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# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON 

UE 262
CITY OF PORTLAND

Direct Testimony of:
Anne Falcon

June 14, 2013

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS AND POSITION.

A. My name is Anne Falcon. I am a Managing Director of Management Services for EES Consulting. My business address is 570 Kirkland Way, Suite 100, Kirkland WA 98033.
Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to comment on the proposed rate calculation for Schedules 91 and 95. As part of UE 215 OPUC Order No. 10-478 PGE/City of Portland Stipulation, PGE has made several changes to the calculation of the rates for Schedules 91 and 95. In particular, PGE eliminated the embedded circuit charge and implemented a marginal cost of service calculation for distribution costs associated with street lighting. While the City appreciates PGE's effort in this regard, there are several areas that should be further modified before rates can be fully implemented. This testimony addresses the City's recommended cost allocation changes.

## Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS?

A. Given the economic downturn, cities and other government entities are under great pressure to control costs and ensure that they receive maximum value for their expenses. As described in UE 262/COP/200/Gray, along with other Oregon local governments, the City of Portland has experienced significant fiscal challenges in the last year.
It is also important to recognize that although the increased cost of schedules 91 and 95 will be passed through to the residents and businesses of the City primarily through taxes, these PGE customers will also experience rate increases in their own electricity bills. The City is concerned with the requested overall increase and the impact on the communities served by PGE. The City encourages PGE to continue efforts to improve efficiency and establish cost control measures to minimize this and future rate increases. As Mr. Gray notes in COP/200/Gray, the City pays for PGE service on over 44,000 street lights. In
addition the City maintains over 11,000 of its own streetlights. In total, the City pays over $\$ 5$ million in rate revenues to PGE for street lighting alone.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE PGE'S METHOD FOR CHARGING STREETLIGHTING.

A. There are three options for pole and luminaire ownership in PGE's street lighting rate schedules. Each option is billed differently depending on the services required from PGE. For option A poles and luminaires, PGE owns and maintains the poles and luminaires. Under option B, the poles and luminaires are customer owned, but PGE maintains these assets. Finally, Option C poles and luminaires are owned and maintained by the street lighting customer.
PGE charges a rental fee for option A poles and luminaires and a maintenance fee for option A and B poles and luminaires. In addition, a kWh energy charge is assessed on option $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and C luminaires based on a fixed kWh per month. This kWh energy charge is composed of three components: power supply, transmission and distribution. Because of the complexity in ownership options, it is important to ensure that each charge is based on the appropriate cost of service provided. For example, Option C poles and luminaires (customer owned) should not be charged for any PGE costs associated with O\&M associated with owning or maintaining poles or luminaires.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE PGE'S CALCULATION OF MARGINAL DISTRIBUTION

 COST TO SCHEDULES 91 AND 95.A. PGE separates distribution marginal costs into Distribution Services and Customer Services. See, "Ratespread14GRC.xlsx" tab "MargCost", attached as COP Exhibit 101. PGE has generally calculated the distribution marginal costs for Schedules 91 and 95 using the same methodology as is used for all other rate schedules. For Distribution Services, Schedules 91 and 95 are allocated costs for subtransmission, substations, feeder backbone, feeders, taplines, services and transformers similar to other rate classes. In addition Schedules 91 and 95 are assigned costs for consumer services (Lights). For Customer Service, Schedules 91 and 95 are allocated costs for billing and other customer costs. Schedules 91 and 95 are not allocated any metering or uncollectibles costs.

## Q. DOES THE CITY HAVE ANY CONCERNS WITH PGE'S CALCULATION OF MARGINAL DISTRIBUTION COST?

A. Yes. The City has two main concerns with the calculation of marginal distribution costs. First, Schedules 15, 91 and 95 are directly assigned "Lighting additional O\&M" in addition to paying a share of all other distribution costs. Second, the customer costs associated with Schedule 91 and 95 appear over-estimated.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CITY'S CONCERN WITH THE FIRST EXPENSE, "LIGHTING ADDITIONAL O\&M".
A. In the calculation of distribution costs, PGE includes a $\$ 3.39$ per luminaire charge for distribution customer service. In the response to the City's Data Request 23, PGE described the costs as including "labor related to providing street and area lighting services". PGE's Response to COP DR 23 is attached as COP Exhibit 102. No other supporting information was provided by PGE, except PGE stated that this charge has been included in the compliance filings for the last four rate cases. Id. PGE's method of calculation marginal costs results in Schedule 15, 91 and 95 paying $\$ 773,000$ for these unspecified services. See, for example, "Ratespread14GRC.xlsx" tab "Dist", attached as COP Exhibit 103. Meanwhile, PGE identified the actual RC 313 Test Period O\&M as \$607,047. See, "Ratespread14GRC.xlsx" tab "misc-usages", attached as COP Exhibit 104.

As described above, the street lighting class is now allocated distribution costs and associated operations and maintenance costs, including labor, based on actual usage of the system in a similar manner to all other rate payers. In addition, as described in further detail below, Schedules 91 and 95 are also directly assigned both billing and other customer service costs. PGE has not provided any justification for singling out the street lighting classes and charging additional distribution O\&M. These O\&M costs should be
allocated to all customer classes as general distribution costs and be removed as a direct assignment, as Schedules 91 and 95 are already allocated the full cost of distributionrelated services based on the marginal cost of providing services to these customers.

## Q. COULD YOU PLEASE DESCRIBE THE ISSUES WITH THE MARGINAL

 CUSTOMER COST CALCULATION?A. In comparison to other rate classes, PGE's marginal cost analysis allocates a large amount for billing to Schedules 91, 92 and 95. Based on this analysis, PGE in this rate filing allocates $\$ 256.21$ in billing related costs per customer per year to Schedules 91,92 and 95 customers, an increase of 38 percent over 2011. In comparison, a residential customer is allocated $\$ 30.44$ per year for billing related services. Other than Schedules 91,92 and 95 , the next highest billing unit cost is Schedule 83 which is allocated $\$ 52.40$ per customer per year in billing related costs. See, "2014 Marginal Customer Cost.xlsx" tab "Billing 2014," attached as COP Exhibit 105. The high billing related cost is associated with account CIS Billing. PGE calculates the marginal billing costs based on hours spent on billing the lighting customers. See, "2014 Marginal Customer Cost.xlsx" tab "STL", attached as COP Exhibit 106. According to this workpaper, it takes over 70 hours per month to bill 222 street lighting customer accounts.

As explained by Mr. Gray in COP/200/Gray, there is no metered data or complicated rates for PGE to process when billing Schedule 91, 92 and 95 customers. PGE has offered no support for why it takes PGE almost five times longer to bill a street lighting customer each month compared to a Schedule 83 customers, or 8 times longer than the typical billing time identified for residential customers.

While the City agrees that the appropriate cost of billing should be paid by Schedule 91, 95 and 92 customers, the billing costs become exaggerated as the direct assignment is
also used to allocate other billing costs. Finally, the marginal billing costs are further inflated due to the gross-up process used to match the overall billing revenue requirement. See, "2014 Marginal Customer Cost.xlsx" tab "2014 Exhibit", attached as COP Exhibit 107. The City would like to work with PGE to minimize the cost of billing going forward to ensure this service is cost effective and applicable to all Option A, B and $C$ lights.
Q. DOES PGE ALLOCATE ANY ADDITIONAL CUSTOMER COSTS TO SCHEDULE 91/95?
A. Yes. PGE also allocates "Other services" costs to Schedules 91 and 95, most of which is related to the account titled "Business customer/key customer group". The allocation of costs for this account has not changed, however the actual costs have increased by almost 60 percent since 2011. Thus the other customer costs allocated to Schedules 91 and 95 have also increased by almost 60 percent. The City would appreciate working with PGE to ensure the services provided under "Other services" are cost effective and appropriately applied to all option $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}$ and C lights.

## Q. DOES THE CITY HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL CONCERNS WITH PGE'S

 CALCULATION OF RENTAL RATES?A. Yes. The City wants to ensure that the approved rate of return will be applied to the pole and luminaire rental rates as well.

## Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCLUDING REMARKS?

