Application No. 23-09-___ Exhibit No. PAC/100-C Witness: Ramon J. Mitchell

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICORP 2024 ECAC

Direct Testimony of Ramon J. Mitchell

[PUBLIC VERSION]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS	1
II.	PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY	1
III.	OVERVIEW OF PACIFICORP'S ECAC	2
	A. ECAC Offset Rate	. 3
	B. ECAC Balancing Rate	. 4
	C. ECAC Time Periods	. 5
IV.	OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED RATES	7
V.	2024 PROJECTED NET POWER COSTS	8
VI.	ECAC PROJECTED NPC COMPARISON	10
VII.	SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES AND INFORMATION	12
VIII.	ENERGY IMBALANCE MARKET	17

ATTACHED EXHIBITS

Exhibit PAC/101 – Projected 2024 NPC

Exhibit PAC/102 – Prior ECAC's Projected 2023 NPC

Confidential Exhibit PAC/103 - Projected NPC Comparison to Prior ECAC

Exhibit PAC/104 – 2024 California-allocated NPC

Confidential Exhibit PAC/105 - Coal Cycling Scenarios

Confidential Exhibit PAC/106 – Coal Volumes

1		I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS
2	Q.	Please state your name, business address, and present position with PacifiCorp
3		d/b/a Pacific Power (PacifiCorp or Company).
4	А.	My name is Ramon J. Mitchell and my business address is 825 NE Multnomah Street,
5		Suite 600, Portland, Oregon 97232. My title is Manager, Net Power Costs.
6	Q.	Briefly describe your education and business experience.
7	A.	I received a Master of Business Administration degree from the University of
8		Portland and a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics from Reed College. I was first
9		employed by the Company in 2015 and during my time at the Company I have held
10		various positions in the regulation, merchant, and transmission departments. After a
11		brief departure from the Company, in 2021 I returned to the Company as Manager,
12		Net Power Costs. In my current role I am responsible for leading and overseeing
13		various efforts associated with the Company's net power costs (NPC) filings.
14	Q.	Have you testified in previous regulatory proceedings?
15	A.	Yes. I have previously provided testimony to the California Public Utilities
16		Commission (Commission), as well as commissions in Oregon, Washington, and
17		Wyoming.
18		II. PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY
19	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding.
20	A.	I present an overview of the Company's proposed Energy Cost Adjustment Clause
21		(ECAC) for calendar year 2024 (2024 ECAC). Specifically, my testimony:
22		• Presents an overview of the ECAC and the relevant time periods associated
23		with the ECAC's Offset and Balancing rates;

1		• Describes how the Company calculates 2024 Projected Net Power Costs
2		(NPC) using the Company's production cost model, Aurora;
3		• Presents the 2024 Projected NPC, which are used to develop the 2024 Offset
4		Rate;
5		• Compares the 2024 Projected NPC to the 2023 Projected NPC from the 2023
6		ECAC;
7		• Provides supplemental analyses on three coal cycling scenarios and additional
8		fuel source and generation information; and
9		• Discusses benefits from the Company's participation in the energy imbalance
10		market (EIM) with the California Independent System Operator (CAISO) and
11		that are passed through to customers in each ECAC.
12		III. OVERVIEW OF PACIFICORP'S ECAC
12 13	Q.	III. OVERVIEW OF PACIFICORP'S ECAC What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC?
	Q. A.	
13		What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC?
13 14		What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC? Generally, PacifiCorp's ECAC tariff provides dollar-for-dollar recovery of NPC and
13 14 15		What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC? Generally, PacifiCorp's ECAC tariff provides dollar-for-dollar recovery of NPC and fuel stock carrying charges, and is trued-up monthly for actual NPC compared to
13 14 15 16		What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC? Generally, PacifiCorp's ECAC tariff provides dollar-for-dollar recovery of NPC and fuel stock carrying charges, and is trued-up monthly for actual NPC compared to forecasted NPC that are reflected in current ECAC rates. The ECAC provides
13 14 15 16 17		What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC? Generally, PacifiCorp's ECAC tariff provides dollar-for-dollar recovery of NPC and fuel stock carrying charges, and is trued-up monthly for actual NPC compared to forecasted NPC that are reflected in current ECAC rates. The ECAC provides PacifiCorp the opportunity to recover NPC in a timely and efficient manner, which
 13 14 15 16 17 18 		What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC? Generally, PacifiCorp's ECAC tariff provides dollar-for-dollar recovery of NPC and fuel stock carrying charges, and is trued-up monthly for actual NPC compared to forecasted NPC that are reflected in current ECAC rates. The ECAC provides PacifiCorp the opportunity to recover NPC in a timely and efficient manner, which allows PacifiCorp to continue to provide adequate, safe, and reliable service to its
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 	A.	What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC? Generally, PacifiCorp's ECAC tariff provides dollar-for-dollar recovery of NPC and fuel stock carrying charges, and is trued-up monthly for actual NPC compared to forecasted NPC that are reflected in current ECAC rates. The ECAC provides PacifiCorp the opportunity to recover NPC in a timely and efficient manner, which allows PacifiCorp to continue to provide adequate, safe, and reliable service to its California customers.
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 	А. Q.	What is the purpose of the Company's ECAC? Generally, PacifiCorp's ECAC tariff provides dollar-for-dollar recovery of NPC and fuel stock carrying charges, and is trued-up monthly for actual NPC compared to forecasted NPC that are reflected in current ECAC rates. The ECAC provides PacifiCorp the opportunity to recover NPC in a timely and efficient manner, which allows PacifiCorp to continue to provide adequate, safe, and reliable service to its California customers. What are the main components of the ECAC?

1 determinant and time period below.

2 A. ECAC Offset Rate

3 Q. What is the purpose of the ECAC Offset Rate?

4 A. The Offset Rate accounts for forecasted NPC and fuel stock carrying charges that are 5 anticipated for the upcoming ECAC period. The Offset Rate is an unbundled rate that 6 is established either during the most recent California general rate case, or between 7 general rate cases if the new Offset Rate changes by more than 5 percent from current 8 rates. The Offset Rate is equal to the Offset Period's California-allocated Projected 9 NPC plus Other Costs for Recovery, all divided by California projected sales and 10 adjusted for the ECAC billing factor (which is the adjustment rate for franchise fees 11 and uncollectible accounts expenses from the most recent general rate case).

12 Q. What is Projected NPC?

A. Projected NPC is the total-company sum of forecasted NPC components that are calculated by the Company's power cost model. The Projected NPC spans the entirety of the Intermediate and Offset Periods.

16 Q. Can you describe what costs are included in Other Costs for Recovery?

17 A. Other Costs for Recovery are costs other than NPC that the Commission has

18 permitted the Company to recover through the ECAC. These include, on a California

19 allocated basis as necessary: payments (or bill credits) for net surplus compensation

- 20 expenses; renewable energy production tax credits; California Air Resources Board
- 21 (CARB) implementation fees; fuel stock carrying charges; purchases of renewable
- 22 energy certificates for renewables portfolio standard compliance; start-up fuel costs;
- 23 mandatory reporting and verification costs associated with the annual greenhouse gas

1		emissions report(s) submitted to CARB; EIM body of state regulators costs; and
2		Western Power Pool western resource adequacy program costs.
3		B. ECAC Balancing Rate
4	Q.	What is the purpose of the ECAC Balancing Rate?
5	A.	The ECAC Balancing Rate either returns to, or recovers from, customers the
6		difference between the actual NPC and the forecasted NPC reflected in PacifiCorp's
7		ECAC balancing account from the previous tracking period. Specifically, the
8		Balancing Rate is the Balancing Period's California-allocated share of the difference
9		between prior ECACs' Projected NPC and Adjusted Actual/Projected NPC, plus
10		Other Costs for Recovery (all adjusted by California actual sales) and divided by
11		California projected sales and adjusted for the ECAC billing factor.
12	Q.	What is Adjusted Actual NPC?
13	A.	NPC are defined as the sum of the Company's fuel expenses, wholesale purchase
14		power expenses, and wheeling expenses, less wholesale sales revenue. Adjusted
15		Actual NPC are the sum of total-company amounts recorded in Federal Energy
16		Regulatory Commission Accounts 501, 503 and 547 (Steam Production Fuel
17		Expense) for the Company's coal, geothermal, and natural gas resources; 555
18		(Purchased Power); and 565 (Wheeling); less Account 447 (Sales for Resale).
19		Additionally, in the ECAC, the Company proposes to expand the ECAC to include
20		the recovery of future costs from FERC Account 509 (Allowances), as further
21		explained in the testimony of Company witness Jack Painter. These Adjusted Actual
22		NPC amounts are adjusted to: (1) align booked NPC in those accounts with NPC used
23		in the rate setting process, ensuring only comparable costs are used in the deferral

1		calculation; and (2) remove prior-period accounting entries, if any, recorded during
2		the deferral period that are not applicable to the current period.
3	Q.	What is Adjusted Actual/Projected NPC?
4	A.	Adjusted Actual/Projected NPC is the combination of Adjusted Actual NPC for the
5		portion of the Balancing Period for which Adjusted Actual NPC has been recorded
6		and the Projected NPC for the remainder of the Balancing Period (this remainder is
7		the Intermediate Period).
8		C. ECAC Time Periods
9	Q.	What are the relevant time periods for PacifiCorp's ECAC?
10	A.	PacifiCorp's ECAC includes three relevant time periods: the Offset Period, the
11		Balancing Period, and the Intermediate Period. Each time period establishes the
12		relevant period to determine the Company's Offset or Balancing Rates.
13	Q.	In this filing, what time period does the Offset Period represent?
14	А.	The Offset Period includes the 12-month period beginning January 1, 2024, and
15		extending through December 31, 2024 (i.e., calendar year 2024). The Offset Period is
16		the rate effective period.
17	Q.	In this filing, what time period does the Balancing Period represent?
18	A.	The Balancing Period includes the 24-month period beginning January 1, 2022, and
19		extending through December 31, 2023 (i.e., calendar years 2022 and 2023).
20	Q.	In this filing, what time period does the Intermediate Period represent?
21	A.	The Intermediate Period includes the portion of the Balancing Period from June 1,
22		2023, through December 31, 2023.
23	Q.	What time periods are relevant to the ECAC Balancing Rate?

