Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_T (CJW-1T) Docket No. UE-050684 Witness: Christian J. Ward

# BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PACIFICORP, d/b/a Pacific Power & Light Company,

Respondent.

DOCKET NO. UE-050684

#### **TESTIMONY OF**

#### CHRISTIAN J. WARD

### STAFF OF WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

#### **RE: PACIFICORP GENERAL RATE CASE**

November 3, 2005

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| I.   | INTRODUCTION1             |  | 1 |
|------|---------------------------|--|---|
| II.  | SCOPE OF TESTIMONY2       |  | 2 |
| III. | DISCUSSION OF ADJUSTMENTS |  |   |
|      | A.                        | Adjustment 4.1, Capital Stock Expense Amortization                   | 3 |
|      | В.                        | Adjustment 4.18, Miscellaneous Administrative and<br>General Expense | 7 |
|      |                           | 1. Account 920 – Administrative and General Salaries                 | 2 |
|      |                           | 2. Account 921 - Office Supplies and Expenses1                       | 2 |
|      |                           | 3. Account 923 - Outside Services Employed1                          | 4 |
|      |                           | 4. Account 930 - Miscellaneous General Expenses                      | 5 |
|      |                           | 5. Other2  | 0 |
|      | C.                        | Adjustment 4.19, Remove RTO Expenses2                                | 1 |

#### LIST OF EXHIBITS

- Exhibit No. \_\_\_ (CJW-2): Adjustment 4.18, Miscellaneous Administrative and General Expense Washington
- Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_ (CJW-3): Adjustment 4.19, Remove RTO Expenses Washington

| 1  |    | I. INTRODUCTION  |  |
|----|----|--|--|
| 2  |    |  |  |
| 3  | Q. | Please state your name and business address.                                   |  |
| 4  | A. | My name is Christian J. Ward. My business address is 1300 S. Evergreen         |  |
| 5  |    | Park Drive S.W., P.O. Box 47250, Olympia, WA 98504. My email address is        |  |
| 6  |    | cward@wutc.wa.gov.   |  |
| 7  |    |  |  |
| 8  | Q. | By whom are you employed and in what capacity?                                 |  |
| 9  | A. | I am employed by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission        |  |
| 10 |    | as a regulatory analyst.   |  |
| 11 |    |  |  |
| 12 | Q. | How long have you been employed by the Commission?                             |  |
| 13 | A. | I have been employed by the Commission since September 1999, and as a          |  |
| 14 |    | regulatory analyst since April 2004.   |  |
| 15 |    |  |  |
| 16 | Q. | Would you please state your educational and professional background?           |  |
| 17 | A. | I graduated from The Evergreen State College in 1998 and received a            |  |
| 18 |    | Bachelor of Arts degree with emphasis in business management and               |  |
| 19 |    | accounting. I have examined and assisted in the analysis of several other      |  |
| 20 |    | utility rate filings. I also successively completed the 47th Annual Regulatory |  |
|    |    | TIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T)<br>ket No. UE-050684 Page 1   |  |

| 1  |    | Studies Program, sponsored by the National Association of Regulatory         |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | Utility Commissioners (NARUC).   |
| 3  |    |  |
| 4  |    | II. SCOPE OF TESTIMONY   |
| 5  |    |  |
| 6  | Q. | What is the scope of your testimony?   |
| 7  | A. | I analyze the following adjustments:   |
| 8  |    | Adjustment 4.1, Capital Stock Expense Amortization;                          |
| 9  |    | • Adjustment 4.18, Miscellaneous Administrative and General Expense;         |
| 10 |    | • Adjustment 4.19, Remove RTO Expenses.                                      |
| 11 |    |  |
| 12 | Q. | Do you sponsor any exhibits?   |
| 13 | A. | Yes. I sponsor Exhibit No (CJW-2), entitled "Adjustment 4.18,                |
| 14 |    | Miscellaneous Administrative and General Expense - Washington." In this      |
| 15 |    | exhibit I summarize the calculation of Staff Adjustment 4.18. I also sponsor |
| 16 |    | Exhibit No (CJW-3), entitled "Adjustment 4.19, Remove RTO Expenses,          |
| 17 |    | - Washington," which shows the calculation of Staff Adjustment 4.19.         |
| 18 |    |  |

