

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

In the Matter of the Application of)
PACIFICORP for an Order)
Approving the Sale of Its Interest in) DOCKET NO. UE-991262
(1) the Centralia Steam Electric)
Generating Plant, (2) the Ratebased)
Portion of the Centralia Coal Mine,)
and (3) Related Facilities, for a)
Determination of the Amount of and)
the Proper Ratemaking Treatment)
of the Gain Associated with the)
sale; and for an EWG Determination)
_____)

In the Matter of the Application of)
PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,) DOCKET NO. UE-991409
for (1) Approval of the Proposed)
Sale of PSE's Share of the Centralia)
Facilities, and (2) Authorization to)
Amortize Gain Over a Five-Year)
Period)
_____)

In the Matter of the AVISTA)
CORPORATION, for Authority to) DOCKET NO. UE-991255
Sell Its Interest in the Coal-Fired)
Centralia Power Plant)
_____)

BRIEF OF COMMISSION STAFF

CHRISTINE O. GREGOIRE
Attorney General

ROBERT D. CEDARBAUM
Senior Counsel
Attorney General's Office
Counsel for Washington Utilities and
Transportation Commission
P.O. Box 40128
Olympia, WA 98504
(360) 664-1188

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
A.	Statement of the Case	1
B.	Summary of Staff Case	2
II.	ARGUMENT	4
A.	The Commission Should Adopt Staff’s Recommendation to Flow the Entire Gain and All Near-Term Power Supply Benefits to Ratepayers	4
1.	The Sale of Centralia Does Not Provide Economic Benefits and Exposes Ratepayers to Higher Energy Costs in the Future	5
a.	PSE	5
b.	Avista	6
c.	PacifiCorp	7
d.	Conclusion on Quantitative Analyses	8
2.	Qualitative Factors Supporting the Sale of Centralia Offset the Economic Harm to Ratepayers	8
3.	Staff’s Recommendation Implements Important Regulatory Policies	10
a.	Traditional Ratebase Rate of Return Regulation	10
b.	Ratepayers have Funded a Significant Portion of Centralia’s Front-Loaded Capital Costs	14
c.	Staff’s Recommendation Cures Ratepayers’ Payment of Excessive Depreciation	15
d.	Staff’s Recommendation is Consistent with Prior Commission Decisions	16
e.	Returning the Entire Gain to Ratepayers is Consistent with Management’s Fiduciary Duties to Investors	17

f.	Staff’s Recommendation is Consistent with Management’s Responsibility to Reduce Utility Costs	18
4.	The Precise Method for Reflecting the Gain in Rates Should be Deferred to a General Rate Case Rather than Decided in this Proceeding	19
5.	Accrued Reclamation Balances Should be Excluded from the Gain Calculation and Allocated Directed to Ratepayers in a General Rate Case	21
B.	Issues Specific to Each Company	22
1.	PacifiCorp	23
a.	Plant and Mine Environmental Liabilities	23
b.	Deferred Federal Income Taxes	24
2.	Puget Sound Energy	24
a.	The Merger Order Does Not Support PSE’s Five-Year Amortization Proposal	24
b.	PSE Should Defer Near-Term Power Supply Savings as Estimated by Staff	26
i.	Staff’s Estimates are Consistent with PSE’s Strategy to Avoid “In-Kind” Replacement Power	26
ii.	PSE’s Estimate of Near-Term Market Costs is Unreasonably High	28
iii.	Staff’s Estimate of Near-Term Power Supply Savings is Conservative	29
iv.	The New AURORA Results Should Not be Substituted in Staff’s Estimate of Near-Term Power Supply Savings	30
v.	Staff’s Estimates of Near-Term Power Supply Savings Should Not Be Trued-Up to Actual	31

3.	Avista	32
4.	NW Energy Coalition (NWECC)	34
III.	CONCLUSION	35