

March 15, 2013

***VIA ELECTRONIC FILING***

Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission

1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive SW

P.O. Box 47250

Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Attn: Steven V. King

 Acting Executive Director and Secretary

**RE: Advice No. 13-03**

 **Rule 14 – General Rules and Regulations – Line Extensions**

Dear Mr. King:

Pursuant to RCW 80.28.060 and WAC 480-80-105, PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light Company (Company) submits revisions to its Rule 14, General Rules and Regulations – Line Extensions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| First Revision of Sheet No. R14.4 |  Rule 14 | General Rules and Regulations – Line Extensions |
| First Revision of Sheet No. R14.5 |  Rule 14 | General Rules and Regulations – Line Extensions |

The proposed change applies to Section II, *Residential Extensions*. The Company is proposing to add Section II.E, *Transformation Facilities* to delineate who bears the responsibility of paying for a residential transformer upgrade.

Rule 14 currently specifies that a customer pays for the cost of a job, including those that require a residential transformer upgrade, less their extension allowance. As a result, customers who notify the Company they are adding load have been paying for transformer upgrades even in cases when the requesting residential customer’s individual load is only a contributing load, and of itself is not sufficiently high enough to require a capacity upgrade. At the same time other customers who are adding load, and do not notify the Company, may overload the transformer they share with other customers, but the Company is unaware of the overloading until the transformer fails or one of the customers calls in with a power quality issue. The proposed language will provide a rule that prescribes the allocation of costs of line extension capacity upgrades for residential transformers that serve more than one residential customer.

The proposed Section II.E outlines that when an existing residential customer adds load, or a new residential customer builds in a subdivision where secondary service is available at the lot line, the facilities upgrade shall be treated as an operational expense to the Company if the customer’s demand does not exceed the name plate rating of the existing facilities. However, if the residential customer’s new total load, in and of itself, exceeds the name plate capacity of the existing facilities, the upgrade shall be treated as a standard line extension payable by the customer, less their extension allowance.

The Company requests that the changes proposed in this filing become effective on May 1, 2013.

If you have any questions regarding this filing, please contact Bryce Dalley, Director, Regulatory Affairs & Revenue Requirement, at (503) 813-6389.

Sincerely,

William R. Griffith

Vice President, Regulation

Enclosures