I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to WAC § 480-07-375, the Alliance of Western Energy Consumers (“AWEC”) hereby moves the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (“WUTC” or “Commission”) for leave to respond to PacifiCorp’s (also “Company”) Motion for Clarification of Order 06 and to Extend the Timeline to Accept or Reject the Conditions in the Order (“Motion”).

II. DISCUSSION

On March 29, 2022, the Commission issued as Order 06 in Docket UE-210402 its Final Order Approving and Adopting Settlement Agreement (“Order”). Within the Order, the Commission conditioned its acceptance of the Settlement Agreement presented by select parties to Docket UE 210402 on certain conditions. Specifically, the Commission established that

In its next PCAM filing, the Company must address the issue of the prudency of its power costs, specifically the prudency of its risk...
management practices for hedging for its Washington-allocated resources over calendar year 2022 and its choice of market exposure for its Washington-allocated portfolio given the concerns raised by the Commission over a number of years.\(^1\)

Additionally, the Commission conditioned its acceptance of the Settlement Agreement on a requirement that

PacifiCorp…perform the power cost update as set forth in the Settlement, but the Company’s recovery of the difference between NPC [(net power cost)] baseline based on the March OFPC [(official forward price curve)] and the NPC baseline set forth in the Company’s initial filing will be subject to later review and possible refund.\(^2\)

On March 31, 2022, PacifiCorp filed its Motion, seeking clarification regarding these two conditions and an extension to accept the conditions in Order 06, given the Company’s uncertainty on how to effectuate the stated conditions.\(^3\)

Specifically, PacifiCorp requested clarification that “the Commission’s use of ‘next PCAM filing’…is a reference to PacifiCorp’s 2022 PCAM and not the 2021 PCAM…and contain a review of the 2021 actual NPC.”\(^4\) PacifiCorp also sought to clarify that the Commission intends for the prudence review, and potential remedy, related to the difference between the NPC baseline established by the authorized power cost update based upon the March OFPC and the NPC baseline presented in the Company’s initial filing was intended to be a review of the Company’s actual NPC, conducted “with the benefit of information requested in the [Order] and in light of the record in this case.”\(^5\) Further, PacifiCorp requests clarity that,

\(^1\) Order, ¶ 154.  
\(^2\) Id.  
\(^3\) See generally Motion.  
\(^4\) Motion, ¶ 4.  
\(^5\) Motion, ¶ 6.
upon any determination of imprudence, “[a] disallowance of actual NPC would be reflected in the adjusted cumulative PCAM deferral balance.”\textsuperscript{6}

As explained in AWEC’s response, because PacifiCorp’s request for clarification regarding how any prudence disallowance would be reflected in the PCAM deferral account could prejudge the amount of any refund owed to customers, and because the clarification PacifiCorp seeks on this issue is unnecessary for the Company to make its compliance filing in this docket, good cause exists to permit AWEC to respond to the Motion.

\textbf{III. CONCLUSION}

Based upon the foregoing, AWEC respectfully requests the Commission permit AWEC to respond to PacifiCorp’s Motion.
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