

Boise Data Request 9.1

Reference Exhibit No. __ (NCS-3), p.8.4.2: Is the Company requesting the Commission to make a determination that the pro-forma capital projects listed in the exhibit are prudent investments in rate base in this proceeding? If yes, please provide an explanation of the Company's proposed ratemaking treatment for any expenditure amounts that ultimately exceed, or are less than, the rate base amounts requested in the exhibit.

Response to Boise Data Request 9.1

Yes. The Company has made no proposal for actual expenditures that differ from the estimated amounts in the exhibit.

PREPARER: Natasha Siores

SPONSOR: Natasha Siores

UE-140762/Pacific Power & Light Company
September 25, 2014
PC Data Request 109

PC Data Request 109

Re: Plant Additions.

Please provide an update to the response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 54 and all of the associated subparts thereto based on the most recent information available.

Response to PC Data Request 109

a-c. For projects listed under Steam Production and Hydro Production, and for the "U2 GSU Transformer Upgrade Replacement" project under General Plant, please refer to Attachment PC 109-1. In preparing this response, the Company discovered that Attachment PC 54-1 included sorting errors resulting in a mismatch between certain projects and their in-service dates and plant in service amounts. The Company will issue a revised response to PC 54 to correct the error.

For all other projects, please refer to Attachment PC 109-2.

d. Please refer to Attachment PC 109-2 for the total accumulated deferred income taxes (ADIT) associated with the projects that are completed and placed into service. The Company is in the process of calculating the total ADIT for the in-service projects listed in Attachment PC 109-1 and will supplement this response when that information is available.

PREPARER: Nathan Adent/Karl Mortensen/Dave Webb/Brian Keyser

SPONSOR: To be determined

PC Data Request 109

Re: Plant Additions.

Please provide an update to the response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 54 and all of the associated subparts thereto based on the most recent information available.

1st Supplemental Response to PC Data Request 109

As a supplement to the Company's previous response to Public Counsel Data Request 109d, the Company provides the following response:

- d. Please refer to Attachment PC 109-1 1st Supplemental for the total accumulated deferred income taxes (ADIT) associated with the projects listed under Steam Production and Hydro Production, and for the "U2 GSU Transformer Upgrade Replacement" project under General Plant that are completed and placed into service.

PREPARER: Nathan Adent/Brian Keyser

SPONSOR: To be determined

PC Data Request 124

Re: Plant Additions.

Please refer to Exhibit No. NCS-11, page 8.4.2 and the response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 109, Attachment PC 109-1. Please explain the following variances between the estimated in-service date identified on Attachment PC 109-1 as compared to Exhibit No. NCS-11, page 8.4.2, and identify which is the correct current estimated in-service date. If neither date is the current estimated in-service date, provide the current estimated in-service date for each of the projects:

- (a) ILR 6.2 Merwin Flow Controls—October 2015 or October 2014; and
- (b) ILR 8.7 Speelyai Hatchery Water Intake—November 2015 or November 2014.

Response to PC Data Request 124

The estimated in-service dates for the Merwin Flow Controls and Speelyai Hatchery Water Intake projects were correctly identified in Attachment PC 109-1 as October 2015 and November 2015, respectively. In addition, while preparing a response to this request, the Company identified that the Merwin 3 TIV Overhaul project will not be completed before the rate-effective date in this proceeding. The in-service dates associated with these projects in Exhibit No. NCS-11, page 8.4.2 will be corrected at the hearing. Because the projected in-service dates for these projects are past the rate-effective date in this case, the Company will remove these projects from the pro forma adjustment for major capital additions.

PREPARER: Will Shallenberger / Natasha Siores

SPONSOR: Natasha Siores

PC Data Request 126

Re: Plant Additions.

Please refer to Exhibit No. NCS-3, page 8.4.2 and Exhibit No. NCS-11, page 8.4.2. Please explain, in detail, what caused the following projected changes in the plant addition amounts between the projected amounts identified in the original filing on Exhibit No. NCS-3, page 8.4.2 and the projected plant addition amount in the rebuttal filing on Exhibit No. NCS-11, page 8.4.2:

- (a) Fry Sub Instl 115 kV Capacitor Bank TPL2 (March 2015) - \$6,381,000 compared to \$7,950,000 (increase of \$1,569,000);
- (b) Knott Sub Install 115-12.5kV Transformer – Trans (Dec 2014) - \$3.4M compared to \$4,622,995 (increase of approximately \$1.2M);
- (c) ILR 8.7 Speelyai Hatchery Water Intake (November 2014) - \$2.0M compared to \$2.46M; and
- (d) Orchard and Wiley Substation Capacity Relief (Clinton Feeder) (Nov 2014) - \$880,000 compared to \$1.4M.

