

Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon

610 SW Broadway, Suite 308 Portland, OR 97205 (503) 227-1984 • (503) 274-2956 • cub@oregoncub.org • www.oregoncub.org

March 23, 2010

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

RE: UE 214 PARTIAL STIPULATION REGARDING RATE SPREAD

Dear Filing Center:

Attached for filing please find UE 214 Partial Stipulation Regarding Rate Spread with attached certificate of service. The original signatures of Greg Adams and Catriona McCracken are included. The original signature of Jason Jones will follow upon receipt.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

r. C. M

G. Catriona McCracken, Attorney #933587 Staff Attorney Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon 610 SW Broadway Ste 308 Portland, OR 97205 (503) 227-1984 phone (503) 274-2596 fax Catriona@oregoncub.org

c. Service list

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON UE 214

))

)

)

))

IN THE MATTER OF IDAHO POWER **COMPANY 2010 ANNUAL POWER COST** UPDATE

PARTIAL STIPULATION REGARDING RATE SPREAD

1	This Partial Stipulation is entered into for the purpose of resolving the rate spread issue
2	among the parties to this docket. This Partial Stipulation only resolves the rate spread issue in
3	Idaho Power Company's ("Idaho Power's" or the "Company's") 2010 Annual Power Cost
4	Update ("APCU").
5	PARTIES
6	The parties entering into this Partial Stipulation are the Oregon Industrial Customers of
7	Idaho Power ("OICIP"), the Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon ("CUB"), and Staff of the Public
8	Utility Commission of Oregon ("Staff"). The only other party to this docket is Idaho Power,
9	who neither supports nor opposes this Partial Stipulation.
10	BACKGROUND
11	1. On October 19, 2009, Idaho Power initiated this docket by filing testimony
12	requesting a \$2.59 million revenue increase in its 2010 APCU, as set forth in Idaho Power's
13	Exhibit 106 in this docket. The Company's testimony states that amount as the energy costs it is

PARTIAL STIPULATION **REGARDING RATE SPREAD** UE 214

13

entitled to collect pursuant to the Company's APCU mechanism authorized by the Public Utility
 Commission of Oregon (the "Commission") in Docket No. UE 195.

2. For rate spread, Idaho Power, in its filing in this docket, proposed to follow the procedure that was used in Docket No. UE 195. This method simply divides the proposed revenue change, in this case \$2.59 million, by the normalized jurisdictional forecasted kWh usage. This "equal cents per kWh charge" is applied to each customer's energy usage. The impact of this approach varies significantly among customer classes, with a percentage increase that varies from 1.7 percent for area lighting (Schedule 15) to 10.6 percent for large power service (Schedule 19).

As the Commission recently recognized on pages 9 to 10 of the Commission's
 order number 10-064 in Idaho Power's 2009 general rate case, certain customer classes will be
 paying far less as a result of the general rate case than those classes' costs-of-service would
 otherwise require. Those classes are the irrigation and traffic control classes. Consequently,
 other customer classes will be paying more than their cost-of-service in order to subsidize those
 underpaying classes.

4. The Commission noted in that order that the parties to the general rate case agreed
for the purposes of this docket to limit the rate increases experienced by the irrigation and traffic
control classes to avoid rate shock of bringing those classes' rates immediately up to their costof-service.

5. The parties to this docket convened in Portland twice, first on December 29, 2009, and next on January 28, 2010, to conduct workshops on the rate spread issue and how the subsidies may be addressed in the APCU proceedings, which occur more frequently than Idaho

23 Power's general rate cases in Oregon.

6. As a result of these workshops, Staff, OICIP, and CUB (the "Joint Parties")
 reached an agreement regarding a rate spread adjustment intended to gradually limit the subsidy
 to the irrigation and traffic control classes. Idaho Power does not support or oppose the Joint
 Parties' agreement as to rate spread.

5 7. The Joint Parties' proposed rate spread mechanism would gradually decrease the 6 subsidies over time, without inducing rate shock significantly above that required to satisfy the 7 Company's revenue requirement.

8. Under the final 2009 general rate case stipulation and the Joint Parties' APCU 9 rate spread mechanism proposed in this Partial Stipulation, the irrigation class would incur a 10 combined APCU and 2009 general rate case increase of 42.66 percent. This is far less than the 11 Company's original filings. Those filings called for irrigators to receive an in-season average 12 increase of about 47 percent in the general rate case, and would have added approximately 13 another 7 percent in this APCU docket, taking the combined total increase for irrigators to 14 around 54 percent.

9. Additionally, if the Commission approves this partial stipulation, the irrigators'
rates would still be approximately 20 percent below the stipulated cost-of-service level.

17 10. This would mitigate the overall rate increase to residential and industrial classes,
18 both of which would still pay in excess of their stipulated cost-of-service.