1	A.	The ECAC Balancing Rate is based on both the Balancing and Intermediate Periods,
2		which include January 1, 2022, to December 31, 2023.
3	Q.	Which NPC are compared in the Balancing Period for the ECAC Balancing
4		Rate (January 1, 2022, to May 31, 2023)?
5	A.	The Balancing Period (January 1 to May 31, 2022) includes (1) the 2022 Projected
6		NPC from the 2022 ECAC which is compared to the 2022 Adjusted Actual NPC, and
7		(2) the 2023 Projected NPC from the 2023 ECAC which is compared to the 2023
8		Adjusted Actual NPC.
9	Q.	Which NPCs are compared in the Intermediate Period for the ECAC Balancing
10		Rate (June 1, 2023, to December 31, 2023)?
11	A.	The Intermediate Period, includes the 2023 Projected NPC from the 2023 ECAC
12		compared to the 2023 Projected NPC from this 2024 ECAC filing, for the time period
13		June 1, 2023, to December 31, 2023.
14	Q.	What are the benefits of a Balancing Rate that includes both the Balancing and
15		Intermediate Periods?
16	A.	As opposed to other states that have separate filings for offset and balancing rates,
17		where each filing examines either the Offset Period or the first year of the Balancing
18		Period, California's approach that requires rebalancing and truing up rates within the
19		second year of the Balancing Period provides rate stability and avoids rate shock. For
20		example, if there are significant changes in market prices that impact NPC during the
21		second year of the Balancing period, PacifiCorp's combined re-balance and true-up of
22		rates provides for incremental rate recovery that smooths out the effects from this
23		market volatility. This avoids deferring intra-period rate changes to subsequent years,

1 and potentially avoids accumulation of the deferred balance.

2 Q. Can you briefly describe how these time periods change each ECAC cycle?

- 3 A. Yes. Each year, the three periods advance one period. This means that the
- 4 Company's: (1) current application includes a new Offset Period that was not
- 5 included in the previous application; (2) the previous Offset and Intermediate Periods
- 6 becomes the current application's Intermediate and Balancing Periods; and (3) the
- 7 previous Balancing Period is no longer relevant to NPC in the current application.
- 8 Please refer to Table 1 below for a representation of how these time periods change
- 9 with each ECAC cycle in relation to each ECAC billing determinant.

 Table 1 – Comparison of ECAC Billing Determinants and Time Periods

ECAC Rate:		Balancing Rate		Offset Rate
Time Period:	Calendar Year 2022	01/2023 - 05/2023	06/2023 - 12/2023	Calendar Year 2024
ECAC Period:	Balancing Period	Balancing Period	Intermediate Period	Offset Period
Prior ECAC Applications:	2022 Hybrid ¹ NPC (2023 ECAC)	2023 (Jan - May) Projected NPC (2023 ECAC)	2023 (Jun - Dec) Projected NPC (2023 ECAC)	N/A
Current ECAC Application:	2022 Adjusted Actual NPC	2023 (Jan - May) Adjusted Actual NPC	2023 (Jun - Dec) Projected NPC	2024 Projected NPC

¹The "2022 Hybrid NPC (2023 ECAC)" is the combination of the prior ECAC's 2022 (Jan - May) Adjusted Actual NPC and the prior ECAC's 2022 (Jun - Dec) Projected NPC.

10

IV. OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED RATES

- 11 Q. Please provide an overview of the ECAC filing.
- 12 A. In this 2024 ECAC filing, the Company is requesting to recover approximately
- 13 \$21.9 million through the Balancing Rate to true-up collection of actual NPC during
- 14 2022 and 2023. The change in the Balancing Rate results in a \$23.4 million increase
- 15 on a California-allocated basis compared to rates currently in effect.¹

¹ Decision (D.) 23-08-030 (Sept. 1, 2023).

1		As shown in further detail in the testimony of Mr. Painter, the Company also
2		proposes to adjust the Offset Rate to \$48.14 per megawatt-hour (MWh), which is an
3		increase of 53.7 percent from the \$31.33 per MWh currently effective Offset Rate. ²
4		This is caused by Projected NPC that are 44 percent greater compared to total-
5		company NPC proposed in the 2023 ECAC, and results in a rate increase of
6		approximately \$12.6 million on a California-allocated basis. The Company's
7		proposed change to the Offset Rate for 2024 satisfies the Commission's requirement
8		that only increases or decreases greater than five percent from prior rates are
9		permitted.
10		Calculations of the Balancing Rate and Offset Rate are provided in the
11		testimony of Mr. Painter (Exhibit PAC/200). If approved, the proposed rates would
12		take effect March 1, 2024. Ms. Judith M. Ridenour provides testimony describing the
13		impact on customer rates (Exhibit PAC/700).
14		V. 2024 PROJECTED NET POWER COSTS
15	Q.	How does the Company calculate its Projected NPC?
16	A.	Projected NPC are calculated for the Intermediate Period and the Offset Period based
17		on forecasted data using the Aurora model, which is a production cost model that
18		simulates the operation of the Company's power system on an hourly basis.
19	Q.	Is the Company's general approach to the calculation of NPC using the Aurora
20		model the same in this case as in the previous ECAC filing?
21	A.	Yes. The Company used the Aurora model in its prior ECAC filing.
22	Q.	What Aurora inputs were updated for this filing?

² Id.

1	A.	Aurora model inputs were updated to include:
2		• Updates to the Company's forward price curves for electricity and natural gas
3		prices with a vintage of March 31, 2023;
4		• New wholesale electricity sales and purchase transactions (including physical
5		and financial);
6		• New natural gas sales and purchase transactions (including physical and
7		financial);
8		• New wheeling contracts and updates to transmission paths and capacities,
9		including on Company-owned transmission;
10		• Updates to existing contracts for wholesale sales and purchases of electricity
11		and natural gas and for wheeling;
12		• New and updated coal supply and transportation contracts and costs;
13		• Updates to the capabilities of the Company's owned generation resources
14		along with the cost to integrate wind generation, solar generation and load on
15		the Company's system; and
16		• Updates to forecast load and reserve obligations.
17	Q.	What reports does the Aurora model produce?
18	A.	The major output from the Aurora model is the NPC report. The 2024 NPC report is
19		attached as Exhibit PAC/101.
20	Q.	Does the Aurora model appropriately reflect the Company's Projected NPC?
21	A.	Yes. The Aurora model reasonably simulates the operation of the Company's system
22		load and resource portfolio, consistent with the Company's system operation
23		constraints and requirements. Any variances from Projected NPC are handled through

- the ECAC balancing account, where Projected NPC are trued up to Adjusted Actual
 NPC on a monthly basis.
- 3 Q. What is the Projected NPC for 2024?
- 4 A. The Company's Projected NPC for calendar year 2024 is \$2.519 billion on a total-
- 5 company basis, \$38.5 million on a California-allocated basis. The Company's 2024
- 6 NPC study is provided as Exhibit PAC/101 and the California-allocated NPC is
- 7 provided as Exhibit PAC/104.
 - VI. ECAC PROJECTED NPC COMPARISON
- 9 Q. Please summarize the major changes in Projected NPC between the 2023 ECAC
- 10 projection of calendar year 2023, and this filing's projection of calendar year
- 11 **2024.**

8

- 12 A. Confidential Table 2 below details the differences between the calendar year 2023
- 13 Projected NPC from the prior filing, and the calendar year 2024 Projected NPC from
- 14 this filing in dollars, whereas Confidential Table 3 details the differences in MWh.

[Begin Confidential] Confidential Table 2



Confidential Table 3



[End Confidential]

1	Compared to the total-company Projected NPC in the 2023 ECAC, total-
2	company Projected NPC in this 2024 ECAC are higher by 44 percent. There is an
3	increase in forecasted wholesale sales revenue of [Begin Confidential]
4	[End Confidential] (which decreases NPC), the totality of which is offset by an
5	increase in purchased power expense of approximately [Begin Confidential]
6	[End Confidential]. Coal fuel expense has decreased by [Begin
7	Confidential] [End Confidential] and natural gas fuel expense has
8	increased by [Begin Confidential] End Confidential]. Finally,
9	wheeling and other expenses have decreased by [Begin Confidential]
10	[End Confidential]. The primary drivers of these changes are increased natural gas
11	fuel prices, coal fuel prices and associated electricity market prices along with a
12	decrease in coal supply availability.
13	These dynamics are reflected in the MWh changes between last ECAC's

1		forecast of 2023 and this ECAC's forecast of 2024, where coal generation decreases
2		because of decreased coal supply and natural gas generation increases to offset the
3		reduced coal generation. For the remaining balance, wholesale sales decreases and
4		purchased power increases to accommodate the increase in total-company load, the
5		slight decline in other generation, and new environmental compliance requirements.
6		This includes the gas conversion and associated outage at the Jim Bridger generating
7		facility, the Washington Cap and Invest Program, and the deconstruction of multiple
8		hydroelectric projects along the Klamath River.
9		These comparisons on a line-by-line basis at the monthly granularity are
10		attached as Exhibit PAC/103 and the prior ECAC's 2023 forecast is attached as
11		Exhibit PAC/102.
12		VII. SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES AND INFORMATION
12 13	Q.	VII. SUPPLEMENTAL ANALYSES AND INFORMATION Has the Commission ordered the Company to provide supplemental information
	Q.	
13	Q. A.	Has the Commission ordered the Company to provide supplemental information
13 14		Has the Commission ordered the Company to provide supplemental information for future ECAC applications?
13 14 15		Has the Commission ordered the Company to provide supplemental information for future ECAC applications? Yes. The Commission ordered the Company to: (1) provide additional information to
13 14 15 16		Has the Commission ordered the Company to provide supplemental information for future ECAC applications? Yes. The Commission ordered the Company to: (1) provide additional information to increase transparency around the Company's NPC modeling; (2) provide and explain
13 14 15 16 17		Has the Commission ordered the Company to provide supplemental information for future ECAC applications? Yes. The Commission ordered the Company to: (1) provide additional information to increase transparency around the Company's NPC modeling; (2) provide and explain different coal cycling scenarios when estimating NPC, and consult with stakeholders
 13 14 15 16 17 18 		Has the Commission ordered the Company to provide supplemental information for future ECAC applications? Yes. The Commission ordered the Company to: (1) provide additional information to increase transparency around the Company's NPC modeling; (2) provide and explain different coal cycling scenarios when estimating NPC, and consult with stakeholders to receive input on these studies prior to filing with the Commission; and (3) provide
 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 		Has the Commission ordered the Company to provide supplemental information for future ECAC applications? Yes. The Commission ordered the Company to: (1) provide additional information to increase transparency around the Company's NPC modeling; (2) provide and explain different coal cycling scenarios when estimating NPC, and consult with stakeholders to receive input on these studies prior to filing with the Commission; and (3) provide additional fuel source and coal generation data. ³ This section discusses these

³ D.22-11-008, Ordering Paragraphs 4–6, 8–9.

1 modeling?

2	A.	Yes. The Commission directed the Company to produce the following information for
3		future ECAC applications: (a) information on the marginal fuel cost assumed for each
4		coal plant, the specific coal plants where adjustments were made to align forecasted
5		generation with minimum take provisions, and the magnitude of adjustments made; ⁴
6		and (b) an Aurora model run that depicts the NPC when average fuel costs are
7		utilized to forecast unit dispatch. ⁵

8 Q. Have you provided the information requested by this first requirement?

9 A. Yes. The Aurora model used by the Company in this Application provides greater 10 flexibility around the modeling of fuel consumption than the GRID model that the 11 Company formerly used. Aurora can model multiple tiered pricing contracts and 12 volumetric contract provisions, and has neither "dispatch tiers" nor "costing tiers" 13 that the GRID model utilized. Consequently adjustments to marginal fuel cost assumed for each coal plant were not made in the preparation for this ECAC. 14 15 Information on the marginal fuel cost assumed for each coal plant, as well as the 16 Company's Aurora run that depicts NPC when average fuel costs are utilized to forecast unit dispatch, are provided in supporting workpapers.⁶ 17

18 Q. Regarding the second requirement, can you please explain the coal cycling

19

studies that the Commission directed PacifiCorp to provide?

