testimony submitted February 6, 2004. Cross examined February 18, 2004. Sponsor: City of Cleveland and WPS Energy Services, Inc.

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for a Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of the Utility Property of the Company for Ratemaking Purposes, To Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate of Return Thereon, To Approve Rate Schedules Designed to Develop Such Return, and For Approval of Purchased Power Contract,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-03-0437. Direct testimony submitted February 3, 2004. Rebuttal testimony submitted March 30, 2004. Direct testimony regarding stipulation submitted September 27, 2004. Responsive / Clarifying testimony regarding stipulation submitted October 25, 2004. Cross examined November 8-10, 2004 and November 29-December 3, 2004. Sponsor: Phelps Dodge, Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition, Federal Executive Agencies, and The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of Application of the Detroit Edison Company to Increase Rates, Amend Its Rate Schedules Governing the Distribution and Supply of Electric Energy, etc.,” **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-13808. Direct testimony submitted December 12, 2003 (interim request) and March 5, 2004 (general rate case). Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of PacifiCorp’s Filing of Revised Tariff Schedules,” Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE-147. Joint testimony regarding stipulation submitted August 21, 2003. Sponsor: Fred Meyer Stores

“Petition of PSI Energy, Inc. for Authority to Increase Its Rates and Charges for Electric Service, etc.,” **Indiana** Utility Regulatory Commission, Cause No. 42359. Direct testimony submitted August 19, 2003. Cross examined November 5, 2003. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Consumers Energy Company for a Financing Order Approving the Securitization of Certain of its Qualified Cost,” **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-13715. Direct testimony submitted April 8, 2003. Cross examined April 23, 2003. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for Approval of Adjustment Mechanisms,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-02-0403. Direct testimony submitted February 13, 2003. Surrebuttal testimony submitted March 20, 2003. Cross examined April 8, 2003.

“Re: The Investigation and Suspension of Tariff Sheets Filed by Public Service Company of Colorado, Advice Letter No. 1373 – Electric, Advice Letter No. 593 – Gas, Advice Letter No. 80 – Steam,” **Colorado** Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 02S-315 EG. Direct testimony submitted November 22, 2002. Cross-answer testimony submitted January 24, 2003. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of The Detroit Edison Company to Implement the Commission’s Stranded Cost Recovery Procedure and for Approval of Net Stranded Cost Recovery Charges,” **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-13350. Direct testimony submitted November 12, 2002. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“Application of South Carolina Electric & Gas Company: Adjustments in the Company’s Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs,” Public Service Commission of **South Carolina**, Docket No. 2002-223-E. Direct testimony submitted November 8, 2002. Surrebuttal testimony submitted November 18, 2002. Cross examined November 21, 2002. Sponsor: South Carolina Merchants Association

“In the Matter of the Application of Questar Gas Company for a General Increase in Rates and Charges,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 02-057-02. Direct testimony submitted

August 30, 2002. Rebuttal testimony submitted October 4, 2002. Sponsor: Utah Association of Energy Users and Federal Executive Agencies