19 11. This Partial Stipulation contains a compromise between the twin goals of setting
 20 cost of service rates and avoiding rate shock in Idaho Power's infrequent general rate cases,

21 while bringing the subsidized parties closer to their cost of service over time through Idaho

22 Power's annual energy cost update filings.

23

1 AGREEMENT 2 12. Staff, OICIP, and CUB filed joint testimony in support of this Partial Stipulation 3 on February 16, 2010, which sets forth the proposal and justification for it in more detail than 4 does this Partial Stipulation. 5 13. In this 2010 APCU, the Partial Stipulation calls for the subsidized parties-- whose 6 rates are paying less than 90 percent of their class cost-of-service-- to pay 150 percent of the 7 average APCU increase. The parties will reanalyze the APCU increase to the subsidized parties 8 in future years. 9 14. The values used in the joint testimony and this Partial Stipulation are based on the requested \$2.59 million APCU revenue requirement in the filing. If the APCU revenue amount 10 11 is adjusted to a different value, the Joint Parties' proposal is to allocate it in line with the method recommended below. 12 Exhibit Staff/OICIP/CUB/102 displays the results of the Joint Parties' proposal 13 15. 14 for the APCU rate spread in conjunction with the relevant figures from the stipulated cost-of-15 service calculations in the UE 213 general rate case. 16. The following steps refer to that exhibit in describing the Joint Parties' stipulated 16 17 methodology for developing the APCU incremental rates. The first seven steps below (i.e., up 18 through Line 48 of the exhibit) operate as if the 2010 October APCU costs were part of the 2009 19 general rate case and test period. The final step and subsequent lines in the exhibit incorporate 20 and adjust for the 2010 sales. 21 17. In step one (Line 34), the APCU revenue requirements, which treat the October Update and March Forecast separately, are allocated according to each class's share of the total 22 23 generation marginal cost as determined in the last general rate case. Because the approach 4

stipulated by all parties in the general rate case combines embedded capacity-related and energyrelated costs prior to their final allocation to the rate schedules, this step-one treatment of the
APCU energy costs is identical to the way they would have been allocated had they been part of
the 2009 general rate case test period.
18. In step two (Line 35), the total dollar amount of a "subsidy correction" is
determined by first applying, for any schedule that paid less than 90 percent of its cost-of-service
index in the last general rate case, a factor that is the lesser of: a) the prior general rate case

8 subsidy (Line 25 minus Line 29) less any APCU subsidy adjustments made since that case; and

9 b) 50 percent of the APCU dollar amount increase calculated in step one. The factor outcomes
10 for each of those schedules are added together and constitute the amount of the APCU revenue

requirement that is to be transferred away from the schedules found in the general rate case to bebearing the subsidy burdens.

13 19. In step three (Line 36), are determined the interclass subsidy burdens borne by the 14 various schedules as initially established in the current/last general rate case, and as subsequently 15 reduced in accordance with the subsidy correction that is here being proposed.

16 20. In step four (Lines 37- 39), the subsidy correction preliminary dollar amount 17 (calculated in step two) is allocated according to each schedule's share of the general rate case 18 cost-of-service-determined subsidy (calculated in step three), and that amount is shown to be

19 subtracted from the initial APCU allocation of step one.

20 21. In step five (Line 40), any negative amount that is produced in step four is

- 21 eliminated by allocating that amount to the other subsidizing schedules of step four, with the
- 22 allocation to those other schedules being performed in the same manner as in step four. This step

23 produces the proposed APCU revenue spread.

1	22. In step six (Line 47), each schedule's ratable (i.e., loss-adjusted) sales are shown.		
2	It is against these sales figures that APCU incremental prices would be multiplied to satisfy the		
3	APCU revenue requirement if it were to be collected as part of the 2009 test period.		
4	23. In step seven (Line 48), each schedule's 2009-oriented APCU incremental rate is		
5	determined by dividing its assigned APCU revenue (Line 40) by the loss-adjusted 2009 test-		
6	year-projected sales (Line 47).		
7	24. In step eight (Line 49), the APCU incremental rate for 2010 is determined by		
8	adjusting the prices of the previous line by the ratio of total loss-adjusted 2009 test-year sales		
9	(Line 47, Column A) to the 2010 October projection (Line 50, Column A). This adjustment is		
10	necessary to recover the APCU revenue requirement with the reduced sales projected for 2010 as		
11	compared to 2009.		
12	25. In addition to those eight steps, Lines 42-46 were included to provide an		
13	indication of the revenues, percentage rate increases, and final cost-of-service index levels that		
14	are the outcome of combining the stipulated general rate case and APCU revenue spreads. Line		
15	51 confirms that the incremental APCU rates will recover the APCU revenue requirement given		
16	the 2010 October sales forecasts (Line 50).		
17	26. Additionally, as further explained in the Joint Testimony, the Joint Parties		
18	recommend that the class-specific rates determined for the October Update component of the		
19	APCU be implemented as an adjustment to each class's base energy rates. Further, the Joint		
20	Parties recommend that the class-specific rates determined for the March Forecast component of		
21	the APCU be listed separately for each customer class on Schedule 55.		
22	27. In the event the March Forecast, when viewed in isolation, results in a rate decrease or a		
23	rate increase in excess of ten percent, the Joint Parties agree to meet promptly for the purpose of		
	6 PARTIAL STIPULATION		

reaching a mutually satisfactory agreement on the rate spread for the March Update revenue
 requirement change, and upon such agreement, the filing of additional Staff and/or Intervener
 testimony for April 1, 2010.

