

1 **BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**
2 **OF OREGON**
3 **UM 1209**

4 In the Matter of

5 MIDAMERICAN ENERGY HOLDINGS
6 COMPANY

7 Application for Authorization to Acquire
8 Pacific Power & Light, dba PacifiCorp

STAFF'S RESPONSE TO THE COMMISSION'S
BENCH REQUEST

9 **INTRODUCTION**

10 On December 23, 2005, a Stipulation and supporting testimony were filed by the
11 stipulating parties that concluded that MidAmerican Energy Holding Company ("MEHC") had
12 satisfied the approval standard found in ORS 757.511. On January 18, 2006, the Public Utility
13 Commission of Oregon ("Commission") issued a bench request that requested a brief from each
14 stipulating party. Specifically, the Commission requests that the stipulating parties supplement
15 the joint supporting testimony by delineating the mitigating measures in the Stipulation that
16 eliminate or reduce potential harms that were identified in the parties' opening comments and
17 testimony. Furthermore, the Commission requests that the stipulating parties identify those
18 commitments that they view as benefits of the transaction.

19 In Order No. 01-778, the Commission determined that the approval standard found in
20 ORS 757.511 requires a two step analysis which is that there will be: 1) a net benefit for the
21 utility's customers and 2) that the transaction will not harm Oregon citizens as a whole. *See*
22 Order No. 01-778 at 11. In describing the meaning of the net benefits standard, the Commission
23 also made clear that the determination of net benefits is not rigid and inflexible nor necessarily
24 reducible to economic considerations but, instead, one applied on a case by case basis. *Id.*

25 Consistent with the Commission's decision on the approval standard, the Public Utility
26 Commission of Oregon ("Staff") believes that the Stipulation provides net benefits to

1 PacifiCorp’s customers and, furthermore, does not harm the Oregon public as a whole. Staff
2 takes the opportunity presented by the Commission’s recent bench request to further, and more
3 specifically, outline its support for approval of the Stipulation.

4 The bench requests specifically requests that this brief outline its support for the
5 stipulation based upon Staff’s opening comments and testimony. Administrative Law Judge
6 Smith’s Issues List identified the following subjects of concern:

- 7 1. Infrastructure and Resource Investments
 - 8 a. Transmission and Resource Investments
 - 9 i. Effect on Oregon ratepayers
 - 10 ii. Proposed annual four percent rate increase
 - 11 iii. Relationship with public power entities
 - 12 b. Renewable Resources and Energy Efficiency
 - 13 i. Commitment to renewable resources
 - 14 ii. Effect on emissions
 - 15 iii. Community renewable energy projects
 - 16 iv. Proposed Demand Side Management study
- 17 2. Financial Stability
 - 18 a. Effect of MEHC ownership on credit ratings and cost of debt
 - 19 b. Acknowledgment and ability to pay possible liabilities pursuant to FERC
20 relicensing of hydroelectric projects owned by PacifiCorp
 - 21 c. Effect of MEHC proposal on corporate overhead charges
- 22 3. Customer Service
 - 23 a. Service Quality Measures
 - 24 b. Other customer guarantees
 - 25 c. Assistance to low-income customers
 - 26 d. Public purpose funding under SB 1149
- 27 4. Holding Company
 - 28 a. Access to information in Oregon, especially in light of PUHCA repeal.
 - 29 b. Effect of debt or acquisition premium on PacifiCorp finances
 - 30 c. Ability of OPUC to regulate Oregon portion of a multi-state utility
- 31 5. Other Effects of the Proposed MEHC Transaction
 - 32 a. Relocation of headquarters or personnel
 - 33 b. Effect of Berkshire Hathaway’s influence on PacifiCorp
 - 34 c. Effect of MEHC and related companies’ business models on PacifiCorp
 - 35 d. Management of hydroelectric resources

1 To the extent that Staff’s opening comments and testimony discuss issues contained on the Issues
2 List, Staff will follow the order outlined by that list.