⁴ *Id.*, Ordering Paragraph 8.

⁵ *Id.*, Ordering Paragraph 9.

⁶ "CA_ECAC_2024_00_Base_NPC_Report CONF" Spreadsheet; "CA_ECAC_2024_01_Average Cost_NPC_Report CONF" Spreadsheet

1	A.	Yes. For NPC purposes, the Commission directed the Company to provide studies
2		that analyze coal cycling: (1) for particular generating units; (2) during particular
3		times of the year; and (3) for all generating units during all times of the year. ⁷
4	Q.	Did the Company consult with its stakeholders to receive input on any additional
5		supplemental coal cycling studies prior to filing?
6	A.	Yes. In June of 2023, the Company contacted the parties from the Company's 2023
7		ECAC proceeding (including the Public Advocates Office and the California Farm
8		Bureau Federation), as well as Sierra Club (who was not a party to the 2023
9		proceeding, but has historically been a party in the ECAC proceeding), and requested
10		their input on these supplemental studies.
11	Q.	Did any of the Company's stakeholders have any input on provide?
12	A.	No. Because of this lack of interest, the Company subsequently asked whether any of
13		the parties from the 2023 ECAC proceeding objected to the Company requested the
14		Commission to remove these requirements for supplemental coal cycling studies
15		going forward. None objected.
16	Q.	What does the cycling of coal resources refer to?
17	A.	The cycling of coal resources refers to providing the Company's production cost
18		modeling software (Aurora) with the flexibility to evaluate the economic startup or
19		shutdown of coal resources. When Aurora allows for cycling of coal-fired generation
20		resources, it will determine whether or not to startup or shutdown a resource based on
21		the economics of the plant compared to other alternatives. Specifically, Aurora will
22		analyze whether the costs of starting up a coal unit and generating power over the

⁷ D.22-11-008, Ordering Paragraph 4.

1		unit's minimum up time is greater than the next best alternative (other sources of
2		generation or market transactions), while adhering to physical constraints for the
3		unit's operation such as ramp rate, minimum up time, and minimum down time.
4	Q.	Do you have definitions for minimum up and down times, and the ramp rate?
5	A.	Yes. Minimum up time is defined as the number of hours that a unit must remain online
6		after being turned on, and minimum down time is defined as the number of hours a unit
7		must stay offline after it has been shut down. Ramp rate is defined as the speed at which
8		a generator can increase generation within an hour.
9	Q.	Please explain the scenarios that were evaluated.
10	A.	Consistent with D.22-11-008, the Company evaluated the following scenarios: (1)
11		cycling of all coal units during particular times of the year; (2) cycling of particular
12		coal units during all times of the year; and (3) cycling of all coal units during all times
13		of the year.
14	Q.	Can you provide a general overview of the results of each scenario?
15	A.	Yes. Similar to the results of the scenarios analyzed in the 2023 ECAC proceeding,
16		the Company's NPC would substantially increase if PacifiCorp pursued any of the
17		three coal cycling strategies.
18		For the first scenario, the Company analyzed economic cycling of three of the
19		Company's large coal units (Hunter 3, Huntington 1 and Huntington 2), for the entire
20		test period (2024). This resulted in substantial market purchases, and if PacifiCorp
21		pursued this strategy, would increase NPC by \$101.9 million for 2024.
22		In the second scenario, the Company analyzed economic cycling of all
		Company-owned coal units between Spring (March-May) and Fall (October-

1		November) of the test period (2024). If PacifiCorp pursued this strategy, it would
2		result in more market purchases compared to scenario one, and would increase NPC
3		by \$139.4 million for 2024.
4		In the third scenario, the Company analyzed economic cycling of all
5		Company-owned coal units for the entire test period (2024). If PacifiCorp pursued
6		this strategy, it would increase NPC by \$270.1 million for 2024.
7		Please see Confidential Exhibit PAC/105 which elaborates on each scenario,
8		details the NPC impacts, provides an explanation of the results, and includes an
9		appendix that provides additional discussions on how economic cycling can increase
10		NPC in Aurora.
11	Q.	Regarding the third requirement, can you please explain the additional fuel
12		source and coal generation data that the Commission directed PacifiCorp to
13		provide?
14		
	A.	Yes. The Commission directed the Company to provide the following information for
15	A.	Yes. The Commission directed the Company to provide the following information for each of the Company's coal units: (1) "minimum take" or "fixed production cost"
15 16	A.	
	Α.	each of the Company's coal units: (1) "minimum take" or "fixed production cost"
16	Α.	each of the Company's coal units: (1) "minimum take" or "fixed production cost" volume used in the net power cost (NPC) model for the current ECAC cycle year for
16 17	A.	each of the Company's coal units: (1) "minimum take" or "fixed production cost" volume used in the net power cost (NPC) model for the current ECAC cycle year for each fuel source supplying the coal plant; (2) forecast generation volume for coal
16 17 18	A.	each of the Company's coal units: (1) "minimum take" or "fixed production cost" volume used in the net power cost (NPC) model for the current ECAC cycle year for each fuel source supplying the coal plant; (2) forecast generation volume for coal plants for the current ECAC cycle year; (3) "minimum take" or "fixed production
16 17 18 19	Α.	each of the Company's coal units: (1) "minimum take" or "fixed production cost" volume used in the net power cost (NPC) model for the current ECAC cycle year for each fuel source supplying the coal plant; (2) forecast generation volume for coal plants for the current ECAC cycle year; (3) "minimum take" or "fixed production cost" volume used in the net power cost (NPC) model for the past three ECAC cycles

⁸ *Id.* Ordering Paragraph 8.

1		VIII. ENERGY IMBALANCE MARKET
2	Q.	Are the benefits from participating in the EIM with the CAISO included in this
3		ECAC?
4	A.	Yes. Participation in the EIM provides benefits to customers in the form of reduced
5		NPC. At the total-company level, while the 2022 ECAC had forecasted EIM benefits
6		of [Begin Confidential] End Confidential], the actual
7		benefits for customers were even greater at [Begin Confidential]
8		[End Confidential]. In this filing, the 2023 forecasted EIM benefits are
9		[Begin Confidential] [End Confidential] and the 2024
10		forecasted EIM benefits are [Begin Confidential] [Begin
11		Confidential].
12	Q.	How does the Company calculate its actual EIM benefits?
13	A.	Using actual information from the EIM, including five- and 15-minute pricing, the
14		Company identifies the incremental resource that could have facilitated the transfer to
15		an adjacent EIM area or the CAISO in each five-minute interval. The benefit is then
16		calculated as the difference between the revenue received less the expense of
17		generation assumed to supply the transfer. In the event of an import, the benefit is
18		equal to the cost of the import minus the avoided expense of the generation that
19		would have otherwise been dispatched.
20	Q.	Does this conclude your direct testimony?
21	A.	Yes.

Application No. 23-09-___ Exhibit No. PAC/101 Witness: Ramon J. Mitchell

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICORP 2024 ECAC

Projected 2024 NPC

Exhibit PAC/101													
acifiCorp													
rojected 2024 NPC													Exhibit PAC/1
	Jan-24	Feb-24	Mar-24	Apr-24	May-24	Jun-24	Jul-24	Aug-24	Sep-24	Oct-24	Nov-24	Dec-24	Total 2024
						Juli-24	Jui-24					000-24	
						\$							
pecial Sales For Resale													
Long Term Firm Sales													
Black Hills Hurricane Sale	\$ - \$ 2,271				•		-		\$ - \$ -	<u>s</u> -	\$ -		\$ 2,27
Leaning Juniper Revenue	\$ 2,2/1 \$ 21,949				s - s 16,681					\$ 20,405	\$ 18,100	s - s 24,970	
PSCo_Sale	\$ 911,135	\$ 856,615 \$	882,524 \$	650,060	\$ 680,640	\$ 872,064	2,208,857	\$ 2,250,464	\$ 2,059,410	\$ 747,395	\$ 711,283	\$ 718,351	\$ 13,548,79
Total Long Term Firm Sales	\$ 935,355	\$ 877,621 \$	903,836 \$	666,925	\$ 697,321	\$ 894,575	2,259,495	\$ 2,304,812	\$ 2,095,368	\$ 767,800	\$ 729,383	\$ 743,321	\$ 13,875,81
Short Term Firm Sales													
Borah	S -	s - s	- S		s -	s - 1		s -	•	S -	s -	s -	S
COB	<u>s</u> -					s - 1			\$.		s -	s .	é
Colorado	<u>s</u> -	•	•		s -				\$.	s -		s -	e e
Four Corners	S -	•			•	s - 1			с –	s -		•	• •
Idaho	<u>s</u> -				s -	s - 1			с –	e -	e -	· ·	e
Mead	s -	•			s -	s - 1		•	• ·	s -	· ·	s -	5
Mid Columbia	5 -	•	•		- c	s - 1			3 -		a -		3
Mona	s -	•			p - S -				3 -	s -	ə -	s -	s
NOB	S -					s - 1			ə -	\$ - \$ -	s -	s -	3
Palo Verde		•				•		•	• •	•	•	•	3
SP15		•	•		s -	s - 1			ə -	<u>s</u> -		s -	3
	•	•			•	\$ - !		•	ə -	ə -	<u>\$</u> -		3
Utah	s -		- 5		s -	s - s			<u>s</u> -	<u>s</u> -	<u>s</u> -	s -	5
Washington	s -	•			s -	S - 5		•	\$ -	s -	s -	ş -	\$
West Main					s -	s - 1			\$ -	\$ -	ş -	ş -	\$
Wyoming	\$ -	\$ - \$	- \$		\$-	\$ - !	-	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$
Total Short Term Firm Sales	ş -	s - s	- 5	, - !	s -	s - !	, -	s -	s -	s -	s -	s -	\$
System Balancing Sales													
COB	\$ 6,329,676	\$ 4,507,181 \$		2,993,237		\$ 5,647,622	7,294,814		\$ 17,629,571				\$ 80,176,97
Four Corners	\$ 12,838,766					\$ 5,466,030 \$	4,298,716				\$ 7,348,700		\$ 80,398,05
Mead	\$ 161,306	\$ 65,848 \$					306,624			\$ 909,263	\$ 67,352	\$ (351,269)	\$ 2,148,61
Mid Columbia	\$ 23,112,048	\$ 12,423,395	7,320,034 \$	8,711,119	\$ 5,476,957	\$ 6,671,889	21,551,484	\$ 26,481,618	\$ 16,966,652	\$ 11,945,817	\$ 12,963,419	\$ 16,366,679	\$ 169,991,11
Mona	\$ 3,090,307	\$ 2,619,193 \$	990,969 \$	868,504	\$ 775,837	\$ 1,487,277	2,055,776	\$ 2,065,757	\$ 3,924,739	\$ 1,327,441	\$ 1,225,935	\$ 2,469,356	\$ 22,901,09
NOB	\$ 4,847,012	\$ 3,823,220 \$	2,394,455 \$	1,334,061	\$ 1,632,566	\$ 2,474,522	4,217,112	\$ 5,717,518	\$ 4,933,438	\$ 2,282,290	\$ 2,854,507	\$ 3,574,293	\$ 40,084,99
Palo Verde	\$ 984,043	\$ 460,452 \$	225,258 \$	123,210	\$ 149,046	\$ 616,364 S	1,386,037	\$ 1,373,039	\$ 817,919	\$ 489,798	\$ 362,356	\$ 701,789	\$ 7,689,30
Trapped Energy	S -										\$ -		\$
Total System Balancing Sales	\$ 51,363,158	\$ 30,081,625	18,360,884 \$	17,766,736	\$ 14,430,963	\$ 22,577,142	41,110,564	\$ 47,879,030	\$ 54,631,073	\$ 29,020,281	\$ 31,816,118	\$ 44,352,574	\$ 403,390,14
otal Special Sales For Resale	\$ 52,298,513	\$ 30,959,247 \$	19.264.720 \$	18,433,661	\$ 15,128,284	\$ 23.471.716 S	43,370,059	\$ 50,183,842	\$ 56,726,442	\$ 29,788,081	\$ 32,545,501	\$ 45,095,894	\$ 417,265,96
Total openial ones for Resale	¥ 52,260,515	÷ 00,000,241 4		10,100,001	· 10,120,204	· 20,771,710 ;	, 10,010,008	÷ 00,100,042	÷ 00,120,112	÷ 20,700,001	÷ 02,040,001	· ···,080,084	+ +11,203