| 1  |  | III. DISCUSSION OF ADJUSTMENTS   |  |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2  |  |  |  |
| 3  |  | A. Adjustment 4.1, Capital Stock Expense Amortization                          |  |
| 4  |  |  |  |
| 5  | Q.   | What is capital stock expense?   |  |
| 6  | А.   | Capital stock expense is the cost the Company incurs to issue equity capital.  |  |
| 7  |  | The costs are basically the fees the Company pays to financial institutions to |  |
| 8  |  | issue new common stock.  |  |
| 9  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Q.   | Did PacifiCorp propose an adjustment to amortize these expenses?               |  |
| 11 | А.   | Yes. PacifiCorp's Adjustment 4.1 accumulates the costs the Company             |  |
| 12 |  | incurred to acquire new common stock in prior years, and amortizes these       |  |
| 13 |  | costs over a twenty year period. The Company's adjustment is shown in          |  |
| 14 |  | Exhibit No (PMW-3), Tab 4, at pages 4.1 and 4.1.1.                             |  |
| 15 |  |  |  |
| 16 | Q.   | Over what period of time did the Company accrue these costs?                   |  |
| 17 | А.   | This expenditure has accumulated on the Company's books since it began         |  |
| 18 |  | operations in the early 1900s up until 1998. According to the Company's        |  |
| 19 |  | Response to Staff Data Request No. 70, "No additions have been recorded to     |  |
| 20 | Capital Stock Expense since 1998." Accordingly, the Company incurred               |  |  |
|    | TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T)<br>Docket No. UE-050684 Page 3 |  |  |

| 1  |    | these costs in periods before 1999. The detailed back-up information the        |
|----|----|---|
| 2  |    | Company provided showed various amounts for various years after 1980,           |
| 3  |    | and a lump sum amount for all periods before 1980.                              |
| 4  |    | In short, these are not current costs. These are costs PacifiCorp               |
| 5  |    | incurred many years ago.  |
| 6  |    |   |
| 7  | Q. | Please explain how the FERC Uniform System of Accounts requires                 |
| 8  |    | PacifiCorp to book capital stock expense.                                       |
| 9  | А. | According to the FERC Uniform System of Accounts (USofA), PacifiCorp is         |
| 10 |    | to book capital stock expense to Account 214. 18 C.F.R. Part 101 describes      |
| 11 |    | Account 214 in part as follows: "A. This account shall include in a separate    |
| 12 |    | subdivision for each class and series of stock all commissions and expenses     |
| 13 |    | incurred in connection with the original issuance and sale of capital stock     |
| 14 |    | B. When capital stock which has been actually issued by the utility is retired, |
| 15 |    | the amount in this account, applicable to the shares retired shall be written   |
| 16 |    | off to account 210, Gain on Resale or Cancellation of Reacquired Capital        |
| 17 |    | Stock, provided, however, that the amount shall be charged to account 439,      |
| 18 |    | Adjustments to Retained Earnings, to the extent that it exceeds the balance in  |
| 19 |    | account 210."   |

TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD Docket No. UE-050684 Exhibit No. \_\_\_\_T (CJW-1T) Page 4

| 1  |    | In other words, the accounting rules require capital stock expenses to        |
|----|----|---|
| 2  |    | be booked in Account 214, which is a reduction to stockholder's equity.       |
| 3  |    | When the equity issuances are retired, the associated amounts in account 214  |
| 4  |    | are simply transferred to other capital accounts, as required by the USofA.   |
| 5  |    | By the nature of this accounting, capital stock expense is not intended to be |
| 6  |    | included as a utility operating cost.   |
| 7  |    |   |
| 8  | Q. | Did PacifiCorp record its capital stock expenses in Account 214?              |
| 9  | А. | Yes. However, PacifiCorp is proposing to amortize these capital stock         |
| 10 |    | expenses through Account 930, a utility operating expense account.            |
| 11 |    |   |
| 12 | Q. | Is PacifiCorp required to follow the FERC USofA?                              |
| 13 | А. | Yes. Under WAC 480-100-203, the Commission requires all electric utilities    |
| 14 |    | to use the uniform system of accounts (USofA) as published by the Federal     |
| 15 |    | Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) in 18 C.F.R. Part 101. According to       |
| 16 |    | WAC 480-100-203(3): "Any deviation from the uniform system of accounts,       |
| 17 |    | as prescribed by the FERC, will be accomplished only after due notice and     |
| 18 |    | order of this Commission."  |
| 19 |    |   |

