## CITY OF

# PORTLAND, OREGON

## OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

James H. Van Dyke, City Attorney

1221 S.W. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 430 Portland, Oregon 97204 Telephone: (503) 823-4047

Fax No.: (503) 823-3089

June 14, 2013

Public Utililty Commission of Oregon 550 Capitol St NE #215 PO Box 2148 Salem, OR 97308-2148

Re:

**Docket No. UE 262** – In the Matter of Portland General Electric

Company, Request for a General Rate Revision

Dear Filing Center:

Enclosed for filing is an original and five copies of the Direct Testimony of Anne Falcon (and Exhibits), Richard Gray (and Exhibits) and David Tooze.

Copies have been served electronically on all parties to this proceeding in the above-referenced docket.

Sincerely,

Benjamin E. Walters

Chief Deputy City Attorney

BW:lw Enclosures

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have this day served the foregoing Direct Testimony of Anne Falcon, Richard Gray and David Tooze, on behalf of the City of Portland upon the parties on the attached service list by causing the same to be sent via electronic mail.

Dated at Portland, Oregon, this 14<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2013.

Benjamin Walters, OSB #85354

Chief Deputy City Attorney Attorneys for City of Portland

## **UE 262 – SERVICE LIST**

	- SERVICE LIST					
BEERY, ELSNER & HAMMOND LLP						
NANCY L WERNER (C)	1750 SW HARBOR WAY, SUITE 380 PORTLAND OR 97201-5016 nancy@gov-law.com					
BOEHM KURTZ & LOWRY						
KURT J BOEHM (C) ATTORNEY	36 E SEVENTH ST - STE 1510 CINCINNATI OH 45202 kboehm@bkllawfirm.com					
BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY						
JODY KYLER COHN (C) ATTORNEY	36 E SEVENTH ST STE 1510 CINCINNATI OH 45202 jkyler@bkllawfirm.com					
BRUBAKER & ASSOCIATES INC						
MICHAEL GORMAN (C)	16690 SWINGLEY RIDGE RD STE 140 CHESTERFIELD MO 63017 mgorman@consultbai.com					
CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT HAAGENSEN & LLOYD						
TOMMY A BROOKS <b>(C)</b>	1001 SW FIFTH AVE, STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97204-1136 tbrooks@cablehuston.com					
CABLE HUSTON BENEDICT HAAGENSEN & LLOYD LLP						
CHAD M STOKES (C)	1001 SW 5TH - STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97204-1136 cstokes@cablehuston.com					
CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON						
OPUC DOCKETS	610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 dockets@oregoncub.org					
ROBERT JENKS (C)	610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 bob@oregoncub.org					
G. CATRIONA MCCRACKEN (C)	610 SW BROADWAY, STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 catriona@oregoncub.org					
CITY OF HILLSBORO						
ANDREW BARTLETT (C)	150 EAST MAIN ST. HILLSBORO OR 97123 andrew.bartlett@hillsboro-oregon.gov					

CITY OF PORTLAND - PLANNING & SUSTAINABILITY	
DAVID TOOZE	1900 SW 4TH STE 7100 PORTLAND OR 97201 david.tooze@portlandoregon.gov
DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC	
S BRADLEY VAN CLEVE (C)	333 SW TAYLOR - STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97204 bvc@dvclaw.com
ENERGY STRATEGIES LLC	
KEVIN HIGGINS (C)	215 STATE ST - STE 200 SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111-2322 khiggins@energystrat.com
FRED MEYER STORES/KROGER	
NONA SOLTERO	3800 SE 22ND AVE PORTLAND OR 97202 nona.soltero@fredmeyer.com
HUTCHINSON COX COONS ORR & SHERLOCK	
SAMUEL L ROBERTS (C)	777 HIGH ST STE 200 PO BOX 10886 EUGENE OR 97440 sroberts@eugenelaw.com
LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES	
MAJA HAIUM <b>(C)</b>	PO BOX 928 SALEM OR 97308 mhaium@orcities.org
TRACY RUTTEN (C)	PO BOX 928 SALEM OR 97308 trutten@orcities.org
MCDOWELL RACKNER & GIBSON PC	
LISA F RACKNER	419 SW 11TH AVE., SUITE 400 PORTLAND OR 97205 dockets@mcd-law.com
NOBLE AMERICAS ENERGY SOLUTIONS, LLC	
GREG BASS	401 WEST A ST., STE. 500 SAN DIEGO CA 92101 gbass@noblesolutions.com
NORTHWEST NATURAL	
E-FILING	220 NW 2ND AVE PORTLAND OR 97209 efiling@nwnatural.com

MARK R THOMPSON	220 NW 2ND AVE PORTLAND OR 97209 mark.thompson@nwnatural.com
PACIFIC POWER	
R. BRYCE DALLEY	825 NE MULTNOMAH ST., STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97232 bryce.dalley@pacificorp.com
SARAH WALLACE	825 NE MULTNOMAH ST STE 1800 PORTLAND OR 97232 sarah.wallace@pacificorp.com
PACIFICORP, DBA PACIFIC POWER	
OREGON DOCKETS	825 NE MULTNOMAH ST, STE 2000 PORTLAND OR 97232 oregondockets@pacificorp.com
PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC	
DOUGLAS C TINGEY (C)	121 SW SALMON 1WTC13 PORTLAND OR 97204 doug.tingey@pgn.com
JAY TINKER (C)	121 SW SALMON ST 1WTC-0702 PORTLAND OR 97204 pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON	
JUDY JOHNSON (C)	PO BOX 2148 SALEM OR 97308-2148 judy.johnson@state.or.us
PUC STAFF - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	
JOHANNA RIEMENSCHNEIDER (C)	BUSINESS ACTIVITIES SECTION 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4796 johanna.riemenschneider@doj.state.or.us
PUC STAFFDEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE	
STEPHANIE S ANDRUS (C)	BUSINESS ACTIVITIES SECTION 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4096 stephanie.andrus@state.or.us
REGULATORY & COGENERATION SERVICES INC	
DONALD W SCHOENBECK (C)	900 WASHINGTON ST STE 780 VANCOUVER WA 98660-3455 dws@r-c-s-inc.com

RICHARDSON & O'LEARY	
GREGORY M. ADAMS (C)	PO BOX 7218 BOISE ID 83702 greg@richardsonandoleary.com
TROUTDALE ENERGY CENTER	·
PAULA E PYRON	4113 WOLF BERRY CT LAKE OSWEGO OR 97035-1827 ppyron@cpkinder.com
WAL-MART STORES, INC.	
STEVE W CHRISS (C)	2001 SE 10TH ST BENTONVILLE AR 72716-0550 stephen.chriss@wal-mart.com

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON

**UE 262** 

# **CITY OF PORTLAND**

Direct Testimony of:

Anne Falcon

A.

Q.

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

2

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.

4

5

# WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND?

6

7

8

9

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

1011

12 13

be further modified before rates can be fully implemented. This testimony addresses the

14

15

Q.

DO YOU HAVE ANY INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS?

City's recommended cost allocation changes.

16

17

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

18 19

City of Portland has experienced significant fiscal challenges in the last year.

20

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.

21

these PGE customers will also experience rate increases in their own electricity bills. The

2223

City is concerned with the requested overall increase and the impact on the communities

24

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

25

26

 Α.

A.

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.

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 A, 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.

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".
  - 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 distribution-related 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?

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

A.

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?

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 A, 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

-
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

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.