rchased Power & Net Interchange													
Long Term Firm Purchases													
Appaloosa 1A Solar	\$ 562,535	\$ 617,749 \$	910,879	983,631 S	1,151,786 \$	1,216,593 \$	1,065,782	\$ 1,038,366	\$ 979,390	\$ 779,343	\$ 579,150 \$	479,999	\$ 10,365,2
Appaloosa 1B Solar	\$ 375,023	\$ 411,832 \$	607,253	655,754 S	767,857 \$	811,062 \$	710,522	\$ 692,244	\$ 652,927	\$ 519,562	\$ 386,100 \$	319,999	\$ 6,910,1
Castle Solar UoU	S - !	s - s		5 - S	- 5	- 5	-	S -	S -	S -	S - S	-	S
Castle Solar IHC	S -	s - s		s - s	- 5	- 5	-	S -	S -	S -	S - S	-	S
Cedar Springs Wind	\$ 1,348,848	\$ 1,136,654 \$	1.032.244	\$ 1.016.035 \$	830,825	743.881 \$	742,782	\$ 585,990	\$ 827,498	\$ 1.090.534	\$ 1.068.343 \$	1.341.093	\$ 11,764,7
Cedar Springs Wind III	\$ 1,025,293	\$ 863,560 \$	784,236	5 772,111 S	631,271 \$	565.347 \$	564,366	\$ 445,199	\$ 628,829	\$ 828,668	\$ 811,823 \$	1,018,881	\$ 8,939,5
Cedar Springs Wind IV	S -								S -			-	S
Combine Hills Wind	S -		-						s -			-	s
Cove Mountain Solar	s 183,114	s 199.253 s	335.342	365.062 S	420,185	451.894 \$	438.350			\$ 286.322	\$ 205,725 \$	169,135	\$ 3.824.8
Cove Mountain Solar II	\$ 453.001	\$ 492,928 \$				1,117,932 \$	1.084.426					416.084	\$ 9,457.0
Deseret Purchase	\$ 3.228,408					2.719.178 \$	3.228.408					410,004	\$ 27,312,9
Eagle Mountain - UAMPS/UMPA	\$		2,011,000		- 5			\$ 0,220,100	\$ -				\$ 27,012,0
Elektron Solar 20yr	s - 1	•				•			s -	•			e
Elektron Solar 25yr	s - 1		-						s -	•	•	-	S
Gemstate	s -				- 4				s -			-	5 5
	\$ 311.883	\$ 365,922 \$			686,777 \$		687.351					265.665	\$ 6,247,4
Graphite Solar Hermiston Purchase	\$ 311,883 \$ -		007,903							\$ 480,478 \$ -		200,000	\$ 0,247,4 \$
Horseshoe Solar	\$ 268,027 \$ 369,331	\$ 344,622 \$					737,711					229,279	\$ 6,115,0
Hunter Solar	• ••••,•••	\$ 433,652 \$	637,866				746,797					321,788	\$ 7,031,2
Hurricane Purchase	\$ 46,925	s - s							\$ -			-	\$ 46,9
MagCorp Buythru	s -	•							\$ -			-	\$
MagCorp Reserves	\$ 272,680	\$ 264,660 \$		\$ 272,680 \$	272,680	272,680 \$	272,680				\$ 272,680 \$	272,680	\$ 3,264,1
Milican Solar	\$ 95,313	\$ 150,647 \$		\$ 280,511 \$		362,395 \$	408,109					83,523	\$ 2,898,8
Milford Solar	\$ 350,630	\$ 418,195 \$					731,293					303,612	\$ 6,937,4
Nucor	\$ 594,150	\$ 594,150 \$	594,150	\$	594,150	594,150 \$	594,150	\$ 594,150	\$ 594,150	\$ 594,150	\$ 594,150 \$	594,150	\$ 7,129,8
Old Mill Solar	S -				- 1	- \$		s -	\$ -	\$-		-	\$
Monsanto Reserves	\$ 1,716,667	\$ 1,716,667 \$	1,716,667	\$ 1,716,667 \$	1,716,667 \$	1,716,667 \$	1,716,667	\$ 1,716,667	\$ 1,716,667	\$ 1,716,667	\$ 1,716,667 \$	1,716,667	\$ 20,600,0
Pavant III Solar	S -	s - s			- 5	i - \$	-	\$-	\$ -			-	\$
PGE Cove	\$ 13,672	\$ 13,672 \$	13,672	\$ 13,672 \$	13,672	13,672 \$	13,672	\$ 13,672	\$ 13,672	\$ 13,672	\$ 13,672 \$	13,672	\$ 164,0
Prineville Solar	\$ 65,430	\$ 103,415 \$	148,062		221,194	240,766 \$	271,137	\$ 239,584	\$ 192,816	\$ 126,252	\$ 80,864 \$	55,491	\$ 1,931,3
Rocket Solar	\$ 295,778	\$ 369,445 \$	537,993	\$ 609,687 \$	712,494	800,701 \$	820,796	\$ 742,700	\$ 624,428	\$ 474,844	\$ 290,098 \$	239,725	\$ 6,518,6
Sigurd Solar	\$ 308.030	\$ 356,200 \$	507.232	\$ 553.807 \$	636.517 \$	699,580 S	650,415	\$ 596,230	\$ 556.646	\$ 451,695	\$ 317,435 \$	266.651	\$ 5,900.4
Skysol Solar	\$ 322,157	\$ 365,293 \$	530,598	5 561,018 S	620,581	804,541 \$	862,576	\$ 762,459	\$ 552,791	\$ 484,197	\$ 285,081 \$	277,856	\$ 6,429,1
Small Purchases east	\$ 5,531	\$ 5,198 \$	6,394	4.636 S	3,869 5	3,916 \$	3.691	\$ 4.013	\$ 5.487	\$ 4,428	\$ 4,478 \$	5,355	\$ 56.9
Small Purchases west	S -	s - s	- 1	s - s	- 5	- 5		S -	S -	S -	S - S		S
Soda Lake Geothermal	S -	s - s		s - s	- 5	- 5	-	s -	s -	s -	S - S	-	S
Three Buttes Wind	\$ 2,782,809	\$ 1,915,027 \$	2,129,777	\$ 1.611.562 \$	1.423.643	1,202,365 \$	803.345	\$ 946,962	\$ 1,181,835	\$ 1,730,465	\$ 2,346,165 \$	2.564.905	\$ 20.638.8
Top of the World Wind	\$ 3,211,949	\$ 3.004.727 \$		3.108.338 S		3,108,338 \$	3,211,949					3,211,949	\$ 37,921,7
Wolverine Creek Wind	\$ 789,484			5 1,081,742 S			695,099					1,003,367	\$ 10,678,1
Glen Canvon	\$ - I		- 1						\$ -			325,678	\$ 337,2
Rush Lake	s - 1								\$ -			010,010	\$ 337,2
Fremont Solar	s - 1					•			s -	•	• •		S
Green River Energy Center	s - 1							s -	s -				Š
Anticline Wind	s - 1							s -	-		• •	18,483	\$ 18,4
Boswell Springs Wind	s -		-			- 3			3 - S -			10,403	\$ 18,4 \$
Two River Wind LLC	s -								5 - 5 -			-	\$ \$
Cedar Creek	ə		-			19,440 \$	1,368,669	\$ 1.082.327	\$ 1.300.232			1.704.296	\$ 9,767,8
					- 3	19,440 \$							
OR Schedule 126 CSP						- \$		S -		\$ -	S - S	-	\$
UT Schedule Adjustment	\$ (1,680,691)	\$ (2,018,190) \$	(3,360,173)	\$ (3,749,047) \$	(4,450,727) \$	(4,535,849) \$	(4,239,494)	\$ (3,966,063)	\$ (3,437,166)	\$ (2,845,889)	\$ (1,819,486) \$	(1,363,469)	\$ (37,466,2
Long Term Firm Purchases Total	\$ 17,315,978	\$ 16,178,067 \$	17,444,600	\$ 16,931,058 \$	16,644,843 \$	16,868,771 \$	18,191,250	\$ 17,418,206	\$ 17,741,342	\$ 15,705,000	\$ 15,446,583 \$	15.856.512	\$ 201,742,2

