



825 NE Multnomah, Suite 2000
Portland, Oregon 97232

May 21, 2019

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Public Utility Commission of Oregon
201 High Street SE, Suite 100
Salem, OR 97301-1166

Attn: Filing Center

Re: UE 356 – Errata Filing

PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power hereby submits the attached Errata to the Direct Testimony (PAC/100) of Mr. Michael G. Wilding in the above-referenced docket.

This Errata corrects Mr. Wilding's testimony on page Wilding/17, lines 4 through 6, by removing the sentence indicating the Hunter unit 2 is an EIM participating unit. Hunter Unit 2 continues to be a non-participating resource due to joint ownership of the unit. For convenience, both a red-line and clean version of the corrected testimony are enclosed.

Please direct informal questions to Cathie Allen, Regulatory Affairs Manager, at (503) 813-5934.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Etta Lockey", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Etta Lockey
Vice President, Regulation

Enclosure

ERRATA

Docket No. UE 356

Exhibit PAC/100

Witness: Michael G. Wilding

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
OF OREGON**

PACIFICORP

ERRATA

Direct Testimony of Michael G. Wilding

May 2019

1 **Q. Does the company model coal economic cycling in the 2020 TAM?**

2 A. The company followed the same logic for the economic coal cycling as it did in the
3 2019 TAM which allows Cholla 4 and Hunter 1 to cycle economically during the
4 cycling period from February 1 to May 31 in the 2020 TAM. ~~Hunter unit 2 was
5 previously allowed to cycle but is now an EIM participating unit and therefore not
6 allowed to economically cycle in GRID for purposes of the 2020 TAM.~~

7 **Q. What is the impact of the economic cycling to the 2020 TAM, as compared to the
8 2019 TAM?**

9 A. The economic cycling of coal plants reduced NPC by \$1.5 million on a total-company
10 basis from the 2019 TAM.

11 **Q. Was the Day Ahead/Real Time (DA/RT) adjustment calculated in a manner that
12 is consistent with the 2019 TAM?**

13 A. Yes, the DA/RT adjustment calculated in this filing was calculated with the same
14 methodology that was used in the 2019 TAM.

15 **Q. What is the impact of the DA/RT adjustment to the 2020 TAM, as compared to
16 the 2019 TAM?**

17 A. The DA/RT adjustment in the 2019 TAM is approximately \$0.81 million (total-
18 company) higher than the DA/RT adjustment approved by the Commission in the
19 2019 TAM.

1 **Q. Does the company model coal economic cycling in the 2020 TAM?**

2 A. The company followed the same logic for the economic coal cycling as it did in the
3 2019 TAM which allows Cholla 4 and Hunter 1 to cycle economically during the
4 cycling period from February 1 to May 31 in the 2020 TAM.

5 **Q. What is the impact of the economic cycling to the 2020 TAM, as compared to the**
6 **2019 TAM?**

7 A. The economic cycling of coal plants reduced NPC by \$1.5 million on a total-company
8 basis from the 2019 TAM.

9 **Q. Was the Day Ahead/Real Time (DA/RT) adjustment calculated in a manner that**
10 **is consistent with the 2019 TAM?**

11 A. Yes, the DA/RT adjustment calculated in this filing was calculated with the same
12 methodology that was used in the 2019 TAM.

13 **Q. What is the impact of the DA/RT adjustment to the 2020 TAM, as compared to**
14 **the 2019 TAM?**

15 A. The DA/RT adjustment in the 2019 TAM is approximately \$0.81 million (total-
16 company) higher than the DA/RT adjustment approved by the Commission in the
17 2019 TAM.