

TABLE 3		
<u>Production Allocation Factor Comparison</u>		
<u>Class</u>	<u>100 Summer Hrs / 100 Winter Hrs</u>	<u>4CP</u>
Sch 16	43.0%	50.6%
Sch 24	13.4%	12.4%
Sch 36	21.4%	19.1%
Sch 48T	8.7%	7.6% 7.0%
Sch 48T-D.F.	9.6%	7.0% 7.6%
Sch 40	3.5%	3.3%
Lighting	0.2%	0.1%
Total	100.0%	100.0%

1 **Q. HAVE YOU MODIFIED THE PACIFICORP ECOS STUDY SO THAT**
 2 **PRODUCTION-RELATED COSTS ARE ALLOCATED USING YOUR**
 3 **RECOMMENDED 4 CP RATHER THAN THE 100 SUMMER/100 WINTER**
 4 **METHOD?**

5 A. Yes. I have calculated the ECOS study for the recommended 4 CP demand allocation
 6 method under both a 100% demand allocation of production capacity costs, and in the
 7 context of PacifiCorp’s Peak Credit classification (43% demand, 57% energy). For
 8 the 100% demand 4 CP allocation, I calculate the ECOS results if the peak credit
 9 method for classification is not used at all and, instead, production fixed costs are
 10 allocated on the basis of 4 CP demand alone. Disuse of the Peak Credit method
 11 altogether will require some modifications to the allocation of production variable
 12 costs and transmission costs. I have used a 100% energy allocator for variable
 13 production costs,^{14/} and a 100% 12 CP allocator for transmission costs. This treatment
 14 of transmission costs will be discussed further in the next section. The results of this

^{14/} The FERC accounts that I have considered variable production are 501, 501NPC, 503, 518, 547NPC and 555 (in part).