A. The City of Portland has a responsibility to protect the interests of its taxpayers and residents. As part of that responsibility the City is committed to reducing costs wherever feasible. This includes ensuring that costs paid to vendors such as PGE are reasonable and fair. Based on the prior UE 215 stipulation, Schedules 91 and 95 are allocated distribution costs in the same manner as all other customers. However, PGE directly
assigns distribution O\&M and customer costs in addition to cost shared among all other rate payers. The City strongly recommends that PGE make the following updates in the proposed rate schedules:

- Remove direct assignment of "Lighting O\&M" from the distribution rate and allocate this expense to all customers.
- Provide a costing analysis of the Billing and Other Services that are directly assigned to the lighting class so the City can determine that the services provided by PGE are cost effective.
- Use the approved rate of return for the calculation of rental rates for poles and lumineres.
Q. MS. FALCON, PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.
A. I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics from the University of San Francisco, and a M.S. in Operations Research from Stanford University. I have worked for EES Consulting for the past 20 years as an analyst, project manager and currently as a Managing Director. As part of my duties, I manage projects concerning cost of service and rate analyses, financial planning and regulatory proceedings for electric, natural gas, water and wastewater utilities.
Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?
A. Yes.
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May 31, 2013

TO: $\quad$ Benjamin Walters
City of Portland
David Tooze
City of Portland
FROM: Patrick Hager
Manager, Regulatory Affairs

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC
UE 262
PGE Response to City of Portland Data Request
Dated May 17, 2013
Question No. 023
Request:
Please provide an explanation of Lighting Additional O\&M section \& RC313 Test period section in tab "misc-usages" in spreadsheet "Ratespread 14GRC.xlsx". How is this information used in the COSA and rate design? What does the additional O\&M costs account for?

## Response:

The O\&M referenced above is added to the distribution costs for Schedules 15, 91, and 95 and charged on a cents $/ \mathrm{kWh}$ basis. It includes labor related to providing street and area light services. The amounts included in the compliance filings for the last four rate . cases is provided below, as well as the proposed amount included in UE 262.

UE 115 (2002) - $\$ 9.40$ per light per year. See Attachment 023-A.
UE 180 (2007) - $\$ 7.67$ per light per year. See Attachment 023-B.
UE 197 (2009) - $\$ 4.68$ per light per year. See Attachment 023-C.
UE 215 (2011) - $\$ 4.23$ per light per year. See Attachment 023-D.

## UE 262

## Attachment 023-A

## Provided in Electronic Format only

Page 18 from PGE's UE 115 Compliance Filing

## PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC

 ALLOCATION OF DISTRIBUTION SERVICE COSTS 2002| Grouping |  | Usagas | Units \& Basis | Marginal Unit Cost | Costs (\$000) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Study |  |  | Equal Percentage |
| SCH 91 - Street \& Highway Lighting (formerly Schedule 91) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission |  | 8,958 | kW, 12 CP | \$12.29 | \$110 | \$125 |
|  | Substation | 21,500 | kW, rateclass pk | \$13.17 | \$283 | \$322 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$447 |
| FACILITIES | Wire | 21,500 | kW, rateciass pk | \$21.51 | \$462 | \$526 |
|  | Transformers | 21,500 | kW, rateclass pk | \$3.21 | \$69 | \$78 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$604 |
| CUSTOMER | Service Drops | 18,032 | Panels | N/A |  | \$0 |
|  | Meters \& CIS | 586 | Customers | \$1.46 | \$1 | \$1 |
|  | Customer Service | 135,238 | Lights | \$9.40 | \$1,271 | \$1,445 |
|  | Sublotal |  |  |  |  | \$1,446 |
| FIXED | Luminaires \& Poles |  |  |  |  | \$6,297 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$926 | \$8,793 |
| SCH 92 - Traffic Signals (formerly Schedule 92) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Subtransmission | 1,500 | kW, 12 CP | \$12.29 | \$18 | \$21 |
|  | Substation | 1,500 | kW, rateclass pk | \$13.17 | \$20 | \$22 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$43 |
| FACILItIES | Wire | 1,500 | kW, rateclass pk | \$16.38 | \$25 | \$28 |
|  | Transformers | 1,500 | kW, rateclass pk | \$3.21 | \$5 | \$5 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$33 |
| CUSTOMER | Service Drops | 1,831 | Service Drops | \$18.81 | \$34 | \$39 |
|  | Meters \& CIS | 25 | Customers | \$1.46 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$39 |
| SUBTOTAL | 1 |  |  |  | \$102 | \$116 |
| SCH 93 - Recreational Field Lighting (formerty Schedule 93) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 108 | kW, 12 CP | \$12.29 | \$1 | \$2 |
|  | Substation | 700 | kW, rateclass pk | \$13.17 | \$9 | \$10 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$12 |
| FACILITIES | Wire | 700 | kW, rateclass pk | \$9.66 | \$7 | \$8 |
| CUSTOMER | Service Drops | 31 | Customers | \$153.00 | \$5 | \$5 |
|  | Meters \& CIS | 31 | Customers | \$1,577.12 | \$49 | \$56 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$61 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$71 | \$81 |
| SCH 97 - Drainage Districts (formerly Schedule 97) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 208 | kW, 12 CP | \$12.29 | \$3 | \$3 |
|  | Substation | 1,000 | kW, rateclass pk | \$13.17 | \$13 | \$15 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$18 |
| FACILITIES | Wire | 1,000 | kW , rateclass pk | \$9.66 | \$10 | \$11 |
| CUSTOMER | Service Drops | 2 | Customers | \$2,234.65 | \$4 | \$5 |
|  | Meters \& CIS | 2 | Customers | \$2,933.03 | \$6 | \$7 |
|  | Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$12 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$36 | \$41 |

## UE 262

## Attachment 023-B

## Provided in Electronic Format only

Page 61 of Attachment B from PGE's UE 180 Compliance Filing

| PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC ALLOCATION OF DISTRIBUTION COST 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grouping |  | Usages | Units \& Bask | Margina Unit Cost | Marginal Cost Reveniuas | Class <br> Reventse Requirement |
| Schedule 89 General Service (4,000 plus kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Secondary Meters |  | Customers | \$172.89 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | Primary Meters | 21 | Customers | \$1,351.81 | $\$ 28$ | \$28 |
|  | Substation Meters | 9 | Customers | \$21,214.80 | \$191 | \$187 |
| FACILTES | 13 kV (Sec. \& Prim. Onty) | 23 | Customers | \$42,841.17 | \$885 | \$966 |
|  | Secondary Connect Costs |  | Customers | \$20,823.37 | \$42 | \$41 |
|  | Primary Connect Casts | 21 | Customers | \$3,068.13 | \$64 | \$63 |
|  | Subtransmission Connect Costs | 9 | Customers | \$58,755.02 | \$511 | \$501 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 413,337 | kW, rateclas's peak | \$13.88 | \$5,737 | \$5,626 |
|  | Substation (Sec. \& Prim. Only) | 246,301 | kW , ratectass peak | \$14.43 | \$3,554 | \$3,485 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$11,113 | \$10,898 |
| Schedule 91 Streetlighting \& Highway Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Customer Service | 143,816 | Lights | \$7.67 | \$1,103 | \$1,082 |
| FACILITIES | 13 kV | 26,745 | kW, sateclass paak | \$27.70 | \$741 | \$726 |
|  | Connect Costs (transformer only) | 143,816 | Lights | \$0.92 | \$132 | \$130 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 26,745 | kW, rateclass peak | \$13.88 | \$371 | \$364 |
|  | Substation | 26,745 | kW, rateclass peak | \$14.43 | \$386 | \$378 |
| SUBTOTAL | Luminaires \& Poles |  |  |  |  | \$7,636 |
|  |  | . |  |  | \$2,733 | \$10,316 |
| Schedule 92 Traffic Signals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FACILITES | 13 kV | 711 | kW, ratectass peak | \$19.43 | \$14 | \$14 |
|  | Cornect Costs | 1,560 | Intersections | \$27.20 | \$42 | \$42 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 711 | kW, rateclass peak . | \$13.88 | \$10 | - \$10 |
|  | Substation | 711 | kW, rateclass peak | \$14.43 | \$10 | \$10 |
| SUETOTAL |  |  |  | - | \$76 | \$75 |
| Schedule 83 Stadium Ligiting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters | 27 | Customers | \$1,305.56 | \$35 | 535 |
| FACILITIES | 13 kV | 351 | kW, rateclass peak | \$19.43 | \$7 | 57 |
|  | Connect Costs |  | Customers | \$148.99 | \$4 | \$4 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission |  | KW, rateclass peak | \$13.88 | \$5 | \$5 |
|  | Substation | 351 | kW, rateclass peak | \$14.43 | \$5 | \$5 |
| SUETOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$56 | \$55 |