| 1  | Q. | Should the Commission accept PacifiCorp's Adjustment 4.1 and allow           |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | PacifiCorp to deviate from the USofA by amortizing these capital stock       |
| 3  |    | expenses using Account 930?  |
| 4  | А. | No. As I explain below, these amounts should not be allowed to be            |
| 5  |    | amortized. The Company's adjustment constitutes retroactive ratemaking.      |
| 6  |    | The Commission should reject the Company's Adjustment 4.1.                   |
| 7  |    |  |
| 8  | Q. | Please explain why the Company's Adjustment 4.1 constitutes retroactive      |
| 9  |    | ratemaking.  |
| 10 | А. | The Company's adjustment seeks to recover costs the Company incurred         |
| 11 |    | many years ago. In other words, the Company is seeking current recovery of   |
| 12 |    | costs the Company incurred in accounting periods ending in 1998; several     |
| 13 |    | years before the test period in this case: the twelve months ended September |
| 14 |    | 30, 2004. This is a classic example of retroactive ratemaking.               |
| 15 |    |  |
| 16 | Q. | How should the Commission treat the Company's Capital Stock Expense          |
| 17 |    | Amortization Adjustment 4.1?   |
| 18 | А. | The Commission should reject the Company's adjustment as retroactive         |
| 19 |    | ratemaking. Staff's Adjustment 4.1 removes the \$171,120 in capital stock    |
| 20 |    | expense the Company allocated to Washington.                                 |
|    |    |  |

| TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD | Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T) |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Docket No. UE-050684           | Page 6               |

| 1  | В. | Adjustment 4.18, Miscellaneous Administrative and General Expense                      |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    |  |
| 3  | Q. | Please explain Adjustment 4.18, Miscellaneous Administrative and                       |
| 4  |    | General Expense.   |
| 5  | A. | This adjustment is intended to remove expenses or other items that are not             |
| 6  |    | appropriate from the Company to recover through rates, such as charitable              |
| 7  |    | contributions, expenses related to political, legislative or promotional               |
| 8  |    | activities, entertainment expenses, club dues, and expenses that do not apply          |
| 9  |    | to Washington.   |
| 10 |    |  |
| 11 | Q. | Why should the Commission exclude charitable contributions for                         |
| 12 |    | ratemaking purposes?   |
| 13 | A. | It is my understanding that under the court's decision in <i>Jewell v. Utilities</i> & |
| 14 |    | Transportation Commission, 90 Wn.2d 775 (1978), the Commission cannot                  |
| 15 |    | include charitable contributions in calculating utility rates. The court said          |
| 16 |    | that there was no proof these expenses resulted in any better service; that            |
| 17 |    | nothing in the Commission's statutes required the utility to be a "good                |
| 18 |    | corporate neighbor;" and that a utility was not entitled to recover expenses           |
| 19 |    | that result in "improving the image of the corporation."                               |
| 20 |    |  |

