

1 **Q. Please state your name, employer and business address.**

2 A. My name is Thomas B. Specketer, MidAmerican Energy Company (“MEC”), 666
3 Grand Avenue, Suite 2900, Des Moines, Iowa 50309.

4 **Q. What is your position in the company and your previous work experience?**

5 A. I am currently vice president U.S. regulatory accounting and MEC controller. My
6 primary duties include responsibility for all accounting, financial reporting,
7 regulatory reporting, tax and budgeting activities for MEC, and regulatory
8 accounting oversight for all domestic regulated entities in the MidAmerican
9 Energy Holdings Company (“MEHC”) group. I have been employed by MEC, or
10 one of its predecessor companies, for over 25 years. During this time, I have held
11 various staff and managerial positions within the accounting, tax and finance
12 organizations.

13 **Q. What is your educational background and your involvement in professional
14 associations?**

15 A. I received a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics from Morningside
16 College. In addition to formal education, I have also attended various
17 educational, professional and electric industry related seminars during my career
18 at MEC. I am a member of Edison Electric Institute’s Chief Accounting Officers
19 Committee and a past member of the Tax Executives Institute, Iowa Association
20 of Tax Representatives and Institute of Management Accountants.

21 **Q. Please describe the purpose of your testimony.**

22 A. The chief purpose of my testimony is to provide an overview of the process by
23 which shared services costs will be distributed to PacifiCorp and other MEHC

1 subsidiaries after completion of the proposed transaction. Therefore, my
2 testimony will address the allocation methodologies expected to be employed, the
3 service agreement that will govern the shared services to be rendered, and the
4 expected costs to PacifiCorp of shared services under MEHC ownership, in
5 contrast to those PacifiCorp experienced under Scottish Power plc
6 (“ScottishPower”) ownership. Additionally, I will address other accounting
7 issues pertinent to this transaction that may be of interest to the Commission and
8 sponsor some of the commitments in MEHC witness Gale’s Exhibit
9 UP&L__(BEG-1).

10 **Accounting Changes**

11 **Q. Please discuss accounting changes brought about by this transaction.**

12 A. PacifiCorp will operate very much as it does today. Upon the closing of the
13 transaction, however, it is MEHC’s intent to transition PacifiCorp to a calendar
14 year-end in contrast to its present March 31 fiscal year-end. The change in year-
15 end will assure greater consistency in information supplied to PacifiCorp’s
16 various regulatory bodies and investors, and assure that financial information
17 provided to MEHC is on a basis consistent with other MEHC subsidiaries.

18 **Shared Services Costs**

19 **Q. What cost changes will occur as a result of this transaction?**

20 A. As mentioned previously, PacifiCorp will operate very much as it does today and,
21 accordingly, most costs incurred by PacifiCorp will not change as a result of this
22 transaction. One exception is the cost of corporate shared services. With the
23 change in ownership, PacifiCorp will no longer incur shared services costs from

1 ScottishPower, but will incur costs of a similar nature from MEHC and MEC.

2 **Q. Why are these shared corporate services being provided by MEHC?**

3 A. If the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 had remained in effect, shared
4 corporate services would have been provided by a new service company. With
5 the repeal of that law, there is no need to form a new company. The people who
6 are MEHC employees providing shared corporate services can continue to remain
7 holding company employees. MEHC will have the same systems in place that a
8 service company would have had to ensure that costs are captured and properly
9 billed and/or allocated to all entities in the MEHC group that benefit from the
10 services provided, including MEHC, PacifiCorp and MEC.

11 **Q. Please describe how shared costs, common to multiple subsidiaries of MEHC,
12 will be charged to PacifiCorp.**

13 A. Common costs of MEHC will originate in two entities: in MEHC itself, and in
14 MEC. MEC, a vertically integrated utility owned by MEHC, serves regulated and
15 unregulated electric and gas customers primarily in Iowa, Illinois, South Dakota
16 and Nebraska. MEC is described in more detail by MEHC witness Gale.

17 **Q. Please describe the shared corporate services that will originate at MEHC.**

18 A. Employees of MEHC include senior executives who provide strategic
19 management, coordination and corporate governance services to all MEHC
20 subsidiaries, including board of directors support, strategic planning, financial
21 planning and analysis, insurance, environmental compliance, financial reporting,
22 human resources, legal, accounting and other administrative services.

23

1 **Q. Will any PacifiCorp employees be transferred to MEHC?**

2 A. No.

3 **Q. Please describe the shared services that will be provided by MEC.**

4 A. MEC employees will also coordinate certain administrative services on behalf of
5 MEHC, including budgeting and forecasting, human resources, and tax
6 compliance. Amounts to be charged to PacifiCorp from MEC are not expected to
7 exceed \$4.0 million per year.