## UE 262

## Attachment 023-C

## Provided in Electronic Format only

Page 66 of Attachment B from PGE's UE 197 Compliance Filing

| Grouping | PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC ALLOCATION OF DISTRIBUTION COST 2009 |  |  | Harginal Unit Cost | 6arginal Cosi Revenues | Ciass Revente Requirement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Usages | Units \& Basis |  |  |  |
| Schedule 89 General Service (4,000 plus kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Secondary Meters | 2 | Customers | \$181.72 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | Primary Meters | 30 | Customers | \$1,117.95 | $\$ 34$ | \$30 |
|  | Substation Meters | 10 | Customers | \$24,784.56 | \$248 | \$218 |
| FACILITIES | 13 kV (Sec. \& Prim. Only) | 32 | Customers | \$46,883.00 | \$1,500 | $\cdot$. 11,321 |
|  | Secondary Connect Costs | 2 | Customers | \$33,743.42 | \$67 | \$59 |
|  | Primary Conmect Costs | 30 | Customers | \$3,806.65 | \$114 | \$101 |
|  | Subtransmission Connect Costs | 10 | Customers | \$74,728:85 | \$747 | \$658 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmisslon | 532,158 | KW, rateclass peak | \$11.49 | \$6,114 | \$5,383 |
|  | Substation (Sec. \& Prim. Only) | 294,908 | kW , rateclass peak | \$17.15 | \$5,058 | \$4,453. |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$13,883 | \$12,223 |
| Schedule 91 Streetlighting \& Highivay Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Customer Service | 149,427 | Lights | \$4.68 | $\$ 699$ | \$615 |
| FACILTIES | 13 kV | 27,734 | KW , rateclass peak | \$31.03 | \$86t | \$758 |
|  | Connect Costs (transformer only) | 149,427 | Lights | \$1.40 | \$209 | \$184 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 27,734 | KW, rateclass peak | \$11.49 | \$319 | \$281 |
|  | Substation | 27,734 | kW, rateclass peak | \$17.15 | \$476 | \$419 |
| FIXED | Luminaires \& Poles | . | . |  |  | \$7,858 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$2,563 | \$10,114 |
| Schedules 92 \& 94 Traffic Signals \& Communications Devices |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FACILITIES | 13 kV | 619 | kW, rateclass peak | \$22.02 | \$14 | $\$ 12$ |
|  | Connect Costs | 1,616 | Intersections | \$22.15 | \$36 | \$32 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmisstion | 619 | kW, rateclass peak | \$11.49 | \$7 | \$6 |
|  | Substation | 619 | kW , rateclass peak | \$17.15 | \$11 | \$9 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | $\$ 67$ | \$59 |
| Schedule 93 Stadium Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters | 24 | Customers | \$1,678.67 | \$40 | $\$ 35$ |
| FACHITIES | 13 KV | 243 | KW, rateclass peak | \$22.02 | \$5 | \$5 |
|  | Connect Costs | 24 | Customers | \$155.95 | \$4 | \$3 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 243 | kW, rateclass peak | \$11.49 | \$3 | \$2 |
|  | Substation | 243 | kW, rateclass peak | \$17.15 | \$4 | \$4 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$56 | \$50 |

## UE 262

## Attachment 023-D

## Provided in Electronic Format only

Page 61 of Attachment B from PGE's UE 215 Compliance Filing

| , |  |  |  |  | PG <br> Att <br> Pa | Attachm Edvice No achment B e 61 | $\begin{gathered} \text { nt 023-D } \\ \text { Page } 1 \\ 10-28 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . |  | ND GENER N OF DIST 2011 | AL ELECTRIC RIBUTION COST |  |  |  |  |
| Grouping |  | Usages | Units \& Basis | $\begin{gathered} \text { Warginal } \\ \text { Unit } \\ \text { Cost } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Marginal Cost Revenues | Ciass Fevenue Requirement |  |
| Scherdule 89 Gen | eral Service (1,009-4,000 kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sacondary Meters | 92 | Customers | \$138.16 | \$13 | \$14 |  |
|  | Pimary Meters | 90 | Customers | \$739.95 | \$67 | $\$ 71$ |  |
|  | Senvice \& Transfomer |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Customers | 52 | Customers | \$4.594.87 | \$423 | \$449 |  |
|  | Primary Customers | 90 | Customers | $\$ 869.70$ | \$79 | \$84 |  |
| FACILIES | Feeder Backbone |  | KW, raleclass peak | $\$ 19.22$ | $\$ 4,254$ | \$4,522 |  |
|  | Feeder Local Facintles | $295,150$ | Design Demand | $\$ 4.74$ | $\$ 1,399$ | $\$ 1,487$ |  |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 224,254 | NW, rateclass peak | \$9.68 | \$2, 171 | \$2,307 |  |
|  | Substation | 221,354 | kW . rateclass peak | \$13.17 | \$2,915 | \$3,098 |  |
| Subtotal |  |  |  |  | \$11,320 | \$12,032 |  |
| Schedule 89 Gen | eral Servica (4,000 plus kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Meters | 2 | Customers | \$138.16 | \$0 | \$0 |  |
|  | Prinairy Meters | 31 | Custorners | \$739.95 | \$23 | \$24 |  |
|  | Substation Meters | 10 | Customers | \$13,800.01 | \$138 | \$147 |  |
|  | Service \& Transformer |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Customers | 2 | Customers | \$24,515.53 | \$49 | \$52 |  |
|  | Pitmary Customers | 31 | Custorners | \$2,555.63 | \$79 | \$84 |  |
| FACllimies | Feeder Backbone |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Customers | 2 | Customers | \$68,988.00 | \$138 | \$447 |  |
|  | Primany Customers | 31 | Custamers | \$88,998.00 | \$2,139 | \$2,273 |  |
|  | Subtransmission 115 kV Feeder | 10 | Customers | \$78,156,00 | \$782 | \$831 |  |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 381,709 | kW, ratecless peak | \$9.68 | \$3,695 | \$3,927 |  |
|  | Substafion (Sec. \& Prim. Only) | 280,655 | kW, ratectass peak | \$13.17 | \$3,696 | \$3,929 |  |
| SUBTOTAL | . |  |  |  | \$10,739 | \$11,414 |  |
| Schedule 91 Stre | etlighting \& Highway Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Customer Service | 154,236 | Lights | \$4.23 | \$653 | \$694 |  |
|  | Transformers | 154.236 | Uights | \$0.96 | \$148 | \$157 |  |
| facrimes | Feeder Backbone | 28,460 | kW, ralectass peak | \$23.48 | \$688 | \$710 |  |
|  | Feeder Local Facitites | 28,460 | Design Demand | \$16.74 | \$476 | \$506 |  |
| DEMAND | Subiransmission | 28,833 | kW, rateclass peak | \$9.68 | \$279 | \$297 |  |
|  | Substafion | 28,460 | kWi, ratedass peak | \$13.17 | \$375 | \$398 |  |
| FIXED | Luminaires \& Poles |  |  |  |  | \$8,159 |  |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$2,600 | \$10,922 |  |

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC ALLOCATION OF DISTRIBUTION COST 2014