| 1  | Q. | Why should the Commission exclude for ratemaking purposes                      |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | PacifiCorp's expenses that are related to political or legislative activities? |
| 3  | A. | WAC 480-100-213 states that the Commission "will not allow either direct or    |
| 4  |    | indirect expenditures" for these items "for rate-making purposes." That rule   |
| 5  |    | defines "political or legislative activities" to include activities such as    |
| 6  |    | supporting or opposing legislation or political action committees, or          |
| 7  |    | candidates. Company activities before the Commission or similar regulatory     |
| 8  |    | or local governmental bodies are not included as political or legislative      |
| 9  |    | activities.  |
| 10 |    |  |
| 11 | Q. | Why should the Commission exclude for ratemaking purposes                      |
| 12 |    | PacifiCorp's expenses that are related to promotional activities?              |
| 13 | A. | WAC 480-100-233 states that the Commission "will not allow expenses for        |
| 14 |    | promotional or political advertising for ratemaking purposes." Promotional     |
| 15 |    | advertising includes advertising "to encourage any person or business to       |
| 16 |    | select or use the service or additional service of an electric utility."       |
| 17 |    |  |
| 18 | Q. | Did PacifiCorp incur expenses in the test period of a promotional or           |
| 19 |    | political nature?  |

TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD Docket No. UE-050684

| 1  | A. | Yes. Some of the groups to whom PacifiCorp paid money promote business         |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | development, which in turn, promotes electric utility usage. In addition,      |
| 3  |    | some of these groups, such as chambers of commerce, engage in lobbying         |
| 4  |    | activities. PacifiCorp included payments to such entities without adjusting    |
| 5  |    | out the portions that are attributable to promotional or political activities. |
| 6  |    |  |
| 7  | Q. | Why should the Commission exclude for ratemaking purposes the                  |
| 8  |    | Company's expenses for entertainment, club dues, and similar items?            |
| 9  | A. | These items are related to Company image building and/or they do not           |
| 10 |    | otherwise result in better utility service. If the Company chooses to incur    |
| 11 |    | these types of expenses, they should be borne by shareholders, not             |
| 12 |    | ratepayers.  |
| 13 |    |  |
| 14 | Q. | Did PacifiCorp propose a Miscellaneous Expense Adjustment?                     |
| 15 | А. | Yes. The Company sponsors Miscellaneous Expense Adjustment 4.3.                |
| 16 |    | According to the Company, this adjustment removes "certain miscellaneous       |
| 17 |    | expenses that should have been charged below the line to non-regulated         |
| 18 |    | expenses." Direct Testimony of Mr. Wrigley, Exhibit NoT (PMW-1T) at 10,        |
| 19 |    | <i>lines</i> 19-21. Company Adjustment 4.3 is shown in Exhibit No (PMW-3),     |
| 20 |    | Tab 4, page 4.0, column 4.3.   |

| TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD | Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T) |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Docket No. UE-050684           | Page 9               |

| 1  |    |   |
|----|----|---|
| 2  | Q. | Does Staff accept PacifiCorp's Adjustment 4.3?                                |
| 3  | A. | Yes.  |
| 4  |    |   |
| 5  | Q. | What PacifiCorp miscellaneous general expense accounts did Staff review       |
| 6  |    | to determine whether there were any additional expense items that should      |
| 7  |    | be removed?   |
| 8  | A. | I reviewed FERC Accounts 910 - Miscellaneous Customer Service and             |
| 9  |    | Informational Expenses; 912 - Demonstrating and selling Expenses; 913 -       |
| 10 |    | Advertising Expenses; 920 - Administrative and General Salaries: 921 - Office |
| 11 |    | Supplies and Expenses; 923 - Outside Services Employed, 930 -                 |
| 12 |    | Miscellaneous General Expenses; and 935 - Maintenance of General Plant.       |
| 13 |    |   |
| 14 | Q. | Based on that review, did you discover any expenses that the Company          |
| 15 |    | recorded "above the line" that should have been recorded "below the           |
| 16 |    | line," or otherwise should be excluded for ratemaking purposes?               |
| 17 | A. | Yes. The Company recorded above the line certain payments it made to          |
| 18 |    | various chambers of commerce, as well as expenses related to the Company's    |
| 19 |    | political activities, sponsorships, gifts to Board Members, community         |
| 20 |    | dinners, galas, club memberships, association dues that had components for    |
|    |    | TMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T)<br>et No. UE-050684 Page 10   |

