

1 Q. Please state your name and business address.

2 A. My name is F. Robert Stewart. My business address is 1900 S.W. 4th Avenue, Plaza
3 Level, Portland, Oregon 97201.

4 Q. By whom and in what capacity are you employed?

5 A. I am employed by PacifiCorp (the Company). My present position is Senior Analyst,
6 Customer & Regulatory Liaison, in the Customer Services Department.

7 Q. Briefly describe your educational and professional background.

8 A. I graduated from Utah State University with a Master of Science degree in
9 Engineering in 1984, and have taken courses on Utility Economics and Regulation
10 from Portland State University and the University of New Mexico. After graduation
11 in 1984 I worked as a field engineer for the Soil Conservation Service for two years. I
12 joined the Company as Coordinator of Policy and Procedures in the Customer Service
13 Department in Salt Lake City in 1986. In 1995 I assumed my current position as a
14 Senior Analyst in the Regulation Department in Portland Oregon.

15 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

16 A. My testimony will describe the Company's proposed changes to Electric Service
17 Schedules and Regulations.

18 Q. Why is the Company proposing changes to its schedules and regulations?

19 A. The Company is proposing to add new service provisions that are currently in effect
20 in other PacifiCorp jurisdictions. This will provide additional consistency between
21 service territories. Changes are also proposed to ensure that the customers who
22 request specific services pay the associated costs. In addition, the Company is

1 proposing to add language to the tariff to comply with a recent change in Commission
2 rules on dispute resolution.

3 Q. Please describe the specific changes you are proposing.

4 A. They are described below.

5 **Meter Verification for Multiple Units**

6 Q. Please explain the verification of service address labels on meter bases for multiple
7 unit installations.

8 A. When a new multiple unit development is built, the developer/owner is responsible
9 for permanently labeling each meter base with the correct service address of the unit
10 served by the meter. If the meter bases are incorrectly labeled then a crossed meter
11 situation exists, and customer billings are associated with the wrong usage. This error
12 can persist for years before being discovered.

13 Q. How does the Company propose to apply the meter verification fee?

14 A. For new installations, the Company proposes to charge the developer/owner the Meter
15 Verification Fee as given in Schedule 300 for verifying correct labeling. However, if
16 all the meter bases for a building are correctly labeled the Meter Verification Fee for
17 that building would be waived.

18 For existing buildings, when the Company receives a customer complaint of
19 switched meters, the Company will check the meter installation for correct labeling
20 and charge the owner the Meter Verification Fee for each meter on the building.
21 However, if all the meter bases for that building are correctly labeled, the Meter
22 Verification Fee for that building will be waived.

23 Q. Is there any other time the Company will charge the Meter Verification Fee?

1 A. Yes. If the developer/owner or landlord requests the Company to verify or certify that
2 the meters are labeled correctly independent of a crossed meter complaint they will be
3 charged the Meter Verification Fee. An instance where such a request might be made
4 is preceding a sale of the facilities.

5 Q. Is this proposed change included in this filing?

6 A. Yes. The Company's proposed charge of \$15/meter is included in Schedule 300,
7 Exhibit UP&L __.1 (FRS-1) and in Regulation 7, Metering, Exhibit UP&L __.2 (FRS-
8 2).

9 Q. What are the estimated costs of providing this service?

10 A. We estimate the cost to be \$15/meter. This cost estimate is based on our experience
11 in another state where crossed meters existed. Such costs are related to the time for
12 metermen to check new apartment complexes for correct labeling plus additional time
13 to identify and subsequently confirm correction on crossed meters.