| Grouping |  | 201 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Usages | Units \& Basis | $\begin{gathered} \text { Marginal } \\ \text { Unit } \\ \text { Cost } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Marginal Cost Revenues | Class <br> Revenue Requirement |
| Schedule 7 Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 733,968 | Customers | \$20.19 | \$14,819 | \$18,878 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 82 | Customers | \$55.45 | \$5 | \$6 |
|  | Service \& Transformer |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 733,968 | Customers | \$82.61 | \$60,633 | \$77,242 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 82 | Customers | \$147.47 | \$12 | \$15 |
| FACILities | Feeder Backbone |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 1,984.164 | kW, rateclass peak | \$24.23 | \$48,076 | \$61,246 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 222 | kW, rateclass peak | \$24.23 | \$5 | \$7 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 2,935.872 | Design Demand | \$17.10 | \$50,203 | \$63,955 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 329 | Design Demand | \$17.10 | \$6 | $\$ 7$ |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 2,010,382 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$22,094 | \$28,146 |
|  | Substation | 1,984,387 | kW. rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$20,082 | \$25,583 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$215,935 | \$275,085 |
| Schedule 15 Residential Outdoor Area Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Customer Service | 9,513 | Lights | \$3.39 | \$32 | \$41 |
|  | Transformer | 9.513 | Lights | \$8.66 | \$82 | \$105 |
| FACILITIES | Feeder Backbone | 1,808 | kW, rateclass peak | \$25.26 | \$46 | \$58 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities | 1,808 | Design Demand | \$17.8i | \$32 | \$41 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 1,832 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$20 | \$26 |
|  | Substation | 1,808 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$18 | \$23 |
| FIXED | Luminaires \& Poles |  |  |  |  | \$749 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$231 | \$1,043 |
| Schedule 15 Commercial Outdoor Area Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Customer Service | 11.108 | Lights | \$3.39 | \$38 | \$48 |
|  | Transformer | 11.108 | Lights | \$8.66 | \$96 | \$123 |
| FACILITIES | Feeeder Backbone | 4.270 | kW, rateclass peak | \$25.26 | \$108 | \$137 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities | 4,270 | Design Demand | \$17.81 | \$76 | \$97 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 4.325 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$48 | \$61 |
|  | Substation | 4.270 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$43 | \$55 |
| FIXED SUBTOTAL | Luminaires \& Poles |  |  |  |  | \$1,768 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$408 | \$2,288 |
| Schedule 15 Outdoor Area Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Gustomer Service |  |  |  |  | \$89 |
|  | Transformer |  |  |  |  | \$227 |
| FACILITIES | Feeeder Backbone |  |  |  |  | \$196 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities |  |  |  |  | \$138 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission |  |  |  |  | \$86 |
|  | Substation |  |  |  |  | \$78 |
| FIXED | Luminaires \& Poles |  |  |  |  | \$2,517 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  |  | \$3,331 |


| Grouping | Usages | Units \& Basis | Marginal <br> Unit <br> Cost | Marginal <br> Cost <br> RevenuesClass <br> Revenue <br> Requirement |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Schedule 32 Small Non-residential General Service CUSTOMER Meters

## Single-Phase Customers

 Three-Phase CustomersService \& Transformer
Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers

FACILITIES Feeder Backbone
Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers
Feeder Local Facilities Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers

DEMAND
Subtransmission
Substation
SUBTOTAL
Schedule 38 General Service
CUSTOMER Meters
Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers
Service \& Transformer Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers

FACILITIES Feeder Backbone
Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers
Feeder Local Facilities Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers

DEMAND
Subtransmission
Substation
SUBTOTAL

Schedule 47 Irrigation \& Drainage Service - < 30 kW CUSTOMER Meters

Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers
Service \& Transformer Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers

FACMITIES
Feeder Backbone
Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers
Feeder Local Facilities
Single-Phase Customers Three-Phase Customers

DEMAND

## Subtransmission

Substation
SUBTOTAL

| 53,942 | Customers | \$19.37 | \$1,045 | \$1,331 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34,854 | Customers | \$68.38 | \$2,383 | \$3,036 |
| 53,942 | Customers | \$123.07 | \$6.639 | \$8.457 |
| 34,854 | Customers | \$264.80 | \$9.229 | \$11,758 |
| 129,628 | kW, rateclass peak | \$28.14 | \$3,648 | \$4,647 |
| 189,860 | kW, rateclass peak | \$28.14 | \$5,343 | \$6,806 |
| 269,711 | Design Demand | \$24.77 | \$6,681 | \$8,511 |
| 393,855 | Design Demand | \$9.44 | \$3,718 | \$4,736 |
| 323,673 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$3,557 | \$4,532 |
| 319,488 | kW , rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$3,233 | \$4,119 |


| 38 | Customers | $\$ 57.76$ | $\$ 2$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 238 | Customers | $\$ 82.42$ | $\$ 20$ |
| 38 | Customers | $\$ 195.06$ | $\$ 7$ |
| 238 | Customers | $\$ 527.62$ | $\$ 126$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 9$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 160$ |
| 858 | kW. rateclass peak | $\$ 33.47$ | $\$ 29$ |
| 12,894 | kW, rateclass peak | $\$ 33.47$ | $\$ 432$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 37$ |
| 1,699 | Design Demand | $\$ 20.26$ | $\$ 34$ |
| 30,128 | Design Demand | $\$ 13.09$ | $\$ 394$ |
| 13,933 | kW, rateclass peak | $\$ 10.99$ | $\$ 153$ |
| 13,752 | kW, rateclass peak | $\$ 10.12$ | $\$ 139$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 1,336$ |


| 220 | Customers | \$53.83 | \$12 | \$15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2,983 | Customers | \$81.81 | \$244 | \$311 |
| 220 | Customers | \$9.70 | \$2 | \$3 |
| 2,983 | Customers | \$25.26 | \$75 | \$96 |
| 724 | kW, rateclass peak | \$70.23 | \$51 | \$65 |
| 17,569 | kW, rateclass peak | \$70.23 | \$1,234 | \$1.572 |
| 2,200 | Design Demand | \$52.32 | \$115 | \$147 |
| 29,830 | Design Demand | \$27.08 | \$808 | \$1.029 |
| 18,533 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$204 | \$259 |
| 18,293 | kW. rateciass peak | \$10.12 | \$185 | \$236 |


| Grouping | PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC ALLOCATION OF DISTRIBUTION COST 2014 |  |  | Page 3 of 5 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Usages ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | Units \& Basis | Marginal Unit Cost | Marginal Cost Revenues | Class <br> Revenue Requirement |
| Schedule 49 Irrigation \& Drainage Service -> 30 kW |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Single-Phase Customers | 4 | Customers | \$57.76 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 1.292 | Customers | \$99.76 | \$129 | \$164 |
|  | Service \& Transformer |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 4 | Customers | \$27.36 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 1,292 | Customers | \$132.97 | \$172 | \$219 |
| FACILITIES | Feeder Backbone |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 92 | kW, rateclass peak | \$71.65 | \$7 | \$8 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 58,374 | kW, raleclass peak | \$71.65 | \$4,183 | \$5,328 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 124 | Design Demand | \$44.06 | \$5 | \$7 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 74,290 | Design Demand | \$27.46 | \$2.040 | \$2,599 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 59.231 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$651 | \$829 |
|  | Substation | 58,466 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$592 | \$754 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$7.778 | \$9,909 |
| Schedule 83 General Service ( $31-200 \mathrm{~kW}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 697 | Customers | \$46.44 | \$32 | \$41 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 10,433 | Customers | \$108.37 | \$1,131 | \$1.440 |
|  | Service \& Transformer |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 697 | Customers | \$426.41 | \$297 | \$378 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 10,433 | Customers | \$1,093.60 | \$11,409 | \$14,534 |
| FACILITIES | Feeder Backbone |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 20,146 | kW, rateclass peak | \$24.68 | \$497 | \$633 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 545,554 | kW, rateclass peak | \$24.68 | \$13,464 | \$17,152 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Single-Phase Customers | 31,489 | Design Demand | \$20.63 | \$650 | \$828 |
|  | Three-Phase Customers | 853,385 | Design Demand | \$9.00 | \$7,680 | \$9,784 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 573,111 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$6,298 | \$8,024 |
|  | Substation | 585.700 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$5,725 | \$7,293 |
| SUBTOTAL | , |  |  |  | \$47,184 | \$60,109 |
| Schedule 85 General Service (201-1,000 kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Customers | 1,335 | Customers | \$151.34 | \$202 | \$257 |
|  | Primary Customers | 155 | Customers | \$1,382.27 | \$214 | \$273 |
|  | Service \& Transformer |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Customers | 1,335 | Customers | \$1.732.11 | \$2,313 | \$2,947 |
|  | Primary Customers | 155 | Customers | \$727.44 | \$113 | \$144 |
| FACILITIES | Feeder Backbone | 510,040 |  | \$21.13 | \$10,777 | \$13,729 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities | 669,607 | Design Demand | \$7.00 | \$4,687 | \$5,971 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 516,722 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$5,679 | \$7,234 |
|  | Substation | 510,040 | kW , raleclass peak | \$10.12 | \$5,162 | \$6,575 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$29,147 | \$37,131 |


| PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRICALLOCATION OF DISTRIBUTION COST2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grouping |  | Usages | Units \& Basis | Marginal Unit Cost | Marginal Cost Revenues | Class <br> Revenue Requirement |
| Schedule 85 General Service (1,001-4,000 kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Meters | 80 | Customers | \$164.19 | \$13 | \$17 |
|  | Primary Meters | 79 | Customers | \$1.382.27 | \$110 | \$140 |
|  | Service \& Transformer |  |  | \$1.382.27 |  |  |
|  | Secondary Customers | 80 | Customers | \$4,581.85 | \$367 | \$467 |
|  | Primary Customers | 79 | Customers | \$867.23 | \$69 | \$88 |
| facilities | Feeder Backbone | 213,587 | kW, rateclass peak | \$21.14 | \$4,515 | \$5.752 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities | 264,530 | Design Demand | \$4.66 | \$1,233 | \$1,570 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 216,385 | kW , rateclass peak | \$10.99 | $\$ 2,378$ | \$3,029 |
|  | Substation | 213,587 | kW , rateclass peak | $\$ 10.12$ | $\$ 2.162$ | \$2,754 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$10.846 | \$13,817 |
| Schedule 89 General Service ( 4,000 plus kW) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Meters | 2 | Customers | \$164.19 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | Primary Meters | 31 | Customers | \$1,382.27 | \$43 | \$55 |
|  | Substation Meters | 8 | Customers | \$16,556.61 | \$132 | \$169 |
|  | Service \& Transformer |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Customers | 2 | Customers | \$11,054.47 | \$22 | \$28 |
|  | Primary Customers | 31 | Customers | \$2,548.39 | \$79 | \$101 |
| FACILITIES | Feeder Backbone |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Secondary Customers | 2 | Customers | \$73,144.00 | \$146 | \$186 |
|  | Primary Customers | 31 | Customers | \$73,144.00 | \$2,267 | \$2,889 |
|  | Subtransmission 115 kV Feeder | 8 | Customers | \$83,464.00 | \$668 | \$851 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 453,534 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 |  |  |
|  | Substation (Sec. \& Prim. Only) | 374.623 | kW. rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$3,791 | \$4,830 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$12,134 | \$15,457 |
| Schedules 91 \& 95 Streetlighting \& Highway Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Customer Service | $158.628$ | Lights | \$3.39 | \$537 | \$684 |
|  | Service \& Transformer | 158,628 | Lights | \$5.01 | \$795 | \$1.012 |
| FACILities | Feeder Backbone | 27.068 | kW, rateclass peak | \$25.26 | \$684 | \$871 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities | 27.068 | Design Demand | \$17.81 | \$482 | \$614 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 27.422 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$301 | \$384 |
|  | Substation | 27,068 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$274 | \$349 |
| FIXED SUBTOTAL | Luminaires \& Poles |  |  |  |  | \$7,946 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$3,073 | \$11,861 |


| Grouping |  | PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC ALLOCATION OF DISTRIBUTION COST 2014 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Marginal } \\ \text { Unit } \\ \text { Cost } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Page 5 | of 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Usages | Units \& Basis |  | Marginal Cost Revenues | Class <br> Revenue Requirement |
| Schedule 92 Traffic Signals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Service \& Transformer | 1,772 | Intersections | \$12.09 | \$21 | \$27 |
| FACluties | Feeder Backbone | 531 | kW, rateclass peak | \$25.26 | \$13 | \$17 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities | 531 | Design Demand | \$9.09 | \$5 | \$6 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 538 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$6 | \$8 |
|  | Substation | 531 | kW , rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$5 | \$7 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$51 | \$65 |
| Schedute 93 Stadium Lighting |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters | 24 | Customers | -\$1,296.40 | \$31 | \$40 |
|  | Service \& Transformer | 24 | Customers | \$72.37 | \$2 | \$2 |
| FACILIties | Feeder Backbone | 1.017 | kW, rateclass peak | \$25.26 | \$26 | \$33 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities | 1,956 | Design Demand | \$9.09 | \$18 | \$23 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 1.030 | kW, rateclass peak | \$10.99 | \$11 | \$14 |
|  | Substation | 1.017 | kW. rateclass peak | \$10.12 | \$10 | \$13 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  | \$98 | \$125 |
| Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CUSTOMER | Meters | 840,466 | Customers |  | \$20,567 | \$26,201 |
|  | Service \& Transformer |  | Customers |  | \$92,561 | \$117,915 |
|  | Customer Service | 179,249 | Lights |  | \$607 | \$773 |
| FACILItIES | Feeder Backbone | 3,718,407 | kW, rateclass peak |  | \$96.218 | \$122,574 |
|  | Feeder Local Facilities | 5,592,682 | Design Demand |  | \$78,868 | \$100,472 |
| DEMAND | Subtransmission | 4,220,651 | kW, rateclass peak |  | \$46,385 | \$59,091 |
|  | Substation | 4,093,030 | kW rateclass Peak |  | \$41,421 | \$52,768 |
| FIXED | Luminaires \& Poles |  |  |  |  | \$10,463 |
| TOTALS |  |  |  |  | \$376,627 | \$490,257 |
|  |  |  |  | EQUAL PERCENT |  | \$490,257 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 127.4\% |


|  | Lights | Intersections |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Schedule 15R | 9,513 |  |
| Schedule 15C | 11,108 |  |
| Schedule $91 \& 95$ | 158,628 |  |
| Schedule 92 |  | 1,772 |
|  |  |  |
| Lights | 179,249 |  |
| Intersections |  | 1,772 |
| RC 313 Test Period O\&M |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| N34206 | $\$ 355,337$ |  |
| N34215 | $\$ 251,710$ |  |
|  | $\$ 607,047$ |  |
| O\&M per light | $\$ 3.39$ |  |

## Design Demand per Rate Schedule

| Grouping |  | Average <br> Customers |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Design |  |  |  | | Design |
| :--- |
| Demand |,$~$| Dehedule 7 1-phase | 4.0 | 733,968 | $2,935,872$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Schedule 7 3-phase | 4.0 | 82 | 329 |
| Schedule 32 1-phase | 5.0 | 53,942 | 269,711 |
| Schedule 32 3-phase | 11.3 | 34,854 | 393,855 |
| Schedule 38 1-phase | 44.7 | 38 | 1,699 |
| Schedule 38 3 phase | 126.5 | 238 | 30,128 |
| Schedule 47 1-phase | 10.0 | 220 | 2,200 |
| Schedule 47 3 phase | 10.0 | 2,983 | 29,830 |
| Schedule 49 1-phase | 31.0 | 4 | 124 |
| Schedule 49 3 phase | 57.5 | 1,292 | 74,290 |
| Schedule 83 1-phase | 45.2 | 697 | 31,489 |
| Schedule 83 3 phase | 81.8 | 10,433 | 853,385 |
| Schedule 85 | 449.3 | 1,490 | 669,607 |
| Schedule 85 1-4 MW | $1,660.2$ | 159 | 264,530 |
| Schedule 93 | 81.5 | 24 | 1,956 |



|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ｜ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  <br>  <br>  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ロロ \％ <br>  | ～ |  |  |
| －－ |  | ＂ |  |  |
|  |  | \％ |  |  |
|  |  | 喈 |  <br>  |  |
|  |  | \％ |  | \％ |
| ¢ |  | 器 |  <br>  |  |
|  |  | 膆 |  |  |
|  |  | \％ |  | － |
|  |  | \％ | 䓓 | － |
|  |  | \％ |  | \％ |
|  |  | \＃ |  | \％ |
|  |  | 妣 |  | \％ |
|  |  | H |  |  |
|  |  | 皆 |  |  |
|  |  | 渞 |  | \％\％ |
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UE 262/COP/Exhibit 106
Falcon

## PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC <br> 2014 MARGINAL COST STUDY <br> SUMMARY OF CUSTOMER SERVICE MARGINAL COSTS

| To apply gross-up factors: $1=$ yes, otherwise $0==>$ | 1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCHEDULE | ANNUAL METERING EXPENSES | ANNUAL <br> BILLING <br> EXPENSES | ANNUAL OTHER EXPENSES | TOTAL CUSTOMER EXPENSES |
| Schedule 7 Residential | \$0.45 | \$ 51.80 | \$20.17 | \$72.42 |
| Schedule 15 Residential | \$0.00 | \$ 40.24 | \$20.16 | \$60.40 |
| Schedule 15 Commercial | \$0.00 | 63.54 | \$36.63 | \$100.17 |
| Schedule 32 General Service | \$1.01 | \$ 68.21 | \$46.31 | \$115.54 |
| Schedule 38 GS TOU | \$12.96 | \$ 43.06 | \$50.52 | \$106.54 |
| Schedule 47 Irrigation | \$0.93 | \$ 65.81 | \$38.47 | \$105.20 |
| Schedule 49 Irrigation | \$1.50 | \$ 77.18 | \$41.25 | \$119.93 |
| Schedule 83 General Service | \$5.06 | \$ 89.18 | \$83.99 | \$178.24 |
| Schedule 85 General Service | \$10.72 | \$ 43.29 | \$824.75 | \$878.76 |
| Schedule 89 General Service (1001-4000 KW) | \$7.65 | \$ 43.52 | \$3,554.04 | \$3,605.20 |
| Schedule 89 General Service (OVER 4,000 KW) | \$0.00 | \$ 43.13 | \$41,182.48 | \$41,225.61 |
| Schedule 91 \& 95 Streetlighting | \$0.00 | \$ 436.03 | \$334.22 | \$770.25 |
| Schedule 92 Traffic Sign. \& Comm. Dev. | \$0.00 | \$ 436.03 | \$188.87 | \$624.90 |
| Schedule 93 Field Lighting | \$9.49 | \$ 63.96 | \$101.58 | \$175.03 |

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON 

UE 262
CITY OF PORTLAND

Direct Testimony of:<br>Richard Gray

June 14, 2013

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS AND POSITION.