8 **Q. Will any other incidental services between MEC and PacifiCorp be
9 provided?**

10 A. For operational reasons, such as a storm restoration, it may be necessary and
11 beneficial to send crews of one utility to the other's service territory to assist in
12 restoration efforts. In addition, other operational expertise may be requested from
13 time to time to take advantage of specific expertise that exists at each of the
14 utilities. Services such as these would also be provided at cost.

15 **Q. How will costs from these two sources (MEHC and MEC) flow to
16 PacifiCorp?**

17 A. Cost assignments to PacifiCorp will be based on generally accepted cost
18 assignment practices. As described in more detail below, direct costs for the
19 MEHC and MEC services will be billed to the entity benefiting from the service
20 provided. All other costs related to the services provided, including indirect costs,
21 will be fully allocated to MEHC and all benefiting subsidiaries.

22 **Q. Could you give an example of what you mean by direct and indirect costs?**

23 A. Direct costs arise from services that are specifically attributable to a single entity.

1 For example, if I'm researching an accounting issue for an affiliate, I would
2 directly bill that entity for the time spent researching the issue. However, the cost
3 of the reference material purchased to research accounting issues would benefit
4 more than one entity, so the cost of the reference material would be an indirect
5 cost and allocated to all entities that benefit from the materials.

6 **Q. Please describe the service agreement that will govern the shared services to**
7 **be provided.**

8 A. The services will be governed by the existing Intercompany Administrative
9 Services Agreement ("IASA") that has been executed by MEHC and its
10 subsidiaries. The IASA is used to govern the provision of certain administrative
11 services between MEHC and affiliates. The existing IASA is attached as Exhibit
12 UP&L__(TBS-1). This agreement outlines the terms and conditions of the
13 shared services arrangement between MEHC and its subsidiaries, which will
14 eventually include PacifiCorp.

15 **Q. Please describe the system of accounts that will be used to capture and bill**
16 **shared costs.**

17 A. Costs and billings originating at MEHC will be accounted for using MEHC's
18 existing system of accounts. The MEHC system of accounts provides details on
19 the type of cost activity involved and the area responsible for incurring the charge.
20 As a regulated public utility, MEC is required to use and account for costs using
21 the FERC uniform system of accounts. In addition to the FERC primary
22 accounts, MEC utilizes an additional three-digit "sub-account" field to provide
23 more descriptive detail of the type of cost activity involved. Both MEHC and

1 MEC utilize a responsibility center field in the code block to establish budgetary
2 control of amounts charged and provide an audit trail to the department originally
3 incurring the charges. Other segments of the code block used by MEC capture
4 cost elements (descriptive of the nature of costs, e.g., labor, payables, etc.) and
5 project numbers. Both the MEHC and MEC code blocks accommodate a high
6 degree of flexibility and capability in tracking and reporting costs.

7 **Q. How will MEC segregate shared costs from costs it incurs on its own behalf**
8 **or directly on behalf of other MEHC subsidiaries?**

9 A. A separate “business unit” will be established within MEC’s accounting system
10 which will be structured to capture the costs of functions providing shared
11 services. Expenses originating in this “business unit” will allocate to all
12 benefiting MEHC entities, instead of merely to MEC operations, to the extent that
13 costs are not directly billed to MEC or to other MEHC subsidiaries. MEC has
14 employed this kind of accounting system in order to allocate costs for state
15 jurisdictional reporting purposes, and this methodology has been utilized in Iowa,
16 Illinois, and South Dakota for a number of years as the basis for rate filings. The
17 allocation process utilizes well-established controls, and an audit trail is
18 maintained such that all costs subject to allocation can be specifically identified
19 back to their origin.

20 **Q. On what basis will shared services be charged?**

21 A. Shared services, whether directly billed or allocated, will be charged at fully
22 loaded actual cost. This means that only the actual cost of providing the service,
23 with no markup for profit, will be charged. Labor, for example, will include such

1 items as loadings for benefits, paid absences and payroll taxes attributable to such
2 labor for actual time spent providing the service. Non-labor costs will be directly
3 billed or allocated at actual amounts incurred by MEHC and MEC.

4 **Q. Will this result in any cross-subsidization between MEHC entities?**

5 A. No. To the contrary, billing at cost will eliminate any potential cross-
6 subsidization between entities and ensure that only actual costs are reflected in
7 rates charged to both MEC customers and PacifiCorp customers.