3 **DISCUSSION**

4 1. Infrastructure and Resource Investments

5 a. Transmission and Resource Investments

6 Staff did not raise a lack of willingness to invest in infrastructure and resource
7 investments as a major concern in this case. Contrarily, Staff argued that both ScottishPower
8 and MEHC would be expected to make prudent decisions in transmission and resources.

9 According to Commitments 34 and 35, MEHC and PacifiCorp have identified
10 transmission and reliability related projects that they believe will provide a benefit to
11 PacifiCorp’s customers. Specifically, these transmission projects involve the potential upgrades
12 to Path C Upgrade, Mona – Oquirrh, and Walla Walla – Yakima or Mid-C.

13 From Staff’s perspective and as noted in its opening testimony, it is important to compare
14 the proposed transaction to continued prudent and well-managed operation of PacifiCorp. *See*
15 *Staff/100, Conway/21, lines 8-11.* In this context, Staff concluded that Commitments 34 and 35
16 will not harm PacifiCorp’s customers because of the inclusion of Oregon Commitment 34 and
17 paragraph 22 of the Stipulation, which make it clear that the transmission commitments are being
18 made by, and are only binding upon, MEHC and PacifiCorp. Furthermore, through Oregon
19 Commitment 34 and paragraph 22 of the Stipulation, Staff has reserved its ability to argue such
20 things as the prudence, just and reasonable character and appropriate ratemaking treatment of
21 these proposed projects in future proceedings. With these reservations of rights and the fact that
22 the transmission commitments only bind MEHC and PacifiCorp, PacifiCorp’s customers are not
23 harmed.

24 While Staff did not consider it an explicit benefit, the willingness of MEHC to invest in
25 these projects and the stated hesitancy of PacifiCorp to invest could be considered an incremental
26 benefit if the transmission projects are fulfilled and result in cost-effective, prudent management

1 of the utility. *See generally* Staff/100, Conway/21, line 18 through Staff/100, Conway/28, line 5.
2 For purposes of analyzing the Stipulation, Staff did not consider the transmission commitments
3 as a benefit because there was no indication that ScottishPower would not also pursue
4 cost-effective transmission projects.

5 2a. Financial Stability

6 In Staff’s opening testimony, it outlined potential harms of the transaction related to debt
7 or leverage at MEHC, its effect on PacifiCorp’s credit ratings and the resulting increase in
8 PacifiCorp’s cost of debt. These concerns were increased due to a weaker credit rating at MEHC
9 as compared to ScottishPower. In order to address these concerns, Staff recommended improved
10 ring fencing and credit support for PacifiCorp.

11 2a(i). Ring fencing

12 In response, the Stipulation contains numerous commitments that mitigate these potential
13 harms, including commitments 11, 15, 18, 21, and Oregon 14 through Oregon 18.¹ Taken
14 together, these commitments work to mitigate the potential financial harms that Staff identified
15 in its opening testimony related to this transaction.

16 Commitment 11(b) provides that the ring-fencing provisions found in Appendix 1 will be
17 put in place for PPW Holdings LLC. In addition, Commitment 15 requires MEHC and
18 PacifiCorp to maintain separate debt and preferred stock, if any, while also providing that
19 PacifiCorp will maintain its own corporate credit rating. These ring fencing provisions are
20 expected to result in credit agencies relying on PacifiCorp’s stand alone credit metrics.
21 PacifiCorp’s stand alone metrics would justify a notch higher debt rating than those of MEHC
22 and, therefore, help to limit a potential downgrade.

23

24 _____
25 ¹ For example, Commitment 11(b) was added to specify which ring fencing provisions will be
26 implemented; Commitment 15 was amended and clarified to require PacifiCorp to keep its own
debt rating from, at a minimum, both S&P and Moodys; Commitment 18 was added in response
to Staff’s opening testimony and increases the minimum equity requirement, incorporates short-
term debt, and specifies the treatment of existing preferred stock; and Commitment 21, when
viewed in combination with O14, provides additional protection against a higher cost of capital.