Falcon Page 1 of 2 UE 262/COP/Exhibit 101

# PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC MARGINAL COSTS FOR DISTRIBUTION & CONSUMER SERVICES

SCH 93 Rec Field Lighting	SCH 92 Traffic Signals	SCH 91 & 95 Street & Highway Light	SCH 89 GT 4 MW Secondary Primary Subtransmission	SCH 89 1-4 MW Secondary Primary	SCH 85 Secondary Primary	SCH 83 Secondary	SCH 49 Irrig. & Drain. Pump.> 30 kW	SCH 47 Irrig. & Drain. Pump. < 30 kW	SCH 38 Opt TOD G.S. > 30 kW	SCH 32 General Service <30 kW	Commercial	SCH 15 Outdoor Area Lighting Residential	SCH 7 Residential	Grouping		
\$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99 \$10.99 \$10.99	\$10,99 \$10.99	\$10.99 \$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99	\$10.99	kW)	trans- mission	S
\$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12 \$10.12 N/A	\$10.12 \$10.12	\$10.12 \$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12	\$10.12	kW)	Sub-	
		\$25.26				\$24.68	\$71.65	\$70.23	\$33,47	\$28.14	\$25.26	\$25.26	\$24.23	Phase	By Cons	Foodor
\$25.26	\$25.26	N/A	\$73,144.00 \$73,144.00 \$83,464.00	\$21.14 \$21.14	\$21.13 \$21.13	\$24.68	\$71.65	\$70.23	\$33.47	\$28.14	N/A	N/A	\$24.23	Phase	By Consumer Type (\$ per kW)	
		\$17.81				\$20.63	\$44.06	\$52.32	\$20.26	\$24.77	\$17.81	\$17.81	\$17.10	Single- Phase	By Consumer Type  (\$ per kW)	DIST
\$9.09	\$9.09		N/A X/A	\$4.66 \$4.66	\$7.00 \$7.00	\$9.00	\$27.46	\$27.08	\$13.09	\$9.44			\$17.10	Three- Phase	ner Type	DISTRIBUTION SER
N/A	\$12.09	\$5.01			N/A	\$426.41	\$27.36	\$9.70	\$195.06	\$123.07	\$8.66	\$8,66	\$82.61	Single- Phase	Service By Cons (\$ pe	N SERVICES
\$72.37	N/A	N/A	\$11,054.47 \$2,548.39	\$4,581.85 \$867.23	\$1,732.11 \$727.44	\$1,093.60	\$132.97	\$25.26	\$527.62	\$264.80	N/A	NIA	\$147.47	Three- Phase	Service & Trans, By Consumer Type (\$ per Cust)	
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A/A	N/A	N/A	\$46,44	\$57.76	\$53.83	\$57.76	\$19.37	N/A	N/A	\$20.19	Single- Phase	Me By Cons (\$ per C	
\$1,296.40	N/A	N/A	\$164.19 \$1,382.27 \$16,556.61	\$164.19 \$1,382.27	\$151.34 \$1,382.27	\$108.37	\$99.76	\$81.81	\$82.42	\$68.38	N/A	N/A	\$55.45	Three- Phase	Meters By Consumer Type (\$ per Consumer)	
		\$3.39									\$3.39	\$3.39		Service (Lights)	Con-	

SCH 93 Rec Field Linbting	SCH 92 Traffic Signals \$0.00 N/A \$436.03 N/A N/A \$188.87	SCH 91 & 95 Street & Highway Light \$0.00 N/A \$436.03 N/A \$334.22 N/A	SCH 89 GT 4 MW       N/A       \$0.00       N/A       \$43.13       N/A       \$41,182.48         Secondary       N/A       \$0.00       N/A       \$43.13       N/A       \$41,182.48         Primary       N/A       \$0.00       N/A       \$43.13       N/A       \$41,182.48         Subtransmission       N/A       \$0.00       \$43.13       N/A       \$41,182.48	SCH 89 1-4 MW  Secondary  N/A \$7.65 N/A \$43.52 N/A \$3,554.04  Primary  N/A \$7.65 N/A \$43.52 N/A \$3,554.04	\$CH 85 \$econdary \$10.72 \$10.72 \$43.29 \$43.29 \$824.75 \$824.75 Primary \$10.72 \$10.72 \$43.29 \$43.29 \$824.75 \$824.75	SCH 83 Secondary \$5.06 \$5.06 \$5.06 \$89.18 \$89.18 \$83.99 \$83.99	SCH 49 Irrig. & Drain. Pump.> 30 kW \$1.50 \$1.50 \$77.18 \$77.18 \$41.25 \$41.25	SCH 47 Irrig. & Drain, Pump.< 30 kW \$0.93 \$0.93 \$65.81 \$65.81 \$38.47 \$38.47	SCH 38 Opt TOD G.S. > 30 kW \$12.96 \$12.96 \$43.06 \$43.06 \$50.52 \$50.52	SCH 32 General Service <30 kW \$1.01 \$1.01 \$68.21 \$68.21 \$46.31 \$46.31	Commercial \$0.00 N/A \$63.54 N/A \$36.63 N/A	SCH 15 Outdoor Area Lighting Residential \$0.00 N/A \$40.24 N/A \$20.16 N/A	SCH 7 Residential \$0.45 \$0.45 \$51.80 \$51.80 \$20.17 \$20.17	Т Θ	By Consumer Type By Consumer Type By Consumer Type Sy Consumer Type (\$ per Cons/Light) (\$ per Cons/Light)	Billing	CONSUMER SERVICES
	<del>\$</del>	<del>\$</del> 4	77	77	<del>6</del> 69 .	<del>(A</del>	€9	€4	€4	60	40	40	44	<u>ي</u> و	(\$ <sup>5</sup>		လ
	136.03	136.03					\$77.18	\$65.81	\$43.06	\$68.21	\$63.54	\$40.24	\$51.80		y Consume per Cons	Billing	NSUMER
	N/A	N/A	\$43.13 \$43.13 \$43.13	\$43.52 \$43.52		\$89.18	\$77.18	\$65.81	\$43.06	\$68.21	N/A	N/A	\$51.80		er Type ;/Light)	2	SERVICES
	N/A	\$334.22			\$824.75 \$824.75	\$83.99	\$41.25	\$38.47	\$50.52	\$46.31	\$36.63	\$20,16	\$20.17	Single- Phase	By Consur (\$ per Cor	Oth	
	\$188.87	N/A	41,182.48 41,182.48 41,182.48 41,182.48	\$3,554.04 \$3,554.04	\$824.75 \$824.75	\$83.99	\$41.25	\$38.47	\$50.52	\$46.31	N/A	N/A	\$20.17			er	
		0.00%				0.21%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%	2.77%	0.00%	0.00%	85.06%	Single- Phase	By Consumer Type Percent	Uncollectibles	
	0.00%		0.25% 3.90% 1.01%	0.23% 0.23%	1.02% 0.12%	3.10%	0.21%	0.08%	0.00%	1.79%			0.01%	Three- Phase	er Type	ibles	

May 31, 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 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/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.

y:\ratecase\opuc\dockets\ue-262 (grc 2014)\dr-in\co portland\finals\coportland\_dr\_023.docx