| 1  |    | political or legislative activities, and payments to Rotary Clubs and other |
|----|----|---|
| 2  |    | charitable organizations.   |
| 3  |    | I discovered PacifiCorp recorded these amounts in the test year in          |
| 4  |    | Accounts 920, 921, 923 and 930. These are "above the line" accounts. Unless |
| 5  |    | these items are excluded for ratemaking purposes, they will be included in  |
| 6  |    | the rates paid by Washington ratepayers.                                    |
| 7  |    |   |
| 8  | Q. | Did PacifiCorp follow the USofA when it recorded above the line these       |
| 9  |    | sorts of expenses you found in Accounts 920, 921, 923 and 930?              |
| 10 | А. | No. PacifiCorp should have recorded the money it paid to charities or       |
| 11 |    | similar organizations in USofA Account 426.1 – Donations. 18 C.F.R. Part    |
| 12 |    | 101, defines Account 426.1 as follows: "This account shall include all      |
| 13 |    | payments or donations for charitable, social or community welfare           |
| 14 |    | purposes."  |
| 15 |    | The Company should have recorded the other expenses I identified            |
| 16 |    | under USofA Account 426.5 – Other Deductions. According to the same         |
| 17 |    | regulations: "This account shall include other miscellaneous expenses which |
| 18 |    | are non-operating in nature, but which are properly deductible before       |
| 19 |    | determining total income before interest charges."                          |
| 20 |    |   |

TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARDExhibit No. \_\_\_T (CJW-1T)Docket No. UE-050684Page 11

Docket No. UE-050684

2

| 3  | Q.   | You testified that you reviewed items in PacifiCorp's Account 920. Please        |
|----|------|--|
| 4  |      | describe what you found and what adjustment is appropriate.                      |
| 5  | А.   | I found Company expenditures relating to entertainment, such as consultant       |
| 6  |      | lunches, raffles, and entertainment for the Portland PacifiCorp retirees'        |
| 7  |      | Christmas lunch. These amounts are not related to utility service and they       |
| 8  |      | should be removed.   |
| 9  |      | As shown on page 1, line 4 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), the total                   |
| 10 |      | company amount I removed was \$27,556, and Washington's share was                |
| 11 |      | \$2,295.   |
| 12 |      |  |
| 13 | 2.   | Account 921 – Office Supplies and Expenses                                       |
| 14 |      |  |
| 15 | Q.   | You also testified that you reviewed items in PacifiCorp's Account 921.          |
| 16 |      | Please describe what you found and what adjustment is appropriate.               |
| 17 | А.   | I found PacifiCorp payments related to chamber of commerce activities,           |
| 18 |      | Rotary Club activities, other charitable activities, other club activities, gala |
| 19 |      | events and dinners, as well as expenses related to PacifiCorp's activities in    |
| 20 |      | the states of Oregon, Wyoming, Idaho and Utah.                                   |
|    | TEST | TIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T)                                 |

Page 12

| 1  |    | As shown on page 1, line 5 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), the total                   |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | system amount the Company recorded in Account 921 for the test period is         |
| 3  |    | \$16,568,398. I removed \$1,202,440 (system wide), and \$100,142 for             |
| 4  |    | Washington.  |
| 5  |    |  |
| 6  | Q. | Why should the Commission disallow the Company's payments to                     |
| 7  |    | chambers of commerce?  |
| 8  | А. | Chambers of commerce engage in business promotional activities of the sort       |
| 9  |    | described in WAC 480-100-223. In addition, chambers of commerce engage           |
| 10 |    | in lobbying activity, and image building for their members. Some chamber         |
| 11 |    | of commerce organizations solicit donations, which qualifies them as a           |
| 12 |    | charity. As I explain earlier, these types of expenses either cannot or should   |
| 13 |    | not be recovered from ratepayers.  |
| 14 |    |  |
| 15 | Q. | Why should the Commission disallow the other types of expenses you               |
| 16 |    | described?   |
| 17 | А. | As I testified earlier, a utility's charitable contributions cannot be recovered |
| 18 |    | from ratepayers. The expenses for gala dinners and other items are also not      |
| 19 |    | utility service related. The expenses relating to Company activities in          |

TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARDExhibit No. \_\_\_T (CJW-1T)Docket No. UE-050684Page 13

| 1  |      | Oregon, Wyoming, Idaho and Utah are removed because they do not apply       |
|----|------|---|
| 2  |      | to Washington.  |
| 3  |      |   |
| 4  | Q.   | What methodology did you use to determine the amount of expenses in         |
| 5  |      | Account 921 that should not be recovered from ratepayers?                   |
| 6  | А.   | There was a tremendous volume of transactions in this account. Therefore, I |
| 7  |      | applied a sampling technique to derive the estimated amount to disallow. I  |
| 8  |      | reviewed a full, two-month period of transactions, and removed              |
| 9  |      | expenditures that PacifiCorp should have charged below the line or should   |
| 10 |      | otherwise not recover, and used that amount to calculate a percentage to    |
| 11 |      | apply to the other months in the test period.                               |
| 12 |      | I then removed the unrecoverable amounts from the two-month                 |
| 13 |      | sample, and applied the percentage to the remaining amounts in the account  |
| 14 |      | for the other months of the test year.                                      |
| 15 |      | This calculation is detailed on lines 21-22 of my Exhibit No (CJW-          |
| 16 |      | 2), page 1.   |
| 17 |      |   |
| 18 | 3.   | Account 923 – Outside Services Employed                                     |
| 19 |      |   |
| 20 | Q.   | What did you find in Account 923, and what adjustment is appropriate?       |
|    | TEST | TIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T)                            |

| TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD | Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T) |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Docket No. UE-050684           | Page 14              |

| 1  | A. | In my review of this account, I discovered PacifiCorp payments associated        |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    | with sponsorships, association memberships, gifts to Scottish Power Board        |
| 3  |    | members, retiree services including the Company's Retiree Ambassador             |
| 4  |    | Program, and the costs associated with an employee retirement video. I           |
| 5  |    | removed these expenses for the reasons I described earlier: these are either     |
| 6  |    | image-building activities or they do not result in better service to ratepayers. |
| 7  |    | I also found expenses PacifiCorp incurred in Oregon, Wyoming,                    |
| 8  |    | Idaho and Utah involving case activities. These expenses were not                |
| 9  |    | associated with Washington and were removed for that reason.                     |
| 10 |    | As shown on page 1, line 6 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), the total                   |
| 11 |    | company amount removed was \$1,593,709. Washington's portion is                  |
| 12 |    | \$132,727. However, to fairly balance out case expenses, I recalculated          |
| 13 |    | Washington's case expenses and included all of those expenses as part of         |
| 14 |    | Staff's Adjustment 4.3, as shown on lines 27-28 of my Exhibit No (CJW-           |
| 15 |    | 2), page 1.  |
| 16 |    |  |
| 17 | 4. | Account 930 – Miscellaneous General Expenses                                     |
| 18 |    |  |
| 19 | Q. | What is your adjustment related to Account 930?                                  |

TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD Docket No. UE-050684

| 1  | А. | I removed three types of expenditures from this Account: 1) Nature            |
|----|----|---|
| 2  |    | Conservancy; 2) Lobbying and similar expenses based on the Company's          |
| 3  |    | Response to Staff Data Request No. 140a; and 3) A portion of the dues         |
| 4  |    | PacifiCorp paid to the Edison Electric Institute (EEI).                       |
| 5  |    | As shown on page 1, line 7 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), company                  |
| 6  |    | wide, I removed \$2,315,100. Washington's portion is \$192,806.               |
| 7  |    |   |
| 8  | Q. | Please explain the Nature Conservancy element of the adjustment.              |
| 9  | А. | In reviewing the Company's Response to Staff Data Request No. 59a, for        |
| 10 |    | Account 930, I found a \$61,000 payment (total company) to the Nature         |
| 11 |    | Conservancy. This is a charitable organization and these expenses cannot be   |
| 12 |    | included in rates. Washington's share is \$5,080.                             |
| 13 |    |   |
| 14 | Q. | Please explain the part of the adjustment based on the Company's              |
| 15 |    | Response to Staff Data Request No. 140a.                                      |
| 16 | A. | Staff Data Request No. 140 asked PacifiCorp to "provide the vendor names      |
| 17 |    | and amounts charged to WA for accounts that are posted above or below the     |
| 18 |    | line for Membership dues, Lobbying Activities, Civic Activities and Political |
| 19 |    | Activities." The Company's response consisted of data on three                |
| 20 |    | spreadsheets.   |

| TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD | Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T) |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Docket No. UE-050684           | Page 16              |

| 1  |          | Spreadsheet "a" listed the above-described activities which PacifiCorp   |
|----|----------|--|
| 2  |          | charged above the line; Spreadsheet "b" listed the above-described activities  |
| 3  |          | that PacifiCorp charged below-the-line; and Spreadsheet "c" listed the   |
| 4  |          | above-described activities which PacifiCorp had removed from the test  |
| 5  |          | period.  |
| 6  |          | Spreadsheet "a" included membership dues, chamber of commerce  |
| 7  |          | activities, other charitable contributions and club dues. As I explained   |
| 8  |          | earlier, the ratepayers should not bear the burden of these costs. These   |
| 9  |          | expenses are more properly borne by shareholders. Accordingly, I removed   |
| 10 |          | them. I removed \$1,884,664, total company. Washington's share is \$156,959.   |
| 11 |          |  |
| 12 |          |  |
|    | Q.       | Please explain the Edison Electric Dues portion of the Staff adjustment to   |
| 13 | Q.       | Please explain the Edison Electric Dues portion of the Staff adjustment to<br>Account 930 by first describing the Edison Electric Institute. |
|    | Q.<br>A. |  |
| 13 |          | Account 930 by first describing the Edison Electric Institute.   |

| TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARD | Exhibit NoT (CJW-1T) |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| Docket No. UE-050684           | Page 17              |

| 1  |    |   |
|----|----|---|
| 2  | Q. | How much did PacifiCorp pay in dues to EEI in the test year?              |
| 3  | А. | The total company amount that PacifiCorp paid EEI was \$847,428, as shown |
| 4  |    | on page 2, line 25 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2). PacifiCorp is including      |
| 5  |    | \$70,576 as Washington's share in the Company's results of operations.    |
| 6  |    |   |
| 7  | Q. | Should the Commission disallow any part of PacifiCorp's payments to       |
| 8  |    | EEI?  |
| 9  | А. | Yes. The foregoing description of EEI shows that it engages in political  |
| 10 |    | activities. The portion of the money PacifiCorp paid to EEI for these     |
| 11 |    | purposes should not be recovered from ratepayers.                         |
| 12 |    |   |
| 13 | Q. | What percentage of PacifiCorp's payments to EEI for 2003 and 2004 were    |
| 14 |    | for political activities and therefore should be disallowed?              |
| 15 | А. | 43.60%. As shown on page 2 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), lines 28 and 30,     |
| 16 |    | this results in an adjustment that removes \$369,436 total company and    |
| 17 |    | Washington's share is \$30,767.   |
| 18 |    |   |

1

# Q. How did you calculate that 43.60%?

| 2  | А. | I reviewed EEI financial data for the year ended December 31, 2003, and the  |
|----|----|--|
| 3  |    | year ended December 31, 2004. In that data, EEI provided a schedule of       |
| 4  |    | Expenses organized by NARUC category as a percentage of dues paid. I         |
| 5  |    | then removed the amounts for those categories that were political in nature. |
| 6  |    | The percentage applicable to 2003 was 43.52%; and for 2004 it was            |
| 7  |    | 43.76%, as shown on page 2 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), lines 6 and 17.         |
| 8  |    | The average of these two percentages is 43.6%. I applied that percentage to  |
| 9  |    | the Company's total EEI expenditures for the test year (\$847,428), as shown |
| 10 |    | on page 2 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), lines 25 and 26, to get the amount       |
| 11 |    | to be removed on lines 28 and 30.  |
| 12 |    |  |
| 13 | Q. | What expense categories were associated with the amounts you removed?        |
| 14 | А. | I removed expenses from the following expense categories:                    |
| 15 |    | 1) Legislative Advocacy  |
| 16 |    | 2) Legislative Policy Research   |
| 17 |    | 3) Advertising   |
| 18 |    | 4) Marketing   |
| 19 |    | 5) Public Relations  |
| 20 |    |  |