8 **Q. Will MEHC own assets used for shared services?**

9 A. Yes, it will own assets used for providing shared services. Assets used for shared
10 services will be billed based on utilization of the asset, at an amount that recovers
11 the fixed costs of the asset.

12 **Q. Will MEHC earn a profit on any shared services it provides?**

13 A. No, MEHC will not earn profits on such services. All such shared services costs
14 incurred by MEHC will be directly charged when the benefiting organization can
15 be specifically identified, and any residual indirect amounts will be allocated each
16 month to all benefiting subsidiaries. Shared services costs incurred by MEC on
17 behalf of MEHC subsidiaries will also be fully allocated, to the extent not directly
18 charged.

19 **Q. Will any costs remain at MEHC?**

20 A. Yes. Costs attributable to activities not appropriately billed or allocated to MEHC
21 subsidiaries, such as general merger and acquisition costs, and interest expense of
22 MEHC, will be paid for and remain at MEHC. MEHC's share of indirect costs
23 will also remain at MEHC.

1 **Q. Will any costs, other than the shared costs mentioned above, be charged to**
2 **PacifiCorp from any other affiliates of MEHC?**

3 A. It is not expected that any significant administrative costs will originate from any
4 MEHC affiliate other than MEC. However, when specific expertise is needed or
5 available from other MEHC business platforms, the IASA provides the flexibility
6 for any member of the MEHC group to request services at cost from other entities
7 in the group. Services of this nature are situation-specific and not expected to be
8 recurring.

9 In addition, normal course of business transactions negotiated at arms-
10 length or subject to tariff provisions, such as the existing contracts between
11 PacifiCorp and MEHC subsidiaries to purchase gas transportation service from
12 Kern River Gas Transmission Company and steam from Intermountain
13 Geothermal Company for PacifiCorp's Blundell plant, may be initiated by
14 PacifiCorp. These services would continue to be subject to the applicable state or
15 federal regulatory approvals, including existing tariffs.

16 **Q. What allocation methodology will be used to allocate MEHC and MEC**
17 **shared costs not directly billed to MEHC entities?**

18 A. Indirect costs of MEHC and MEC, allocable to MEHC and all subsidiaries, will
19 be allocated using a two-factor formula comprised of assets and payroll, each
20 equally weighted. Within thirty (30) days of receiving all necessary state and
21 federal regulatory approvals of the proposed transaction, a final cost allocation
22 methodology will be submitted to the Commissions. On an ongoing basis, the
23 Commission will be notified of anticipated or mandated changes to this cost

1 allocation methodology. Of course, as specified in commitment 7(f) in Table 1
2 later in my testimony, the Commission will determine the appropriate corporate
3 cost allocation for establishing rates.

4 **Q. Why is the two-factor formula appropriate?**

5 A. This allocation methodology is based on the formula presently approved for use
6 by MEC and MEHC to allocate indirect common corporate costs. Further, it is
7 consistent with the IASA that will govern these services, and it has been utilized
8 by MEC for a number of years as the basis for rate filings in each of the states it
9 operates. These regulators have recognized that a single allocation factor to
10 allocate common corporate costs is not reasonable.

11 **Q. How does the two-factor formula compare to the three-factor formula used
12 by PacifiCorp?**

13 A. The factors produce similar results. Estimated costs allocated to PacifiCorp using
14 the two-factor formula are not expected to be materially different than costs
15 allocated using the three-factor formula.

16 **Q. Will PacifiCorp's inter-jurisdictional cost allocation methodology change as
17 a result of the MEHC purchase transaction?**

18 A. No. The methodology described above will only be used to allocate shared
19 services costs from MEHC and MEC. PacifiCorp's current methods for assigning
20 costs jurisdictionally will not change as a result of the transaction.

21 **Q. What is the expected impact on PacifiCorp costs of the shared services
22 charges from MEHC and MEC?**

23 A. Shared services charges to PacifiCorp are expected to decrease from historical

1 amounts billed to PacifiCorp from ScottishPower. Exhibit UP&L__(TBS-2)
2 presents an analysis of historical shared services costs from ScottishPower and
3 expected shared services costs upon MEHC's acquisition of PacifiCorp. Net
4 cross-charges to be paid by PacifiCorp to ScottishPower for the fiscal year ending
5 March 31, 2006, are projected to be \$15.0 million. MEHC estimates that its
6 shared costs to PacifiCorp would have totaled \$9.6 million for the same period.
7 MEHC is making a commitment that such costs will not exceed \$9 million per
8 year for five (5) years following the close of this transaction.