A. My name is Richard Gray. I am a Senior Management Analyst for the City of Portland's Bureau of Transportation (PBOT). My business address is 2929 N. Kerby Avenue, Portland, OR 97227.

## Q. WHAT TOPICS DOES YOUR TESTIMONY ADDRESS?

A. My testimony addresses the issues of Associated Circuits and Pole Costs, as these relate to street lighting.

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CITY OF PORTLAND'S STREET LIGHTING SYSTEM.

A. The City of Portland first began lighting its streets in 1852, 161 years ago. Since then the City's street lighting system has expanded to include over 55,000 lights, all owned by the City and nearly all High Pressure Sodium (HPS). The City buys electricity and much of the maintenance for its street lighting system from PGE. PGE also serves the street lights in PacifiCorp's allocated service territory within Portland, under a 1977 agreement between the two electric utilities.

PGE's Schedule 91 provides three options for street lighting services:

| Schedule 91 | Option A | Option B | Option C |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ownership | PGE Provides <br> (customer pays rent) | Customer <br> Provides | Customer <br> Provides |
| Maintenance | PGE Provides | PGE Provides | Customer <br> Provides |
| Energy | PGE Provides | PGE Provides | PGE Provides |

PBOT's crews maintain more than 11,000 Option C lights. PGE maintains almost 44,000 Option B lights for Portland. The City has no Option A lights.

All of these street lights are unmetered and billed on a flat rate basis for both maintenance and energy, based on assumed operation of 4,150 hours per year. Ninety percent of the City's street lighting annual budget of $\$ 7$ million is paid for out of the General Fund. ${ }^{1}$ The City has a long history of working hard to keep these costs low to protect the City's taxpayers. Street lighting is a vital component of public safety and helps support the economic vitality of the City of Portland.

Going into fiscal year 2013-2014, the City of Portland was facing a budget shortfall of $\$ 25$ million. ${ }^{2}$ In response to this large shortfall, the City's FY 2013-14 budget includes eliminating 183 positions throughout the City and reduces budgets in all bureaus to 90 percent of current cost of service in addition to additional targeted cuts. ${ }^{3}$ While the economy is slowly improving, the City is facing significant risk associated with the level of the City's future General Fund revenues. Approximately 90 percent of the City's revenues come from three sources: property taxes, business licenses and utility licenses/franchise fees. All of these rely on economic recovery to ensure the City collects sufficient revenues to meet costs. On December 19, 2012, the City Council adopted two ordinances regarding the conversion of City street lights from high pressure sodium to energy efficient light-emitting diodes (LEDs). City of Portland Ordinance No. 185837 (authorizing revenue bonds for the lighting efficiency program) and City of Portland Ordinance No. 185838 (directing system replacement and renewable energy from LED streetlight conversion). PBOT has solicited formal bidding
${ }^{1}$ City of Portland, Oregon - FY 2012-13 Adopted Budget: Transportation and Parking Service Area, pp. 504-506, http://www.portlandoregon.gov/cbo/article/405643 (accessed on June 11, 2013).
${ }^{2}$ Office of Management and Finance, Five Year General Fund financial Forecast, p. 1, Table 1 (December, 2012) http://www.portlandoregon.gov/cbo/article/424030 (accessed on June 13, 2013).
${ }^{3}$ Memorandum from Budget Director Andrew Scott to Portland City Council, Approval of City of Portland FY
proposals from contractors to provide labor, equipment, materials and incidental work necessary to completely remove the existing HPS luminaires and install approximately 44,000 LED luminaires within the City of Portland. City of Portland Bid Solicitation Number 115487. The due date for bidding on this project closed on June 11, 2013 at 2:00 p.m. Through this process, the City intends to ultimately convert all of its street lights to LED. The resultant lower power consumption will save the City money and will help to reduce the City's creation of green house gasses consistent with the City's Climate Policy. LEDs also require much less maintenance, resulting in further savings. The City's goal is to purchase power under PGE's Schedule 95 Option C and perform maintenance primarily through the use of contractors.

## I. ASSOCIATED CIRCUITS

## Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CITY'S CONCERNS WITH ASSOCIATED CIRCUITS.

A. PGE's proposed Schedule 91, page 91-4 provides that once a customer assumes maintenance of the new LED streetlights (which the customer purchases and installs), the customer will be required to also assume on-going maintenance of "associated circuits". The City of Portland objects to this requirement as an inappropriate shift in responsibilities and costs to Option C streetlight customers. These circuits are inherently part of PGE's distribution system. Maintenance of these circuits should be treated the same as maintenance of other parts of PGE's distribution system.

## Q. WHAT ARE THESE CIRCUITS?

A. Associated circuits are secondary voltage lines that feed street light services, whether

2013-14 Budget (May 22, 2013) http://www.portlandoregon.gov/cbo/article/450323 (accessed on June 13, 2013).
individual or group luminaires. See, PGE's response to City of Portland DR 36, attached as COP Exhibit 201. Associated circuits are part of PGE's power distribution system and are dedicated to serving street lights. These circuits typically run from PGE's other distribution facilities to the customer's light (in the City of Portland's case, these lights are all owned by the City) much like the service drop to a customer's house (the service drop is owned and maintained by PGE). These circuits can be overhead or underground. Many of the circuits are not located in the public right-of-way. If PGE unilaterally transfers maintenance responsibilities of these circuits to the customer, this will result in the customers having access issues.

## Q. WHO OWNS AND MAINTAINS THESE CIRCUITS?

A. PGE owns and maintains the associated circuits as part of its distribution system. PGE is currently reimbursed for its investment cost through a circuit charge applied to each Option A and Option B light. The charge is $\$ 1.38$ per light per month, regardless of whether the light uses these dedicated circuits. PGE describes this in its response to the City of Portland's DR 38, attached as COP Exhibit 202. PGE proposes to discontinue this cost as part of UE 262 and include those costs as part of its distribution system charges. PGE's adoption of this new methodology further reinforces the City's position that these are distribution assets and should not be the customers' responsibility. PGE has indicated at various times that they do not want to maintain what they don't own. The City of Portland feels the same way with regard to these parts of PGE's distribution system. These circuits are analogous to the service drop to a house: PGE owns the distribution wire, including the service drop, to the house; the homeowner has no responsibility to maintain the distribution wire as a component of PGE's
distribution system; PGE is compensated for the maintenance work and recovers its investment through distribution charges embedded in the energy rate.

## Q. HAVE CIRCUIT CHARGES BEEN ADDRESSED IN PRIOR PGE RATE

## PROCEEDINGS?

A. Yes. In UE 215 the City of Portland raised objections to PGE's circuit charge. PGE and the City conducted a study of these charges, that concluded with PGE's commitment to include the circuit charges as part of its distribution rates. UE 215, PGE/City Of Portland's Report on Stipulation in compliance with Order No. 10-478 (January 19, 2012). PGE recently reaffirmed its commitment to this approach. See, COP Exhibit 202. The City of Portland applauds and endorses this change. As discussed above, these circuits are properly part of PGE's distribution system.