Qualifying Facilities														
QF California	\$ 144,138											139,098	\$	1,691,84
QF Idaho	\$ 605,201	\$ 543,397	\$ 628,658	\$ 669,151	\$ 756,864	\$ 745,232	\$ 653,778	\$ 555,366	\$ 520,800	\$ 585,228	\$ 559,512 \$	561,253	\$	7,384,4
QF Oregon	\$ 2,282,896			\$ 4,549,011	\$ 4,603,695	\$ 4,747,221			\$ 3,536,881			1,581,696	\$	41,585,9
QF Utah	\$ 359,738	\$ 403,638	\$ 480,494	\$ 577,328	\$ 633,629	\$ 651,580	\$ 593,828	\$ 598,393	\$ 589,272	\$ 510,766	\$ 383,475 \$	307,746	\$	6,089,8
QF Washington	S -	S -	S -	\$ 22,559	\$ 23.311	\$ 44,799	\$ 46,293	\$ 46,293	\$ 44,799	\$ 3,283	S - S	-	5	231.3
QF Wyoming	\$ 24,584	\$ 18,617	\$ 23,206	\$ 19,704	\$ 18.046	\$ 6,756	\$ 10,630	\$ 11,984	\$ 17,488	\$ 16,668	\$ 18,738 \$	13.681	Ś	200.1
Biomass One QF	\$ 1.669.991	\$ 1,503,089	\$ 1.600.266	\$ 1,569,336	\$ 1,761,538	\$ 1.692.832	\$ 1.567.580	\$ 1.622.548	\$ 1.601.615	\$ 1,636,336	\$ 1.646.005 \$	857,607	S	18,728,7
Chopin Wind QF	\$ 193,044					\$ 177,933						165,528	ŝ	2,052,8
DCFP QF	\$ 3.732											11.623	Š	159.4
Enterprise Solar I QF	\$ 605,776					\$ 1,367,030						531,699	š	12,435,1
Escalante Solar I QF	\$ 556,159			\$ 1.001.202		\$ 1,278,616						496.091	ŝ	11.472.6
Escalante Solar II QF	\$ 522,020											462,683	ŝ	10,812,6
Escalante Solar III QF	\$ 507,994											424,125	s	9,946.5
Escalante Solar III QF ExxonMobil QF												424,120	د ۲	8,840,3
	•	•									S - S	-		
Five Pine Wind QF	\$ 591,751											1,011,378	\$	9,671,0
Granite Mountain East Solar QF	\$ 538,975					\$ 1,244,331						457,151	\$	10,791,1
Granite Mountain West Solar QF	\$ 357,192					\$ 823,479						302,471	\$	7,127,4
Iron Springs Solar QF	\$ 623,624			\$ 1,002,096		\$ 1,269,977						487,975	\$	11,087,0
Latigo Wind Park QF	\$ 1,008,523											798,194	\$	9,807,1
Mountain Wind 1 QF	\$ 1,411,927					\$ 503,734						1,005,544	\$	8,949,4
Mountain Wind 2 QF	\$ 2,046,500					\$ 901,569						1,478,389	\$	13,853,9
North Point Wind QF	\$ 1,180,761	\$ 2,028,043	\$ 1,836,607	\$ 1,950,796	\$ 1,193,212	\$ 1,325,700	\$ 1,590,909	\$ 1,616,707	\$ 1,938,184	\$ 1,860,511	\$ 2,035,525 \$	1,987,806	\$	20,544,7
Oregon Wind Farm QF	\$ 1.023.863	\$ 1,189,669	\$ 824,060	\$ 957,933	\$ 677.064	\$ 820,732	\$ 1,639,189	\$ 2.076.126	\$ 1,223,711	\$ 617,187	\$ 836,690 \$	1,432,888	5	13,319,1
Orchard Wind 1 QF	\$ 63,171	\$ 69,701	\$ 97,721	\$ 124,816	\$ 110,803	\$ 123,524	\$ 123,449	\$ 105,362	\$ 79,489	\$ 84,148	\$ 75,107 \$	80,003	\$	1,137,2
Orchard Wind 2 QF	\$ 61.356	\$ 68,707	\$ 91.023	\$ 124,993	\$ 112,506	\$ 123,255	\$ 125,420	\$ 106,117	\$ 79,928	\$ 85,657	\$ 76,765 \$	81,568	S	1,137,2
Orchard Wind 3 QF	\$ 63.522						\$ 121,662			\$ 84,637		78,427	Ś	1,137,2
Orchard Wind 4 QF	\$ 63,331	\$ 69,219	\$ 103,949	\$ 122,994	\$ 111,676	\$ 123,692	\$ 122,969	\$ 105,683	\$ 78,915	\$ 82,859	\$ 73,472 \$	78,535	S	1,137,2
Pavant II Solar QF	\$ 216,445					\$ 588,172						211,986	š	5,372,9
Pioneer Wind Park I QF	\$ 1,293,636											1.076.883	Š	10.582.4
Power County North Wind QF	\$ 463,416					\$ 390,685						688,202	š	6.131.3
Power County South Wind QF	\$ 411,220											600.833	÷	5,493,1
Roseburg Dillard QF	\$ 101.657					\$ 85.173						254,905	ŝ	1.874.7
Sage I Solar QF	\$ 79,115											73,738	5	
						\$ 256,841 \$ 256,127						73,738		2,228,7
Sage II Solar QF	\$ 79,198												\$	2,227,2
Sage III Solar QF	\$ 66,690					\$ 209,266	\$ 269,677					62,528	\$	1,833,4
Spanish Fork Wind 2 QF	\$ 224,537	•				\$ 216,357	\$ 297,964			•		256,145	\$	2,831,5
Sunnyside QF	- S	\$-						s -			S - S	-	\$	
Sweetwater Solar QF	\$ 254,931					\$ 957,706						196,650	\$	7,627,6
Tesoro QF	\$ 30,563					\$ 5,257	\$ 119					67,863	\$	293,4
Three Peaks Solar QF	\$ 410,390											366,970	\$	8,497,1
Threemile Canyon Wind QF	\$ 82,972	\$ 180,579				\$ 218,186			\$ 120,822	\$ 125,922	\$ 99,256 \$	80,214	\$	1,802,3
Utah Pavant Solar QF	\$ 286,427	\$ 350,863	\$ 542,142	\$ 636,557	\$ 760,728	\$ 845,521	\$ 996,360	\$ 925,894	\$ 767,702	\$ 566,106	\$ 357,167 \$	296,358	\$	7,331,8
Utah Red Hills Solar QF	\$ 480,440	\$ 640,061	\$ 773,732	\$ 1,020,201	\$ 1,193,809	\$ 1,227,730	\$ 1,539,540	\$ 1,463,201	\$ 1,311,693	\$ 800,670	\$ 581,951 \$	454,373	\$	11,487,4
Qualifying Facilities Total	\$ 20,991,402	\$ 23,336,202	\$ 25,950,847	\$ 28,037,739	\$ 27,575,428	\$ 28,711,826	\$ 32,249,303	\$ 31,063,844	\$ 26,171,236	\$ 23,230,634	\$ 21,194,503 \$	19,594,480	\$	308,107,4
Mid-Columbia Contracts													+	
Douglas - Wells	S -	s -	s -	S -	s -	s -	s -	s -	S -	s -	S - S	-	\$	
Grant Reasonable	\$ (764,786)					\$ (764,786)	\$ (764,786)	S (764,786				(764,786)	ŝ	(9,177,
Grant Meaningful Priority	\$ 6,321,559					\$ 6,321,559						6,321,559	Š	75,858,
Grant Surplus	\$ 206,051											206,051	ŝ	2,472,0
			a 5 700 004		e 5 700 004							6 700 004	+-	00.450
Iid-Columbia Contracts Total	\$ 5,762,824		\$ 5,762,824		\$ 5,762,824	\$ 5,762,824					\$ 5,762,824 \$	5,762,824	\$ 	69,153,
otal Long Term Firm Purchases	\$ 44,070,204	\$ 45,277,093	\$ 49,158,270	\$ 50,731,621	\$ 49,983,096	\$ 51,343,420	\$ 56,203,376	\$ 54,244,874	\$ 49,675,402	\$ 44,698,458	\$ 42,403,910 \$	41,213,817	\$	579,003,

