

Exhibit No.      (JLB-5)  
Docket UE-140762, et al.  
Witness: Jason L. Ball

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,**

**Complainant,**

**v.**

**PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT  
COMPANY,**

**Respondent.**

**UE-140762 and UE-140617  
(consolidated)**

---

**In the Matter of the Petition of**

**PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT  
COMPANY,**

**For an Order Approving Deferral of  
Costs Related to Colstrip Outage.**

**DOCKET UE-131384 (consolidated)**

---

**In the Matter of the Petition of**

**PACIFIC POWER & LIGHT  
COMPANY,**

**For an Order Approving Deferral of  
Costs Related to Declining Hydro  
Generation.**

**DOCKET UE-140094 (consolidated)**

**EXHIBIT TESTIMONY OF**

**Jason L. Ball**

**STAFF OF  
WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

*Pacific Power Response to Public Counsel Data Request No. 48*

**October 10, 2014**

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**Docket No. UE-140762**

**Pacific Power General Rate Case**

**Pacific Power Response to Public Counsel Data Request 48**

UE-140762/Pacific Power & Light Company  
July 21, 2014  
PC Data Request 48

**PC Data Request 48**

**Re: Expenses – IHS Escalation Factors.** In the Direct Testimony of R. Bryce Dalley, at page 10 line 18 through page 11 line 7, Mr. Dalley indicates that the proposed approach of applying IHS Global Insight indices by FERC function to historical non-labor operation and management (O&M) expense levels is used in the California, Oregon, Utah and Wyoming cases.

- (a) Does the Company agree that each of the Company's most recent rate case filings in the above referenced jurisdictions were based on a future test period? If no, please explain.
- (b) For the two most recent rate cases filed in each of the above referenced jurisdictions, please identify: (1) the date the case was filed; (2) historic test period (or base period) presented with the filing, if applicable; and (3) the test period the rate increase request was based upon.
- (c) Please explain why the approach explained in this section of Mr. Dalley's testimony is not used in Idaho.

**Response to PC Data Request 48**

- (a) Yes. The Company did not use a forecast test period in this case based on the strong preference by parties and commission precedent to use historical test periods in Washington. As an incremental step to better reflect costs anticipated during the rate effective period, the Company proposes to use IHS Global Insight indices to determine the level of operations and maintenance expense included in the proceeding.

(b)

<u>State</u>	<u>Date Filed</u>	<u>Base Period</u>	<u>Test Period</u>
CA	Nov 2009	Jun 2009	Dec 2011
CA	Nov 2005	Mar 2005	Dec 2007
OR	Mar 2013	Jun 2012	Dec 2014
OR	Mar 2012	Jun 2011	Dec 2013
UT	Jan 2014	Jun 2013	Jun 2015
UT	Feb 2012	Jun 2011	May 2013
WY	Mar 2014	Jun 2013	Jun 2015
WY	Dec 2011	Jun 2011	Mar 2013

- (c) Like Washington, Idaho uses an historical test year with known and measurable adjustments. The Company has not proposed the use of IHS Global Insight indices in Idaho.

PREPARER: Craig Stelter