# **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

			•	Marginal _	Costs (\$000)		
_				Unit		Equal	
Grouping	<del></del>	Usages	Units & Basis	Cost	Study	Percentage	
SCH 91 - Street	& Highway Lighting						
(formerly Schedu							
DEMAND	Subtransmission	8,958	kW, 12 CP	\$12,29	\$110	\$125	
	Substation	21,500	kW, rateclass pk	\$13.17	\$283	\$322	
	Subtotal		•	•	****	\$447	
<b>FACILITIES</b>	Wire	21,500	kW, rateclass pk	\$21.51	\$462	\$526	
	Transformers	21,500	kW, rateclass pk	\$3.21	\$69	\$78	
	Subtotal					\$604	
CUSTÓMER	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	
•	Subtotal			•		\$1,446	
FIXED	Luminaires & Poles					<u>\$6,297</u>	
SUBTOTAL					\$926	\$8,793	
001100 7-05-	a:					*	
SCH 92 - Traffic							
(formerly Schedu	•	4.500	1144 40 00				
DEMAND	Subtransmission	•	kW, 12 CP	\$12.29	\$18	\$21	
	Substation	1,500	kW, rateclass pk	\$13.17	\$20	<u>\$22</u>	
ELON ITIES	Subtotal	4 500				\$43	
FACILITIES	Wire		kW, rateclass pk	\$16.38	\$25	\$28	
	Transformers	1,500	kW, rateclass pk	\$3.21	<b>\$</b> 5	<u>\$5</u>	
OUOTOMED	Subtotal	4.004				\$33	
CUSTOMER	Service Drops Meters & CIS		Service Drops	\$18.81	\$34	\$39	
		25	Customers	\$1.46	\$0	\$0	
SUBTOTAL	Subtotal				2422	\$39	
SUBTUTAL	•				\$102	\$116	
SCH 93 - Recrea	tional Field Lighting						
(formerly Schedu							
DEMAND	Subtransmission	108	kW. 12 CP	\$12.29	\$1	. \$2	
,	Substation		kW, rateclass pk	\$13.17	\$9	\$10	
	Subtotal	700	itt, idioodoo pit	Ψ10.11	ΨΘ	\$12	
FACILITIES	Wire	700	kW, rateclass pk	\$9.66	\$7	\$8	
CUSTOMER	Service Drops		Customers	\$153.00	\$5	<b>\$</b> 5	
000.00	Meters & CIS	-	Customers	\$1,577.12	\$49	\$56	
	Subtotal			Ψ1,011.12	<u> </u>	.\$61	
SUBTOTAL					\$71	\$81	
						• • •	
SCH 97 - Draina	=				-	J.*	
(formerly Schedu						•	
DEMAND	Subtransmission		kW, 12 CP	\$12.29	\$3	\$3	
	Substation	1,000	kW, rateclass pk	\$13.17	\$13	<u>\$15</u>	
	Subtotal					\$18	
FACILITIES	Wire		kW, rateclass pk	\$9.66	\$10	\$11	
CUSTOMER	Service Drops		Customers	\$2,234.65	\$4	<b>\$</b> 5	
	Meters & CIS	2	Customers	\$2,933.03	<u>\$6</u>	<u>\$7</u>	
	Subtotal					\$12	
SUBTOTAL				•	\$36	\$41	

UE 262/COP/Exhibit 102 Falcon Page 3 of 9

# **UE 262**

# Attachment 023-B

# **Provided in Electronic Format only**

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

PGE Advice No. 07-01 Attachment B 61

		20	007			
<b>^</b>				Marginal Unit	Marginal Cost	Class Revenue
Grouping	and Comics (COO at 110)	Usages	Units & Basis	Cost	Revenues	Requirement
	neral Service (4,000 plus kW) Secondary Meters					
COSTOMEN	Primary Meters		2 Customers	\$172.89	\$0	\$0
	Substation Meters		Customers	\$1,351.81	\$28	\$28
•	Substation Meters		Customers	\$21,214.80	\$191	\$187
FACILITIES	13 kV (Sec. & Prim. Only)	23	Customers	\$42,841.17	\$985	\$966
	Secondary Connect Costs	2	Customers	\$20,823.37	\$42	\$41
	Primary Connect Costs	21	Customers	\$3,068.13	\$64	\$63
	Subtransmission Connect Costs	9	Customers	\$56,755.02	\$511	\$501
DEMAND	Subtransmission	413,337	kW. rateclass peak	\$13.88	\$5,737	\$5.626
	Substation (Sec. & Prim. Only)		kW, rateclass peak	\$14.43	\$3,554	\$3,485
SUBTOTAL			•.	•	\$11,113	\$10,898
	eetiighting & Highway Lighting					
CUSTOMER		143,816		\$7.67	\$1,103	\$1,082
FACILITIES	13 kV		kW, rateclass peak	\$27.70	\$741	\$726
	Connect Costs (transformer only)	143,816	Lights	<b>\$0</b> .92	· \$132	\$130
DEMAND	Subtransmission	26,745	kW, rateclass peak	\$13.88	\$371	\$364
•	Substation	26,745	kW, rateclass peak	\$14.43	\$386	\$378
FIXED	Luminaires & Poles					\$7,636
SUBTOTAL	•				\$2,733	\$10,316
Schedule 92 Tra	ffic Sionals			•	•	
FACILITIES	13 kV	711	kW, ratectass peak	\$19,43	· \$14	\$14
	Connect Costs			\$27.20	\$42	\$42
DEMAND	Subtransmission	711	kW, rateclass peak	\$13.88	\$10	\$10
	Substation		kW, rateclass peak	\$14.43	\$10	\$10
SUBTOTAL			·		\$76	\$75
Schedule 93 Stat	dium Lighting					
CUSTOMER	Meters	· 27	Customers	\$1,305.56	\$35	\$35
<b>FACILITIES</b>	13 kV	351	kW, rateclass peak	\$19.43	\$7	\$7
	Connect Costs	27	Customers	\$148.99	\$4	\$4
DEMAND	Subtransmission	351	kW, rateclass peak	\$13.88	\$5	\$5
	Substation	351	kW, rateclass peak	\$14.43	\$5	\$5
SUBTOTAL			•		\$56	\$55

# **UE 262**

# Attachment 023-C

# **Provided in Electronic Format only**

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

## UE 262 PGE Response to City of Portland DR No. 023

Attachment 023-C PGE Advice No. 08 ag 1 Attachment B Page 66

		200	39			
				Marginal Unit	Marginal Cost	Class Revenue
Grouping		Usages	Units & Basis	Cost	Revenues	Requirement
	eral Service (4,000 plus kW)					
	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	. \$1,321
•	Secondary Connect Costs	•	Customers	\$33,743.42	\$67	\$59
	Primary Connect Costs		Customers	\$3,806.65	\$114	\$101
	Subtransmission Connect Costs	10	Customers	\$74,729:85	\$747	\$658
DEMAND	Subtransmission		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 Stre	etlighting & Highway Lighting					
CUSTOMER	Customer Service	149,427	Lights	\$4.68	\$699	\$615
FACILITIES	13 kV	27,734	kW, rateclass peak	\$31.03	\$861	\$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	<b>\$419</b>
FIXED	Luminaires & Poles					\$7,858
SUBTOTAL			•	•	\$2,563	\$10,114
Schedules 92 &	94 Traffic Signals & Communication	ons Devices				*
FACILITIES	13 kV		kW, rateclass peak	\$22.02	\$14	\$12
	Connect Costs	1,616	Intersections	\$22.15	\$36	\$32
DEMAND	Subtransmission		kW, rateclass peak	\$11.49	\$7	\$6
	Substation	619	kW, rateclass peak	\$17.15	\$11	\$9
SUBTOTAL	·				\$67	\$59
Schedule 93 Sta	<b>—</b> •				***	<b>h</b> or
CUSTOMER			Customers	\$1,678.67		\$35 · \$5
FACILITIES	13 kV		kW, rateclass peak	\$22.02	. \$5	. \$5 \$3
	Connect Costs	24	Customers	\$155.95	\$4	<b>\$3</b>
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