Storage & Exchange													
						•							
Rush lake_BESS		- \$ -				•				\$ - \$ -		-	\$
Fremont Solar_BESS Green River Energy Center BESS		- S -							\$ - \$ -	\$ - \$ -		-	3 S
Umpgua Storage Placeholder	•	- 5 -	•	•	•	•	•	•	s -	\$ -	•		S
Cowlitz Swift		- 5 -				š -			s -	s -		-	Š
EWEB FC I	S -	- 5 -	S -	S - 1	s -	S -	S -	S -	S -	S -	S - S	-	S
PSCo Exchange	\$.	- \$ -	\$ -	\$ - 1	\$ -	\$ -	\$.	S -	\$ -	\$ -	s - s	-	\$
PSCO FC III		- \$ -	\$ -	\$ - I					s -	\$-	s - s	-	\$
SCL State Line	\$.	- 5 -	s -	s - !	s -	s -	\$ -	s -	s -	s -	s - s	-	\$
Total Storage & Exchange	5 -	- 5 -	S -	s - :	s -	s -	ş .	ş -	s -	S -	s - s	-	5
Short Term Firm Purchases													
COB	\$ 6,325,800	\$ 6,082,500	\$ 6,325,800				\$ 11,970,600		\$ 11,120,400			-	\$ 54,195,3
Colorado	\$.	•	\$ -		•	•	*	- S -	\$ -	\$-		-	\$
Four Corners		- 5 -								s -		-	
Idaho	•	- 5 -					•	- S -	s -	*		-	\$
Mead Mid Columbia	\$ \$ 1,931,280	- \$ -) \$ 1,857,000	\$ 1,931,280			\$ 4,045,000	\$ 5,694,000	\$ 5,913,000	\$ 5.256.000	\$ - \$ -	• •	-	\$ \$ 33,730,7
Mona	\$ 1,931,280 \$, a 1,007,000	\$ 1,931,280 \$ -					\$ 5,913,000	¢ 0,200,000	5 - 5 -	• •	-	\$ 33,730,7
NOB		- s -							5 - 5 -	s -			3 S
Palo Verde	•	- 5 -		•		•	•			s -	• •	-	S
SP15	•	- 5 -				•	•		s -			-	Š
Utah	\$.	- \$ -	\$ -	S - 1	s -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	S -	\$ -	S - S	-	S
Washington	\$.	- \$ -	\$ -	\$ - 1	š -	\$ -	\$.		\$ -	\$ -	\$ - \$	-	\$
West Main		- \$ -							S -	\$ -		-	\$
Wyoming	\$	- \$ -	\$ -	s - !	\$-	ş -	5 -	- S -	\$ -	S -	s - s	-	\$
Total Short Term Firm Purchases	\$ 8,257,080	\$ 7,939,500	\$ 8,257,080	\$ 3,551,600	\$ 3,551,600	\$ 4,045,000	\$ 17,664,600	\$ 18,283,200	\$ 16,376,400	s -	s - s	-	\$ 87,926,0
System Balancing Purchases													
COB	\$ 3,995,728		\$ 5,651,083	\$ 970,957		\$ 3,952,085					\$ 3,833,493 \$	3,161,202	\$ 47,284,5
Four Corners	\$ 5,133,296		\$ 2,211,625			\$ 3,069,395	\$ 10,123,179				\$ 2,799,012 \$	3,776,547	\$ 49,843,0
Mead	\$ 75,205		\$ 23,914			\$ 125,428					\$ 38,113 \$	1,033,231	\$ 2,832,0
Mid Columbia	\$ 58,924,615		\$ 33,475,706			\$ 35,137,154					\$ 38,907,100 \$	52,474,493	\$ 575,366,2 \$ 44,988,2
Mona NOB	\$ 4,153,375 \$ 15,096,070		\$ 2,295,606 \$ 8,236,824	\$ 2,329,668 \$ 2,839,992		\$ 1,900,608 \$ 6,295,025					\$ 3,333,314 \$ \$ 11,455,054 \$	4,714,433 16,579,276	\$ 44,988,2 \$ 138,463,0
Palo Verde	\$ 3,384,529					\$ 1,513,182					\$ 2,010,031 \$	1,722,061	\$ 27,140,4
EIM Imports/Exports	\$ (11,184,399											(11,123,005)	\$ (107,981,0
Emergency Purchases	\$ 26,797						\$ 298,835			\$ 73,184		17,990	\$ 687,1
Total System Balancing Purchases	\$ 79,605,215	5 \$ 53,922,598	\$ 46,051,679	\$ 34,884,948	\$ 24,840,054	\$ 45,337,828	\$ 120,830,137	\$ 112,571,705	\$ 82,507,921	\$ 50,598,272	\$ 55,117,177 \$	72,356,229	\$ 778,623,7
otal Purchased Power & Net Interchange	\$ 131,932,499	\$ 107,139,191	\$ 103,467,029	\$ 89,168,169	\$ 78,374,749	\$ 100,726,249	\$ 194,698,112	\$ 185,099,778	\$ 148,559,724	\$ 95,296,730	\$ 97,521,087 \$	113,570,045	\$ 1,445,553,3
/heeling & U. of F. Expense													
Firm Wheeling	\$ 12.352.191	\$ 12.895.715	\$ 13.686.689	\$ 13.886.857	s 13.168.217	\$ 14.028.114	\$ 15,738,603	\$ 15.397.001	\$ 14.607.293	\$ 13.622.190	\$ 14.375.663 \$	15,100,810	\$ 168.859.3
C&T EIM Admin fee	\$ 210,477					\$ 233,135						194,490	\$ 2,584,7
ST Firm & Non-Firm		- S -								s -			
otal Wheeling & U. of F. Expense	\$ 12,562,668	•	\$ 13,917,340			\$ 14,261,250						15,295,300	\$ 171,444,1
	• 12,002,000		÷ 10,017,040	· 17,107,202	¥ 10,000,000	¥ 17,201,200	÷ 10,011,041	• 10,010,220	÷ 11,017,002	• 10,000,000	• 17,007,007 a	10,200,000	• 0.0,444,0
calstein	\$ 1,296,581	I \$ 1.601.139	\$ 1.697.432	\$ 1.541.416	\$ 1,488,284	\$ 1,434,960	< 1 000 440	\$ 1,887,585	\$ 1,929,987	\$ 1,354,687	\$ 1.601.970 \$	1,548,448	\$ 19,281,9
Colstrip	\$ 1,296,581 \$ 2,126,467					\$ 1,434,960 \$ 1,889,930	\$ 1,899,416 \$ 2,152,366				\$ 1,001,970 \$ \$ 2,042,946 \$	2,356,369	\$ 19,281,9 \$ 23,970,0
Craig Dave Johnston	\$ 2,120,407		\$ 3,638,115			\$ 1,889,930 \$ 5,301,547					\$ 2,042,940 \$ \$ 4,636,845 \$	2,300,309	\$ 58,273,9
Havden	\$ 929,093		\$ 907,950			\$ 940.638						1,090,686	\$ 10,993,8
Hunter	\$ 22,211,585		\$ 9,234,133			\$ 9,172,441						13,866,190	\$ 158,966,0
Huntington	\$ 12,147,430		\$ 5,108,132			\$ 4,671,193						7,157,863	\$ 78,987,5
Jim Bridger	\$ 10,006,534					\$ 10,883,936						11,305,212	\$ 130,853,6
Naughton	\$ 3,598,079			\$ 2,549,687		\$ 2,339,114					\$ 2,235,831 \$	3,102,076	\$ 36,833,2
Wyodak	\$ 2,203,136	\$ 2,056,603	\$ 1,661,419	\$ 2,199,411	\$ 1,616,018	\$ 1,732,790	\$ 2,023,341	\$ 2,233,061	\$ 2,092,274	\$ 2,408,261	\$ 1,743,371 \$	2,534,985	\$ 24,504,6
otal Coal Fuel Burn Expense	\$ 58,931,622	2 \$ 51,100,328	\$ 37,984,917	\$ 32,537,301	\$ 34,628,410	\$ 38,366,549	\$ 59,118,754	\$ 55,359,812	\$ 41,534,146	\$ 43,928,483	\$ 40,366,365 \$	48,808,276	\$ 542,664,9

Chehalis	\$ 26,314,72	3 \$ 17,644	1,291 1	\$ 12,506,954	\$ 11,703,091	\$ 9,948,011	\$ 5,638,290	\$ 13,109,856	\$ 12,929,796	\$ 11,044,330	\$ 11,414,289	\$ 14,085,298	\$ 19,687,118	\$	166,026,04
Currant Creek	\$ 14,162,44	7 \$ 13,007	7,931	\$ 8,878,068	\$ 7,063,462	\$ 6,434,738	\$ 6,032,451	\$ 7,671,735	\$ 7,466,409	\$ 8,324,061	\$ 1,789,323	\$ 8,231,376	\$ 12,126,425	Ś	101,188,42
Gadsby	\$ 3,516,06	5 \$ 3,528	3.678	\$ 2,281,038	\$ 1,777,091	\$ 1,262,181	\$ 1,899,538	\$ 2.007.207				\$ 2.578.617		S	28,608,8
Gadsby CT	\$ 2,194,11	I \$ 2,136	3,464	\$ 1,472,078	\$ 1,248,474	\$ 1,286,331	\$ 1,503,739	\$ 1,297,976	\$ 1,552,646	\$ 1,353,390	\$ 1,309,016	\$ 1,541,501	\$ 2,150,100	Ś	19,045,8
Hermiston	\$ 5,730,033	3 \$ 4,908	3.624 1	\$ 2,063,975	\$ 2,741,146	\$ 1,231,901	\$ 1,748,215	\$ 2.323.511	\$ 3,635,697	\$ 3,490,577	\$ 3,672,198	\$ 4,258,005	\$ 4,230,602	S	40.034.4
Jim Bridger - Gas		- 5	- 1									S 11,443,216		Ś	103,534,1
Lake Side 1	\$ 14,253,68	IS 14.050	0,694 \$	\$ 8,405,234	\$ 7,303,003	\$ 7,266,202	\$ 7,255,199	\$ 8,576,665	\$ 8,612,488	\$ 8,615,058	\$ 5,732,808	\$ 9,872,675	\$ 13,586,767	S	113,530,4
Lake Side 2	\$ 17,445,834		3,427 \$		\$ 3,478,407		\$ 8,836,000					\$ 12,405,537		Ś	129,913,2
Naughton - Gas	\$ 2,801,384	S 2,710	0,121	\$ 3,136,882	\$ 1,973,797	\$ 2,819,345	\$ 3,761,594	\$ 2,737,633	\$ 3,289,413	\$ 2,898,020	\$ 1,189,104	S -	\$ 2,056,798	S	29,374.0
Total Gas Fuel Burn	\$ 86,418,27	7 \$ 73,773	3,230	\$ 54,646,722	\$ 40,732,071	\$ 42,064,539	\$ 47,963,157	\$ 61,133,450	\$ 64,430,909	\$ 58,712,148	\$ 47,641,114	\$ 64,416,226	\$ 89,323,778	\$	731,255,6
Gas Physical	S	- S	- 1	S - 1	s -	s -	S -	•	S -	S -	S -	S - 1	•	S	
Gas Swaps	\$ (11,212,85		9,528)		\$ 1,206,750		\$ 1,584,750	\$ 814,254				\$ 3,429,863		ŝ	(2,173,3
Clay Basin Gas Storage	\$ (775,56		3,925)									\$ (169,614)		s	(2,019,9
Pipeline Reservation Fees	\$ 3,789,73		5,752					\$ 3,787,147						ŝ	45,229,3
ripeline Reservation rees	a 3,168,13.	c o 3,110	3,132 4	a 3,100,180	¢ 3,101,314	¢ 3,108,132	a 3,140,240	a 3,101,141	a 3,103,081	a 3,130,616	a 3,763,810	a 3,130,180	a 3,100,421	-	40,228,0
														+-	
														+-	
tal Gas Fuel Burn Expense	\$ 78,219,59	I \$ 69,185	5,529	\$ 64,230,379	\$ 45,742,377	\$ 48,042,898	\$ 53,348,396	\$ 65,787,093	\$ 68,731,848	\$ 63,610,519	\$ 54,731,632	\$ 71,427,264	\$ 89,234,181	\$	772,291,7
ther Generation Expense														-	
Blundell	\$ 443,392		3,935		\$ 414,690	\$ 208,315	\$ 391,298	\$ 418,061	\$ 430,310	\$ 413,742	\$ 401,326	\$ 431,972	\$ 453,273	\$	4,323,3
Blundell Bottoming Cycle	\$	- \$	- 1	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$-	\$ -	\$ -	\$-	\$ -	\$ - 1	s -	\$	
Cedar Springs Wind II	\$	- \$	- 1	\$ -	s -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$-	\$-	S - 1	s -	\$	
Dunlap I Wind	\$	- \$	- 1	\$ -	s -	s -			s -	S -	\$ -	S -	s -	\$	
Ekola Flats Wind	S	- \$	- 1	\$ -	s -	s -	s -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	s -	\$	
Foote Creek I Wind	\$	- \$	- 1	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	\$ -	S - 1	s -	\$	
Foote Creek II Wind	S	- \$	- 1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - 1	S -	\$	
Foote Creek III Wind	\$	- \$	- 1	\$ -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S - 1	s -	\$	
Foote Creek IV Wind	S	- \$	- 1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - I	s -	\$	
Glenrock Wind	\$	- \$	- 1	s -	s -	s -	S -	s -	s -	S -	S -	S -	s -	\$	
Glenrock III Wind	S	- \$	- 1	S -	S -	s -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	S -	S - 1	s -	Ś	
Goodnoe Wind	S	- 5	- 1	s -	S -	S -	S -	S -	S -	S -	S -	S -	S -	S	
High Plains Wind	S	- S	- 1	S -	s -	s -	s -	<u>s</u> -	s -	\$ -	S -	S -	S -	Ś	
Leaning Juniper 1	S	- 5	- 1	S -	s -	S -	S -	5 -	S -	S -	S -	S -	s -	S	
Marengo I Wind	S	- \$	- 1	s -	s -	s -	s -	\$ -	s -	\$ -	s -	S -	s -	Š	
Marengo II Wind		- 5	- 1						S -			S -	s -	Š	
McFadden Ridge Wind		- S	- 1						s -			S -	s -	Š	
Pryor Mountain Wind		- 5	- 1									s -		Š	
Rolling Hills Wind		- 5	- 1						s -			S -		Š	
Seven Mile Wind	•	- 5	- 1		•	•			s -	*	•	S -		Š	
Seven Mile II Wind		- S				s -			s -			S -		Š	
Black Cap Solar		- 5	- 3			s -	s -	s -	s -			S -	s -	Š	
TB Flats Wind		- 5				s -			s -		s -	-	s -	Š	
TB Flats Wind II		- S	- 1	s -	s -	s -			s -	*	•	S -	s -	Š	
Rock Creek 1		- S							\$ -	-		S -		Š	
Rock Creek 2		- 5	- 1			s -			s -			S -	s -	Š	
Rock River 1		- Š	- 1			s -			s -			s -		ŝ	
Integration Charge	\$	- \$	- 4	s -	s -	s -	s -	s -	s -	s -	s -	s -	s -	\$	
tal Other Generation Expense	\$ 443.39	2 \$ 228	3.935 1	s 88.076	\$ 414,690	\$ 208,315	\$ 391,298	\$ 418,061	\$ 430,310	\$ 413,742	\$ 401,326	\$ 431,972	\$ 453,273	s	4,323
et Power Cost	\$ 229,791,25			\$ 200,423,021								\$ 191,765,784		\$	2,519,011,

