BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF OREGON

UM 1081

In the Matter of An Investigation into Direct)
Access Issues for Industrial and Commercial)
Customers under SB 1149)
)

SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY OF

LINCOLN WOLVERTON

ON BEHALF OF

THE INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS OF NORTHWEST UTILITIES

JULY 12, 2004

Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND PROVIDE YOUR BUSINESS
	ADDRESS.

1 2

Α.

3 A. My name is Lincoln Wolverton and my business address is East Fork Economics,

4 Post Office Box 620, 35011 North Fork Rd., La Center, Washington 98629. I

5 previously submitted Direct Testimony in this proceeding on May 27, 2004.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY?

To provide a comparison by month of the delivered cost of power for a Schedule 48T customer taking service under the cost-of-service rate and under direct access based on the Company's Transition Adjustment proposed in their rebuttal testimony. I provide this comparison because PacifiCorp did not include such a comparison in their rebuttal testimony or in response to a discovery request from the Industrial Customers of Northwest Utilities ("ICNU").

In PacifiCorp's direct testimony in this proceeding, PacifiCorp provided exhibits that compared the current and the Company's then proposed Transition Adjustment by month, by on-peak and off-peak hours, by Rate Schedule, and Delivery Voltage from November 2003. PPL/200, Apperson/9-10; PPL/202; PPL/203. PacifiCorp also provided an exhibit that calculated the difference between the two schedules. PPL/200, Apperson/10; PPL/204. These exhibits became obsolete when PacifiCorp abandoned its original Transition Adjustment and proposed a new Transition Adjustment in its rebuttal testimony. PacifiCorp's rebuttal testimony did not include exhibits that compared or calculated the difference between the total cost-of-service rate and the total rate under the Company's new Transition Adjustment.

In ICNU Data Request 5.1, ICNU requested that PacifiCorp provide a comparison of the cost of power for a direct access customer using its newly proposed Transition Adjustment with a cost-of-service rate. PacifiCorp refused to perform the analysis and provided ICNU with the workpapers necessary to perform the analysis. The data request and PacifiCorp's response (with the voluminous workpapers omitted) are attached as Exhibit ICNU/106.

Exhibit ICNU/107 is my calculation that compares the monthly delivered cost of power for a Schedule 48T customer taking service under the cost-of-service rate and under direct access utilizing PacifiCorp's newly proposed Transition Adjustment. I assumed that the energy price for the direct access purchase is made at the forward market price curve used to set the Transition Adjustment. In preparing Exhibit ICNU/107, I utilized PacifiCorp's cost-of-service rates that are publicly available and the discovery material provided by the Company to ICNU in this proceeding. Exhibit ICNU/107 includes a comparison of the percentage difference between the Company's cost-of-service rate, the Company's new Transition Adjustment and the ICNU Transition Adjustment. The calculation that I performed is essentially the same calculation that PacifiCorp declined to perform in response to ICNU's discovery request.

I also updated my calculations regarding the Transition Adjustment proposed by ICNU with the information contained in the Company's testimony. In Exhibit ICNU/107 and Exhibit ICNU/108, I update the Transition Adjustment from my direct testimony with the forward price information. Exhibit ICNU/108 was developed from a spreadsheet provided by the Company that provides sample

7	A.	Yes.
5 6	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR SUPPLEMENTAL TESTIMONY?
4		this spreadsheet with the updated forward price information.
3		removed the Kickstart information and added the ICNU Transition Adjustment to
2		Kickstart program, and its newly proposed Transition Adjustment. I simply
1		transition adjustments for the Company's current Transition Adjustment, the