## Q. HOW DOES PGE PROPOSE THAT THESE DISTRIBUTION CIRCUITS BE

 MAINTAINED?A. PGE proposes that the maintenance of the circuits used to power Option C lights be maintained by the customer. The circuits used to power Option A lights would continue to be maintained by PGE (under Schedule 95, there will be no Option B lights) at no additional charge beyond the "Distribution Charge" paid by all Schedule 95 customers and shown in the tariff. Because all customers pay the same rate, this means that Option C customers will be paying for circuit maintenance services that they would not be receiving. To the extent that PGE is working on a marginal COS model, the distribution charges should drop for Option C street lights in an amount equivalent to PGE's avoided costs of providing maintenance on the associated circuits. On top of this, these customers will have to perform maintenance on
parts of the power distribution system that the customer would be forced to purchase.

## Q. HAS PGE OTHERWISE EXPRESSED AN OFFER TO SELL THESE CIRCUITS TO THE CITY?

A. No. Portland Bureau of Transportation Street Lighting staff have been in discussions with PGE representatives for months, making preparations for the City's proposed conversion to LEDs and an all Option C system. There have been discussions between City and PGE representatives regarding the City's potential purchase of several Street Lighting Only (SLO) poles. However, at no time during these meetings has PGE raised the issue of the City purchasing the associated circuits. This has only surfaced as part of PGE's response to a data request from the City of Portland. See, PGE response to City of Portland DR 40(a), attached as COP Exhibit 203.

PGE has seemingly embarked upon a campaign to encourage customers to elect Option A street lighting. The requirement for Option C street lights to purchase and maintain associated circuits seems to have arisen as a financial inducement to choosing Option A or as fiscal penalty to choosing Option C. Ownership of the circuits is not mentioned in the existing or proposed Schedule 95. Rather, existing Schedule 95 references future circuit maintenance obligations for Option C luminaire conversions. ${ }^{4}$ The only apparent reference to an obligation to acquire associated circuits seems to otherwise be restricted to PGE's response to a City data request.

Further, PGE apparently retains sole discretion on how it will determine what constitutes an

[^0]"associated circuit." PGE hasn't identified any consistent methodology on how the costs of the associated circuits might be appropriately evaluated, nor a mechanism for rolling these assets off its balance sheet. Moreover, some of these associated circuits may be located on private property, to which PGE may have access rights but not the City or other street lighting customers. PGE has not provided any details on what the process may be for PGE coordinating with customers on performing maintenance, as these associated circuits may be interwoven with other distribution facilities. The OPUC should disallow this change: Street lighting customers (and their constituent taxpayers) should not be mandated to purchase parts of PGE's distribution system in a form of reverse condemnation where a private entity requires the public to purchase private assets.

## II. POLE COSTS

Q. HOW HAVE POLE COSTS CHANGED IN UE 262?
A. Pole rental costs have gone up $55 \%$ and pole maintenance costs have gone up approximately $26 \%$, with no accompanying justification.

## Q. HOW MANY POLES DOES PGE MAINTAIN FOR THE CITY?

A. The City pays PGE to maintain nearly 5,700 poles. These are a mixture of Option A (PGEowned) and Option B (Customer-owned).

## Q. WHAT IS PGE'S CHARGE FOR POLE MAINTENANCE?

A. PGE charges $0.2742 \%$ times the installation costs for maintenance. See, cell J2 of work file "St12014 Investment Calc.xlsx" tab "91 Pole Inv, attached as COP Exhibit 204. While there is no corresponding explanation for this percentage, the City's experience in past rate cases has been that pole knockdowns (usually from vehicle crashes) are the major driver to this cost
component.

## Q. HAS THIS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED IN ANY PRIOR PGE RATE CASES?

A. In UE 115, the City of Portland submitted testimony regarding four examples of emergency pole replacement rates with other pole owners that had a much lower rate of knockdowns. UE 115 (COP Exhibit 200, beginning at page 11). This testimony can be summarized as follows:

| Pole Owner | \% replaced due to <br> knockdown/year. |
| :--- | :--- |
| City of Portland Option C | $0.25 \%$ |
| Eugene Water and Electric Board | $0.10 \%$ |
| McMinnville Water \& Light | $0.10 \%$ |
| Salem Electric | $0.10 \%$ |

The average of these figures is about $0.15 \%$. The City of Portland, the League of Oregon Cities and PGE wound up resolving that matter by agreeing to a replacement frequency rate of $0.25 \%$. UE 115, Order No. 01-777, App. C, p. 4 (August 31, 2001). PGE has apparently adhered to this number until now, when it inexplicably employed a higher replacement rate of $0.2742 \%$.

## Q. HAVE YOU DONE ANY FURTHER RESEARCH REGARDING EMERGENCY

 POLE REPLACEMENT RATES?A. Yes. Charter Communications staff recently reported that they have about 1,000 poles in Oregon and no knowledge of any knockdowns. McMinnville Power and Light recently reported that they have about 2,000 street lighting poles and average 3 knockdowns per year
$(0.15 \%)$. The City of Gresham reports owning 5,367 poles and only having 3 knockdowns last year ( $0.055 \%$ ). CenturyLink reports that they had 23 emergency pole replacements over the last five years out of an inventory of 141,933 poles. This equates to $.0162 \%$ over 5 years or $.00324 \%$ per year. Reed Schmidt, an economist with the California City-County Street Light Association, has indicated that emergency replacement rates of $1-3$ poles per 10,000 is typically common. Other utilities have provided similar reports.

## Q. HAVE YOU IDENTIFIED OTHER ISSUES WITH PGE'S POLE COST

## CALCULATIONS?

A. There appears to be no offset for insurance reimbursements. It is common for pole knockdowns to have a police report identifying the person causing the damage. In Gresham's example, all three of the knockdowns were by insured motorists and PGE had the information available to recover their costs. They probably did. Responsible pole owners/maintainers have a duty to get compensation from drivers who damage poles, rather than simply recover the costs through rates. Based on my research, obtaining reimbursements is common practice. However, PGE offers no offset for this. Instead, PGE may get reimbursed by both the driver and the street lighting customer. The City of Portland has an extensive inventory of electrical facilities in the right-of-way; we received about $\$ 200,000$ in the last fiscal year from insurance claims, thus saving the taxpayer from bearing the costs.

## Q. WHAT DO YOU CONCLUDE ABOUT POLE MAINTENANCE COSTS?

A. PGE provides no evidence for their maintenance rates, they seem to be using numbers far different than the experience of other pole owners and contrary to their prior stipulation and there is no evidence of attempting to reduce ratepayer costs by recovering from those who
damage poles.
Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.
A. I have a Bachelor of Science in Political Science from the University of Oregon and a Master of Science in Public Affairs from the University of Oregon. In my current position with PBOT, my responsibilities include: Contract Administrator, Legislative Liaison, Contractor Outreach, Consultant for Street Lighting, and several other functions. Among my prior job responsibilities with the City of Portland, I served as PBOT's Street Lighting Manager for ten years. In that capacity, I offered testimony in several prior electric utility rate cases. I also conducted audits of PGE's charges for street lighting services resulting in over $\$ 375,000$ in credits for inappropriate charges. I am also a founding member and Board Member of the Oregon Joint Use Association, a non-profit charged with advising the OPUC on utility joint use issues.

## Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes.

June 5, 2013

| TO: | Benjamin Walters <br> City of Portland |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | David Tooze <br> City of Portland |
| FROM: $\quad$ | Patrick Hager <br> Manager, Regulatory Affairs |

## PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC

## UE 262

PGE Response to City of Portland Data Request
Dated May 22, 2013
Question No. 036

## Request:

In various places in the proposed tariff revisions, PGE references "associated circuits" when discussing the conversion of streetlights to Option C luminaires. See, for example, UE 262/Exhibit 1501 /Cody-Macfarlane at pages 30, 79 and 91. Please describe:
a. What are "associated circuits" as PGE uses this phrase.
b. How will PGE determine what are "associated circuits," whether on the basis of individual luminaires or for groups of luminaires?
c. How will PGE determine what "associated circuits" are for any specific luminaire or groups of luminaires?
d. Are distribution circuits "associated circuits"?
e. What other elements of PGE's distribution system might be included within "associated circuits?"
f. Do "associated circuits" include underground facilities, or aerial facilities, or a mixture of both?
g. Are "associated circuits" dedicated to serving luminaires, or are the "associated circuits" used by PGE for providing service to other PGE customers?
h. Are the "associated circuits" used to provide power to service drops to. residential or commercial properties?

June 5, 2013
Page 2
i. Please provide any audits or inspection reports of "associated circuits" regarding whether these circuits supply power to residential or commercial service drops?