| 1  | 5. | Other  |
|----|----|--|
| 2  |    |  |
| 3  | Q. | Did you remove other expenditures in Staff's Miscellaneous                     |
| 4  |    | Administrative and General Expense Adjustment 4.18?                            |
| 5  | А. | Yes. I removed a note receivable that PacifiCorp had included in a rate base   |
| 6  |    | account, a one-time uncollectible accrual, and a Washington non-operating      |
| 7  |    | direct access cost.  |
| 8  |    |  |
| 9  | Q. | Please explain Staff's adjustment for the note receivable.                     |
| 10 | А. | Based on the Company's Response to Staff Data Request No. 228, I               |
| 11 |    | discovered that the Company had recorded a note receivable as a                |
| 12 |    | miscellaneous rate base item. The Company should have recorded this item       |
| 13 |    | on its balance sheet in Account 141, current and accrued assets, which are not |
| 14 |    | included as a direct rate base component. Notes receivables are considered     |
| 15 |    | investments because they are already earning a return in the form of interest. |
| 16 |    | Including these in rate base would constitute double earning.                  |
| 17 |    | Accordingly, I removed this item from rate base. As shown on page 1,           |
| 18 |    | line 13 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), Washington's share is \$57,761.              |
| 19 |    |  |

TESTIMONY OF CHRISTIAN J. WARDExhibit No. \_\_\_T (CJW-1T)Docket No. UE-050684Page 20

| 1  | Q. | Please explain Staff's adjustment for the one-time uncollectible accrual.   |
|----|----|---|
| 2  | А. | This adjustment simply removes from the test period results of operations a |
| 3  |    | non-recurring uncollectible expense allocated to Washington. Non-recurring  |
| 4  |    | items are usually excluded for ratemaking purposes because they do not      |
| 5  |    | reflect the Company's ongoing operations.                                   |
| 6  |    | Based on the Company's Response to Staff Data Request No. 234, and          |
| 7  |    | as shown on page 1, line 9 of my Exhibit No (CJW-2), the expense to         |
| 8  |    | Washington is \$5,726.  |
| 9  |    |   |
| 10 | Q. | Please explain Staff's adjustment for the Washington non-operating direct   |
| 11 |    | access cost.  |
| 12 | A. | This adjustment corrects the system-wide allocation of Direct Access costs  |
| 13 |    | that should have been assigned directly to Oregon. Based on the Company's   |
| 14 |    | Response to Staff Data Request No. 236, and shown on line 10 of my Exhibit  |
| 15 |    | No (CJW-2), the expense to Washington is \$12,825.                          |
| 16 |    |   |
| 17 |    | C. Adjustment 4.19, Remove RTO Expenses                                     |
| 18 |    |   |
| 19 | Q. | Please explain the Staff's adjustment for RTO-related expenses.             |

Page 21

| 1  | А. | This adjustment removes the expenses the Company recorded in the test       |
|----|----|---|
| 2  |    | year in Account 901, related to the Company's participation in the Regional |
| 3  |    | Transmission Organization (RTO) formation effort.                           |
| 4  |    | These amounts should not be included because the Company has not            |
| 5  |    | demonstrated that Washington retail customers have benefited from these     |
| 6  |    | efforts, or that these expenses are in the best interest of Washington      |
| 7  |    | ratepayers.   |
| 8  |    |   |
| 9  | Q. | What is the magnitude of the RTO adjustment?                                |
| 10 | A. | As shown on line 7 of my Exhibit No (CJW-3), the RTO adjustment             |
| 11 |    | removes \$904,511, total company. Washington's portion is \$75,329.         |
| 12 |    |   |
| 13 | Q. | Does this conclude your testimony?  |
| 14 | A. | Yes.  |