1 A further benefit of the ring fencing provisions included in the stipulation is that they are
2 expected to prevent PacifiCorp from being drawn, involuntarily, into a MEHC bankruptcy.
3 While Staff did not specifically raise the possibility of MEHC filing for bankruptcy, recent
4 history has demonstrated that unexpected events can quickly lead to seemingly healthy
5 companies filing for bankruptcy. This benefit is bolstered by Commitment 17, which requires a
6 non-consolidation opinion. A non-consolidation opinion is a formal legal opinion that states that
7 the ring fencing provisions are sufficient to prevent a bankruptcy court from “pulling”
8 PacifiCorp into an MEHC bankruptcy. While this particular commitment can be viewed as
9 mitigation against a MEHC bankruptcy, Staff notes that it did not identify in its opening
10 testimony a MEHC bankruptcy as a potential of this transaction. In that context, some may view
11 this additional protection as an incremental benefit beyond the identified potential harms. This
12 view is supported by the fact that PacifiCorp does not have a non-consolidated opinion. Staff
13 does not believe that PacifiCorp would be able to obtain a non-consolidation opinion based on its
14 current ring fencing.

15 Oregon Commitment 18 provides additional protection in that MEHC and PacifiCorp
16 have agreed not to make any dividends to PPW Holdings LLC or MEHC if PacifiCorp’s
17 unsecured debt rating reaches certain listed ratings, which would keep equity at PacifiCorp under
18 those described situations. No such provision currently exists for PacifiCorp.

19 2a(ii). Credit Support

20 MEHC has provided credit support by increasing the minimum level of common equity
21 in PacifiCorp’s capital structure that must be maintained if dividends are to be paid; agreeing to
22 include debt issued by the intermediate holding company in the calculation of PacifiCorp’s
23 minimum equity requirement, and agreeing to prohibitions on dividends in the event
24 PacifiCorp’s ratings fall below listed levels, no matter what the level of common equity. These
25 commitments are considered ring fencing, but also provide credit support. These commitments
26

1 are Commitment 18 and O15 and were negotiated in response to concerns Staff raised in its
2 opening testimony.

3 2a(iii). Additional protection against potential increases in the cost of debt.

4 Staff believes the ring fencing and credit support have decreased the probability of a
5 downgrade due to MEHC's ownership, but nonetheless obtained protections in the unlikely event
6 of a downgrade. Oregon Commitment 14 provides mitigation against possible harm by
7 establishing a known and measurable reduction to the cost of debt if two or more rating agencies
8 lower PacifiCorp's senior long-term debt within 12 months of Commission approval of the
9 transaction. A further protection is provided by Commitment 21 which offers some mitigation of
10 potential harm by providing that MEHC and PacifiCorp will not advocate for a higher cost of
11 capital than would have been absent MEHC's ownership. This commitment would allow the
12 Commission to reduce PacifiCorp's cost of capital in the event it is higher due to MEHC's
13 ownership. These commitments were negotiated in response to concerns Staff raised in its
14 opening testimony.

15 2b. Effect of MEHC proposal on corporate overhead charges

16 Staff addressed two major concerns under this general heading. These concerns were an
17 expected increase in costs for PacifiCorp due to changes in its net cross charges and the lack of a
18 comparable insurance captive. In both cases, the commitments related to these areas were
19 negotiated in response to concerns Staff raised in its opening testimony.

20 2b(i). Net Cross Charges

21 Staff raised a concern and demonstrated that PacifiCorp should expect increased costs
22 due to changes in net cross charges. Staff calculated that \$7.3 million was the current cross-
23 charge cost to PacifiCorp from Scottish Power.

24 These concerns were mitigated by Commitments O9 and O11. Specifically these
25 commitments required:

26 a. Customers to be held harmless for increases in management fees, which were
calculated by Staff at \$1.5 million (total company).