Application No. 23-09-___ Exhibit No. PAC/102 Witness: Ramon J. Mitchell

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICORP 2024 ECAC

Prior ECAC's Projected 2023 NPC

Exhibit PAC/102 PacifiCorp Projected 2023 NPC

		Jan-23	Feb-23	Mar-23	Apr-23	May-23	Jun-23	Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	1	Total 2023
							\$								
Special Sales For Resale															
Long Term Firm Sales	-													_	
Black Hills	\$	554,036	100,011		• ••••••	534,560 \$	525,100 \$	570,729		020,210 4	525,100 \$	515,084 \$	576,294	\$	6,446,989
Hurricane Sale		536	605	670	648	670	648	670	670	648	670	648	670		7,750
Leaning Juniper Revenue		15,478	14,746	16,009	8,357	9,773	13,111	35,803	35,734	25,487	14,851	12,004	14,235		215,587
PSCo_Sale		894,040	824,640	910,380	653,600	677,440	881,920	1,839,220	2,216,455	2,092,288	719,881	700,412	702,586		13,112,861
Total Long Term Firm Sales	\$	1,464,089	1,323,913	1,484,433	\$ 1,173,793 \$	1,222,443 \$	1,420,779 \$	2,446,422	\$ 2,820,248	2,644,635	\$ 1,260,501 \$	1,228,147 \$	1,293,784	\$	19,783,187
Total Short Term Firm Sales Total Secondary Sales	\$	43,407,574	\$ 26,870,456 -	20,808,000	\$ 11,751,681 \$ -	14,220,232 \$	24,540,012 \$	40,430,587	\$ 41,662,420	51,233,247 S	34,442,068 \$ -	32,199,240 \$	34,706,536	\$	376,272,054
Total Special Sales For Resale	\$	44,871,663	28,194,369	22,292,433	\$ 12,925,474 \$	15,442,675 \$	25,960,790 \$	42,877,009	\$ 44,482,668	53,877,883	35,702,569 \$	33,427,388 \$	36,000,320	\$	396,055,240
Purchased Power & Net Interchange															
Long Term Firm Purchases															
Cedar Springs Wind		1,348,848	1,095,201	1,032,244	1,016,035	830,825	743,881	742,782	585,990	827,498	1,090,534	1,068,343	1,341,093		11,723,272
Cedar Springs Wind III		1,025,293	832.068	784,236	772,111	631,272	565,348	564.366	445,199	628.829	828.668	811,823	1.018.881		8,908,094
Combine Hills Wind		391,576	474,473	576,362	572.609	490,602	421,752	473.077	398,136	376.057	390.640	479,846	432,646		5,477,775
Cove Mountain Solar		183,848	193,154	336,688	366,527	421,871	453,707	440,109	416,435	357,107	287,471	206,551	169,814		3,833,283
		385,462	404,972	705,910	768,471	884,508	951,255	922,745		748,720	602,719	430,655	354,060		8.032.587
Cove Mountain Solar II Deseret Purchase		3.117.513	2,988,099	2,988,099	2,765,067	2,789,849	2.627.393	3.142.294	873,109 3,142,294	3,109,252	3,142,294	3.074.834	3,114,759		36.001.746
Eagle Mountain - UAMPS/UMPA		3,117,513	2,800,088	2,800,088	2,705,007	2,708,048	2,027,385	3,142,284	3, 142,284	3,108,232	3,142,284	3,014,034	3,114,758		30,001,740
Gemstate		150,100	150,100	150,100	150,100	150,100	150,100	150,100	150,100		-	-			1,200,800
Graphite Solar		313,766	355,437	561,331	616.028	690,923	708.977	691,500		579,734	483.379	357,284	267,268		6,272,497
Horseshoe Solar		313,700	300,437	001,331	010,028	090,923	/08,9//	091,000	646,870	578,734	483,379	307,284	207,208		0,272,497
Hunter Solar		371,168	420,781	641.039	669.033	762,896	789,454	750.512	705.507	657,834	561.379	398.161	323.388		7.051.153
Hurricane Purchase		15,936	15,994	16,145	16,128	16,145	16,128	16,145	16,145	16,128	16,145	16,128	16,145		193,311
MagCorp Reserves		320,800	312,800	316,800	324,800	316,800	324,800	328,800	312,800	308,800	296,700	344,900	328,800		3,837,600
Milican Solar		92,708	141,477	216,779	272,858	323,854	352,508	396,975	350,779	282,304	184,848	118,394	81,245		2,814,730
Milford Solar		353,274	406,820	600,085	667,481	784,725	827,371	736,808	709,314	661,660	533,619	388,227	305,919		6,975,304
Monsanto Reserves		1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700	1,716,700		20,600,400
Nucor		594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150	594,150		7,129,800
Old Mill Solar		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Pavant III Solar		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
PGE Cove		12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899	12,899		154,785
Prineville Solar		63,645	97,125	144,022	181,280	215,160	234,197	263,740	233,048	187,556	122,808	78,658	53,977		1,875,216
Rock River Wind		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Rocket Solar		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Sigurd Solar		309,554	345,619	509,742	556,548	639,667	703,042	653,634	599,181	559,401	453,931	319,006	267,971		5,917,296
Skysol Solar		-	-	698,731	756,489	964,767	1,278,104	1,603,572	1,541,676	1,061,102	626,170	344,706	317,083		9,192,400
Small Purchases east		1,173	1,213	1,172	1,172	1,233	1,203	1,226	1,202	1,154	1,157	1,209	1,176		14,288
Small Purchases west		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Soda Lake Geothermal		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-
Three Buttes Wind		2,790,662	1,806,920	2,135,792	1,616,110	1,427,656	1,205,752	805,618	949,664	1,185,169	1,735,343	2,352,785	2,572,230		20,583,701
Top of the World Wind		5,436,528	3,612,747	4,243,888	3,269,405	2,908,093	2,401,211	1,720,683	1,871,512	2,296,328	3,513,955	4,491,128	4,872,798		40,638,275
Tri-State Purchase		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
UT Schedule Adjustment		(699,228)	(760,409)	(1,267,242)	(1,384,499)	(1,575,430)	(1,660,232)	(1,614,246)	(1,519,979)	(1,328,454)	(1,086,098)	(787,939)	(621,328)		(14,305,084
Wolverine Creek Wind		779,175	910,409	1,160,283	1,067,617	806,161	866,062	686,022	652,525	770,670	848,339	986,255	990,276		10,523,795
Long Term Firm Purchases Total	\$	19,075,552	16,128,750	18,875,955	\$ 17,365,119 \$	16,805,426 \$	16,285,762 \$	15,800,212	\$ 15,405,254	\$ 15,610,596 \$	\$ 16,957,749 \$	17,804,702 \$	18,531,949	\$	204,647,025

