

CONFIDENTIAL SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER
Exhibit No. JMF-2C
Docket UE-230482
Witness: John M. Fritz

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PACIFICORP dba
PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Respondent.

Docket UE-230482

PACIFICORP

**REDACTED
EXHIBIT OF JOHN M. FRITZ**

Staff Response to AWEC DR 9

May 2024

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STAFF RESPONSES TO DATA REQUESTS

DATE PREPARED: April 17, 2024	WITNESS: Wesley Yeomans
DOCKET: UE-230482	RESPONDER: Wesley Yeomans
REQUESTER: AWEC	TELEPHONE:

DATA REQUEST NO. 9:

If Staff’s answer to the prior request is “yes,” does Staff maintain its conclusion that PacifiCorp’s hedging policy was “risk responsive” during the deferral period?

- a. If yes, please explain.
- b. If not, does the conclusion that PacifiCorp’s hedging policy was not “risk responsive” during the deferral period change Staff’s conclusion that PacifiCorp’s hedging program was prudent during the deferral period? If not, please explain.

RESPONSE:

- a. Yes. The hedging policy still has all the attributes of a risk responsive hedge program. On July 1, 2021 PacifiCorp [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] This is evident from the change in the Energy Risk Management Policy (Approved January 7, 2021) Appendix G to the Energy Risk Management Policy (Approved July 1, 2021) Appendix F. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
- b. Response to subpart a is yes.