- 1 b. Corporate allocations from MEHC to PacifiCorp included in PacifiCorp's rates
will be \$7.3 million or less.
- 2 c. Customers to be held harmless for increases in costs resulting from PacifiCorp
3 corporate costs previously billed to PPM Energy and other affiliates of
PacifiCorp. Staff valued these costs at \$7.9 million annually (total company).
- 4 d. If the above is not achieved, customers could receive rate credits up to \$1.5
5 million (total company) for the management fee and \$7.9 million (total company)
annually for the costs previously incurred by affiliates.

6 2b(ii). Lack of a Captive

7 Staff raised a concern and demonstrated that PacifiCorp should expect increased
8 insurance costs (or increases in uninsured losses) due to the inability to participate in
9 ScottishPower's captive insurance (Dornoch), should the transaction close.

10 These concerns were mitigated by Commitment O10. Specifically, this commitment
11 required:

- 12 a. MEHC to use an existing captive or form a new captive insurance company to
13 provide certain insurance coverage for PacifiCorp's operations. The cost of
forming the captive would not be reflected in regulated accounts.
- 14 b. The captive would be comparable in costs for equivalent coverage previously
provided by PacifiCorp's existing captive.
- 15 c. That premium costs would be capped at the current captive costs of \$7.4 million
16 (total company) until December 31, 2010.
- 17 d. If this \$7.4 million cost is exceeded, MEHC would provide rate credits up to \$4.3
million (total company) annually.

18 3. Customer Service

19 Staff did not raise customer service as a major concern. Staff noted that the existing
20 service quality measures were already in place for approximately nine more years through a
21 stipulation reached in UE 147. Further Staff observed that PacifiCorp had opted to continue
22 customer guarantees on its own accord presumably because it was beneficial to its shareholders.
23 Nonetheless, MEHC has committed to extend the customer guarantees through 2011. (*See*
24 Commitments 1 and 45.)

25 ///

26 ///

1 4. Holding Company

2 4a. Access to information in Oregon, especially in light of PUHCA repeal.

3 Staff concerns regarding access to information in Oregon, were mitigated by

4 Commitments 4, 5, 6, 17, O1 and O5. These commitments help ensure access to MEHC's and
5 Berkshire Hathaway's books and records and require retention of certain information. Further,
6 O1 outlines a dispute resolution process in the event there is a disagreement regarding discovery.

7 In addition to concerns over access to information, Staff raised concerns regarding the
8 effects of Berkshire Hathaway's influence on PacifiCorp. *See* Staff/100, Conway/40, line 7
9 through Staff/100, Conway/43, line 2. These identified concerns were mitigated when MEHC
10 filed an amended application that added Berkshire Hathaway as an applicant and included the
11 sworn statements of Warren Buffet and Walter Scott Jr., which limit their influence over
12 PacifiCorp's activities and operations.

13 The filed sworn statements provide that neither Warren Buffet nor Walter Scott Jr. will
14 exercise any control, directly or indirectly, on matters that pertain to PacifiCorp, except for
15 matters related to PacifiCorp that are ministerial in nature. The sworn statements also provide
16 that Warren Buffet and Walter Scott Jr. will recuse themselves from voting as MEHC or
17 Berkshire Hathaway directors on MEHC or Berkshire Hathaway Board of Directors matters
18 concerning PacifiCorp activities or operations. Additionally, the sworn statements provide that
19 any future transfer of the shares, if Warren Buffet and Walter Scott Jr. have knowledge that the
20 transferee would own 5% or more of the voting interests of MEHC or Berkshire Hathaway after
21 such transfer, will require an agreement by the transferee to abide by the same limitations as
22 Warren Buffet and Walter Scott Jr. have agreed to in the sworn statements. The addition of
23 Berkshire Hathaway as an applicant along with the sworn statements of Warren Buffet and
24 Walter Scott Jr. mitigated Staff's identified harms related to influence over PacifiCorp's
25 operations and activities.