9 **Q. Will PacifiCorp continue to provide services to its direct subsidiaries?**

10 A. Yes, such services will continue under existing service agreements.

11 **Q. Please summarize this portion of your testimony regarding the shared
12 services acquisition commitments that MEHC is undertaking in connection
13 with the proposed transaction.**

14 A. Shared services costs will be direct billed or allocated to PacifiCorp, MEHC and
15 other subsidiaries, primarily from MEHC or MEC. To the extent costs are not
16 directly billed and need to be allocated, a two-factor allocator consisting of assets
17 and labor, each equally weighted, will be used to allocate the costs to each entity
18 benefiting from the type of cost incurred. The IASA will govern the shared
19 services to be provided by MEHC or MEC. MEHC is making a commitment that
20 shared services costs from MEHC and MEC will not exceed \$9 million per year
21 for five (5) years following the close of the transaction.

22

1 **Commitments**

2 **Q. Are you providing support for some of the commitments in MEHC witness**
 3 **Gale’s Exhibit UP&L__(BEG-1)?**

4 **A.** Yes. I am sponsoring the following financial and structural commitments that
 5 MEHC is undertaking with respect to the proposed transaction.
 6

Table 1 Financial and Structural Commitments that MEHC is Undertaking in Connection with the Proposed Transaction		
	Regulatory Oversight	
D	Accounting Records	The Commission or its agents may audit the accounting records of MEHC and its subsidiaries that are the bases for charges to PacifiCorp, to determine the reasonableness of allocation factors used by MEHC to assign costs to PacifiCorp and amounts subject to allocation or direct charges. MEHC agrees to cooperate fully with such Commission audits.
E	Affiliate Transactions	MEHC and PacifiCorp will comply with all existing Commission statutes and regulations regarding affiliated interest transactions, including timely filing of applications and reports.
F	Affiliate Transactions	PacifiCorp will file on an annual basis an affiliated interest report including an organization chart, narrative description of each affiliate, revenue for each affiliate and transactions with each affiliate.
G	Cross-subsidization	PacifiCorp and MEHC will not cross-subsidize between the regulated and non-regulated businesses or between any regulated businesses, and shall comply with the Commission’s then-existing practice with respect to such matters.

H	Affiliate Transactions	Due to PUHCA repeal, neither Berkshire Hathaway nor MEHC will be registered public utility holding companies under PUHCA. Thus, no waiver by Berkshire Hathaway or MEHC of any defenses to which they may be entitled under <i>Ohio Power Co. v. FERC</i> , 954 F.2d 779 (D.C. Cir.), cert. denied sub nom. <i>Arcadia v. Ohio Power Co.</i> , 506 U.S. 981 (1992) (" <i>Ohio Power</i> "), is necessary to maintain the Commission's regulation of MEHC and PacifiCorp. However, while PUHCA is in effect, Berkshire Hathaway and MEHC waive such defenses.
K	Cost Allocations	Within 30 days of receiving all necessary state and federal regulatory approvals of the final corporate and affiliate cost allocation methodology, a written document setting forth the final corporate and affiliate cost methodology will be submitted to the Commission. On an on-going basis, the Commission will also be notified of anticipated or mandated changes to the corporate and affiliate cost allocation methodologies.
L	Cost Allocations	Any proposed cost allocation methodology` for the allocation of corporate and affiliate investments, expenses, and overheads required by law or rule to be submitted to the Commission for approval, will comply with the following principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) For services rendered to PacifiCorp or each cost category subject to allocation to PacifiCorp by MEHC or any of its affiliates, MEHC must be able to demonstrate that such service or cost category is necessary to PacifiCorp for the performance of its regulated

		<p>operations, is not duplicative of services already being performed within PacifiCorp, and is reasonable and prudent.</p> <p>(b) Cost allocations to PacifiCorp and its subsidiaries will be based on generally accepted accounting standards; that is, in general, direct costs will be charged to specific subsidiaries whenever possible and shared or indirect costs will be allocated based upon the primary cost-driving factors.</p> <p>(c) MEHC will have in place time reporting systems adequate to support the allocation of costs of executives and other relevant personnel to PacifiCorp.</p> <p>(d) An audit trail will be maintained such that all costs subject to allocation can be specifically identified, particularly with respect to their origin. In addition, the audit trail must be adequately supported. Failure to adequately support any allocated cost may result in denial of its recovery in rates.</p> <p>(e) Costs which would have been denied recovery in rates had they been incurred by PacifiCorp regulated operations will likewise be denied recovery whether they are allocated directly or indirectly through subsidiaries in the MEHC</p>
--	--	--

		(f) group. Any corporate cost allocation methodology used for rate setting, and subsequent changes thereto, will be submitted to the Commission for approval if required by law or rule.
--	--	---

1

2 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

3 A. Yes it does.