

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND)	
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,)	
)	Docket No. UE-050684
Complainant,)	
)	Docket No. UE-050412
vs.)	
)	<i>(consolidated)</i>
PACIFICORP d/b/a PACIFIC POWER &)	
LIGHT COMPANY)	
)	
Respondent.)	

EXHIBIT NO. ____ (RJF-10)

ISSUES ARISING IN FUEL AND PURCHASE POWER REVIEW CASES

November 3, 2005

EXHIBIT NO.__(RJF-10)
ISSUES ARISING IN FUEL AND PURCHASE POWER REVIEW CASES

Southwestern Public Service (“SPS”), Public Utility Commission of Texas (“PUCT”) Docket No. 19512. Employee lawsuit settlements charged to eligible fuel expense, allegations of fraud and billing errors in subcontractor invoices. Resulted in refund of various charges.

Big Rivers Electric Cooperative, Kentucky Public Service Commission Docket No. 92-490, 92-490A and 90-360. Bid rigging fraud and allegations of criminal behavior. Resulted in arrest and trial of the general manager.

Utah Power Company, Utah Public Service Commission Case No. 84-035-12. Allegations stemming from a “whistle-blower” - resulted in a refund to ratepayers.

Houston Lighting and Power Company (“HL&P”), PUCT Docket Nos. 18753 and 26195. Eligibility of mine closing costs. Removal of costs related to provision of spinning reserves to another utility, Central Power and Light Company (“CP&L”), as part of a nuclear plant construction lawsuit settlement.

Central Power and Light Company, PUCT Docket No. 27035. Allocation of trading profits and costs between affiliated companies.

Entergy Gulf States, Inc. (“EGSI”), PUCT Docket Nos. 21111 and 23550. Prudence and cost of extended thermal plant outages, eligibility of affiliate purchases.

Georgia Power Company, Georgia Public Service Commission Docket No. 3741-U. Acquisition planning for a low-sulfur coal plant.^{1/}, Rate treatment of payment of “front-end costs” for development of failed coal mine.

^{1/} This issue was also litigated in the Big Rivers cases mentioned above.