Attachment 023-D
Page 1
PGE Advice No. 10-28
Attachment B
Page 61

		2011					
Grouping		Usages	Units & Basis	Marginal Unit Cost	Marginal Cost Revenues	Class Revenue Requirement	
	neral Service (1,001-4,000 kW)						
CUSTOMER			Customers	\$138.16	\$13	\$14	
	Secondary Meters Primary Meters		Customers	\$739.95	\$67	\$74 \$71	
•	Service & Transformer	50	COSTOTINGS	\$1,93.90	404	ф. і	
	Secondary Customers	63	Customers	\$4,594.87	\$423	\$449	
	Primary Customers		Customers	\$869.70	\$79	\$84	
	· minis odobinoro		O Q O LO O LO	ψοσσ.,, σ	4,2	Ψ51	
FACILITIES	Feeder Backbone	221,354	kW, rateclass peak	\$19.22	\$4,254	\$4,522	
	Feeder Local Facilities		Design Demand	\$4.74	\$1,399	\$1,487	
			-				
DEMAND	Subtransmission	224,254	kW, 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	
Cobadula 80 Co	neral Service (4,000 plus kW)						
CUSTOMER							
COSTONER	Secondary Meters	9	Customers	\$138.16	\$0	\$0	
	Primary Meters		Customers	\$739.95	\$23	\$24	
	Substalion Meters		Customers	\$13,800.01	\$138	\$147	
	Service & Transformer			4.5,500.0	*	****	
	Secondary Customers	2	Customers	\$24,515.53	\$49	\$52	
	Primary Customers	31	Customers	\$2,555.63	\$79	\$84	
FACILITIES	Feeder Backbone				•		
( FROILI I ILLO	Secondary Customers	2	Customers	\$68,998.00	\$138	\$147	
	Primary Customers	_	Customers	\$68,998.00	\$2,139	\$2,273	
	Subtransmission 115 kV Feeder		Customers	\$78,156.00	\$782	\$831	
DEMAND	Subtransmission	204 700	kW, rateclass peak	\$9.68	\$3,695	\$3.927	
DEMAND	Substation (Sec. & Prim. Only)		kW, rateclass peak	\$13.17	\$3,696	\$3,929	
	Cobstance (CCC. a. Finz City)	200,000	nii, ratovaso posa	Ψιστι	φυμου	40,020	
SUBTOTAL	•				\$10,739	\$17,414	
Schedule 91 Str	eetlighting & Highway Lighting						
	Customer Service ·	154,236	Lights	\$4.23	\$653	\$694	
	Transformers	154,236	Lights	\$0.96	\$148	\$157	
FACILITIES	Feeder Backbone	28,460	kW, rateclass peak	\$23.48	\$668	\$710	
	Feeder Local Facilities		Design Demand	\$16.74	\$476	\$506	
DEMAND	Subtransmission	20 000	kW, rateclass peak	\$9.68	\$279	\$297	
	Substation		kW, rateclass peak	\$13.17	\$375	\$398	
FIXED	Luminaires & Poles					\$8,159	
SUBTOTAL	marrier and at a study	•			\$2,600	\$10,922	

# UE 262/COP/Exhibit 103 Falcon Page 1 of 5

Grouping		Usages	Units & Basis	Marginal Unit Cost	Marginal Cost Revenues	Class Revenue Requirement
Cabadula 7 Dasi	double					
Schedule 7 Resi CUSTOMER						
OOOTOMEN	Single-Phase Customers	733 968	Customers	\$20.19	\$14,819	\$18,878
	Three-Phase Customers	•	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					
FACILITIES	Single-Phase Customers	1,984,164	kW, rateclass peak	\$24.23	\$48,076	\$61,246
	Three-Phase Customers		kW, rateclass peak	\$24.23	\$5	\$01,240 \$7
	Feeder Local Facilities	LLL	KVV, rateolass peak	<b>VZ-4.20</b>	Ψΰ	Ψ/
•	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		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
000,011.2					4210,555	\$273,003
Schedule 15 Res	idential Outdoor Area Lighting					
CUSTOMER	Customer Service	9,513	Lights	\$3.39	\$32	\$41
	Transformer	9,513	Lights	\$8.66	\$82	\$105
EACH ITIES	Early Dealthan					
FACILITIES	Feeder Backbone Feeder Local Facilities		kW, rateclass peak	\$25.26	\$46	\$58
	reeder Local racilities	1,808	Design Demand	\$17.81	\$32	\$41
DEMAND	Subtransmission	1.832	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.99	\$20	\$26
	Substation		kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$18	\$23
		·		,	•	•
FIXED	Luminaires & Poles					\$749
SUBTOTAL					\$231	\$1,043
Sahadula 15 Can	amaraial Outdoor Araa Linhtina					
CUSTOMER	nmercial Outdoor Area Lighting Customer Service	11,108	Lighte	\$3,39	\$38	\$48
OCOTOMEN	Transformer	11,108		\$8.66	\$96	\$123
		,	2.3.110	40.00	400	ψ120
<b>FACILITIES</b>	Feeeder Backbone	4,270	kW, rateclass peak	\$25.26	\$108	\$137
	Feeder Local Facilities	4,270	Design Demand	\$17.81	\$76	\$97
DELLAND	Out to accordant					
DEMAND	Subtransmission Substation		kW, rateclass peak	\$10.99	\$48	\$61
	Substation	4,270	kW, rateclass peak .	\$10.12	\$43	\$55
FIXED	Luminaires & Poles					\$1,768
SUBTOTAL					\$408	\$2,288
						,-,
	door Area Lighting					
CUSTOMER						\$89
	Transformer					\$227
FACILITIES	Feeeder Backbone					\$106
MOLETTICO	Feeder Local Facilities					\$196 \$138
						¥100
DEMAND	Subtransmission					\$86
	Substation					\$78
EWE-						
FIXED SUBTOTAL	Luminaires & Poles					\$2,517
SUBTUTAL						\$3,331

# UE 262/COP/Exhibit 103 Falcon Page 2 of 5

Grouping		Usages	Units & Basis	Marginal Unit Cost	Marginal Cost Revenues	Class Revenue Requirement
Schedule 32 Sm	all Non-residential General Service					
CUSTOMER						
	Single-Phase Customers	53 942	2 Customers	\$19.37	\$1,045	\$1,331
	Three-Phase Customers	•	Customers	\$68.38	\$2,383	\$3,036
	Service & Transformer			\$00.00	Ψ2,000	Ψ3,030
	Single-Phase Customers	53,942	2 Customers	\$123.07	\$6,639	\$8,457
	Three-Phase Customers		l Customers	\$264.80	\$9,229	\$11,758
<b>FACILITIES</b>	Feeder Backbone					
	Single-Phase Customers	129,628	kW, rateclass peak	\$28.14	\$3,648	\$4,647
	Three-Phase Customers		kW, rateclass peak	\$28.14	\$5,343	\$6,806
	Feeder Local Facilities		,		*-,	40,000
	Single-Phase Customers	269,711	Design Demand	\$24.77	\$6,681	\$8,511
	Three-Phase Customers	393,855	Design Demand	\$9.44	\$3,718	\$4,736
						. ,
DEMAND	Subtransmission	323,673		\$10.99	\$3,557	\$4,532
	Substation	319,488	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$3,233	\$4,119
SUBTOTAL					\$45,476	\$57,933
Schedule 38 Gen	eral Service					
CUSTOMER	Meters					
	Single-Phase Customers	38	Customers	\$57.76	\$2	· \$3
	Three-Phase Customers	238	Customers	\$82.42	\$20	\$25
	Service & Transformer					¥~5
	Single-Phase Customers	38	Customers	\$195.06	\$7	\$9
	Three-Phase Customers	238	Customers	\$527.62	\$126	\$160
<b>FACILITIES</b>	Feeder Backbone					
	Single-Phase Customers	858	kW, rateclass peak	\$33.47	\$29	\$37
•	Three-Phase Customers	12,894	kW, rateclass peak	\$33.47	\$432	\$550
	Feeder Local Facilities					•
	Single-Phase Customers	1,699	Design Demand	\$20.26	\$34	\$44
	Three-Phase Customers	30,128	Design Demand	\$13.09	\$394	\$502
DEMAND	Subtransmission	13,933	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.99	\$153	\$195
	Substation	13,752	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$139	\$177
SUBTOTAL					\$1,336	\$1,702
Schedule 47 Irrig	ation & Drainage Service - < 30 kW					
CUSTOMER	Meters					
	Single-Phase Customers	220	Customers	\$53.83	\$12	\$15
	Three-Phase Customers	2,983	Customers	\$81.81	\$244	\$311
	Service & Transformer					
	Single-Phase Customers	220	Customers	\$9.70	\$2	\$3
	Three-Phase Customers	2,983	Customers	\$25.26	\$75	\$96
<b>FACILITIES</b>	Feeder Backbone					
	Single-Phase Customers	724	kW, rateclass peak	\$70.23	\$51	\$65
	Three-Phase Customers		kW, rateclass peak	\$70.23	\$1,234	\$1,572
	Feeder Local Facilities	-	•			,,,,,,
	Single-Phase Customers	2,200	Design Demand	\$52.32	\$115	\$147
	Three-Phase Customers		Design Demand	\$27.08	\$808	\$1,029
DEMAND	Subtransmission	18 533	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.99	\$204	\$259
	Substation		kW. rateclass peak	\$10.33	\$204 \$185	\$236
		.0,200	, raicolass pean	Ψ10.12	\$100	<b>3</b> 236
SUBTOTAL					\$2,930	\$3,732

