Exhibit No.___(BAC-1T) Docket UE-13____ Witness: Barbara A. Coughlin

BEFORE THE WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

Complainant,

vs.

PACIFICORP dba Pacific Power & Light Company

Respondent.

Docket UE-13____

PACIFICORP

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF BARBARA A. COUGHLIN

January 2013

| 1 | Q. | Please state your name, business address, and present position with | | |
|----|----------------------|---|--|--|
| 2 | | PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power & Light Company (PacifiCorp or Company). | | |
| 3 | A. | My name is Barbara A. Coughlin. My business address is 825 NE Multnomah | | |
| 4 | | Street, Suite 800, Portland, Oregon 97232. My present position is Director, | | |
| 5 | | Customer & Regulatory Liaison in the Customer Services Department. | | |
| 6 | Qual | fications | | |
| 7 | Q. | Please describe your education and professional experience. | | |
| 8 | A. | I have worked in the gas and electric utility industry since 1978. I received a | | |
| 9 | | Legal Assistant Certificate from Marycrest College in 1991. From 1978 to 1997, | | |
| 10 | | I held various positions of increasing responsibility within the legal/regulatory | | |
| 11 | | department of Iowa-Illinois Gas and Electric, a predecessor company to | | |
| 12 | | MidAmerican Energy Company. In 1997, I was promoted to a customer services | | |
| 13 | | supervisor, and in 1999, I was promoted to customer services manager at | | |
| 14 | | MidAmerican Energy Company. I worked as manager of regulatory projects at | | |
| 15 | | PacifiCorp from 2006 through 2008, when I was promoted to my current position | | |
| 16 | | as Director of Customer & Regulatory Liaison. | | |
| 17 | Purpose of Testimony | | | |
| 18 | Q. | What is the purpose of your testimony? | | |
| 19 | A. | The purpose of my testimony is to propose changes to Rule 6, General Rules and | | |
| 20 | | Regulations, and Schedule 300, Charges as Defined by the Rules and Regulations, | | |
| 21 | | of the Company's Washington tariff schedules. The Company is proposing | | |
| 22 | | changes to some Schedule 300 charges after a review of the charges concluded a | | |
| 23 | | number of them do not align with the current actual costs. By aligning the | | |

Direct Testimony of Barbara A. Coughlin

| 1 | | charges with current actual costs, the costs would be paid by the cost-causer, |
|----|------|---|
| 2 | | rather than by the Company's other customers. My testimony will first address |
| 3 | | the proposed wording changes to Rule 6, followed by the proposed changes to |
| 4 | | Schedule 300. The proposed changes to Rule 6 and Schedule 300 are included in |
| 5 | | Exhibit No(JRS-2). |
| 6 | Rule | 6.I—Permanent Disconnection and Removal of Company Facilities |
| 7 | Q. | Please describe the specific changes the Company is proposing to Rule 6.I? |
| 8 | A. | The Company proposes wording changes to Rule 6, section I, Permanent |
| 9 | | Disconnection and Removal of Company Facilities, to reflect the changes the |
| 10 | | Company is proposing to the Residential Service Removal Charge in Schedule |
| 11 | | 300. Specifically, the Company proposes to replace the reference to the |
| 12 | | Residential Service Removal Charge with a general reference to the removal |
| 13 | | charges listed in Schedule 300. The Company also proposes to make minor |
| 14 | | language changes to clarify how the Company calculates the actual removal costs |
| 15 | | that are billed to customers and to delete paragraph 5 of Section I. |
| 16 | Q. | Why is the Company proposing these changes? |
| 17 | A. | The proposed changes to Rule 6.I are necessary to align the language of the rule |
| 18 | | with the changes proposed to Schedule 300. As discussed later in my testimony, |
| 19 | | the Company proposes to eliminate the set fees that residential customers pay for |
| 20 | | requesting removal of service drops and meters and instead charge customers the |
| 21 | | actual costs for these removals. To be consistent with Schedule 300, Rule 6.I |
| 22 | | requires minor wording changes. |
| 23 | | In addition, the Company proposes to explicitly state on Schedule 300 |