26 ///

1 4b. Effect of debt or acquisition premium on PacifiCorp finances

2 Staff concerns regarding the acquisition premium on PacifiCorp's finances is mitigated
3 by Commitment O13 and Staff's belief that the Commission will never recognize goodwill for
4 ratemaking purposes. Commitment O13 identifies the circumstances that must exist before
5 MEHC can request that the Order resulting from UM 1209 be modified. The Commission is not
6 required to grant the request and is not required to allow goodwill in rates. Staff opposes the
7 inclusion of goodwill, now and in the future, in customer rates. Because the exclusion of
8 goodwill from customer rates was essential to Staff's finding of net benefits, it is highly unlikely
9 that there will exist circumstances such that the order should be modified to allow the recovery
10 of goodwill. As discussed in the joint testimony, benefits are expected and therefore cannot be
11 used as a rationale to include goodwill in rates. *See Joint/100, Joint/24, lines 18-23.*

12 5. Other Effects of the Proposed MEHC Transaction

13 5a. Relocation of headquarters or personnel

14 Staff did not raise the relocation of headquarters as a major concern in this transaction.
15 However, Staff concerns regarding the relocation of headquarters and key staff to Utah is
16 mitigated by Commitment 47. This commitment requires adequate staffing and presence in each
17 state, including Oregon. This commitment does not currently exist for PacifiCorp while the Utah
18 pressures to relocate staff to Salt Lake, which Staff understands are related to Utah's increasing
19 percentage of PacifiCorp's load, are independent of this transaction.

20 5b. Other benefits

21 MEHC provides two commitments that Staff views as a benefit that is not directly tied to
22 any harm. First, Commitment O12 has MEHC committing to A&G reductions. These A&G
23 reductions are guaranteed and not present with any existing PacifiCorp commitment. Further,
24 the A&G savings commence, in full, immediately with the beginning of the first month
25 following closing. Second, through Commitment O8, MEHC commits to reducing the costs
26 associated with West Valley. There are no plans for such a reduction in West Valley contract

1 costs absent this MEHC transaction. To capture these savings before the next rate change, the
2 benefits of both of these commitments are deferred for the benefit of customers.

3 In addition, many of the other commitments and portions of the Stipulation could be
4 viewed as additional benefits. For example: Section 15(d) provides that MEHC and PacifiCorp
5 will work with ICNU to develop service quality standards for high-tech industrial customers;
6 Commitment O22 increases the minimum level of shareholder matching contributions for low
7 income assistance; Commitment O25 provides that MEHC and PacifiCorp will have 400 MW of
8 cost-effective new renewable resources in PacifiCorp's generation portfolio by the end of 2007;
9 and Commitment 40 reaffirms PacifiCorp's commitment to acquire 1400 MW of new
10 cost-effective renewable resources, while also committing to bring at least 100 MW of
11 cost-effective wind resources into service within one year of the close of the transaction.
12 Importantly, Staff does not view these commitments as mitigating harm nor does Staff believe
13 that these commitments harm the Oregon public as a whole. As a result, Staff views these
14 commitments as benefits that are targeted at a subset of customers or designed to guarantee the
15 performance we expect from a well-managed utility. While Staff viewed these additional
16 commitments as targeted benefits, it did not rely on them to conclude that the transaction
17 provided net benefits. Rather, Staff concluded that the other commitments discussed herein
18 resulted in net benefits and that these additional commitments could be viewed as targeted
19 benefits for a subset of customers or to guarantee performance.

20 CONCLUSION

21 While it is impossible to identify every potential harm that may exist in the future, Staff
22 is comfortable that the harms that it has identified in its opening testimony related to this
23 particular transaction have been mitigated to the extent that, when considered within the context
24 of the overall Stipulation, the commitments protect PacifiCorp's customers from harm and meet
25 the approval standard of ORS 757.511. Specifically, the Stipulation as a whole substantially
26 mitigates the potential harms that Staff identified while also providing benefits. In combining

1 the commitments that mitigate potential harm and those commitments that provide benefits,
2 overall the Stipulation is expected to provide “net” benefits to PacifiCorp’s customers. At the
3 same time, the Stipulation does not harm the Oregon public as a whole. As a result, the
4 Stipulation meets the approval standard as outlined in Order No. 01-778 and should be approved.