# UE 262/COP/Exhibit 103 Falcon Page 3 of 5

Grouping		Usages	Units & Basis	Marginal Unit Cost	Marginal Cost Revenues	Class Revenue Requirement
			G Duoi3	3031	1/CTUHUES	. redon sment
Schedule 49 Irri CUSTOMER	igation & Drainage Service - > 30 kW  Meters					
	Single-Phase Customers	4	Customers	\$57.76	\$0	\$0
	Three-Phase Customers Service & Transformer	1,292	Customers	\$99.76	\$129	\$164
	Single-Phase Customers	4	Customers	\$27.36	\$0	\$0
	Three-Phase Customers	1,292	Customers	\$132.97	\$172	\$219
<b>FACILITIES</b>	Feeder Backbone					
	Single-Phase Customers	92	kW, rateclass peak	\$71.65	\$7	\$8
	Three-Phase Customers	58,374	kW, rateclass peak	\$71.65	\$4,183	\$5,328
	Feeder Local Facilities	•		*******	7.,	40,020
	Single-Phase Customers	124	Design Demand	\$44.06	. \$5	\$7
	Three-Phase Customers	74,290		\$27.46	\$2,040	\$2,599
DEMAND	Subtransmission	59,231	kW, rateclass peak	\$10,99	<b>\$</b> \$\$	6000
DEW/MD	Substation	•	•		\$651	\$829
	Substation	28,466	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$592	\$754
SUBTOTAL					\$7,778	\$9,909
Schedule 83 Ge CUSTOMER	neral Service (31-200 kW) Meters					
	Single-Phase Customers	697	Customers	\$46.44	\$32	\$41
	Three-Phase Customers	10,433		\$108.37	\$1,131	\$1,440
	Service & Transformer	10,400	Gustomers	Ψ100.37	φ1,101	Φ1, <del>44</del> U
	Single-Phase Customers	697	Customers	\$426.41	\$297	\$378
	Three-Phase Customers	10,433	Customers	\$1,093.60	\$11,409	\$14,534
<b>FACILITIES</b>	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	•	,	•	* 1	411,102
	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	ec 200	<b>80.004</b>
DEIMAND	Substation	•			\$6,298	\$8,024
	Substation	363,700	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$5,725	\$7,293
SUBTOTAL	• *				\$47,184	\$60,109
Schedule 85 Ger CUSTOMER	neral Service (201-1,000 kW) Meters					
	Secondary Customers	1,335	Customers	\$151.34	\$202	\$257
	Primary Customers	155	Customers	\$1,382.27	\$214	\$273
	Service & Transformer					
	Secondary Customers		Customers	\$1,732.11	\$2,313	\$2,947
	Primary Customers	155	Customers	\$727.44	\$113	\$144
FACILITIES	Feeder Backbone	510,040	kW, rateclass peak	\$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		kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$5,162	\$6,575
SUBTOTAL					\$29,147	\$37,131
					φ23, 14 <i>1</i>	\$31,131

# UE 262/COP/Exhibit 103 Falcon Page 4 of 5

		2014	•			
Grouping		Usages	Units & Basis	Marginal Unit Cost	Marginal Cost Revenues	Class Revenue Requirement
	neral Service (1,001-4,000 kW)					
CUSTOMER	Meters		01			
	Secondary Meters Primary Meters		Customers	\$164.19	\$13	\$17
	Service & Transformer	79	Customers	\$1,382.27	\$110	\$140
	Secondary Customers	90	Customers	\$4,581.85	¢267	£407
	Primary Customers		Customers	\$867.23	\$367 \$69	\$467 \$88
	i mary outliners	, ,	Coaloiners	\$607.23	909	\$66
<b>FACILITIES</b>	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		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
Sahaduta 00 Car	and Samina (4.000 mlus take					
CUSTOMER	neral Service (4,000 plus kW) Meters					
OOOTOMEN	Secondary Meters	2	Customers	\$164.19	\$0	\$0
	Primary Meters		Customers	\$1,382.27	\$43	\$55
	Substation Meters	8		\$16,556.61	\$132	\$169
	Service & Transformer	· ·		410,000.01	Ψ10 <u>2</u>	Ψ109
	Secondary Customers	2	Customers	\$11,054.47	\$22	\$28
	Primary Customers	31	Customers	\$2,548.39	\$79	\$101
FACILITIES	Feeder Backbone					
77101271120	Secondary Customers	2	Customers	\$73,144.00	\$146	\$186
	Primary Customers		Customers	\$73,144.00	\$2,267	\$2.889
	Subtransmission 115 kV Feeder		Customers	\$83,464.00	\$668	\$851
DEMAND	Subtransmission	453,534		\$10.99	\$4,984	\$6,350
	Substation (Sec. & Prim. Only)	374,623	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$3,791	\$4,830
SUBTOTAL					\$12,134	\$15,457
Schedules 91 & 4	95 Streetlighting & Highway Lighting					
CUSTOMER	Customer Service	158,628	Lights	\$3.39	\$537	\$684
	Service & Transformer	158,628		\$5.09 \$5.01	\$795	\$1,012
		100,020	c.g.no	\$0.01	Ψίου	\$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		kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$274	\$349
		•	•			4-14
FIXED	Luminaires & Poles					\$7,946
SUBTOTAL					\$3,073	\$11,861