## Response:

a. "Associated circuits" as used in PGE Exhibit 1501/Cody - Macfarlane, pages 30, 79,91 is used to indicate secondary voltage that feeds streetlight-only service.
b. Associated circuits could serve an individual luminaire or a group of luminaires.
c. PGE is conducting an ongoing field inspection of the lights in the City of Portland to verify that associated circuits serve streetlights only.
d. See (a.) above.
e. No other elements of the PGE distribution system are included within "associated circuits."
f. Associated circuits include underground and overhead facilities.
g. "Associated circuits" are dedicated to serving luminaires; they are generally not used by PGE to provide any other services to customers.
h. See PGE's responses to part (g.) above.
i. PGE is conducting an ongoing field inspection of the lights in the City of Portland to identify if any streetlight-only (SLO) poles supply power to residential or commercial service drops. If a SLO pole is used to supply power to a residential or commercial service drop, the pole will be reclassified as "secondary only" and is not an associated circuit.

June 5, 2013

TO: Benjamin Walters<br>City of Portland<br>David Tooze<br>City of Portland<br>FROM: Patrick Hager<br>Manager, Regulatory Affairs

## PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC

UE 262
PGE Response to City of Portland Data Request
Dated May 22, 2013
Question No. 038

## Request:

Regarding these "associated circuits," please describe how the capital investment in these circuits is recovered by PGE in rates.

## Response:

The portion of the associated circuit that is covered by the line extension allowance is currently recovered through the circuit charge for each luminaire. The circuit charge is $\$ 1.38$ per light. In UE 262, PGE proposes to include the circuit investment in distribution and recover through the distribution energy charge. Any amount beyond the line extension allowance is paid directly by the Customer upon installation.

June 5, 2013

TO: Benjamin Walters
City of Portland
David Tooze
City of Portland
FROM: Patrick Hager
Manager, Regulatory Affairs

PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC
UE 262
PGE Response to City of Portland Data Request
Dated May 22, 2013
Question No. 040

## Request:

Are the "associated circuits" currently owned by PGE? Are the "associated circuits" curreatly considered part of PGE' s "utility plant?"
a. Please discuss whether the "associated circuits" would continue to be assets owned by PGE following conversion to Option C luminaires.
b. Please discuss if, after conversion to Option C luminaires, the customer's responsibility for maintenance costs of the "associated circuits" would include responsibility for replacement costs.
c. If the customer will be responsible for replacement costs of the "associated circuits," please describe whether the replaced "associated circuits" will be PGE capital assets.
d. If the customer will be responsible for the replacement costs, how will these capital assets be treated in PGE's rates?

## Response:

The associated circuits for Option B luminaires are currently owned by PGE. They are considered utility plant.
a. In order to convert to Option C, the Customer is required to purchase the associated circuits and they will no longer be PGE assets.

UE 262/COP/Exhibit 203

## Gray

Page 2 of 2
UE 262 PGE Response to City of Portland DR No. $040^{\circ}$
June 5, 2013
Page 2
b. Once the Customer assumes ownership, the Customer is responsible for maintenance and replacement costs of associated circuits of Option C luminaires.
c. Once the Customer assumes ownership, the associated circuits will not be PGE capital assets.
d. As they are not PGE capital assets, they are not included in PGE rates.

Portland General Electric
Schedule 91
Street and Highway Lighting Luminaire Revenue Summary
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# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON 

UE 262<br>CITY OF PORTLAND

Direct Testimony of:
David A. Tooze

June 14, 2013
Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, EMPLOYER AND BUSINESS ADDRESS?
A. My name is David A. Tooze. I am currently employed as the Senior Energy Specialist for the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability at the City of Portland, Oregon. My business address is $1900 \mathrm{SW} 4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue, Suite 7100 , Portland, Oregon, 97201.

## Q. WHAT ARE THE PURPOSES OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

A. The purposes of my testimony are to (i) propose the creation of two five-year Cost of Service Opt-out Tariffs for Street Lighting and (ii) to propose the creation of a five-year Cost of Service Opt-out Tariff for Traffic Signals.

## Q. YOU MENTION TWO COST OF SERVICE OPT-OUT TARIFFS FOR STREET

 LIGHTING. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY TWO TARIFFS.A. Portland proposes that PGE create two new schedules - a Cost of Service Opt-out tariff, Schedule 491 for street lighting systems with high pressure sodium luminaires and a Schedule 495 for street lighting systems with new technology, like Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs).

## Q. WHY ARE FIVE-YEAR TRANSMISSION ACCESS TARIFFS NEEDED FOR

 TRAFFIC SIGNALS AND STREET LIGHTING?A. Three-year and five-year Cost of Service Opt-out tariffs (PGE's 400 series of Tariffs) do not exist for street lighting and traffic signal customers. Instead, only one-year Direct Access Tariffs are offered (Schedules 591 and 592). The City of Portland's Bureau of Transportation desires to have the option to elect three or five-year Cost of Service Opt-out. The primary motivation would be cost reduction for street lighting customers. Only under the 400 series Transmission Access Tariff offering five-year Cost of Service Opt-out is a customer relieved
of paying Long-Term Transition Cost Adjustments. (Schedule 129), with access to the full benefits of buying electricity in the competitive marketplace.
Q. ARE PORTLAND'S STREET LIGHTING AND TRAFFIC SIGNAL LOADS OF SUFFICIENT SIZE TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR TRANSMISSION ACCESS TARIFFS?
A. Yes. Portland's Schedule 91 Street Lighting system uses over 40 million kilowatt-hours annually with a demand of roughly $9,000 \mathrm{~kW}$. Portland's Schedule 92 Traffic Signal system uses nearly 2.4 million kWh annually with a demand of roughly 270 kW . PGE's existing Transmission Access Tariffs for Cost of Service Opt-out have a demand minimum of 200 kW (see PGE Schedule 485).
Q. SHOULD ALL STREET LIGHTING AND TRAFFIC SIGNAL CUSTOMERS BE ALLOWED ENROLLMENT ON FIVE-YEAR TRANSMISSION ACCESS TARIFFS?
A. Portland General Electric has varying criteria for Direct Access and Cost of Service Opt-out. For example, one-year Direct Access Street Lights under Schedule 591 has no minimum size for participation while Direct Access for Traffic Signals under Schedule 592 refers to a system size of 50 intersections. The Tariff for Large Nonresidential Cost of Service Opt Out, Schedule $485(201-1000 \mathrm{~kW})$, refers to accounts having exceeded a demand of 200 kW . When creating Cost of Service Opt-out Schedules 491 and 495 for Street Lights, eligibility should be determined by the luminaire count of the street lighting system. Portland suggests a minimum system size of 3,000 luminaires. A system of 3,000 high pressure sodium luminaries has an electrical demand of roughly 400 kW , while a system of 3,000 LED luminaires has an electrical load of roughly 200 kW . A 200 kW threshold is used by PGE in Schedule 485 for Cost of Service Opt-out participation by large nonresidential customers.

When creating Cost of Service Opt-out Schedule 492 for Traffic Signals, eligibility should continue to be based on the system's number of intersections. Portland suggests a minimum system size of 200 intersections - four times the minimum size required for participation in one-year Direct Access under Schedule 592.

## Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS.

A. I received a Bachelor of Science Degree from Oregon State University, 1974. In 1980 I joined the Pacific Power and Light Company as an Energy Conservation Specialist. Through a chain of increasing responsibility, I provided customer services under Pacific Power's Home Weatherization Program. In 1983 I began providing Account Manager services for selected commercial and industrial customers.

In 1987 I joined the City of Portland to design and launch a new energy program targeting multifamily rentals. In 1991 I began the City Energy Challenge, Portland's internal energy efficiency program. Since then, more than 220 energy efficiency projects have been completed in office buildings, community centers, police and fire stations, water and wastewater treatment facilities and on traffic signal and street lighting systems, producing annual savings of $\$ 5.8$ million.

Presently I am the Senior Energy Manager in the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, responsible for energy efficiency and renewable power advances in city-owned buildings and facilities.
Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE COMMISSION?
A. Yes. I have previously submitted testimony in Oregon Public Utility Commission Dockets UE 115, UE 116, UE 179 and UE 180.
Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?
A. Yes.


[^0]:    ${ }^{4}$ See, PGE PUC Oregon No. E-18, Sheet 95-2, Maintenance Service under Option C (November 7, 2012) http://www.portlandgeneral.com/our company/corporate info/regulatory documents/pdfs/schedules/Sched 095.pdf (accessed June 13, 2013)

