

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

v.

PACIFICORP dba  
PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

Respondent.

Docket UE-230172  
*(Consolidated)*

In the Matter of

ALLIANCE OF WESTERN ENERGY  
CONSUMERS'

Petition for Order Approving Deferral of  
Increased Fly Ash Revenues

Docket UE-210852  
*(Consolidated)*

**PACIFICORP**

**EXHIBIT OF MATTHEW D. MCVEE**

**Public Counsel’s Response to PacifiCorp Data Requests 2-5**

**October 2023**

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**Docket UE-230172**

**Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission v. PacifiCorp d/b/a/ Pacific  
Power & Light Co.**

**RESPONSE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL TO PACIFICORP  
DATA REQUEST NO(S). 002 – 005**

Request No: 002  
Directed to: Lisa Gafken, Public Counsel  
Date Received: September 25, 2023  
Date Produced: October 9, 2023  
Prepared by: Corey J. Dahl  
Witnesses: Corey J. Dahl

**PACIFICORP DATA REQUEST NO. 002:  
Re: Equity Analysis**

In reference to Dahl, Exh. CJD-1T, page 3, lines 16-18, Witness Dahl states: “The Commission should require PacifiCorp to complete a full, documented equity analysis of the rate increases it proposes in this proceeding and provide the findings to the Commission in a compliance filing.”

- a. Please provide a comprehensive explanation of the referenced “equity analysis” that Witness Dahl recommends PacifiCorp undertake in a subsequent compliance filing. This explanation should include the method, scope, and specific inputs utilized in the analysis.
- b. Please provide, to the extent possible, any comparable “equity analysis” submissions made by other regulated utilities to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission that PacifiCorp could utilize as a reference in preparing the requested analysis.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. Please refer to Direct Testimony of Corey J. Dahl, Exh. CJD-1T at 22:12–23:17. This is an illustrative example of what an analysis of rate impacts on Named Communities. The Company has the burden of proof to provide analysis and evidence of the equity impacts of their filing in accordance with Commission guidance.

*See* RCW 80.28.425(1); *Wash. Utils. & Transp. Comm'n v. Cascade Nat. Gas Corp.*, Docket UG-210755, Order 09: Final Order, ¶¶ 52–58 (Aug. 23, 2022). *See also* *Wash. Utils. & Transp. Comm'n v. Avista Corp.*, Dockets UE-220053, UG-220054, UE-210854, (consol.) Final Order 10/04, ¶¶ 73–78 (Dec. 12, 2022); *Wash. Utils. & Transp. Comm'n v. Puget Sound Energy*, Dockets UE-220066, UG-220067, and UG-210918 (consol.), Final Order 10, ¶¶ 224–36 (Dec. 22, 2022); *Wash. Utils. & Transp. Comm'n, Pro-Equity Anti-Racism*, <https://www.utc.wa.gov/PEAR> (last visited Oct. 4, 2023).

- b. Equity analyses in the context of filings before the Commission are nascent and should be based on guidance in final orders of Docket UG-210755; consolidated Dockets UE-220053, UG-220054; and consolidated Dockets UE-220066, UG-220067, and UG-210918. The potential for further Commission guidance on equity analysis and the public interest standard does not relieve the Company of its obligation to provide such evidence in this filing as to whether its request will correct or perpetuate inequities. To that extent, PacifiCorp's filing is the first multi-year rate plan filed in the wake of those rate case orders with initial substantive guidance regarding equity analysis. The burden is on the applicant to follow Commission guidance and provide corresponding analysis. PacifiCorp has provided no such analysis in this filing.

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**Docket UE-230172**

**Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission v. PacifiCorp d/b/a/ Pacific  
Power & Light Co.**

**RESPONSE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL TO PACIFICORP  
DATA REQUEST NO(S). 002 – 005**

Request No: 003  
Directed to: Lisa Gafken, Public Counsel  
Date Received: September 25, 2023  
Date Produced: October 9, 2023  
Prepared by: Corey J. Dahl  
Witnesses: Corey J. Dahl

**PACIFICORP DATA REQUEST NO. 003:  
Re: Equity Analysis**

In reference to Dahl, Exh. CJD-1T, pages 22-23, Witness Dahl requests that the Company provide an assessment of “whether the Company’s request is reducing or perpetuating systemic harms, in line with the Washington State Office of Equity’s goals,” a demonstration of “how the Company’s filing adheres to the four tenets of energy justice,” and an assessment of the impact of PacifiCorp’s proposal on Named Communities and any disproportionate impacts.

