1	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
2	A.	My name is Daniel C. Peterson. My business address is One Utah Center, Suite
3		2300, 210 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111-2300.
4	Qual	ifications
5	Q.	What is your current position at PacifiCorp (the Company) and your
6		previous employment history with the Company?
7	A.	I am currently employed as a Manager in the Regulatory Affairs Department of
8		PacifiCorp. I joined the Company in 1978, and I have held various accounting
9		and regulatory positions prior to my current position.
10	Q.	What are your responsibilities?
11	A.	I am responsible for the support of general regulatory issues and filings across
12		PacifiCorp's six-state service territory.
13	Q.	What is your educational background?
14	A.	I received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting from Bradley University
15		in 1970 and a Master of Public Administration Degree from Brigham Young
16		University in 1977. In addition to formal education, I have also attended various
17		educational, professional and electric industry seminars during my career at the
18		Company. I am a licensed CPA in the state of Utah.
19	Purp	ose of Testimony
20	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony?
21	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to support the Stipulation recommending the
22		continuation of the Home Electric Lifeline Program (HELP) that was filed by
23		parties in combined Docket No. 03-035-01/04-035-21. I will describe the

Page 1 - Direct Testimony of Daniel C. Peterson

24		modifications to the HELP Program proposed by the Stipulation and show why
25		these changes are fair and reasonable. Specifically, I will address the increase in
26		the Schedule 3 monthly credit, the increase in the program annual collections cap,
27		the adjustment to the targeted Lifeline account balance and the reductions to the
28		Schedule 91 surcharges. My testimony also supports the conclusion that
29		continuation of the Program under the terms of the Stipulation is in the public
30		interest.
31	Publi	ic Interest
32	Q.	Why does PacifiCorp support continuation of the HELP Program as being in
33		the public interest?
34	A.	In previous orders, the Commission determined that it had authority to implement
35		the HELP Program. PacifiCorp believes that the Program satisfied and, with the
36		changes identified in the Stipulation, continues to satisfy the following criteria
37		previously identified by the Commission: 1) the need for the Program is real and
38		unmet by direct-payment programs; 2) the Program targets only low-income
39		households and does not raise rates for low-income households based upon
40		electricity consumption; 3) the Program's benefits continue to offset any impacts
41		on the ratemaking objective because the Program results in just and reasonable
42		rates based on the economic impact of charges on a category of customers; and 4)
43		the Program is efficient and simple to administer. Other parties to the Stipulation
44		are taking the lead in demonstrating that the first three factors which supported
45		the establishment of HELP in 2000 support the continuation of the Program today.
46		PacifiCorp supports the conclusions reached by the other parties with respect to

Page 2 - Direct Testimony of Daniel C. Peterson

47 these key indicators. I address item 4 – the Program is efficient and simple to
48 administer.

49	Q.	Has HELP been efficient and simple to administer?
50	A.	Yes. In fact, the Program has actually cost less to administer than was originally
51		anticipated. PacifiCorp was authorized to charge the HELP Program up to
52		\$10,000 annually for administration costs. The Company's actual charges for
53		fiscal years 2003 through 2005 have averaged less than half that amount. The
54		Utah Department of Community and Culture (DCC) was authorized to seek
55		reimbursement for up to \$40,000 annually to cover program administration costs.
56		The DCC's actual billings for fiscal years 2003 through 2005 averaged less than
57		\$12,000 annually. In addition, the changes proposed in the Stipulation that will
58		make it easier to track and retain eligible participants who change addresses or are
59		disconnected from service will further simplify the administration of the Program.
60	Sche	dule 3 Monthly Credit
61	Q.	Please explain the change to the Schedule 3 monthly credit proposed by the
62		Stipulation.
63	A.	The Schedule 3 credit will be increased from \$8.00 per monthly bill to \$11.25 per
64		monthly bill.
65	Q.	What is the reason for this proposed increase in the Lifeline credit?
66	A.	The parties to the Stipulation agreed that it was reasonable to maintain the
67		relationship between the amount of the Lifeline credit and the average monthly
68		residential customer bill that resulted from the 2000 Commission order in Docket
69		No. 00-035-T07. Electric prices have increased since 2000, and average monthly