# UE 262/COP/Exhibit 103 Falcon Page 5 of 5

Grouping		2014		Marginal Unit	Marginal Cost	Class Revenue
Grouping		Usages	Units & Basis	Cost	Revenues	Requiremen
Schedule 92 Trai	ffic Signals					
	Service & Transformer	1,772	Intersections	\$12.09	\$21	\$27
<b>FACILITIES</b>	Feeder Backbone	531	kW, rateclass peak	\$25.26	\$13	\$17
	Feeder Local Facilities	531		\$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
chedule 93 Stac	lium Lighting					
CUSTOMER	Melers	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	\$3
	Feeder Local Facilities	1,956	Design Demand	\$9.09	\$18	\$2
DEMAND	Subtransmission	1,030	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.99	\$11	\$14
	Substation	1,017	kW, rateclass peak	\$10.12	\$10	\$13
SUBTOTAL					\$98	\$125
ummary						
CUSTOMER	Meters	840,466	Customers		\$20,567	\$26,201
	Service & Transformer Customer Service		Customers		\$92,561	\$117,915
FACILITIES	Feeder Backbone	179,249			\$607	\$773
AOILITILO	Feeder Local Facilities		kW, rateclass peak Design Demand		\$96,218 \$78,868	\$122,574
DEMAND	Subtransmission		kW, rateclass peak		\$46,385	\$100,472 \$59,091
	Substation		kW rateclass Peak		\$41,421	\$52,768
FIXED	Luminaires & Poles	,,525,000	tatolaou i our		ΨΤ1,Τ4,1	\$10,463
TOTALS					\$376,627	\$490,257
					TARGET	\$490,257
				EQUAL PERC	ENT	127.49

# UE 262/COP/Exhibit 104 Falcon Page 1 of 1

## **Lighting Additional O&M**

	Lights	Intersections
Schedule 15R	9,513	
Schedule 15C	11,108	
Schedule 91 & 95	158,628	
Schedule 92	.'	1,772
Lights Intersections	179,249	1,772

## RC 313 Test Period O&M

N34206	\$355,337
N34215	<u>\$251,710</u>
	\$607,047
O&M per light	\$3.39

## Design Demand per Rate Schedule

Grouping	Design	Average Customers	Design Demand
Schedule 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

UE 262/COP/Exhibit 105 Falcon Page 1 of 1

	Coatumen Count & Weighting  1. ** * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	Percent of Total Dollars (\$) 207 - Actor Sarvices 219 - Cash Remittance 219 - Cash Remittance 431 - Customer Contact Operations 432 - Customer Contact Operations 433 - Resil Receivables 434 - Customer Contact Operations 435 - Customer Contact Operations 437 - Cis Bling 439 - Specialized Biling 439 - Specialized Biling 439 - Pacil Collections 431 - Field Collections 432 - Field Collections 433 - Community Officer 434 - Web Management 737 - Web Management 737 - Printing & Automated Mail Sves 739 - Business Services Group 932 - Revenue Operations 932 - Network Oata Operations	cost per Customer	Tille  Forecasted  Cuttomer Count  2010 Billing Merginal Cons 2017 - Meter Services 229 - Cash Remittance 423 - Customer Const 433 - Result Receivab 435 - Cust System Qu 437 - Customer Coult 439 - Specialited Bill 430 - Specialited Bill 431 - Customer Delicus 432 - Customer Delicus 433 - Customer Delicus 434 - Customer Delicus 435 - Customer Delicus 437 - Fanning & Auto 437 - Fanning & Auto 438 - Customer Delicus 439 - Customer Delicus 430 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 432 - Customer Delicus 433 - Customer Delicus 434 - Customer Delicus 435 - Customer Delicus 436 - Customer Delicus 437 - Fanning & Auto 437 - Customer Delicus 438 - Customer Delicus 439 - Customer Delicus 430 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 432 - Customer Delicus 433 - Customer Delicus 434 - Customer Delicus 435 - Customer Delicus 436 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 438 - Customer Delicus 439 - Customer Delicus 430 - Customer Delicus 430 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 432 - Customer Delicus 433 - Customer Delicus 434 - Customer Delicus 435 - Customer Delicus 436 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 439 - Customer Delicus 430 - Customer Delicus 430 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 432 - Customer Delicus 433 - Customer Delicus 434 - Customer Delicus 435 - Customer Delicus 436 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 439 - Customer Delicus 430 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 433 - Customer Delicus 434 - Customer Delicus 435 - Customer Delicus 436 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 430 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 431 - Customer Delicus 432 - Customer Delicus 433 - Customer Delicus 434 - Customer Delicus 435 - Customer Delicus 435 - Customer Delicus 436 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicus 437 - Customer Delicu
	1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006 1000006	1000000 1000000 1000000 1000000 1000000 1000000		#ERC #CCOUNT  ACCOUNT  9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001 9030001
\$28,380,698	\$430.138 weighted percentage \$508,5700 number of existence; \$3,863,500 number of existence; \$3,863,500 number of existence; \$1,955,249 adjusted write off; \$1,136,818 number of existence; \$1,136,818 number of existence; \$1,274,245 adjusted write off; \$1,290,829 number of existence; \$1,290,829 number of existence; \$1,290,829 number of existence; \$1,290,820 number of existence; \$1,390,820 number of existence; \$1,300,820 number of existence; \$1,300,820 number of existence; \$1,200,820 number of existence;	\$430,138 weighted percentage \$500,548 number of customers \$3,365,207 number of customers up to 200 kW \$1,355,249 advasted write offs \$1,011,120 billing suballocable \$5,101,120 billing suballocable \$51,710,0 billing suballocable \$51,710,0 billing suballocable \$21,720 billing suballocation \$1,136,839 number of customers up to 200 kW \$1,594,399 number of customers up to 200 kW \$422,400 billing suballocation \$4,148,795 number of customers \$50,131,83 number of customers \$50,542 billing suballocation \$1,108,772 Number of customers	\$28,380,698	Amount.  Allocation  Allocation  Allocation  Allocation  S430,138 weighted percentage  \$500,548 number of existomers  \$3,363,507 number of existomers up to 200 kW \$1,555,249 adjusted write offs  \$1,101,182 billing ababilication  \$1,136,818 number of existomers, STL & ignals reparation  \$7,710 DA history  \$1,274,245 adjusted write offs  \$1,30,829 number of existomers up to 200 kW \$1,394,359 number of existomers up to 200 kW \$1,394,355 number of existomers  \$6,005,425 billing tabalication  \$8,005,425 billing tabalication  \$8,005,425 billing tabalication  \$1,108,272 Number of existomers less unmetered lightin  \$1,108,272 Number of existomers less unmetered lightin
	sparati	eparati	~ ~   <sub>~</sub>	1 1
	734050 734050 734050 734050 734050 614589 734050 0 0 734050 734050 734050 734050 734050 734050 734050 734050	66.49X 87.10X 87.10X 91.34X 91.34X 91.34X 91.34X 91.34X 87.13X 87.13X 87.10X 87.10X 87.10X 87.10X	\$23,719,075 30.44 8.42	Sch. 7 734,050
	581 882 882 9 882 0 0 0 0 0 882 1 1 1 1 882 882 1 1	%00.0 %01.0 %01.0 %01.0 %01.0 %01.0 %01.0 %01.0 %01.0 %01.0 %00.0 %01.0	\$21,083 \$ 23.65 \$	Sch. 15  Rec.  882  \$728  \$728  \$728  \$759
	904 1377 1377 1377 0 3 3 1377 1377 1377 137	0.08% 0.16% 0.16% 0.00% 0.00% 0.18% 0.27% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16% 0.16%	\$51, <u>573</u> 97.99	Soh. 15 Comm.  1,372  5952  5952  5952  5953  51,830  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435  51,435
	197585 88797 88797 39658 11251 11251 88797 88797 88797 11251 88797 88797 11251 11251 11251	17,90% 10,50% 10,50% 10,50% 12,79% 12,79% 10,50% 10	\$3,652,027 \$ 40.08 \$	Sch. 32  Gen. Serv.  83,797.  83,798.  \$76,890  \$76,890  \$54,116  \$545,200  \$56,466  \$112,936  \$112,936  \$112,936  \$122,0640  \$10,057)  \$2210,640  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$231,0540  \$3437,111
	7807 276 0 0 276 276 276 276 276 276 276	0,71x 0,03x 0,00x	\$10,025 \$ 25.30 S	53,042 53,042 53,042 53,042 53,042 53,042 53,042 53,043
	6520 3203 3203 3203 723 14 3203 3203 3203 3203 3203 3203 3203 320	0.59% 0.39% 0.09% 0.09% 0.03% 0.03% 0.03% 0.03% 0.03% 0.03% 0.03%	\$126,418 \$ 38.67	\$ch. 47 irrigation 3,203 \$1,240 \$12,343 \$12,343 \$12,343 \$12,343 \$12,343 \$12,759 \$4,482
	3946 1296 1296 1296 1676 3 1296 1296 1296 1296 1296 1296 1296 1296	0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.12% 0.12% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15% 0.15%	\$ 45.35	1,296 1,1296 1,1296 1,1296 1,1296 1,1296 1,1297 1,1296 1,1297 1,1
	119910 11129 11129 27557 27557 27557 11129 11129 11129 11129 11129 11129 11129 11129 11129 11129 11129 11129	10.86% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 2.34% 2.34% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32% 1.32%	\$ \$530,175 \$ \$2.40	Sch. 83  Gen. Serv.  11.129  \$46,717  \$46,717  \$ \$3,038  \$ \$10,037  \$ \$11,109  \$ \$10,037
	90128 90128 1972 29 1972 29 0 97 0 97 1972 29 1972 20 1972 20 1972 20 1972 20 1972 20 1972 20 1972 20 1972 20	5% 2.73W 2% 0.00% 3% 0.00% 3% 0.15% 3% 0.15% 5% 0.127% 5% 0.00% 5% 0.00% 5% 0.12% 5% 0.15% 5% 0.15% 5% 0.15%	~ _	201-1,000   Sch. 85  Sch. 85  (v. Gen. 55vv. 1)  20 1,372  20 1,37
	28 2073 77 1440 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3% 0.19% 6% 0.00% 6%	~	0 1,001-4,000 5 5 5,018 77, 657, 5670, 77 140 77 140 78 5808 990 \$101 90 \$102
	005500005500053		۰.	Sch. Gen. 3
	0 0 3 3 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5 0 0 0 0 5 5 6	0.000X	۰ ا	School 19 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	205 205 2074 208 208 208	0.00% 0.	۵.	h n
		0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	\$4,356 156.21 \$	Sch 92 St 197 St
	S1000000000000000000000000000000000000	0.05% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00%	\$3,101 37.58 \$	Sch. 93 Field Ugnts  519 517 517 519 517 517 517 511 511 511 511 511 511 511
	1104038 942802 840753 803664 62615 62601 107870	100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100%	\$28,380,699 919.57	Fotbl  \$43,002  \$43,002  \$430,138 match \$508,548 match \$5,1011,122 match \$1,125,283 match \$1,124,245 match \$1,148,272 match