4 28. This Partial Stipulation will be offered into the record of this proceeding as 5 evidence pursuant to OAR 860-014-0085. The Joint Parties agree to support this Partial 6 Stipulation throughout this proceeding and any appeal (if necessary), provide witnesses to 7 sponsor this Stipulation at the hearing and recommend that the Commission issue an order 8 adopting the settlements contained herein.

9 29. The Parties have negotiated this Partial Stipulation as an integrated document. If 10 the Commission rejects all or any material portion of this Partial Stipulation or imposes 11 additional material conditions in approving this Partial Stipulation, any party disadvantaged by 12 such action shall have the rights provided in OAR 860-014-0085 and shall be entitled to seek 13 reconsideration or appeal of the Commission's order.

14 30. By entering into this Partial Stipulation, no Party shall be deemed to have
15 approved, admitted, or consented to the facts, principles, methods, or theories employed by any
16 other Party in arriving at the terms of the Partial Stipulation, other than those specifically
17 identified in the body of this Partial Stipulation. No party shall be deemed to have agreed that
18 any provision of this Partial Stipulation is appropriate for resolving issues in any other
19 proceeding, except as specifically identified in this Partial Stipulation.

20 31. This Partial Stipulation may be executed in counterparts and each signed
21 counterpart shall constitute an original document.

22 SIGNATURE PAGE FOLLOWS

23

1

Respectfully Submitted,

2

STAFF

By:	
-----	--

Date:

CITIZENS' OREGON	UTILITY	BOARD	OF
By:		1	
Date: 3-2	23-10)	

OREGON INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF IDAHG POWER By: 3 18-2010 Date:

Respectfully Submitted,

2

1

STAFF By: 10 3 Date: 1

BOARD

.

OF

CITIZENS' UTILITY OREGON

OREGON INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF IDAHO POWER

By:

Date:_____

By:					
Date:					

3

4

UE 214 – CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on this 23rd day of March, 2010, I served the foregoing **PARTIAL STIPULATION REGARDING RATE SPREAD** in docket UE 214 upon each party listed in the UE 214 PUC Service List by email and, where paper service is not waived, by U.S. mail, postage prepaid, and upon the Commission by email and by sending 2 copies by U.S. mail, postage prepaid, to the Commission's Salem offices.

(W denotes waiver of paper service)

MCDOWELL & RACKNER PC LISA F RACKNER (C) ATTORNEY 520 SW SIXTH AVENUE STE 830 PORTLAND OR 97204 lisa@mcd-law.com

OREGON PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION ED DURRENBERGER (C)

PO BOX 2148 SALEM OR 97308-2148 ed.durrenberger@state.or.us

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL T WEIRICH, AAG (C) REG UTILITY & BUS SECTION 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4096 michael.weirich@doj.state.or.us

W IDAHO POWER COMPANY DOUG JONES PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 djones@idahopower.com

W **IDAHO POWER COMPANY** TIM TATUM **(C)** PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 ttatum@idahopower.com

(C denotes service of Confidential material authorized)

IDAHO POWER COMPANY BARTON L KLINE (C) SENIOR ATTORNEY PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 bkline@idahopower.com

W DON READING (C) 6070 HILL ROAD BOISE ID 83703 dreading@mindspring.com

W IDAHO POWER COMPANY CHRISTA BEARRY (C) PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 cbearry@idahopower.com

W IDAHO POWER COMPANY

GREGORY W SAID (C) DIRECTOR - REVENUE REQUIREMENT PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707 gsaid@idahopower.com

W IDAHO POWER COMPANY CAMILLA VICTORIA PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 cvictoria@idahopower.com

UE 214- Certificate of Service PARTIAL STIPULATION REGARDING RATE SPREAD

W IDAHO POWER COMPANY DONOVAN E WALKER (C) CORPORATE COUNSEL PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 dwalker@idahopower.com

W MCDOWELL RACKNER & GIBSON PC ADAM LOWNEY 520 SW SIXTH AVE, SUITE 830 PORTLAND OR 97204 adam@mcd-law.com

W RICHARDSON & O'LEARY GREGORY MARSHALL ADAMS (C) ATTORNEY PO BOX 7218 BOISE ID 83702 greg@richardsonandoleary.com

- W IDAHO POWER COMPANY SCOTT WRIGHT (C) PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 swright@idahopower.com
- W WENDY MCINDOO (C) OFFICE MANAGER 520 SW 6TH AVE STE 830 PORTLAND OR 97204 wendy@mcd-law.com

W RICHARDSON & O'LEARY PLLC PETER J RICHARDSON (C) PO BOX 7218

BOISE ID 83707 peter@richardsonandoleary.com

Respectfully submitted,

G. Catriona McCracken Staff Attorney The Citizens' Utility Board of Oregon 610 SW Broadway, Ste. 308 Portland, OR 97205 (503)227-1984 Catriona@oregoncub.org