



STATE OF WASHINGTON
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W., P.O. Box 47250 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7250
(360) 664-1160 • www.utc.wa.gov

July 24, 2013

NOTICE OF BENCH REQUESTS
(Due by Tuesday, July 30, 2013)

RE: *Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission v. PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light Company*, Docket UE-130043

Bench Request No. 3 is directed initially to PacifiCorp. Bench Request No. 4 is directed initially to Staff. Please respond no later than **Tuesday, July 30, 2013**. Earlier responses will be appreciated inasmuch as these facilitate analysis of the Company's revenue requirements by the Commission's advisors.

Albeit initially directed to PacifiCorp and Staff, any party may respond to these bench requests with relevant information.

Bench Request No. 3: Mr. McDougal testifies in Exhibit No. SRM-1T at 3:10-12 (emphasis added) that: "Washington results of operations in this proceeding are based on the WCA, as approved by the Commission in Order 08, docket UE-061546, *with certain modifications*." Please explain why Mr. McDougal's results of operations exhibit (*i.e.*, Exhibit No. SRM-3) states per books results of operations and rate base that do not conform fully to the requirements of the Commission's final order (*i.e.*, Order 08 in Docket UE-061546) resolving the Company's most recently completed general rate case, as required by WAC 480-07-510(3)(h). What is the Company's justification for deviating from this requirement?

Bench Request No. 4: Please explain why Ms. Huang's results of operations exhibit (*i.e.*, Exhibit JH-2) states per books results of operations and rate base that do not conform fully to the requirements of the Commission's final order resolving the Company's most recently completed general rate case, as required by WAC 480-07-510(3)(h). It appears that Staff is accepting the modifications (essentially pro forma adjustments) to the Commission-approved WCA allocation methodology that

PacifiCorp proposes through Mr. McDougal and other witnesses. Since Staff opposes the proposed modifications, why does Staff accept the Company's portrayal of per books results of operations that include the modifications?

DENNIS J. MOSS
Administrative Law Judge

cc: All Parties