“The Kroger Co. v. Dynegy Power Marketing, Inc.,” **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**, EL02-119-000. Confidential affidavit filed August 13, 2002. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the matter of the application of Consumers Energy Company for determination of net stranded costs and for approval of net stranded cost recovery charges,” **Michigan** Public Service Commission, Case No. U-13380. Direct testimony submitted August 9, 2002. Rebuttal testimony submitted August 30, 2002. Cross examined September 10, 2002. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of Public Service Company of Colorado for an Order to Revise Its Incentive Cost Adjustment,” **Colorado** Public Utilities Commission, Docket 02A-158E. Direct testimony submitted April 18, 2002. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Generic Proceedings Concerning Electric Restructuring Issues,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-00000A-02-0051, “In the Matter of Arizona Public Service Company’s Request for Variance of Certain Requirements of A.A.C. R14-2-1606,” Docket No. E-01345A-01-0822, “In the Matter of the Generic Proceeding Concerning the Arizona Independent Scheduling Administrator,” Docket No. E-00000A-01-0630, “In the Matter of Tucson Electric Power Company’s Application for a Variance of Certain Electric Competition Rules Compliance Dates,” Docket No. E-01933A-02-0069, “In the Matter of the Application of Tucson Electric Power Company for Approval of its Stranded Cost Recovery,” Docket No. E-01933A-98-0471. Direct testimony submitted March 29, 2002 (APS variance request); May 29, 2002 (APS Track A proceeding/market power issues); and July 28, 2003 (Arizona ISA). Rebuttal testimony submitted August 29, 2003 (Arizona ISA). Cross examined June 21, 2002 (APS Track A proceeding/market power issues) and September 12, 2003 (Arizona ISA). Sponsor: Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of Savannah Electric & Power Company’s 2001 Rate Case,” **Georgia** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 14618-U. Direct testimony submitted March 15, 2002. Cross examined March 28, 2002. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“Nevada Power Company’s 2001 Deferred Energy Case,” Public Utilities Commission of **Nevada**, PUCN 01-11029. Direct testimony submitted February 7, 2002. Cross examined February 21, 2002. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“2001 Puget Sound Energy Interim Rate Case,” **Washington** Utilities and Transportation Commission, Docket Nos. UE-011570 and UE-011571. Direct testimony submitted January 30, 2002. Cross examined February 20, 2002. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of Georgia Power Company’s 2001 Rate Case,” **Georgia** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 14000-U. Direct testimony submitted October 12, 2001. Cross examined October 24, 2001. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for Approval of Its Proposed Electric Rate Schedules and Electric Service Regulations,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 01-35-01. Direct testimony submitted June 15, 2001. Rebuttal testimony submitted August 31, 2001. Sponsor: Utah Association of Energy Users

“In the Matter of Portland General Electric Company’s Proposal to Restructure and Reprice Its Services in Accordance with the Provisions of SB 1149,” Public Utility Commission of **Oregon**, Docket No. UE-115. Direct testimony submitted February 20, 2001. Rebuttal testimony submitted May 4, 2001. Joint testimony regarding stipulation submitted July 27, 2001. Sponsor: Fred Meyer Stores

“In the Matter of the Application of APS Energy Services, Inc. for Declaratory Order or Waiver of the Electric Competition Rules,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No.E-01933A-00-0486. Direct testimony submitted July 24, 2000. Sponsor: APS Energy Services

“In the Matter of the Application of Questar Gas Company for an Increase in Rates and Charges,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 99-057-20. Direct testimony submitted April 19, 2000. Rebuttal testimony submitted May 24, 2000. Surrebuttal testimony submitted May 31, 2000. Cross examined June 6 & 8, 2000. Sponsor: Large Customer Group

“In the Matter of the Application of Columbus Southern Power Company for Approval of Electric Transition Plan and Application for Receipt of Transition Revenues,” Public Utility Commission of **Ohio**, Case No. 99-1729-EL-ETP; “In the Matter of the Application of Ohio Power Company for Approval of Electric Transition Plan and Application for Receipt of Transition Revenues,” Public Utility Commission of **Ohio**, Case No. 99-1730-EL-ETP. Direct testimony prepared, but not submitted pursuant to settlement agreement effected May 2, 2000. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“In the Matter of the Application of FirstEnergy Corp. on Behalf of Ohio Edison Company, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company, and the Toledo Edison Company for Approval of Their Transition Plans and for Authorization to Collect Transition Revenues,” Public Utility Commission of **Ohio**, Case No. 99-1212-EL-ETP. Direct testimony prepared, but not submitted pursuant to settlement agreement effected April 11, 2000. Sponsor: The Kroger Co.