Page 3 - Direct Testimony of Daniel C. Peterson

70		residential bills have increased correspondinglyfrom just over \$41 in 2000 to
71		nearly \$58 in 2005. In order to maintain a percentage relationship between the
72		Lifeline credit and the average customer bill that is comparable to the relationship
73		established in the 2000 order, it is necessary to increase the credit from \$8.00 to
74		\$11.25.
75	Q.	Does the Stipulation anticipate that the amount of the credit should be
76		monitored and be subject to further adjustments in the future?
77	A.	Yes. The parties agree that the amount of the credit should be monitored over
78		time and reviewed in the course of the next PacifiCorp general rate case to
79		determine if further adjustments are required as tariffed rates change.
80	Annual Collections Cap	
81	Q.	Please explain the change in the program annual collections cap proposed by
82		the Stipulation.
82 83	A.	<b>the Stipulation.</b> Under the terms of the Stipulation, the annual program collections cap will be
	A.	
83	A.	Under the terms of the Stipulation, the annual program collections cap will be
83 84	A.	Under the terms of the Stipulation, the annual program collections cap will be increased from \$1.85 million to \$2 million. The parties agreed that this increase
83 84 85	A.	Under the terms of the Stipulation, the annual program collections cap will be increased from \$1.85 million to \$2 million. The parties agreed that this increase is reasonable to reflect growth in PacifiCorp's customer base. A fixed collections
83 84 85 86	A.	Under the terms of the Stipulation, the annual program collections cap will be increased from \$1.85 million to \$2 million. The parties agreed that this increase is reasonable to reflect growth in PacifiCorp's customer base. A fixed collections cap ignores the fact that the number of eligible HELP participants increases along
83 84 85 86 87	A.	Under the terms of the Stipulation, the annual program collections cap will be increased from \$1.85 million to \$2 million. The parties agreed that this increase is reasonable to reflect growth in PacifiCorp's customer base. A fixed collections cap ignores the fact that the number of eligible HELP participants increases along with the overall growth in customer base. Therefore, even with no change in the
83 84 85 86 87 88	A.	Under the terms of the Stipulation, the annual program collections cap will be increased from \$1.85 million to \$2 million. The parties agreed that this increase is reasonable to reflect growth in PacifiCorp's customer base. A fixed collections cap ignores the fact that the number of eligible HELP participants increases along with the overall growth in customer base. Therefore, even with no change in the surcharge, it is reasonable and necessary for the annual collections cap to increase.
83 84 85 86 87 88 88	A.	Under the terms of the Stipulation, the annual program collections cap will be increased from \$1.85 million to \$2 million. The parties agreed that this increase is reasonable to reflect growth in PacifiCorp's customer base. A fixed collections cap ignores the fact that the number of eligible HELP participants increases along with the overall growth in customer base. Therefore, even with no change in the surcharge, it is reasonable and necessary for the annual collections cap to increase. The proposed increase is consistent with the actual amount collected during

## Page 4 - Direct Testimony of Daniel C. Peterson

	on the total number of customers multiplied by the then-applicable class
	surcharge rate.
Accou	int Balance
Q.	Is the current Lifeline account balance in line with the amount anticipated in
	the 2000 Commission order?
A.	No. The 2000 order anticipated an account balance that would not exceed 5
	percent of the annual amount collected, or about \$92,000. The current balance is
	over \$2 million, and it is the intent of the parties to the Stipulation to decrease that
	balance over time through the adjustments described in my testimony.
Q.	What changes does the Stipulation propose to make to the targeted account
	balance?
A.	On a going forward basis, the parties to the Stipulation have agreed that the
	targeted account balance should be equal to approximately three months worth of
	surcharge collections. Thus, based on recent experience, the targeted account
	balance is estimated to be \$450,000, subject to fluctuation over time with varying
	participation and customer levels.
Q.	Once the program changes proposed in the Stipulation have been
	implemented, how long will it take to reduce the account balance to the
	target level?
A.	The modifications included in the Stipulation are designed to achieve the target
	balance in a reasonable period of time, which the parties have agreed should be
	two years or less. The actual rate at which the balance will be reduced is
	dependent upon future levels of program participation. Under the terms of the
	Q. A. Q. Q.