5 DATED this 6th day of February 2006.

6 Respectfully submitted,

7
8 HARDY MYERS
9 Attorney General

10 /s/ Jason W. Jones _____
11 Michael T. Weirich, #82425
12 Jason W. Jones, #00059
13 Assistant Attorney General
14 Of Attorneys for the Public Utility Commission
15 of Oregon
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on February 6, 2006, I served the foregoing upon the parties hereto by electronic mail, and by sending a true, exact and full copy by regular postage prepaid mail, to the parties accepting paper service, or by hand delivery/shuttle mail to:

NW ENERGY COALITION 219 FIRST ST STE 100 SEATTLE WA 98104 steve@nwenergy.org	RATES & REGULATORY AFFAIRS PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC RATES & REGULATORY AFFAIRS 121 SW SALMON STREET, 1WTC0702 PORTLAND OR 97204 pge.opuc.filings@pgn.com
UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA PO BOX 37 SAN CLEMENTE CA 92674-0037 uwua@redhabanero.com	JIM ABRAHAMSON -- CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNITY ACTION DIRECTORS OF OREGON PO BOX 7964 SALEM OR 97303-0208 jim@cado-oregon.org
DOUGLAS L ANDERSON MIDAMERICAN ENERGY HOLDINGS CO 302 S 36 ST STE 400 OMAHA NE 68131 danderson@midamerican.com	SUSAN ANDERSON CITY OF PORTLAND OFFICE OF SUSTAINABLE DEV 721 NW 9TH AVE -- SUITE 350 PORTLAND OR 97209-3447 susananderson@ci.portland.or.us
ADAM S ARMS -- CONFIDENTIAL MCKANNA BISHOP JOFFE & SULLIVAN LLP 1635 NW JOHNSON ST PORTLAND OR 97209 aarms@mbjlaw.com	EDWARD BARTELL KLAMATH OFF-PROJECT WATER USERS INC 30474 SPRAGUE RIVER ROAD SPRAGUE RIVER OR 97639
CURTIS G BERKEY ALEXANDER, BERKEY, WILLIAMS & WEATHERS 2000 CENTER STREET, SUITE 308 BERKELEY CA 94704 cberkey@abwwlaw.com	CHARLTON H BONHAM TROUT UNLIMITED 828 SAN PABLO AVE SUITE 208 ALBANY CA 94706 cbonham@tu.org
MAGGIE BRILZ IDAHO POWER COMPANY PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 mbrilz@idahopower.com	LOWREY R BROWN -- CONFIDENTIAL CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON 610 SW BROADWAY, SUITE 308 PORTLAND OR 97205 lowrey@oregoncub.org
JOANNE M BUTLER IDAHO POWER COMPANY PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 jbutler@idahopower.com	D KEVIN CARLSON - CONFIDENTIAL DEPT OF JUSTICE - GENERAL COUNSEL DIVISION 1162 COURT ST NE SALEM OR 97301-4096 d.carlson@doj.state.or.us