“2000 Pricing Process,” **Salt River Project** Board of Directors, oral comments provided March 6, 2000 and April 10, 2000. Sponsor: Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“Tucson Electric Power Company vs. Cyprus Sierrita Corporation,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-000001-99-0243. Direct testimony submitted October 25, 1999. Cross examined November 4, 1999. Sponsor: Cyprus Sierrita Corporation

“Application of Hildale City and Intermountain Municipal Gas Association for an Order Granting Access for Transportation of Interstate Natural Gas over the Pipelines of Questar Gas Company for Hildale, Utah,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 98-057-01. Rebuttal testimony submitted August 30, 1999. Sponsor: Industrial Gas Resource Corp.

“In the Matter of the Application by Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. for Approval of Its Filing as to Regulatory Assets and Transition Revenues,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01773A-98-0470. Direct testimony submitted July 30, 1999. Cross examined February 28, 2000. Sponsor: Asarco, Cyprus Climax Metals, and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of the Application of Tucson Electric Power Company for Approval of its Plan for Stranded Cost Recovery,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01933A-98-0471; “In the Matter of the Filing of Tucson Electric Power Company of Unbundled Tariffs Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1601 et seq.,” Docket No. E-01933A-97-0772; “In the Matter of the Competition in the Provision of Electric Service Throughout the State of Arizona,” Docket No. RE-00000C-94-0165. Direct testimony submitted June 30, 1999. Rebuttal testimony submitted August 6, 1999. Cross examined August 11-13, 1999. Sponsor: Asarco, Cyprus Climax Metals, and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for Approval of its Plan for Stranded Cost Recovery,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01345A-98-0473; “In the Matter of the Filing of Arizona Public Service Company of Unbundled Tariffs Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1601 et seq.,” Docket No. E-01345A-97-0773; “In the Matter of the Competition in the Provision of Electric Service Throughout the State of Arizona,” Docket No. RE-00000C-94-0165. Direct testimony submitted June 4, 1999. Rebuttal testimony submitted July 12, 1999. Cross examined July 14, 1999. Sponsor: Asarco, Cyprus Climax Metals, and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of the Application of Tucson Electric Power Company for Approval of its Plan for Stranded Cost Recovery,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. E-01933A-98-0471; “In the Matter of the Filing of Tucson Electric Power Company of Unbundled Tariffs Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1601 et seq.,” Docket No. E-01933A-97-0772; “In the Matter of the Application of Arizona Public Service Company for Approval of its Plan for Stranded Cost Recovery,” Docket No. E-01345A-98-0473; “In the Matter of the Filing of Arizona Public Service Company of Unbundled Tariffs Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1601 et seq.,” Docket No. E-01345A-97-0773;

“In the Matter of the Competition in the Provision of Electric Service Throughout the State of Arizona,” Docket No. RE-00000C-94-0165. Direct testimony submitted November 30, 1998. Sponsor: Asarco, Cyprus Climax Metals, and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“Hearings on Pricing,” **Salt River Project** Board of Directors, written and oral comments provided November 9, 1998. Sponsor: Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“Hearings on Customer Choice,” **Salt River Project** Board of Directors, written and oral comments provided June 22, 1998; June 29, 1998; July 9, 1998; August 7, 1998; and August 14, 1998. Sponsor: Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of the Competition in the Provision of Electric Service Throughout the State of Arizona,” **Arizona** Corporation Commission, Docket No. U-0000-94-165. Direct and rebuttal testimony filed January 21, 1998. Second rebuttal testimony filed February 4, 1998. Cross examined February 25, 1998. Sponsor: Asarco, BHP Copper, Cyprus Climax Metals, Phelps Dodge, Ajo Improvement Co., Morenci Water & Electric Co., and Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition

“In the Matter of Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.’s Plans for (1) Electric Rate/Restructuring Pursuant to Opinion No. 96-12; and (2) the Formation of a Holding Company Pursuant to PSL, Sections 70, 108, and 110, and Certain Related Transactions,” **New York** Public Service Commission, Case 96-E-0897. Direct testimony filed April 9, 1997. Cross examined May 5, 1997. Sponsor: The Joint Supporters

“In the Matter of the Petition of Sunnyside Cogeneration Associates for Enforcement of Contract Provisions,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 96-2018-01. Direct testimony submitted July 8, 1996. Sponsor: Sunnyside Cogeneration Associates