 $^{
m Falcon}$  2014 Test Year Street and Highway lighting, Traffic Signals and Outdoor Area Lighting Billing Costs  $^{
m Page}$  1 of 1 UE 262/COP/Exhibit 106

	2011 Test Year	2014 Test Year		Sch 91.92.95.15
	Sch 91 & 92	Sch 91,92,95	15	Total
Current billing: hours per month	70.68	70.68	84.92	
Hourly Billing Rate (unloaded)	נו			
Monthly Rilling (unloaded)	23.57	\$22.71	\$26.14	
Approximate (unicaded)	\$ 1,662	\$1,605	\$2,220	
Annual Billing	\$ 19,940	\$19,262	\$26,638	
(otal Loaded Cost	\$ 34,429	\$34,243	\$47,356	\$81,600
Loading	1.7266	1.77779	1.77779	
	2011 2011	2014	Allocated S	Sch 91.92.95.15
Standard Service Schedules	Customer Count Allocated Cost	Customer Count		Total
Schodule 91 & 95 - Street and Highway Lighting		205	\$31,621	
Schedule 92 - Traffic Signals Standard Service	17 \$ 2,636.44	17	\$2,622	
	222 \$ 34,429	222	\$34,243	
Schedule 15 - Residential - Outdoor Area Lighting Schedule 15 - Commercial - Outdoor Area Lighting		882	\$18,531	
Schedule 15 - Commercial - Outdoor Area Lighting		1,372	\$28,826	
		2,254	\$47,356.25	\$81,600

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

To apply gross-up factors: 1=yes, otherwise 0 ==>	
I I O apply groce, up tactore: 1-year otherwise 0>	
1 TO ADDIV 01055-00 186.015 T-VES OHIELWISE 0>	
1	

		_			
	ANNUAL	A	ANNUAL	ANNUAL	TOTAL
	METERING		BILLING	OTHER	CUSTOMER
SCHEDULE	EXPENSES	ΕX	KPENSES	EXPENSES	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:

Richard Gray

# 

# 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	Customer	Customer
	(customer pays rent)	Provides	Provides
Maintenance	PGE Provides	PGE Provides	Customer
			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.

Memorandum from Budget Director Andrew Scott to Portland City Council, Approval of City of Portland FY

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. 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 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).

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

<sup>2013-14</sup> Budget (May 22, 2013) http://www.portlandoregon.gov/cbo/article/450323 (accessed on June 13, 2013).

13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |

individual or group luminaires. <u>See</u>, 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 <u>and</u> 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

<sup>4</sup> <u>See</u>, PGE PUC Oregon No. E-18, Sheet 95-2, *Maintenance Service under Option C* (November 7, 2012) <a href="http://www.portlandgeneral.com/our\_company/corporate\_info/regulatory\_documents/pdfs/schedules/Sched\_095.pdf">http://www.portlandgeneral.com/our\_company/corporate\_info/regulatory\_documents/pdfs/schedules/Sched\_095.pdf</a> (accessed June 13, 2013)

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. 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

"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 "Stl2014 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

## 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 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

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.

(0.15%). The City of Gresham reports owning 5,367 poles and only having 3 knockdowns

# 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.

#### O. 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. O. 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 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. 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?

UE 262 PGE Response to City of Portland DR No. 036 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

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
Ouestion 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.

y:\ratecase\opue\dockets\ue-262 (gre 2014)\dr-in\co portland\finals\coportland\_dr\_038.docx

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" currently 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 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.

