Exhibit No.___(KAB-1T)
Docket UE-13____
Witness: Kelcey A. Brown

BEFORE THE
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, Complainant, vs. PACIFICORP dba Pacific Power & Light Company Respondent.	Docket UE-13____

PACIFICORP

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF KELCEY A. BROWN

January 2013

(at system input) for the 12 months ending December 2014. In addition, I will discuss the Company's inclusion of temperature normalization of the commercial class for the July 2011 through June 2012 test period.

Summary of Changes in Sales and Load

Q. Please summarize the changes in Washington sales in the current filing as compared to the Washington sales included in the Company's 2011 general rate case, docket UE-111190 (2011 Rate Case).

A. As shown in Table 1 below, the Company's Washington sales in the test period were 25,118 megawatt-hours (MWh), or 0.6 percent lower than the sales included in the 2011 Rate Case on a weather normalized basis.[1] The decrease in sales is largely driven by lower sales to the residential class and is offset in part by increases in sales to the commercial and industrial classes.

Table 1

Comparison of Washington Sales*				
Class	Current Case 12 months ending June 2012 (MWh)	2011 Rate Case 12 months ending Dec 2010 (MWh)	Difference	Percentage Difference
Residential	1,603,870	1,664,001	(60,131)	-3.6%
Commercial	1,412,675	1,398,980	13,695	1.0%
Industrial	820,615	799,160	21,455	2.7%
Irrigation	152,272	150,522	1,750	1.2%
Public Street and Highway Light	9,146	11,032	(1,886)	-17.1%
Total Washington Sales	3,998,577	4,023,695	(25,118)	-0.6%

*At meter

[1] In this case, the Company calculated temperature normalization for the residential, commercial, and irrigation customers consistently with the methodology approved by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) in the Company's 2005 general rate case, docket UE-050684 (2005 Rate Case), and 2006 general rate case, docket UE-090205 (2006 Rate Case).

Q. How are the temperature normalized sales and load for the test period used in the preparation of this case?

A. The temperature normalized retail sales for the test period are used by Ms. Joelle R. Steward to develop present revenues and proposed rates, and Mr. Steven R. McDougal uses the test period temperature normalized loads to calculate West Control Area inter-jurisdictional allocation factors.

Q. Please summarize the changes in forecasted load compared to the 2011 Rate Case.

A. As shown in Table 2 below, the temperature normalized forecasted load for the 12 months ending December 2014 are lower than forecasted loads for both the state of Washington and the west control area from the 2011 Rate Case, which were based on the 12 months ending May 2013.

Table 2

Comparison of West Control Area Loads*				
State	Current Case 12 months ending Dec 2014 (MWh)	2011 Rate Case 12 months ending May 2013 (MWh)	Difference	Percentage Difference
Washington	4,369,000	4,552,400	(183,400)	-4.0%
Oregon	14,711,436	14,959,165	(247,729)	-1.7%
California	894,220	977,580	(83,360)	-8.5%
System Load	19,974,656	20,489,145	(514,489)	-2.5%

*At system input (includes losses)

The decrease in the load forecast in this case is driven by prolonged recessionary impacts in all states and growth in energy efficiency and conservation programs.