

### **Bench Request 1**

1. Identify where the Settlement addresses the issue of how any rate change will be allocated among customer classes.
2. If the Settlement does not address the issues of rate spread and rate design, indicate whether the non-Company parties intend to oppose the rate spread or rate design proposed by Company witness Robert M. Meredith, in Exhibit RMM-1T.

### **Settling Parties Response to Bench Request 1**

1. The allocation of the rate change is not explicitly addressed in the terms of the settlement stipulation (“stipulation”). However, paragraph 15, in section II subsection B, identifies that the stipulation acts as a comprehensive resolution of all the disputed issues in the proceeding and a modification to PacifiCorp’s filing. Paragraph 1 in the stipulation also identifies that the parties to the stipulation have reached a full multiparty settlement as defined under WAC 480-07-730(3)(a).<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the non-Company parties to the stipulation have agreed to not dispute PacifiCorp’s proposed allocation within its initial filing as part of a comprehensive settlement of all the issues. PacifiCorp notes that the allocation among the customer classes used in this proceeding is the same allocation approved for net power costs in PacifiCorp’s 2021 Rate Case (Docket UE-191024).
2. The non-Company parties to the stipulation have reviewed this response and have indicated that they do not intend to oppose the rate spread and rate design proposed by the Company in Exhibit RMM-1T as part of a comprehensive settlement of all the issues.

---

<sup>1</sup> WAC 480-07-730(3)(a) (“A full multiparty settlement is an agreement among some, but not all, parties to resolve all disputed issues between them.”).