## UE 262/COP/Exhibit 204

## Gray

## Schedule 91 Street and Highway Lighting Luminaire Revenue Summary

-			
Page	1	of	1

	Luminalre Revenue Summary											
ŀ.	A	de Set Parte towards	C	D	$\perp$	E	F	6	Н		1	ĸ
1 2	Schear	ile 91 Pole Investment			+	}		—				
3		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<del></del>	<del></del>	+			<del> </del> -	9.59		0.2742	%
4				Pole	_			Total	Levella		Proposed	T
5	CODE		Materia			don C	ategory				Replacemen	
15	1 2	Standard Post	Wood			4 S	tandard	\$926	20 \$88	.81 \$7.4		
8	3	Standard	Aluminu	m 30 40 to 5	. /		bsolete	<u> </u>		\$8.8		Pole 31 Pric
9	4	Ameron Post Top	Concret		5 4		landard Custom	\$1,214				
10	5	Ameron Post Top	Concret		E		ustom	\$3,192	.95 \$306.	.15 \$25.5		
11	6	Davit	Aluminu	n 30	A		ustom	\$1,827	.36 \$175.	22 \$14.6	\$0.7	31
12	7 8	Painted Regular	Steel	25	В	~	bsolete					2 Pole 8 Price
13	9	Regutar Available Pole Code	Aluminu		_ B		ustom				\$0.4	
15	10	Available Pole Code	- °-	0	100		0	<del> </del>				
16	11	Painted Underground	Wood	35	+ ×		osolete			97.4		<del></del>
17	12	Davit	Aluminus	n 30	В		ustom			\$7.40	\$0.4	Pole 1 Price
18 19	13 14	Davit	Aluminun		В		ustom				\$0.4	
20	15	Double Davit Available Pote Code	Aluminun	30	В		ustom				\$0.6	
21	16	Anchor Base -Gray	Fiberglas		0 A		0 ustom	****				
22	17	Anchor Base - Gray	Fiberglas		B		ustom	\$2,183.	84 \$209.4	\$17.45		ļ
23	18	Davit	Aluminun	25	Ā		ustom	\$1,836.	08 \$176,0	15 \$14.67	\$0.5	
24	19	Available Pole Code	0	0	0		0			¥11,31		<del> </del>
25 26	21	Available Pole Code Unpainted with 6-foot Mast Arm	Steel	0	0		0					
27	22	Painted SLO Pole	Steel Wood	35	B	_	solete				\$0.42	Pole 12 Price
28	23	Laminated without Mast Arm	Wood	20	- A		solete		+	\$7.40		Pole 1 Price
29	24	Laminted SLO Pole	Wood	20	A		solete			\$6.51	\$0.19	Pole 58 Price
30	25	Omamental Post	Concrete	35 or les	s B	Ob	solete			30.31	\$0.42	Pole 57 Price Pole 8 Price
31 32	26 27	Painted Underground Double Davit	Wood	35	j B		solete					Pole 46 Price
32	28	Regular	Aluminum	30 35	A		stom	\$2,701.3				
34	29	Davit	Aluminum		A		stom	\$2,380,6				
35	30	Omamental Post	Concrete	35 or les			solele	\$1,998.6	\$191,6	\$15.97 \$14.70		Dela 20 5
36	31	Regular	Aluminum	16	A		stom	\$1,108.6	8 \$106,3			Pole 32 Price
37 38	33	Regular Regular	Alummum	25	A		storn	\$1,839.8				
39	34	Regular	Aluminum	30 16	A B		stom	\$1,988,5	7 \$190.67	\$15.89		
10	35	Direct Bury with Shroud	Fiberglass	18	A		stom	P1 212 C	4 2405.00		\$0.25	
12	36	Direct Bury with Shroud	Fiberglass	18	В		stom	\$1,313.6	4 \$125.96	\$10.50	****	
12	37	Painted Regular	Steel	25	A		olete		<del>                                     </del>	\$14.70	\$0.30	Pole 32 Price
13	38	Painted Regular Laminated without Mast Arm	Steel	30	A		olete			\$15.89		Pole 33 Price
5	40	Unpainted with 8-foot Mast Arm	- Wood Steel	20 35	A		olete			\$6.51		Pole 57 Price
16	41	Curved laminated	Wood	30	B		olete		├		\$0.46	Pole 53 Price
7	42	Unpainted with 8-foot Davit Arm	Steel	35	- <del>-</del>		olete		<del> </del>	\$10.26		Pole 59 Price
8	43	Painted Omamental - Portland Rd.	Aluminum	35	A		tom	\$5,465.74	\$524.08	\$43.67	\$0.46	Pole 53 Price
9	44	Painted Omamental - Portland Rd. Curved laminated	Aluminum	35	В		tom			- <del> </del>	\$1.25	
1	48	Stendard	Wood	30 to 35	B		olete					Pole 60 Price
2	47	Standard	Wood	40 to 55	B	Stan			ļ		\$0.21	
3	48	Regular	Aluminum	30	В	Cus			<del></del>		\$0.28	
41	49	Painted Regular	Steel	30	В	Obse	lete				\$0.45	Pole 48 Price
5 6	50	Available Pole Code Unpainted with 6-foot Davit Ann	0	0	0	(					\$0.40	OIC 40 FIICE
7	52	Available Pole Code	Steel	30 0	B 0	Obsc			ļ	-	\$0.42	Pole 12 Price
B	53	Davit	Atuminum	35	В	Cus						
2	54	Regular	Aluminum	35	В	Cus					\$0.46 \$0.54	
2	55	Bronze Atlay GardCo	Bronze	12	В	Obso	lete :				\$0.23	
2	56 57	Available Pole Code Black	0 Fiberiass	0	0	0						
	58	Black	Fiberglass Fiberglass	20	B	Stand		\$814.65	\$78.11	\$6.51		
	59	Bronze	Fiberglass	30	<u></u>	Stand		\$1 282 55	\$123.07	\$40.00	\$0.19	
1	60	Bronze	Fiberglass	30	8	Stand			#1 <u>23.0/</u>	\$10.26	\$0.29	
	61 62	Gray	Fiberglass	30	A	Stand		\$1,385.24	\$132.82	\$11.07	30.78	
	83	Gray Fluted Omamental -Black	Fiberglass	30	В	Stand	ard				\$0.32	
	64	Fluted Omamental -Black	Fiberglass Fiberglass	14	- A B	Cust		\$1,965.25	\$188.44	\$15,70		
	65	Fluted Victorian Ornamental	Aluminum	14	A	Custo	-	1,625.84	\$15E DC	*****	\$0.45	
	86	Fluted Omamental	Ahaminum	18	A	Custo		1,661.47	\$155.89 \$159.31	\$12.99 \$13.28		
	67 68	Regular - Color may vary	Fiberglass	22	Α	Custo	MI I	\$725.63	\$69.58	\$5.80	———·  ·	
1-	69	Regular - Color may vary Non-fluted Techtra Ornamental	Fiberglass	35	A	Custo		1,193.04	\$114.39	\$9.53		
Т	70	Davit with 8-foot Arm	Aluminum Aluminum	18	A	Custo		3,200.51	\$306.88	\$25.57		
	71	Fluted Victorian Omamental	Aluminum	14	A	Custo		2,713.20	\$260.15	\$21.68		
	72	Fluted Omamental	Aluminum	16	В	Custo					\$0.37	
	73	Regular - Color may vary	Fiberglass	22	В	Custo					\$0.38 \$0.17	
	74 75	Regular - Color may vary Non-fluted Techtra Omamental	Fiberglass	35	В	Custo					\$0.27	
	76	Davit with 8-foot Arm	Aluminum	18	_₿.	Custo					\$0.73	
	77	HADCO Non-fluted Omamental	Aluminum	16	B	Custo		3 404 5			\$0.62	
	78	HADCO Non-fluted Omamental	Aluminum	16	В	Custo		3,401.54	\$326.15	\$27.18	—- <u>-</u>	
	19	Fluted Westbrooke	Aluminum	18	A	Custo		3,208.75	\$307.67	\$25.64	\$0.78	
	30	Fluted Westbrooke	Aluminum	18	В	Custo	m			749.07	\$0.73	
	12	Non-fluted Westbrooke Non-fluted Westbrooke	Ahumhum	18	A	Custo		3,401.54	\$326.15	\$27.18		
	3		Aluminum Fiberglass	18	B	Custo	_	-			\$0.78	
8	4		Fiberglass	18	B	Custo		\$810.66	\$77.73	\$6.48		
	5	Decorative Ameron	Concrete	20	A	Custor		3,192.95	\$306.15	\$25.51	\$0.19	
В	8	Decorative Ameron	Concrete	20	8	Custor		1			\$0.73	
										<del></del>	\$0.73	

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON

**UE 262** 

## **CITY OF PORTLAND**

Direct Testimony of:

David A. Tooze

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

23

24

25

26

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 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 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.

26 ////

/////

facilities.

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

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.