

1 **Q. Please state your name, business address with PacifiCorp dba Rocky**
2 **Mountain Power.**

3 A. My name is Steven R. McDougal and my business address is 201 South Main,
4 Suite 2300, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84111.

5 **Q. Are you the same Steven R. McDougal that previously provided pre-filed**
6 **direct testimony in this proceeding?**

7 A. Yes.

8 **Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental direct testimony?**

9 A. My supplemental direct testimony explains revisions made to the Company's
10 filing as a result of the Utah Commission's order issued February 18, 2010, in
11 Docket No. 09-035-23, and the revised revenue requirement increase the
12 Company is now seeking to defer for later recovery.

13 **Q. What changes were made to the Company's filing in this Docket as a result of**
14 **the Utah Commission order in Docket No. 09-035-23?**

15 A. The Company has updated the base case in this filing to comport with the final
16 revenue requirement approved by the Commission in Docket No. 09-035-23, and
17 has recalculated the incremental revenue requirement impact of the two major
18 plant additions identified in this filing. As I described in my direct testimony, a
19 base period is needed as the starting point from which to calculate the incremental
20 impacts of the individual plant additions, and at the time this case was filed the
21 Company's rebuttal testimony in Docket No. 09-035-23 was the most current
22 filing by the Company for which complete model runs were available. Exhibit
23 RMP___(SRM-1S) summarizes the revised revenue increase calculation in the

24 Company's supplemental filing. Due to the revisions to the base case the
25 Company is now seeking to defer an overall revenue requirement increase of
26 \$33.0 million.

27 **Q. Were any changes made to the individual revenue requirement adjustments**
28 **for the two major plant additions in the Company's filing?**

29 A. No. Exhibit RMP___(SRM-1S) details the incremental adjustments to revenue
30 requirement for each of the major plant additions in this case. The various
31 components of these incremental adjustments have not changed from the
32 Company's original filing. The net impact of each adjustment has changed due to
33 the updated base case, with the only significant change related to the updated cost
34 of capital.

35 Consistent with the Company's original filing and the Commission's order
36 approving the revenue requirement in Docket No. 09-035-23, I have computed the
37 Utah allocated revenue requirement for each project using Rolled In multiplied by
38 101 percent. The starting column uses Rolled In from the rate case, prior to the
39 price increase. I have included with my supplemental testimony an updated
40 jurisdictional allocation model (JAM) which includes the revised base case and
41 incremental impact of each major project.

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

43 A. Yes.