

August 17, 2004

**NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF COMMISSION BENCH REQUESTS  
(August 20, 2004)**

RE: WUTC v. PacifiCorp, Docket No. UE-032065

The following Bench Requests are directed to the parties indicated. Other parties may provide responses. The Commission directs the parties to respond to the following Bench Requests as soon as possible, but no later than August 20, 2004:

5. PACIFICORP: Mr. Weston's rebuttal testimony (Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JTD)-4T [sic]) identifies "Union Incentive" as "Adjustment 4.11. However, Adjustment 4.11 in Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JTW-3), Tab 4 is identified as Property Insurance. Please reconcile this apparent inconsistency.
6. PACIFICORP: Mr. Weston's rebuttal testimony and his accompanying Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JTW-5) appear to state incremental changes to certain adjustments originally set forth in Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JTW-3). Please provide full substitute pages to Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JTW-3) that reflect the revised amounts in their original context. All numbers that are changed from those portrayed in Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JTW-3) should be printed in bold typeface.

Please also consider whether Mr. Weston's descriptions of the incremental changes in his narrative testimony are accurate, and clarify as appropriate. *E.g.*, Mr. Weston testifies that the original adjustment 8.9, hydro relicensing, overstated Washington rate base by \$60,148 and he substitutes that amount at line 47 on page 1.1 of Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JTW-5) as an adjustment to accumulated depreciation (*i.e.*, (60,148)). However, the original amount of accumulated depreciation shown for adjustment 8.9 at line 47, page 8.0.1, of Exhibit No. \_\_\_(JTW-3), tab 8 is (71,354). It is unclear whether the (60,148) is a substitute figure for the (71,354) figure or should be added to the (71,354) for a total of (131,502).

If the former, then it appears the original adjustment overstated rate base by only 11,206, not 60,148.

7. ICNU: ICNU's response to Bench Request No. 3 includes the table "NET OPERATING INCOME and RATE BASE." The figures in the Net Operating Income (Protocol) column of that table differ from the adjustments proposed on Table 1 in Mr. Falkenberg's testimony (Exhibit No. \_\_\_(RJF)-1CT, page 7). This appears to be true even after applying to the figures presented on the Table in Bench Request No. 3, the revenue conversion factor supported by either the company (1.69287) or the Commission staff (61.899%). Please reconcile this apparent inconsistency.

---

DENNIS J. MOSS  
Administrative Law Judge