Direct Testimony of Barbara A. Coughlin

| 1 | | how the costs of permanent disconnection and removal of facilities are calculated, |
|----|------|---|
| 2 | | and align paragraphs 2 and 4 of Rule 6.I to the revised Schedule 300. These |
| 3 | | proposed changes use terminology that is similar to other language in the tariff |
| 4 | | (for example, in Rule 6.H) to ensure consistency and reduce confusion. With |
| 5 | | these clarifications to paragraphs 2 and 4, paragraph 5 is no longer needed. |
| 6 | Sche | dule 300—Charges as Defined by the Rules and Regulations |
| 7 | Q. | Please describe the changes the Company proposes to Schedule 300. |
| 8 | A. | The separate charges for residential underground and overhead service, and the |
| 9 | | separate charge for all other residential and non-residential services, are no longer |
| 10 | | necessary as the Company proposes to charge actual costs for all permanent |
| 11 | | disconnection and removal of facilities. As a result, the Company is proposing |
| 12 | | one charge titled Permanent Disconnection and Facilities Removal Charge for all |
| 13 | | removals under Rule 6.I. |
| 14 | | The Company proposes to modify the amounts for the following charges: |
| 15 | | Permanent Disconnection and Facilities Removal Charge |
| 16 | | Reconnection Charge |
| 17 | | Unauthorized Reconnection/Tampering Charge |
| 18 | | The Schedule 300 changes are further described below. |
| 19 | Perm | anent Disconnection and Facilities Removal Charge |
| 20 | Q. | Please describe the Permanent Disconnection and Facilities Removal Charge. |
| 21 | A. | The Permanent Disconnection and Facilities Removal Charge is used when a |
| 22 | | customer requests that the Company permanently disconnect service or when a |
| 23 | | customer elects to change electric service providers and the Company |

| 1 | | permanently removes electric facilities. If the facilities will no longer be used by |
|----------------------|----|--|
| 2 | | the Company at the site, the Company will remove the facilities at the customer's |
| 3 | | expense in accordance with Rule 6.I. |
| 4 | Q. | What is the current facilities removal charge? |
| 5 | A. | The current charge for removal of a residential overhead service drop and meter is |
| 6 | | \$200.00. The current charge for removal of a residential underground service |
| 7 | | drop and meter is \$400.00. The current charge for removal of all other residential |
| 8 | | service and non-residential service is actual costs less salvage. |
| 9 | Q. | What is the proposed change to the current facilities removal charges? |
| 10 | A. | The Company proposes to establish one permanent disconnection and facilities |
| 11 | | removal charge for all removals of service under Rule 6.I., which is a charge of |
| 12 | | actual removal cost, less salvage and depreciation. |
| 13 | Q. | Why is the Company proposing this change instead of requesting an increase |
| 14 | | to the fixed residential service removal charge? |
| 15 | ٨ | |
| | A. | The Company reviewed its costs associated with removal of overhead and |
| 16 | А. | The Company reviewed its costs associated with removal of overhead and underground residential service drops and meters and determined that the current |
| 16 17 | A. | |
| | A. | underground residential service drops and meters and determined that the current |
| 17 | A. | underground residential service drops and meters and determined that the current charges do not reflect the actual costs associated with performing this work. |
| 17 18 | A. | underground residential service drops and meters and determined that the current charges do not reflect the actual costs associated with performing this work. A removal charge that reflects actual costs ensures that the costs are borne by the |
| 17 18 19 | Α. | underground residential service drops and meters and determined that the current charges do not reflect the actual costs associated with performing this work. A removal charge that reflects actual costs ensures that the costs are borne by the cost-causer, rather than the Company's other customers. Additionally, each |
| 17 18 19 20 | Α. | underground residential service drops and meters and determined that the current charges do not reflect the actual costs associated with performing this work. A removal charge that reflects actual costs ensures that the costs are borne by the cost-causer, rather than the Company's other customers. Additionally, each removal has unique characteristics and the use of actual costs rather than fixed |

1 **Reconnection Charge**

- 2 **Q.** Please describe the reconnection charge.
- A. The reconnection charge is assessed when a customer has been disconnected due
 to default or non-payment of their energy bill and then requests reconnection of
 service.

6 Q. What is the Company's current reconnection charge?

A. For service reconnections performed during normal business hours (Monday
through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., excluding holidays), the Company
charges \$25.00. For service reconnections requested to be performed on Monday
through Friday from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. (excluding holidays), the Company
charges \$50.00. For requests for service reconnection from 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
on weekends and holidays, the Company charges \$75.00.

