

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

2 A. My name is Carole A. Rockney. My business address is 825 N. E. Multnomah  
3 Street, Suite 300, Portland, Oregon 97232.

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

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

7 **Q. Briefly describe your educational and professional background.**

8 A. In 1985, I graduated from Portland State University with a Bachelor of Science  
9 degree in Business Administration, with a minor in Economics. In addition, I  
10 have taken graduate courses from Portland State University in the area of  
11 Economics. I joined the Company as an Assistant Pricing Analyst in the  
12 Regulation Department in 1985. I advanced to the level of Senior Pricing Analyst  
13 before leaving that department in 1990 to become a Commercial Segment  
14 Manager in the Company's Marketing Department. In 1991, I returned to the  
15 Regulation Department as Manager of Cost of Service. In 1993, I became a  
16 Supervisor in Economic Regulation and in 1996 became Regulatory Policy  
17 Manager. In 1998 I was appointed as Manager of Tariff Policy. I assumed my  
18 current position in 2000.

19 **Q. Have you appeared as a witness in previous regulatory proceedings?**

20 A. Yes. I have testified in the states of Utah, Wyoming, Oregon, California,  
21 Washington and Montana.

22 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

23 A. The purpose of my testimony is to propose changes to Utah Electric Service

24 Schedules and Regulations to increase the Company's charges for field visits,  
25 reconnection of service and returned payments to better reflect the cost of  
26 providing these services. In addition, I am proposing housekeeping changes to  
27 Regulation No. 12 on Line Extension and Regulation No. 2 on General  
28 Definitions to improve the clarity of these regulations and better describe the  
29 application of these regulations.

30 **Increase in Field Visit Charge**

31 **Q. Please describe the Field Visit Charge.**

32 A. This charge is assessed when the Company visits a Customer's site to disconnect  
33 or reconnect service, but due to the Customer's action, the Company does not  
34 complete the disconnection or reconnection at the time of the visit.

35 **Q. Please describe the change the Company is proposing to its existing Field  
36 Visit Charge in Electric Service Schedule No. 300.**

37 A. As shown in Exhibit UP&L\_\_\_\_(CAR-1) (page 300.2), the Company is proposing  
38 to increase the Field Visit Charge from \$15.00 to \$20.00.

39 **Q. Please provide the cost of performing a Field Visit.**

40 A. The estimated cost of providing this service is \$20.34. The current charge for this  
41 service of \$15.00 is below the cost of providing the service and the change  
42 proposed by the Company will ensure that the customers who request this service  
43 pay for the costs associated with it. This will reduce the subsidization of this  
44 service by other customers.

45 **Q. What is the charge for this service in the other states served by the Company?**

46 A. The charge for this service was recently increased to \$20.00 in both Oregon and  
47 Wyoming. A field visit charge of \$20.00 has been proposed in California. The Company  
48 will also be proposing an increase in the field visit charge in Washington and Idaho in the  
49 coming months.

50 **Q. How many Field Visit Charges were assessed by the Company last year?**

51 A. In calendar year 2005, the Company assessed approximately 20,000 field visits in Utah.

52 **Increase in Reconnection Charges**

53 **Q. Please describe the Reconnection Charge.**

54 A. This charge is assessed when the Company reconnects service following disconnection of  
55 service after a default by the Customer.

56 **Q. Please describe the changes the Company is proposing to make to its existing  
57 Reconnection Charges in Electric Service Schedule No. 300.**

58 A. As shown in Exhibit UP&L\_\_\_(CAR-1) (page 300.2), the Company is proposing to  
59 increase the Reconnection Charge assessed at All Other Times from \$75.00 to \$100.00.

60 **Q. What is the basis for proposing an increase in the reconnection charge during other  
61 than normal office hours from \$75.00 to \$100.00?**

62 A. The cost for providing this service is more than \$115.00. The proposed increase in the  
63 fee from \$75.00 to \$100.00 is intended to better reflect the cost of providing this service  
64 and to reduce the subsidy paid by other customers for a reconnection visit after normal  
65 office hours.

66 **Q. What is the charge for this service in the other states served by the Company?**

67 A. The Company recently increased the cost of providing this service to \$100.00 in

68 Wyoming. The Company has proposed to increase this charge up to \$175.00 in  
69 California. In other states this charge varies between \$40.00 and \$175.00.

70 **Q. How many reconnection visits at All Other Times did the Company make within the**  
71 **last year?**

72 A. In 2005 the Company performed 555 reconnection visits during other than normal office  
73 hours.

74 **Q. Is the Company also proposing to increase the reconnection charge for reconnection**  
75 **at the pole?**

76 A. Yes. The Company is proposing to increase the reconnection charge at the pole during  
77 normal office hours from \$89.00 to \$125.00. The cost for performing this work is more  
78 than \$140.00 and in 2005 the Company completed 61 pole reconnections during normal  
79 office hours. The Company is also proposing to increase the charge for pole reconnection  
80 during All Other Times from the current \$107.00 to \$250.00. The cost for performing  
81 this work after hours is more than \$260.00 and the Company completed 9 pole  
82 reconnections in 2005 after normal business hours.

83 **Q. What other changes to Reconnection Charges are being proposed?**

84 A. As shown in Exhibit UP&L\_\_(CAR-1) (page 300.2), the Company is proposing to  
85 change the Reconnection Charge assessed non-residential customers to Actual Cost But  
86 Not Less Than \$30.00 from the current Actual Cost But Not Less Than \$25.00. The  
87 purpose of this change is to update Schedule No. 300 to be consistent with the \$30.00  
88 Normal Business Hours Reconnection Charge for residential customers. There are only a  
89 few instances a year where non-residential service is disconnected/reconnected due to a  
90 default by the customer. The proposed change is housekeeping in nature.