1	PHIL CARVER -- CONFIDENTIAL OREGON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY 625 MARION ST NE STE 1 SALEM OR 97301-3742 philip.h.carver@state.or.us	RALPH CAVANAGH -- CONFIDENTIAL NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL 111 SUTTER ST FL 20 SAN FRANCISCO CA 94104 rcavanagh@nrdc.org
2		
3	BRYAN CONWAY PO BOX 2148 SALEM OR 97309-2148 bryan.conway@state.or.us	JOHN CORBETT YUROK TRIBE PO BOX 1027 KLAMATH CA 95548 jcorbett@yuroktribe.nsn.us
4		
5		
6	JOAN COTE -- CONFIDENTIAL OREGON ENERGY COORDINATORS ASSOCIATION 2585 STATE ST NE SALEM OR 97301 cotej@mwvcaa.org	CHRIS CREAM -- CONFIDENTIAL MULTNOMAH COUNTY 501 SE HAWTHORNE, SUITE 500 PORTLAND OR 97214 christopher.d.cream@co.multnomah.or.us
7		
8		
9	MELINDA J DAVISON -- CONFIDENTIAL DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC 333 SW TAYLOR, STE. 400 PORTLAND OR 97204 mail@dvclaw.com	ROBERT DENHAM MUNGER TOLLES & OLSEN LLP 355 SOUTH GRAND AVE – 35 TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES CA 90071 robert.denham@mto.com
10		
11		
12	MICHAEL EARLY INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS / NORTHWEST UTILITIES 333 SW TAYLOR STE 400 PORTLAND OR 97204 mearly@icnu.org	JASON EISDORFER -- CONFIDENTIAL CITIZENS' UTILITY BOARD OF OREGON 610 SW BROADWAY STE 308 PORTLAND OR 97205 jason@oregoncub.org
13		
14	ANN L FISHER AF LEGAL & CONSULTING SERVICES 2005 SW 71ST AVE PORTLAND OR 97225-3705 energlaw@aol.com	ANDREA FOGUE LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES PO BOX 928 1201 COURT ST NE STE 200 SALEM OR 97308 afogue@orcities.org
15		
16		
17	JOHN R GALE IDAHO POWER COMPANY PO BOX 70 BOISE ID 83707-0070 rgale@idahopower.com	BERNARDO R GARCIA UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA 215 AVENDIA DEL MAR, SUITE M SAN CLEMENTE CA 92672 uwua@redhabanero.com
18		
19		
20	JESSICA GORHAM ATER WYNNE LLP 222 SW COLUMBIA STE 1800 PORTLAND OR 97201 jac@aterwynne.com	ANN ENGLISH GRAVATT -- CONFIDENTIAL RENEWABLE NORTHWEST PROJECT 917 SW OAK - STE 303 PORTLAND OR 97205 ann@rnp.org
21		
22		
23	DAVID E HAMILTON NORRIS & STEVENS 621 SW MORRISON ST STE 800 PORTLAND OR 97205-3825 davidh@norrstev.com	NANCY HARPER IBEW, LOCAL 125 17200 NE SACRAMENTO GRESHAM OR 97230 nancy@ibew125.com
24		
25		
26		

1	BRIAN JOHNSON -- CONFIDENTIAL TROUT UNLIMITED 825 SAN PABLO AVE	ANDREA L KELLY PACIFICORP 825 NE MULTNOMAH ST STE 800
2	SUITE 208 ALBANY CA 94706	PORTLAND OR 97232 andrea.kelly@pacificorp.com
3	bjohnson@tu.org	
4	BARTON L KLINE -- CONFIDENTIAL IDAHO POWER COMPANY PO BOX 70	KAITLIN LOVELL -- CONFIDENTIAL TROUT UNLIMITED 213 SW ASH ST, SUITE 205
5	BOISE ID 83707-0070	PORTLAND OR 97204
6	bkline@idahopower.com	klovell@tu.org
7	KATHERINE A MCDOWELL -- CONFIDENTIAL STOEL RIVES LLP 900 SW FIFTH AVE STE 1600	DANIEL W MEEK DANIEL W MEEK ATTORNEY AT LAW 10949 SW 4TH AVE
8	PORTLAND OR 97204-1268	PORTLAND OR 97219
9	kamcdowell@stoel.com	dan@meek.net
10	WILLIAM MILLER -- CONFIDENTIAL IBEW, LOCAL 125 17200 NE SACRAMENTO	MARK C MOENCH MIDAMERICAN ENERGY HOLDINGS COMPANY 201 SOUTH MAIN ST, STE 2300
11	GRESHAM OR 97230	SALT LAKE CITY UT 84111
	bill@ibew125.com	mcmoench@midamerican.com
12	CHRISTY MONSON LEAGUE OF OREGON CITIES 1201 COURT ST. NE STE. 200	BARBARA LEE NORMAN -- CONFIDENTIAL KARUK TRIBE OF CALIFORNIA PO BOX 657
13	SALEM OR 97301	YREKA OR 96097
14	cmonson@orcities.org	bnorman@karuk.us
15	MICHAEL W ORCUTT HOOPA VALLEY TRIBE FISHERIES DEPT PO BOX 417	MATTHEW W PERKINS -- CONFIDENTIAL DAVISON VAN CLEVE PC 333 SW TAYLOR, STE 400
16	HOOPA CA 95546	PORTLAND OR 97204
17	director@pcweb.net	mwp@dvclaw.com
18	JANET L PREWITT -- CONFIDENTIAL DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE 1162 COURT ST NE	LISA F RACKNER -- CONFIDENTIAL ATER WYNNE LLP 222 SW COLUMBIA ST STE 1800
19	SALEM OR 97301-4096	PORTLAND OR 97201-6618
	janet.prewitt@doj.state.or.us	lfr@aterwynne.com
20	PETER J RICHARDSON RICHARDSON & O'LEARY PO BOX 7218	STEVE ROTHERT -- CONFIDENTIAL AMERICAN RIVERS 409 SPRING ST, SUITE D
21	BOISE ID 83707	NEVADA CITY CA 95959
22	peter@richardsonandoleary.com	srothert@americanrivers.org
23	GREGORY W SAID IDAHO POWER COMPANY PO BOX 70	THOMAS P SCHLOSSER -- CONFIDENTIAL MORISSET, SCHLOSSER, JOZWIAK & MCGAW 801 SECOND AVE, SUITE 1115
24	BOISE ID 83707	SEATTLE WA 98104-1509
25	gsaid@idahopower.com	t.schlosser@msaj.com
26		

