- Q. Please state your name, business address and present position with
   PacifiCorp, dba Rocky Mountain Power (the "Company").
- A. My name is William R. Griffith. My business address is 825 NE Multnomah
  Street, Suite 2000, Portland, Oregon, 97232. My present position is Vice
  President, Regulation, Pacific Power.

#### 6 Qualifications

## 7 Q. Briefly describe your educational and professional background.

8 A. I have a B.A. degree with High Honors and distinction in Political Science and 9 Economics from San Diego State University and an M.A. in Political Science 10 from that same institution; I was subsequently employed on the faculty. I attended 11 the University of Oregon and completed all course work towards a Ph.D. in 12 Political Science. I joined the Company in the Rates & Regulation Department in 13 December 1983. In June 1989, I became Manager, Pricing in the Regulation 14 Department. In February 2001, I became Director, Pricing, Cost of Service and 15 Regulatory Operations. In February 2012, I was promoted to my current position.

## 16 Q. Have you appeared as a witness in previous regulatory proceedings?

- A. Yes. I have testified for the Company in regulatory proceedings in Utah,
  Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and California.
- **Purpose of Testimony**
- 20 **Q.** What is the purpose of your testimony?
- A. The purpose of my testimony is to address the Company's proposed EBA revenue
  spread and EBA rates in this case.

### 23 Proposed EBA Revenue Spread

#### 24 What is the test period the Company proposes to use in this case? 0. 25 A. The Company proposes to use the forecast test period 12 months ending May 26 2013 as filed with the Utah Public Service Commission in Docket No. 11-035-27 200. This forecast test period matches the 12 month period the proposed EBA 28 rates shall be in effect. 29 What is the total EBA deferral amount in this case? 0. 30 A. The total EBA revenue deferral is \$29.286 million, or 1.7 percent, as shown in 31 Table 1 of Mr. Brian S. Dickman's testimony. 32 How does the Company propose to allocate the EBA revenue across **O**. 33 customer classes? 34 A. The Company proposes to spread the EBA revenue across customer classes 35 consistent with the approved spread of the base EBA costs to rate schedules in the 36 Company's last general rate case, Docket No. 10-035-124 ("2011 GRC"). 37 How were base EBA costs spread to rate schedules in the 2011 GRC? **O**. 38 A. Base EBA costs were spread to rate schedules in the 2011 GRC in the same way 39 that all other costs were spread to rate schedules according to the stipulation 40 approved by the Commission in that docket on Cost of Service, Rate Spread, and 41 Rate Design ("Stipulation"). 42 **O**. Please explain. 43 A. The parties to the Stipulation agreed that any rate change should be spread 44 according to the percentages of the revenue requirement increase reflected in the 45 column labeled "Stipulated Percentage of Revenue Requirement Increase" of

Page 2 – Direct Testimony of William R. Griffith

- 46 Exhibit A to the Stipulation (Paragraph 5). The parties further agreed to withdraw 47 and not contest any cost of service issues in the case (Paragraph 6), and that the 48 cost of service/rate design issues were suspended (Paragraph 11).
- 49 Q. Did the revenue requirement stipulation in the 2011 GRC ("Revenue
- 50 Requirement Stipulation") provide any further guidance concerning the
- 51 spread of the EBA in this case?
- 52 A. Yes. Paragraph 59 of the Revenue Requirement Stipulation indicated that:
- 53 ...The Parties agree that this \$60.0 million ("EBA") amount
  54 should be recovered through an annual \$20.0 million surcharge
  55 over three years without a carrying charge applied as a line item in
  56 the EBA surcharge commencing June 1, 2012. <u>The surcharge shall</u>
  57 <u>be allocated to rate schedules relying on the Cost of Service</u>
  58 <u>Stipulation consistent with the EBA Order. (emphasis added)</u>
- 59 Q. Please describe Exhibit RMP\_\_(WRG-1).
- 60 A. Exhibit RMP\_\_(WRG-1) contains the Company's proposed rate spread which
- 61 follows the rate spread from the 2011 GRC as discussed above. On an overall
- basis, based on the forecast test period 12 months ending May 2013, this proposal
- 63 would result in an overall increase of 1.7 percent to tariff customers in Utah.
- 64 **Proposed Rates for Schedule 94**
- 65 Q. How were the proposed Schedule 94 rates developed for each customer class?
- 66 A. The proposed rates for each customer class were developed to apply to customers'
- 67 Monthly Power Charges and Energy Charges by dividing their responsible EBA
- 68 revenue amount by the corresponding present revenues.
- 69 Q. Please describe Exhibit RMP\_\_(WRG-2).
- 70 A. Exhibit RMP\_\_\_(WRG-2) contains the billing determinants and the calculations
- 71 of the proposed ECAM rates in this case.

- 72 Q. Please describe Exhibit RMP\_\_(WRG-3).
- A. Exhibit RMP\_\_\_(WRG-3) contains the proposed rates for Schedule 94.

# 74 Q. Did you include workpapers with this filing?

- 75 A. Yes. Workpapers have been included with this filing that detail the calculations
- shown in my exhibits.
- 77 Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?
- 78 A. Yes, it does.