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| In the Matter ofPACIFIC POWER & LIGHTCOMPANY,2015 Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism | Docket UE-\_\_\_\_\_\_\_PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY’S MOTION FOR STANDARD PROTECTIVE ORDER (**Expedited Treatment Requested**) |

# I. RELIEF REQUESTED

*1* In conjunction with Pacific Power & Light Company’s (Pacific Power or Company), a division of PacifiCorp, 2015 Power Cost Adjustment Mechanism (PCAM) filing, submitted on June 1, 2016, Pacific Power moves for the entry of the standard protective order by the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) under WAC 480-07-420(1). Pacific Power seeks expedited treatment of this motion to ensure that its confidential information is covered by a standard protective order as promptly as possible. Pacific Power’s representatives in this proceeding are:
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| Matthew McVeeAssistant General CounselPacific Power825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1800Portland, OR 97232Phone: (503) 813-5585matthew.mcvee@pacificorp.com | R. Bryce DalleyVice President, RegulationPacific Power825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 2000Portland, OR 97232Phone: (503) 813-6389bryce.dalley@pacificorp.com |
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# II. BACKGROUND AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT

*2* On June 1, 2016, Pacific Power submitted its 2015 PCAM filing. In Order 09 of Docket UE-140762, the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) approved a PCAM to allow the Company to recover the difference between the actual net power costs (NPC) incurred to serve Washington customers and the NPC collected through base rates established in a general rate case. Pacific Power’s 2015 PCAM filing includes confidential workpapers in support of its filing. Pending entry of the Commission’s standard protective order, the Company designated this information as confidential under the Commission’s general rule on confidentiality, WAC 480-07-160, and under RCW 80.04.095.

*3* The information that Pacific Power marked “confidential” includes commercially sensitive information regarding the Company’s pricing strategy, fuel costs, contracts, reports, and other terms that could be misappropriated by parties for their commercial benefit and to the Company’s and its customers’ detriment. In discovery, parties to this proceeding may request other types of information that is commercially valuable to the Company or involves confidential information of customers, employees, business counter-parties, or other third-parties. Pacific Power minimized the amount of information it designated as confidential to promote the ability of the public to review the filing and participate in this case.

*4* The Commission has authority to grant Pacific Power’s motion under WAC 480-07-420(1), which allows the Commission to enter “a standard form of protective order to promote the free exchange of information when parties reasonably anticipate that discovery in a proceeding will call for the production of confidential information.” Under WAC 480-07-0423(3)(a), a protective order “is intended to protect information that might compromise a company’s ability to compete fairly or that otherwise might impose a business risk if disseminated” publicly. There is ample Commission precedent for the entry of protective orders in cases involving the Company’s NPC, including the protective order the Commission entered in Pacific Power’s 2014 general rate case.[[1]](#footnote-1)

*5* The material Pacific Power seeks to protect in this case is the type of information that is intended to be eligible for confidential protections under WAC 480-07-423(3)(a). Public release of any of the confidential information could compromise the Company’s ability to compete fairly and impose a business risk to the Company. The result would be increased costs for Pacific Power and, ultimately, its customers.

# III. CONCLUSION

*6* For the reasons set forth above, Pacific Power respectfully requests that the Commission enter its standard form of protective order in this case.
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| --- |
| Respectfully submitted this 1st day of June 2016.\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Matthew McVeeAssistant General CounselPacific Power825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 1800Portland, OR 97232Telephone: (503) 813-5585matthew.mcvee@pacificorp.com Attorney for Pacific Power & Light Company |

1. *Washington Utils. & Trans. Comm. v. PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light Company,* Docket UE-140762, Order 02 (May 14, 2014). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)