“In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp, dba Pacific Power & Light Company, for Approval of Revised Tariff Schedules and an Alternative Form of Regulation Plan,” **Wyoming** Public Service Commission, Docket No. 2000-ER-95-99. Direct testimony submitted April 8, 1996. Sponsor: Wyoming Industrial Energy Consumers

“In the Matter of the Application of Mountain Fuel Supply Company for an Increase in Rates and Charges,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 95-057-02. Direct testimony submitted June 19, 1995. Rebuttal testimony submitted July 25, 1995. Surrebuttal testimony submitted August 7, 1995. Sponsor: ESI, Central Valley Water Reclamation, E.A. Miller and Sons, Geneva Steel, Great Slat Lake Minerals Corp., Hercules, Inc., Springville City, Utah State University, Western Electrochemical Co.

“In the Matter of the Investigation of the Reasonableness of the Rates and Tariffs of Mountain Fuel Supply Company,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 89-057-15. Direct

testimony submitted July 1990. Surrebuttal testimony submitted August 1990. Sponsor: State of Utah Energy Office

“In the Matter of the Review of the Rates of Utah Power and Light Company pursuant to The Order in Case No. 87-035-27,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 89-035-10. Rebuttal testimony submitted November 15, 1989. Cross examined December 1, 1989 (rate schedule changes for state facilities). Sponsor: State of Utah Energy Office

“In the Matter of the Application of Utah Power & Light Company and PC/UP&L Merging Corp. (to be renamed PacifiCorp) for an Order Authorizing the Merger of Utah Power & Light Company and PacifiCorp into PC/UP&L Merging Corp. and Authorizing the Issuance of Securities, Adoption of Tariffs, and Transfer of Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Authorities in Connection Therewith,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 87-035-27; Direct testimony submitted April 11, 1988. Cross examined May 12, 1988 (economic impact of UP&L merger with PacifiCorp). Sponsor: State of Utah Division of Public Utilities

“In the Matter of the Application of Mountain Fuel Supply Company for Approval of Interruptible Industrial Transportation Rates,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 86-057-07. Direct testimony submitted January 15, 1988. Cross examined March 30, 1988. Sponsor: State of Utah Energy Office

“In the Matter of the Application of Utah Power and Light Company for an Order Approving a Power Purchase Agreement,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 87-035-18. Oral testimony delivered July 8, 1987. Sponsor: State of Utah Energy Office

“Cogeneration: Small Power Production,” **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission**, Docket No. RM87-12-000. Statement on behalf of State of Utah delivered March 27, 1987, in San Francisco.

“In the Matter of the Investigation of Rates for Backup, Maintenance, Supplementary, and Standby Power for Utah Power and Light Company,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 86-035-13. Direct testimony submitted January 5, 1987. Case settled by stipulation approved August 1987. Sponsor: State of Utah Energy Office

“In the Matter of the Application of Sunnyside Cogeneration Associates for Approval of the Cogeneration Power Purchase Agreement,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 86-2018-01. Rebuttal testimony submitted July 16, 1986. Cross examined July 17, 1986. Sponsor: State of Utah Energy Office

“In the Matter of the Investigation of Demand-Side Alternatives to Capacity Expansion for Electric Utilities,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 84-999-20. Direct testimony

submitted June 17, 1985. Rebuttal testimony submitted July 29, 1985. Cross examined August 19, 1985. Sponsor: State of Utah Energy Office

“In the Matter of the Implementation of Rules Governing Cogeneration and Small Power Production in Utah,” **Utah** Public Service Commission, Case No. 80-999-06, pp. 1293-1318. Direct testimony submitted January 13, 1984 (avoided costs), May 9, 1986 (security for levelized contracts) and November 17, 1986 (avoided costs). Cross-examined February 29, 1984 (avoided costs), April 11, 1985 (standard form contracts), May 22-23, 1986 (security for levelized contracts) and December 16-17, 1986 (avoided costs). Sponsor: State of Utah Energy Office