13 Q. What are the Company's proposed changes to the Reconnection Charge?

- 14 A. For service reconnections performed during normal business hours (Monday
- 15 through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., excluding holidays), the Company
- 16 proposes a reconnection charge of \$50.00. For service reconnections requested to
- 17 be performed on Monday through Friday from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. (excluding
- 18 holidays), the Company proposes a reconnection charge of \$100.00. For service
- 19 reconnections requested to be performed from 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekends
- 20 and holidays, the Company proposes a reconnection charge of \$175.00.
- 21 The current and proposed reconnection charges are summarized below:

Direct Testimony of Barbara A. Coughlin

| | Current | Proposed |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Schedule 300 | Schedule 300 |
| | Charge | Charge |
| Reconnection | | |
| Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. | | |
| (excluding holidays) | \$25.00 | \$50.00 |
| Reconnection | | |
| Monday-Friday, 4:00 p.m.to 7:00 p.m. | | |
| | \$50.00 | \$100.00 |
| Reconnection | | |
| Weekends and holidays | | |
| 8:00 a.m. to7:00 p.m. | \$75.00 | \$175.00 |

1 Q. What is the Company's current actual cost to reconnect service?

2 A. The cost to reconnect service for customers during normal business hours is 3 approximately \$57.00. The cost to perform this work after hours ranges from 4 approximately \$305.00 on weekdays to approximately \$360.00 on weekends and 5 holidays. Reconnection work is performed by a field specialist or a journeyman 6 7 lineman, depending on when the reconnection work takes place. The 8 reconnection work allocated between field specialists and journeyman linemen 9 during the period July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012, was: 10 • 87 percent is completed by field specialists and 13 percent is 11 completed by journeyman linemen, Monday through Friday from 8:00 12 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (excluding holidays). 13 • 31 percent is completed by field specialists and 69 percent is 14 completed by journeyman linemen, Monday through Friday from 4:00 15 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. (excluding holidays).

16 • 100 percent is completed by journeyman linemen on weekends and
17 holidays from 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.

| 1 | | Because the hourly rate for a journeyman lineman is higher than that of a | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | | field specialist, the cost to complete the after-hour reconnect is higher. | |
| 3 | | Additionally, journeyman linemen charge a minimum of two hours for all after- | |
| 4 | | hours reconnection work. | |
| 5 | Unauthorized Reconnection/Tampering Charge | | |
| 6 | Q. | Please describe the Unauthorized Reconnection/Tampering Charge. | |
| 7 | A. | This charge is assessed when a Company employee visits a site to perform an | |
| 8 | | initial investigation for unauthorized reconnection of service. Unauthorized | |
| 9 | | reconnection generally involves situations where a customer removes the device | |
| 10 | | referred to as a "boot." The boot is installed by the Company to discontinue the | |
| 11 | | flow of energy to the meter at the time service is terminated for nonpayment of | |
| 12 | | electric service. To re-energize the meter, the customer removes the boot, and the | |
| 13 | | energy used by the customer is then recorded on the meter. The Company's cost | |
| 14 | | for investigating and resolving these situations is intended to be recovered | |
| 15 | | through the Unauthorized Reconnection/Tampering Charge. | |
| 16 | | Unauthorized reconnection can also include situations where a customer | |
| 17 | | installs equipment to bypass the meter or divert energy. Because the meter is | |
| 18 | | bypassed, the energy that is used is not registered on the meter. Although less | |
| 19 | | common, diversion situations can be complex, will typically take longer than one | |
| 20 | | hour to investigate and require assistance from multiple employees. | |
| 21 | Q. | What is the Company's current Unauthorized Reconnection/Tampering | |
| 22 | | Charge? | |
| 23 | A. | The Unauthorized Reconnection/Tampering Charge is currently \$75.00. | |

1

Q. Why is the Company requesting an increase to the Unauthorized

2 **Reconnection/Tampering Charge?**

- A. The Company proposes to increase the Unauthorized Reconnection/Tampering
 Charge to \$180.00 to better reflect the actual average cost incurred by the
- 5 Company to perform the initial investigation of the unauthorized reconnection.

Q. What is the Company's current actual average cost for investigating an unauthorized reconnection?

- 8 A. The estimated cost of investigating an unauthorized reconnection is
- 9 approximately \$180.00. This cost only covers the initial investigation of the
- 10 unauthorized reconnection performed by the journeyman meter man. Given that
- 11 the costs associated with diversions can vary significantly based on the time and
- 12 resources needed to fully investigate, the costs associated with investigating
- 13 diversions are not included in the \$180.00 estimate.

14 Q. How many times was this charge assessed during the test period?

- 15 A. The Company had 44 instances where the Unauthorized Reconnection/Tampering
- 16 Charge was assessed in Washington during the period from July 1, 2011, through
- 17 June 30, 2012. Given the difference between the current charge and the actual
- 18 average cost, approximately \$4,620.00 was not charged to the customer (cost
- 19 causer) under the current Schedule 300.
- 20 Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
- 21 A. Yes.