

SUPPLEMENTAL ACTION REQUEST

Date: May 16, 2016

FROM: Public Service Commission Due: June 14, 2016
SUBJECT: RMP Results of Operations Report for Utah, 2015, Docket No. 16-035-15
(Company Name, Case Number, etc.)

This is a request for the Division to conduct:

Review Tariff Compliance
 Analysis of Complaint
 Investigation
 Other

EXPLANATION AND STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED:

RE: Docket No. 16-035-15, Results of Operations Report for the Utah Jurisdiction for the twelve months ended December 31, 2015, Customer Numbers.

Customer numbers for Utah, as reported in PacifiCorp's 2015 Results of Operation JAM model filed in this docket and used in the development of the CN allocation factor appear to be different than customer numbers used to develop the same factor in PacifiCorp's JAM models used for ratemaking purposes. For example, PacifiCorp reports 966,815 Utah customers in its 2015 Results of Operation JAM model. In comparison, PacifiCorp reported 850,309 Utah customers in its June 4, 2014, Rebuttal JAM model used in the general rate case in Docket No. 13-035-184. [The Rebuttal JAM model can be found on the Commission's website in Docket No. 13-035-184 at the June 4, 2014 entry entitled "McDougal Rebuttal Workpapers - Copy of UT GRC Rebuttal JAM - June 2015 Test Period."]

Please explain how the customer numbers are determined for the different applications and identify their associated data source(s), broken out by rate schedule. Also, please explain the basis and impacts of the identified methodology or methodologies.