

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

IN THE MATTER OF THE)
APPLICATION OF PACIFICORP)
FOR APPROVAL OF ITS)
PROPOSED ELECTRIC RATE)
SCHEDULES & ELECTRIC)
SERVICE REGULATIONS)

Docket No. 03-2035-02
SUPPLEMENTAL
TESTIMONY
OF D. DOUGLAS LARSON

OCTOBER 2003

1 **Q. Are you the same D. Douglas Larson who previously testified in these**
2 **proceedings?**

3 A. Yes.

4 **Summary of Testimony**

5 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

6 A. I will present a brief overview of the Company's case as updated in this filing.

7 **Proposed Rate Increase**

8 **Q. What is the result of the update?**

9 A. The Company has recognized changes since the original filing. These changes
10 have moved in both directions and actually reduce the total revenue requirement
11 the Company believes that it can justify by around \$1 million. The result of this
12 updated analysis shows that in order to earn the Company's proposed 11.5%
13 ROE, an increase of \$127.5 million is required. Pursuant to the stipulation in this
14 case, the Company is requesting a \$125 million increase.

15 **Update Filing**

16 **Q. Please describe the Company's update filing.**

17 A. The update filing includes the supplemental testimony of, J.Ted Weston, Mark T.
18 Widmer, Bruce N. Williams and Larry O. Martin. That supplemental testimony
19 addresses the Company's revenue requirement request: including the impact of
20 known and measurable changes on the Company's net power costs; changes in
21 long term debt and preferred stock costs; and updates and changes to the requested
22 tax settlement payments.

1 Also included with the update filing are replacement pages for the direct
2 testimony of Daniel J. Rosborough and Samuel C. Hadaway. Those replacement
3 pages reflect changes required by the supplemental testimony of Mr. Williams and
4 updates and corrections to the direct testimony.

5 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

6 **A. Yes.**