Page 5 - Direct Testimony of Daniel C. Peterson

116		Stipulation, the Division will submit an annual audit report to the Commission,
117		which will include a review of the target account balance. If this report shows
118		that the account balance is materially diverging from the established parameters,
119		the parties to the Stipulation will recommend necessary adjustments to the
120		Commission.
121	Schee	dule 91 Surcharges
122	Q.	Please explain the changes to the Schedule 91 Surcharges proposed by the
123		Stipulation.
124	A.	Under the terms of the Stipulation, the Schedule 91 surcharges will be reduced for
125		all applicable customer classes by 17 percent (rounded to the nearest cent). This
126		reduces the residential surcharge from \$0.12 to \$0.10 per monthly bill, and results
127		in a change to the average Schedule 9 customer's bill from \$6.25 to \$5.19. Under
128		the Stipulation, the new Utah Lifeline tariff cap will become \$5.19 per customer
129		(one location at one point of delivery) per month or \$62.28 annually.
130	Q.	What is the basis for the proposed 17 percent reduction in the surcharge?
131	А.	A 17 percent reduction in the surcharge is required to reduce the Lifeline account
132		balance to the target level of \$450,000 within two years, at anticipated program
133		participation levels.
134	Q.	Please explain how the surcharge reduction was calculated.
135	A.	As I previously indicated, the adjustments in the Stipulation are predicated on a
136		goal of reducing the Lifeline account balance from the current level of over \$2
137		million to the target level of approximately \$450,000 over a period of two years
138		or less. Changes in the account balance are determined by three factors: (1) the

Page 6 - Direct Testimony of Daniel C. Peterson

139		amount of the monthly Schedule 3 credit; (2) the Schedule 91 surcharge collection
140		rates; and (3) the level of program participation. As I indicated earlier, the
141		monthly Schedule 3 credit is being increased from \$8.00 to \$11.25 to reflect
142		increases in average residential bills. As shown in Exhibit UP&L (DCP-1),
143		given an \$11.25 monthly credit and an assumed participation rate of
144		approximately 19,000, a surcharge reduction of 17 percent is required to reduce
145		the account balance to the target level in two years.
146	Q.	Please explain the reasons for assuming a participation level of 19,000.
147	A.	In addition to increasing the Lifeline credit to reflect current electric prices and
148		reducing the account balance to a more reasonable level, one of the primary goals
149		of the changes proposed in the Stipulation is to increase the level of program
150		participation among eligible customers. For example, the parties have agreed that
151		Schedule 3 should be amended to permit PacifiCorp to continue to provide
152		Schedule 3 pricing to eligible households after a move or reconnect after
153		disconnect without the need for the household to recertify before such time as an
154		annual recertification would have been due. Based on these changes, the
155		Stipulation indicates that a reasonable expected annual average participation rate
156		is approximately 22,000 Utah households in the near term. In contrast, the
157		average participation for the 12 months ended March 31, 2005 was only 17,200.
158		Progress toward the higher target participation rate will occur as changes
159		proposed in the Stipulation are implemented, making it possible to track and
160		retain eligible participants who change addresses or are disconnected from service.
161		Additional participation will also be generated by general customer growth and

## Page 7 - Direct Testimony of Daniel C. Peterson

162		efforts to streamline the eligibility certification process. However, the growth in
163		average participation levels from 17,000 to 22,000 will not occur overnight.
164		Therefore, for purposes of calculating the surcharge reduction, it was assumed
165		that an average participation level of 19,000 would be reasonable and
166		conservative for the next two years. If in fact the participation rate grows at a
167		faster rate than has been assumed, it will simply result in the account balance
168		being reduced to the target level in less than two years.
169	Q.	Does the Stipulation intend that the 17 percent surcharge reductions be made
170		permanent?
171	A.	No. The parties have agreed that these reductions are necessary at this time in
172		order to help reduce the current Lifeline account balance. However, the parties
173		also agree that the surcharge should be monitored over time and reviewed in the
174		course of the next PacifiCorp general rate case to determine if further adjustments
175		are required to stay within the design parameters of the HELP Program.
176	Q.	If the current changes are designed to accelerate the reduction of the balance
177		to bring it in line with the recommended \$450, 000 level, what actions will
178		need to be taken at the end of two years to prevent the balance from going
179		into arrears?
180	A.	When the recommended balance is achieved, the program may need to be
181		modified to reduce the credit, increase the surcharge or limit participation so that
182		the balance can be maintained.
183		

## Page 8 - Direct Testimony of Daniel C. Peterson

## 184 Conclusion

- 185 Q. Please summarize your testimony.
- 186 My testimony has shown that the modifications to the HELP Program proposed A. 187 by the Stipulation are fair and reasonable and should be approved by the 188 Commission. I have explained why PacifiCorp believes that continuation of 189 HELP is in the public interest. Specifically, I have shown that the increase to the 190 Schedule 3 credit is necessary to keep the amount of the credit in line with higher 191 average residential bills. I have also explained that the increase in the annual 192 program collections cap is required to reflect growth in PacifiCorp's customer 193 base. Finally, I have demonstrated that the reductions to the Schedule 91 194 surcharges, when coupled with the higher credit and initiatives to increase eligible 195 customer participation, will reduce the Lifeline account balance to an appropriate 196 level within a reasonable time. 197 **O**. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
- 198 A. Yes.