

Docket No. 04-035-42
Marlin H. Barrow
DPU Exhibit 1.0R
January 14, 2005

-BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH-

IN THE MATTER OF THE)	DOCKET NO. 04-035-42
APPLICATION OF PACIFICORP)	
FOR APPROVAL OF IT'S PROPOSED)	
ELECTRIC RATE SCHEDULES &)	
ELECTRIC SERVICE REGULATIONS)	

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY

MARLIN H. BARROW

FOR THE

DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

STATE OF UTAH

January 14, 2005

1 **Q. Please state your name, business address, and present position with the Division**
2 **of Public Utilities (Division).**

3 A. My name is Marlin H. Barrow; my business address is the Heber Wells
4 Building, 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah. My position with the Division is
5 a Utility Analyst.

6 **Q. Are you the same Marlin H. Barrow that has previously filed testimony in this**
7 **case?**

8 A. Yes.

9 **Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony in this filing?**

10 A. My purpose is to provide Exhibit DPU 1.1R that details the Division's
11 proposed adjustments as well as introduce the Divisions' witnesses who will be
12 testifying to any changes made since the filing of direct testimony in Docket 04-035-
13 42 by the Division on December 3, 2004.

14 **Q. Could please explain the sequence of events that have taken place since that**
15 **initial filing that makes this revision necessary?**

16 A. Yes. At the time the Division was required to file testimony in this case, there
17 were still several pieces of data the Division was seeking information on and
18 therefore, at the time of the filing, the Division was unable to make its
19 recommendation on what if felt the revenue requirement should be in this case.

20 Since that time, the information has been provided and several adjustments
21 were made to the Division's Exhibit DPU 1.1 (Revised Exhibit DPU 1.1), which was
22 filed with the Commission on December 17, 2004 as part of the supplemental direct
23 testimony of Division Witness Artie Powell (DPU 2.0S). On the Revised Exhibit

1 DPU 1.1, PacifiCorp's requested increase had changed from \$123.6 million to \$128.7
2 million on an uncapped MSP basis, (on a capped MSP basis, from \$111 million to
3 \$116 million), as a result of PacifiCorp's update to its net power cost data. Also the
4 Division's witnesses, who had previously filed testimony, received additional data,
5 which led them to make adjustments to and in some cases drop previously
6 recommended adjustments all together. The net result of those adjustments showed
7 the Division making a recommendation for an increase in the revenue requirement for
8 PacifiCorp of \$29.454 million on an uncapped MSP basis and of \$17.571 million on a
9 capped MSP basis.

10 Since that time, Division witnesses Mr. Bruce Moio and Ms. Andrea Coon
11 have made additional adjustments, which have changed the Divisions recommended
12 revenue increase to \$28.348 million on an uncapped MSP basis and to \$16.501
13 million on a capped MSP basis. (Exhibit DPU 1.1R)

14 **Q. Will you introduce the Division witnesses who have made adjustments as a**
15 **result of newly acquired information.**

16 A. Division witnesses Ms. Mary Cleveland, Mr. Bruce Moio, Mr. Bart Croxford,
17 Mr. Dave Thomson and Ms. Andrea Coon will be discussing the reasons for making
18 the changes to their initial recommendations in their respective rebuttal testimonies
19 filed in this case.

20 **Q. Please explain the methodology used to model the adjustments proposed by the**
21 **various Division witnesses.**

22 A. The methodology used is the same methodology used in the initial filing in
23 this case.

1 **Q** **Does this conclude your testimony?**

2 **A** Yes.