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

<p>ROB ROY SMITH -- CONFIDENTIAL MORISSET, SCHLOSSER, JOZWIAK & MCGAW 1115 NORTON BUILDING 801 SECOND AVENUE SEATTLE WA 98104-1509 r.smith@msaj.com</p>	<p>THANE SOMERVILLE -- CONFIDENTIAL MORISSET, SCHLOSSER, JOZWAIK & MCGAW 801 SECOND AVE, SUITE 1115 SEATTLE WA 98104-1509 t.somerville@msaj.com</p>
<p>GLEN H SPAIN -- CONFIDENTIAL PACIFIC COAST FEDERATION OF FISHERMEN'S ASSOC PO BOX 11170 EUGENE OR 97440-3370 fish1ifr@aol.com</p>	<p>JOHN W STEPHENS -- CONFIDENTIAL ESLER STEPHENS & BUCKLEY 888 SW FIFTH AVE STE 700 PORTLAND OR 97204-2021 stephens@eslerstephens.com</p>
<p>MARK THOMPSON PUBLIC POWER COUNCIL 1500 NE IRVING STREET, SUITE 200 PORTLAND OR 97232 mthompson@ppcpdx.org</p>	<p>DOUGLAS C TINGEY PORTLAND GENERAL ELECTRIC 121 SW SALMON 1WTC13 PORTLAND OR 97204 doug.tingey@pgn.com</p>
<p>SANDI R TRIPP -- CONFIDENTIAL KARUK TRIBE DEPT. OF NATURAL RESOURCES PO BOX 1016 HAPPY CAMP CA 95546 stripp@karuk.us</p>	<p>BENJAMIN WALTERS -- CONFIDENTIAL CITY OF PORTAND - OFFICE OF CITY ATTORNEY 1221 SW 4TH AVE - RM 430 PORTLAND OR 97204 bwalters@ci.portland.or.us</p>
<p>STEVEN WEISS NORTHWEST ENERGY COALITION 4422 OREGON TRAIL CT NE SALEM OR 97305 weiss.steve@comcast.net</p>	<p>LINDA K WILLIAMS KAFOURY & MCDUGAL 10266 SW LANCASTER RD PORTLAND OR 97219-6305 linda@lindawilliams.net</p>
<p>PAUL WOODIN WESTERN WIND POWER 282 LARGENT LN GOLDENDALE WA 98620-3519 pwoodin@gorge.net</p>	

Neoma Lane
Neoma Lane
Legal Secretary
Department of Justice
Regulated Utility & Business Section