Response to PC Data Request 126

- (a) The project cost included in the initial filing was based on a projection of \$6.38 million that was developed before the Company chose a contractor. Following award of the contractor bid in late July 2014, nearly three months after the Company's initial filing, the estimated project cost was updated to \$7.95 million. The selected contractor provided the lowest bid for this project. The Company, however, now anticipates that the Fry Substation project will be placed in service after the rate-effective date in this case. Accordingly, the Company will remove this project from the pro forma adjustment for major capital additions.
- (b) The \$3.4 million amount included with the Company's initial filing was based on preliminary projections and high-level scope for project. Project scoping was further defined, full design achieved, and firm construction bids were received. The revision to \$4.6 million is based on final scope, confirmed material costs, and receipt of firm bid results.
- (c) As discussed in the Company's response to PC Data Request 124, the current estimated in-service date for this project is November 2015. Because the in-service date is past the rate-effective date in this case, the Company will remove this project from the pro forma adjustment for major capital additions..

- (d) The \$880,000 amount included with the Company's initial filing was based on preliminary projections and high level scope for project. Project scoping was further defined, full design achieved, and firm construction bids were received. The revision to \$1.4 million is based on final scope, confirmed material costs, and receipt of firm bid results.

PREPARER: J.D. Podlesnik/Carrie Laird /Will Shallenberger

SPONSOR: Natasha Soares/Mark Tallman/Rick Vail

PC Data Request 127

Re: Plant Additions.

Please refer to Exhibit No. NCS-11, page 8.4.2. Please confirm that the Union Gap—Add 230-115kV Capacity—TPL002 project is now in-service and that the actual cost is the amount identified in the exhibit of \$8,416,403. If not in-service, provide the current estimated in-service date. If the amount in Exhibit 8.4.2 is not the actual cost of the project and the project is in-service, please provide the actual amount. Additionally, please explain, in detail, why this project was not identified as in-service in response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 109 since page 8.4.2 identifies the in-service date as August 2014.

Response to PC Data Request 127

The Union Gap—Add 230-115kV Capacity—TPL002 project is now in-service. The amount included in Exhibit No. NCS-11, page 8.4.2, reflected the projected amount from the Attachment PC 54-2. Actual in-service costs through September 2014 are \$8,533,785. The majority of the project costs went into service in August 2014. Foundation issues, however, delayed some final steps to complete this sequence of work and the north feeder was not energized until October 2014. In addition, the relocation of the existing 20 MVA transformer was completed November 7, 2014. Because of these remaining steps after August 2014, this project was not included in the Company's response to Public Counsel Data Request 109. The projected costs were included in Attachment PC 54-2.

PREPARER: J.D. Podlesnik/Natasha Siores

SPONSOR: Rick Vail/Natasha Siores

PC Data Request 130

Re: Plant Additions.

Please refer to the rebuttal Testimony of R. Bryce Dalley, at page 10 lines 5 through 9 in which he states: “To respond to Staff’s and Public Counsel’s recommendations that only the known and measurable amounts for projects that have actually been placed in service be included in rates, the Company proposes in this case to limit its adjustment for pro forma capital additions to the amounts actually placed in service by the date of the Company’s compliance filing”.

- (a) Please confirm that under this proposal, such “pro form capital additions” would be limited to those projects specifically identified on page 8.4.2 of Exhibits Nos. NCS-3 and NCS-11? If not limited to those projects specifically identified on page 8.4.2, please explain, in detail, why not and identify all additional projects that may be included beyond those identified on page 8.4.2.
- (b) The approach proposed in the rebuttal testimony would not allow the parties the ability to review the actual plant addition amounts or investigate cost over-runs if the costs of such projects exceed the amounts projected in the filing. Under the Company’s proposed approach, for those projects that are placed in-service between October 2014 and the “date of the Company’s compliance filing,” would the Company be willing to limit the amount for each project in the compliance filing to the lower of the actual costs or the amount included for the project in its Exhibit No. NCS-3, page 8.4.2? In other words, if the actual costs for a project placed into service between October 2014 and the date of the compliance filing exceeds the projected amount contained in the original filing for the project, the amount to include in the compliance filing would be capped at the amount contained in the Company’s original filing. If no, please explain, in detail, why not.

Response to PC Data Request 130

- (a) Confirmed.
- (b) For those projects placed in service between the date of the Company’s rebuttal filing (November 14, 2014) through the rate-effective date (March 31, 2014), the Company would be willing to limit the amount included in this case (as part of the compliance filing) to the lower of the actual costs or the amounts included in the Company’s rebuttal testimony. Please note that the Company provided corrected actual in-service amounts for certain projects in its response to Public Counsel Data Requests 123 and 125. The corrected actual amounts for these projects would be used in the Company’s compliance filing.

UE-140762/Pacific Power & Light Company
December 1, 2014
PC Data Request 130

Exh. No. NCS__CX
Witness: Natasha C. Siores
Page 9 of 9

PREPARER: Bryce Dalley

SPONSOR: Bryce Dalley