91 **Increase in Returned Check Charge**

92 **Q. Please describe the Company's proposal regarding an increase in the Returned**  
93 **Check Charge.**

94 A. As shown in Exhibit UP&L\_\_\_(CAR-1) (page 300.1), the Company is proposing to  
95 implement an increase in the current Returned Check Charge from \$15.00 to \$20.00.  
96 This charge is assessed when the customer's payment for services rendered is not honored  
97 by the customer's financial institution. The Company is also proposing to change the  
98 name of this service to "Returned Payment Charge" in order to more generically describe  
99 this charge.

100 **Q. What is the basis for proposing to increase this charge?**

101 A. The Company is proposing to increase this charge to better reflect the cost of processing a  
102 returned item which is estimated to be more than \$23.00.

103 **Q. Is a similar fee in place in the other jurisdictions served by the Company?**

104 A. Yes. A returned payment charge is in effect in all states served by the Company. This  
105 charge was recently increased in Oregon and Idaho to \$20.00 and a \$20.00 charge has  
106 been proposed in California and Washington. In Wyoming this charge is set by State  
107 Law and is currently \$30.00.

108 **Q. How many Returned Payment Charges were assessed last year?**

109 A. In 2005 the Company assessed 14,900 Returned Payment Charges.

110 **Q. Please describe Exhibit UP&L\_\_\_(CAR-2).**

111 A. Exhibit UP&L\_\_\_(CAR-2) contains the Company's proposed revised electric service  
112 regulations in this case.

113 **Line Extension Wording Changes**

114 **Q. Please describe the changes the Company is proposing to Regulation No. 12.**

115 A. As shown in Exhibit UP&L\_\_\_(CAR-2), the Company is proposing several changes to  
116 Regulation No. 12 to improve the clarity of the rule and better describe the application of  
117 the rule. The first change proposed is a clarification in Section 1 to replace the words  
118 “does not include” with “does not apply to” in Section 1(d) (page 12R.2). This proposed  
119 change will more clearly communicate the application of this section of the rule.

120 **Q. Please describe the second proposed change to Regulation No. 12.**

121 A. The second change proposed is removal of the phrase “obtaining rights of way” from  
122 Section 1(f) (page 12R.2) since this is not considered a special requirement and is  
123 addressed under Section 1(j) of Regulation No. 12.

124 **Q. Please describe the third proposed change to Regulation No. 12.**

125 A. In Section 1(j) (page 12R.3) entitled “Routes, Easements and Rights-of-Way” the  
126 Company is proposing clarifying language to reflect the Company’s practice of requiring  
127 Applicants to obtain rights-of-ways, along with the necessary signature(s) for any rights-  
128 of-ways. The proposed change also clarifies that rights-of-ways will be obtained on  
129 Company forms which will ensure that adequate rights are obtained. The option for the  
130 Applicant to request assistance from the Company to obtain a right-of-way remains, but  
131 the proposed language makes it clear that the responsibility to obtain the right-of-way  
132 rests with the Applicant.

133 **Q. Please describe the fourth proposed change to Regulation No. 12.**

134 A. In Section 5(a)(1) (page 12R.9), entitled “Applicant Built Line Extensions,” the Company  
135 is proposing language that will clarify the scope of this rule to indicate this provision only

136 applies to new construction and is not available for relocations, conversions from  
137 overhead to underground, changing from single-phase to three-phase or increasing the  
138 capacity of facilities. Working in close proximity to energized power lines is a clear  
139 safety risk and there is a higher potential for problems to arise while working on existing  
140 facilities. There are also work coordination issues, and the concern about maintaining  
141 service to existing Customers that limit Applicant Built Line Extensions to new  
142 construction only. The proposed change makes the rule clear as to its intended  
143 application.

144 **Q. Please describe the fifth proposed change to Regulation No. 12.**

145 A. In Section 6(a) (page 12R.13) entitled “Relocation of Facilities” the proposed change  
146 requires the Customer requesting the relocation to provide necessary easements. Some  
147 relocations are made within public utility or franchise easements and do not require  
148 additional easements. Other times the Company is asked to move a line to a location  
149 where there is not an easement or the easement is insufficient. The proposed change  
150 would add language to clarify that the Customer is responsible for providing easements  
151 for a relocation much the same way they are required to provide easements for a line  
152 extension. Another clarification is added in the second paragraph (page 12R.14) that  
153 defines “overhead to underground relocations” as “conversions.”

154 **Q. Do any of the above changes to Regulation No. 12 significantly modify the**  
155 **application of the existing regulation?**

156 A. No. The proposed changes help clarify the regulation and better communicate  
157 longstanding Company practice.

158 **Housekeeping Changes**

159 **Q. Is the Company proposing any other housekeeping changes?**

160 A. Yes. Housekeeping changes are proposed to correct wording in Regulation No. 2 to  
161 change the word “of” to “or” in the Extension definition (page 2R.2) and change the word  
162 “isolate” to “isolated” in the Remote Service definition (page 2R.4).

163 **Revenue Requirement Impact of Proposed Changes**

164 **Q. If the Commission approved the Company’s proposed changes to Schedule 300 as**  
165 **outlined above, what would be the increase in revenues to the Company and how**  
166 **would the Company propose to treat the increase in revenues?**

167 A. If the Commission approved the proposed changes to Schedule 300 described above, the  
168 increase in revenues to the Company would be approximately \$192,000. The increased  
169 revenues could be treated as an offset to revenue requirement.

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

171 A. Yes.