14 Q. How many meters does the Company estimate would be impacted annually?

15 A. We estimate the number of crossed meters in Utah to be 150 to 450 annually.

16 **Tampering/Unauthorized Reconnection Charge - Damages to Company Property**

17 Q. Please describe the Company's proposal regarding the Tampering/Unauthorized
18 Reconnection Charge.

19 A. The Company is proposing to implement a new fee of \$75.00 for
20 Tampering/Unauthorized Reconnection of service. The purpose of this fee is to
21 charge customers for the cost of work required to document that the Company's
22 facilities have been tampered with or an unauthorized reconnection has occurred. We
23 estimate the cost of this work to be greater than \$90.00. This proposed fee is in

1 addition to the provisions of Section 3(b) in Regulation 7 which states that the
2 customer will be responsible for paying for restoration of the Company's equipment
3 due to tampering. In addition, the tampering charge is not a waiver of any right by the
4 Company to recover billing losses due to tampering.

5 Q. Does the Company have a tampering charge in place in any other jurisdiction?

6 A. Yes. Tampering fees are in place in Oregon and Washington, where they were
7 recently raised to \$75.00 from \$60.00 and \$15.00, respectively. In addition, a
8 tampering fee of \$75.00 is currently proposed in Wyoming.

9 Q. How many incidents of tampering does the Company estimate occur on an annual
10 basis?

11 A. Based on the number of times this fee has been applied in another state where the fee
12 exists and assuming the same incident/customer ratio we estimate there will be 400
13 cases of tampering per year in the Company's Utah service territory.

14 Q. Is this proposed change included in this filing?

15 A. Yes. This change is included in Schedule 300, Exhibit UP&L _.1 (FRS-1) and in
16 Regulation 10, Exhibit UP&L _.3 (FRS-3).

17 **Other Work at Customer's Request**

18 Q. What is the Company proposing with regards to work at Customer's request?

19 A. The Company is proposing to add wording to Regulation 1 to clarify that if the
20 Customer requests the Company to perform work on their behalf, there will be an
21 associated charge made of the actual costs of performing this work.

22 Q. What are some examples of the type of work that would be included under this
23 service provision?

1 A. Work at a customer's request may include a customer requesting that the Company
2 temporarily disconnect service during non-working hours for the purpose of trimming
3 trees or performing electrical work. Other examples are lifting lines for house moves,
4 setting a rural service pole for a customer's meter, or locating customer-owned
5 underground facilities.

6 Q. Is a similar provision in place in any other jurisdiction served by the Company?

7 A. Yes. A similar provision is in effect in Oregon. In addition, the Company has
8 proposed to make this change in Wyoming.

9 Q. Is this proposed change included in this filing?

10 A. Yes. It has been added to Regulation 1, Exhibit UP&L _4 (FRS-4).

11 **Wording Changes on New Rules on Dispute Resolution Process**

12 Q. What change is the Company proposing to Rule 1, Section 8 on Informal and Formal
13 Review of disputes?

14 A. New rules were adopted by the Commission effective February 15, 2001 concerning
15 dispute resolution. The Company proposes to modify Regulation 1, Section 8 to
16 incorporate the change in Commission rules.

17 Q. Is this proposed change included in this filing?

18 A. Yes. It is included in Regulation 1, Exhibit UP&L _4 (FRS-4).

19 **Other Changes**

20 Q. Is the Company proposing other changes to the electric service schedules or
21 regulations?

22 A. Yes. There is a minor change to Schedule 13 to remove some wording that became
23 obsolete when the Regulation 12 was changed effective May 25, 2000. The 300 feet

1 of distribution facilities, transformer, meter and service extension allowance was
2 eliminated, and so the reference to this allowance in Schedule 13 is now obsolete.
3 This change is included in Schedule 13, Exhibit UP&L _2 (WRG-2), an Exhibit
4 associated with ~~Bill~~ Mr. Griffith's testimony.

5 Q. Are there any other changes being proposed to the rules?

6 A. Yes. Exhibit UP&L_5 (FRS-5) consists of the remainder of the regulations and title
7 sheets. These changes do not affect the regulations themselves, but reflect the change
8 from Utah P.S.C.U. No. 43 to P.S.C.U. No. 44 as well as the proposed issued and
9 effective dates of the tariffs.

10 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

11 A. Yes.