

July 14, 2000

BENCH REQUESTS

Re: Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v.
PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light,
Docket No. UE-991832

TO PARTIES OF RECORD:

The Commission issues the following bench request to Respondent, PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light:

Bench Request No. 3

Please provide a schedule identical in format to Mr. Griffith's analysis at page 5 of Exhibit No. 230T (WRG-T), assuming that both the Stipulation Re: Rate Spread filed June 6, 2000 ("Rate Spread Stipulation"), and the Stipulation filed June 20, 2000 ("Comprehensive Stipulation"), are approved as filed.

Bench Request No. 4

Please explain the interplay between the provision of the Comprehensive Settlement that relate to deferral of the Commission's consideration of a Systems Benefit Charge (i.e., Section 7 of the Stipulation), and the part of the Rate Spread Stipulation (filed and approved June 6, 2000) that provides:

Any overall increase in annual electric revenues of 9% or more, *including any Systems Benefit Charge*, will be phased-in over two years (9% in Year 1; Residual in Year 2).

Section 2.d. of the Rate Spread Stipulation (emphasis added).

Bench Request No. 5

Please explain the italicized portion of the following quote from Section 2 of the Comprehensive Stipulation:

"[t]he amount of the merger credit is \$3.0 million per year, or *approximately 1.7%* . . ."

That is, how is the estimated 1.7% derived?

Bench Request No. 6

A. Please clarify whether the reference in Section 11 of the Comprehensive Stipulation to *WUTC v. Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company*, Cause No. U-72-30 (October 1972) is to the Second Supplemental Order, or to another order in that proceeding.

B. Please articulate the "six part standard adopted by the Commission" in the relevant order and describe the specific triggering event or events that would justify filing a general rate case under this provision of the Stipulation.

C. Please clarify whether the Parties intend by Section 11 that PacifiCorp can be required to make a general rate case filing on motion by any Party or by the Commission, or whether some other process is contemplated. What showing, if any, would be required of a party that petitioned the Commission under this Section of the Comprehensive Stipulation? Who would bear the burden of proof in any subsequent proceedings?

Bench Request No. 7

Please explain what is meant by the following statements in Section 1 of the Stipulation:

"the rate plan covers a period of significant transition for the Company. The rate plan recognizes the difficulty of setting rates during this transitional period . . ."

Include, but do not necessarily limit your response to, an explanation of what factors make this a "period of significant transition" and an explanation of why it is more difficult to set rates during this period than in any other period. Be specific.

Bench Request No. 8

Please clarify with respect to Section 6 of the Comprehensive Stipulation whether only PacifiCorp is allowed to "take actions in response to such Joint Report" prior to the Company's next general rate filing.

Please respond no later than 1:30 p.m. Monday, July 17, 2000, with an original and fourteen

copies.

Sincerely,

DENNIS J. MOSS
Administrative Law Judge