- a. Please provide a comprehensive explanation of the analysis Witness Dahl recommends regarding the impact of the Company’s request on systemic harms and compliance with the Washington State Office of Equity’s goals. This explanation should include the method, scope, and specific inputs utilized in the analysis.
- b. Please provide a comprehensive explanation of the analysis Witness Dahl recommends regarding a demonstration of how the Company’s filing adheres to the tenets of energy justice. This explanation should include the method, scope, and specific inputs utilized in the analysis.
- c. Please provide a comprehensive explanation of the analysis Witness Dahl recommends regarding the impact of the proposed rate increase on Named Communities and any disproportionate impacts. This explanation should include the method, scope, specific inputs utilized in the analysis, and metrics for assessing whether an impact is disproportionate.
- d. Please provide, to the extent possible, any comparable submissions related to Witness Dahl’s aforementioned recommendations made by other regulated utilities to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission that PacifiCorp could utilize as a reference in preparing the requested analyses.

**RESPONSE:**

In response to subpart 3.a. through c.: Please refer to the final orders in Docket UG-210755; consolidated Dockets UE-220053, UG-220054; and consolidated Dockets UE-220066, UG-220067, and UG-210918. The burden is on the applicant to follow Commission guidance and provide corresponding analysis. PacifiCorp has provided no such analysis in this filing.

In response to subpart 3.d: As provided in response to data request 2.b., equity analyses in the context of filings before the Commission are nascent and should be based on guidance in final orders of Docket UG-210755; consolidated Dockets UE-220053, UG-220054; and consolidated Dockets UE-220066, UG-220067 and UG-210917. To that extent, PacifiCorp's filing is the first multi-year rate plan filed in the wake of those rate case orders with initial substantive guidance regarding equity analysis. The burden is on the applicant to follow Commission guidance and provide corresponding analysis. PacifiCorp has provided no such analysis in this filing.

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**Docket UE-230172**

**Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission v. PacifiCorp d/b/a/ Pacific  
Power & Light Co.**

**RESPONSE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL TO PACIFICORP  
DATA REQUEST NO(S). 002 – 005**

Request No: 004  
Directed to: Lisa Gafken, Public Counsel  
Date Received: September 25, 2023  
Date Produced: October 9, 2023  
Prepared by: Corey J. Dahl  
Witnesses: Corey J. Dahl

**PACIFICORP DATA REQUEST NO. 004:  
Re: Equity Analysis**

In reference to Dahl, Exh. CJD-1T, page 23, Witness Dahl suggests that the Washington Department of Health’s Environmental Health Disparities Map could be a helpful tool in assessing whether Named Communities bear a disproportionate share of the proposed rate increase compared to the general customer population.

- a. Please explain further how Witness Dahl defines general customer population.
- b. Please explain further how use of the mapping tool would facilitate assessment of whether Named Communities bear a “disproportionate share of the proposed rate increase” compared to the general customer population.

**RESPONSE:**

- a. “General customer population” refers to all customers in the Company’s service territory or a defined segment of the territory.
- b. Please refer to Direct Testimony of Corey J. Dahl, CJD-1T 23:4–7. Based on historical usage data and the Company’s current proposed revenue requirement, rate spread, and rate design, the Company can compare average customer bills in segments of the service territory with high concentrations of Named Communities to overall average bill impacts. This is merely an illustrative example of how this type of rate impact equity analysis could be conducted. The burden remains with the applicant to respond to Commission guidance and provide evidence in this filing.

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**Docket UE-230172**

**Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission v. PacifiCorp d/b/a/ Pacific  
Power & Light Co.**

**RESPONSE OF PUBLIC COUNSEL TO PACIFICORP  
DATA REQUEST NO(S). 002 – 005**

Request No: 005  
Directed to: Lisa Gafken, Public Counsel  
Date Received: September 25, 2023  
Date Produced: October 9, 2023  
Prepared by: Michael Deupree  
Witnesses: Dr. Dismukes

**PACIFICORP DATA REQUEST NO. 005:**

**Re: Rate Design**

In reference to Dismukes, Exh. DED-1T, pages 33-34, what is Public Counsel's position on PacifiCorp's proposal to differentiate the basic charge for single-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings?

**RESPONSE:**

Dr. Dismukes' testimony relating to the PacifiCorp's proposed customer is clear – Public Counsel does not support the PacifiCorp's proposal to increase residential customer charges for single-family dwellings. Since Public Counsel's position is for current customer charges to remain unchanged, PacifiCorp's proposal to differentiate the basic charge between single-family and multi-family dwellings is moot.