Exhibit PAC/102

ro					

	Jan-23	Feb-23	Mar-23	Apr-23	May-23	Jun-23	Jul-23	Aug-23	Sep-23	Oct-23	Nov-23	Dec-23	-	Tota
						\$								
Qualifying Facilities OF California	s 167,498	\$ 177.630	s 211.597 s	\$ 215.520 \$	201.586 S	163.935 S	139.039	134,406 \$	127.305 S	131.831 \$	130,101 \$	149.015	s	
QF California QF Idaho	630,421	\$ 177,030 621,030	\$ 211,597 3 669,633	674,163	700,750	677,814	733,869	667,907	614,562	647,635	656,520	780,122	÷	
QF Oregon	2,249,395	2,672,810	3,668,128	4,722,574	5,040,568	5,343,553	5,183,600	4,928,306	4,109,928	3,012,556	2,004,720	1,937,595		
QF Utah	852,212	891,894	1,078,846	1,105,629	1,216,055	1,236,570	1,149,183	1,147,019	1.075.785	1.012.884	890,675	808,880		
QF Washington	-	-	-	5,120	18,598	51,806	58,266	53,533	25,617	1,742	-	-		
QF Wyoming	8,180	8.841	12.131	6.897	4,745	2,535	9,505	9.015	4.847	6,879	8,471	14,805		
Biomass One QF DCFP QF	1,579,705	1,323,820	1,494,894	1,505,786	1,599,616	799,407	1,524,929	1,573,783	1,537,958	1,563,610	1,583,204	861,970		
Enterprise Solar I QF	1,336,798	1,266,359	1,350,863	1,377,933	1,641,196	1,694,455	2.033.197	1,983,633	1,536,718	1,294,393	1,319,792	1,189,423		
Escalante Solar I QF	1,261,552	1,287,541	1,388,400	1,465,328	1,726,643	1,548,752	2,085,695	2,040,619	1,629,794	1,389,426	1,293,403	1,251,163		
Escalante Solar II QF	1,201,508	1,230,801	1,318,673	1,393,956	1.641.710	1,613,560	1,979,775	1,940,204	1,547,938	1,321,311	1,234,022	1,191,251		
Escalante Solar III QF	1,211,123	1,201,950	1,281,329	1,359,516	1,604,958	744,974	1,910,217	1,892,248	1,507,540	1,209,970	1,133,123	1,089,601		
ExxonMobil QF	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Five Pine Wind QF	554,862	906,947	816,351	850,866	515,894	584,654	659,194	640,311	808,926	791,265	940,370	949,712		
Granite Mountain East Solar QF	1,365,069	1,315,904	1,427,608	1,459,469	1,669,147	1,753,064	2,076,824	1,886,662	1,521,000	1,314,442	1,228,111	1,231,956		1
Granite Mountain West Solar QF	907,188	872,410	945,744	961,555	1,105,880	1,160,442	1,376,383	1,191,554	1,006,070	611,749	595,023	808,345		
Iron Springs Solar QF	1,395,725	1,340,095	1,465,891	1,498,478	1,716,029	1,798,792	2,122,668	2,055,158	1,556,628	1,339,896	947,737	1,229,598		
Latigo Wind Park QF	1,008,380	918,313	1,126,808	899,197	858,863	750,011	679,576	565,615	621,442	804,293	711,357	771,505		
Mountain Wind 1 QF	1,401,681	1,040,630	876,976	685,272	485,602	506,501	405,887	436,961	463,524	674,633	897,977	1,008,543		
Mountain Wind 2 QF	2,044,719	1,560,214	1,355,844	1,069,021	760,815	916,414	746,259	724,942	768,629	1,011,319	1,395,548	1,493,772		
North Point Wind QF	1,165,131	1,954,536	1,818,665	1,911,384	1,153,737	1,323,642	1,536,181	1,586,828	1,921,789	1,839,754	1,998,437	1,964,698		
Oregon Wind Farm QF	715,838	958,244	1,111,489	1,297,182	1,260,298	1,223,667	1,244,796	1,111,614	929,186	738,978	795,816	1,000,463		
Pavant II Solar QF	558,591	547,864	601,146	653,745	718,608	745,746	954,469	959,358	647,132	546,241	567,874	544,732		
Pioneer Wind Park I QF	1,297,050	918,271	1,286,892	1,019,427	683,882	737,428	853,972	823,289	542,193	864,331	1,344,839	1,055,265		
Power County North Wind QF	449,376	590,711	568,304	560,359	380,537	383,093	388,127	390,852	408,819	548,386	567,673	662,087		
Power County South Wind QF	396,841	520,011	513,090	520,715	327,839	341,698	342,539	363,999	362,093	479,885	512,477	575,010		
Roseburg Dillard QF	59,044	130,556	65,605	103,400	129,189	78,072	244,021	185,888	89,387	87,095	110,763	109,665		
Sage I Solar QF	79,705	78,928	187,861	203,039	233,053	259,536	331,713	331,792	206,029	153,821	103,600	74,348		
Sage II Solar QF	79,789	79,021	188,061	203,258	233,267	259,829	332,067	332,160	206,263	153,978	103,728	74,419		
Sage III Solar QF	67,187	65,762	155,157	165,491	191,023	212,279	270,704	270,549	170,042	129,039	87,807	63,160		
Spanish Fork Wind 2 QF	224,422	180,687	209,101	164,243	157,003	219,750	296,750	325,778	277,565	246,966	256,226	259,486		
Sunnyside QF	2,591,440	2,364,563	2,689,304	2,292,206	2,818,676	3,056,161	3,087,299	3,039,881	-	-	-	-		
Sweetwater Solar QF	255,091	368,749	557,947	676,497	804,030	969,793	1,098,050	1,027,809	802,870	618,001	295,309	198,224		
Tesoro QF	78,413	58,137	46,539	26,695	37,564	7,070	8,464	30,441	9,687	7,805	18,112	69,929		
Three Peaks Solar QF	1,062,105	1,035,787	1,157,428	1,198,060	1,321,812	1,166,846	1,462,357	1,434,276	1,145,504	1,004,651	987,254	823,708		1
Threemile Canyon Wind QF				-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-		
Utah Pavant Solar QF Utah Red Hills Solar QF	890,466 1,247,931	757,840 1,346,584	904,296 1,535,451	946,457 1,595,103	1,168,480 1,897,065	1,185,014 1,812,377	1,467,464 2,396,290	1,452,949 2,340,239	1,147,430 2,241,127	1,003,746 1,445,427	906,896 1,463,082	848,120 1,205,154		
Qualifying Facilities Total	\$ 30,394,436	\$ 30,593,441	\$ 34,086,051	\$ 34,793,541 \$	36,024,721 \$	35,329,237 \$	41,189,330	39,879,580	31,571,328 \$	28,007,938 \$	27,090,047	26,295,723	\$	3
Mid-Columbia Contracts														
Grant - Priest Rapids	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - \$	5 - 5	- \$	- \$	- 1	- 5	- \$	- \$	- 1	s -	\$	
Grant Reasonable	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
Grant Surplus	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400	193,400		
	\$ 193,400				193,400 \$	193,400 \$				193,400 \$			\$	
Total Long Term Firm Purchases	\$ 49,663,388	\$ 46,915,591	\$ 53,155,407	\$ 52,352,059 \$	53,023,547 \$	51,808,398 \$	57,182,942	55,478,234	47,375,325 \$	45,159,087 \$	45,088,149	\$ 45,021,072	\$	6
Storage & Exchange														
	\$-	\$-	\$-1	5 - 5	- \$	- \$	- 1	- 1	- \$	- \$	- 1	s -	\$	
Cowlitz Swift	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
PSCo Exchange	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
SCL State Line	-					-			-					
Total Storage & Exchange	\$.	\$ -	\$ - S	5 - 5	- \$	- \$	- 1			- \$	- 1	; -	\$	
	\$ (3,071,048) \$		\$ (3,252) \$		604,471 \$ - \$	893,985 \$ - \$	104,234,133			18,874,950 \$ - \$	17,402,935		S S	3
	\$ 46,592,341					52,702,384 \$	161,417,075		105,349,819 \$					9
-				•						•			-	
Wheeling & U. of F. Expense	e 12 040 200	C 12 522 500	\$ 15 807 000 4	14 755 500 8	12 754 200 8	15 020 800 8	10 800 200	18 000 000	18 261 600 8	14 277 000 .	12 007 000	14 450 200	•	
Firm Wheeling	\$ 13,849,200	\$ 13,522,500	\$ 15,687,900	\$ 14,755,500 \$	13,754,300 \$	15,920,600 \$	18,680,200	16,009,800	16,351,500 \$	14,277,800 \$	12,997,000	5 14,459,200	\$	18
	\$ 13,849,200	\$ 13,522,500	\$ 15,687,900 \$ -	\$ 14,755,500 \$ -	13,754,300 \$	15,920,600 \$	18,680,200	16,009,800	16,351,500 \$	14,277,800 \$	12,997,000	14,459,200	\$	1

Projected 2023 NPC

	-	Jan-23		Feb-23		Mar-23	_	Apr-23	_	May-23		Jun-23		Jul-23	Aug	-23	s	Sep-23	Oct	-23	_	Nov-23	1	Dec-23		Total 2023
												\$														
Coal Fuel Burn Expense												•														
Cholla	S	-	s	-	s	-	s	-	s	- 1	s	- 1	s	- 5	6	- 1	s	- 5	5	-	s	-	s	-	s	-
Colstrip		2,174,245		1,975,275		2,182,557		2,094,039		2,139,242		2,122,854		1,499,440	1,7	744,758		1,507,117		952,391		1,618,458		1,370,987		21,381,364
Craig		2,198,880		1,762,353		1,721,552		1,229,274		2,204,251		2,056,726		1,867,839	2,2	266,654		2,002,239	1.	901,018		1,794,543		1,971,912		22,977,240
Dave Johnston		7,330,301		6,473,077		6,491,171		6,293,945		7,242,468		7.014.623		4,460,424	5.2	289,664		4,616,880	5.	470,458		3,937,004		4,498,033		69,118,049
Hayden		974,623		769.873		832,533		785,884		943.320		856,920		936,398	7	780.323		1.045.441		723.673		815.013		781.521		10.245.524
Hunter		14,036,511		12,470,441		10,389,517		12,177,205		13,450,947		13,766,915		10,500,347	10,9	941,232		10,137,195	11.	322,124		11,171,034		9,321,892		139,685,359
Huntington		12,457,934		10,811,447		10,961,709		9,584,676		10,501,738		11,217,608		9,845,578	10,1	145,393		7,779,898	7.	471,986		8,816,671		10,593,394		120,188,032
Jim Bridger		14,897,069		14,485,395		13,116,479		8,213,163		10,495,756		12,008,887		23,845,600	25,1	112,897		21,917,814	18,	476,924		20,052,321		21,558,445		204,180,750
Naughton		2,348,994		2,708,260		2,402,087		2,325,465		2,093,803		2,865,732		3,355,263	3,3	324,569		2,931,311	2.	876,373		2,366,896		2,658,442		32,257,195
Wyodak		3,087,006		2,969,574		3,210,712		3,020,770		3,247,307		3,187,568		2,430,085	2,3	319,353		2,025,733	2,	136,222		1,583,973		1,074,764		30,293,067
Total Coal Fuel Burn Expense	\$	59,505,564	\$	54,425,695	\$	51,308,317	\$	45,724,422	\$	52,318,831	\$	55,097,834	\$	58,740,974	61,9	924,843	\$	53,963,628	51,	331,168	\$	52,155,914	\$	53,829,389	\$	650,326,579
Gas Fuel Burn Expense																										
Chehalis	\$	15,008,276	\$	5,853,237	\$	4,628,231	\$	925,900	\$	954,700	\$	2,932,550	\$	7,181,013	6,7	736,006	\$	7,381,445	5 9,	801,770	\$	7,154,205	\$	7,937,506	\$	76,494,841
Currant Creek		6,340,125		3,345,479		6,027,127		6,667,631		4,314,248		6,753,804		7,953,785	6,1	159,850		5,413,349	6.	622,383		8,184,247		6,613,061		74,395,091
Gadsby		1,383,872		913,861		795,770		490,329		620,530		894,587		1,770,489	2,1	120,023		1,802,051	1.	135,862		1,464,253		1,866,262		15,257,890
Gadsby CT		1,038,646		976,256		863,692		314,140		-		582,503		1,211,343	1,3	325,007		1,073,761	1.	120,336		1,161,760		1,234,734		10,902,178
Hermiston		6,363,920		4,833,331		4,148,021		2,868,477		3,305,894		1,951,342		1,533,344	1,3	392,667		1,581,567		477,967		2,632,903		4,043,147		35,132,580
Lake Side 1		5,121,014		4,028,903		6,137,784		6,309,680		7,239,151		7,141,878		7,551,521	7,6	662,446		6,537,643	6.	446,921		6,630,095		6,187,793		76,994,829
Lake Side 2		5,046,811		3,187,137		4,193,129		1,657,660		716,580		3,846,842		6,557,820	6,6	883,152		5,649,445	5,	435,076		5,615,017		6,823,548		55,412,217
Naughton - Gas		875,497		534,862		764,954		720,508		568,483		980,043		3,065,708	3,1	165,085		1,726,489	1,	778,534		1,971,756		4,620,761		20,772,679
Total Gas Fuel Burn Expense	\$	41,178,162	\$	23,673,066	\$	27,558,708	\$	19,954,326	\$	17,719,586	\$	25,083,551	\$	36,825,023	\$ 35,2	244,236	\$	31,165,749	32,	818,849	\$	34,814,236	\$	39,326,813	\$	365,362,304
Other Generation																										
Black Cap Solar	\$		\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	- 1	\$	- 1	\$	- 1		- 1	\$	- \$			\$	-	\$	-	\$	-
Blundell		461,755		417,069		461,755		387,279		432,185		418,243		381,550	3	390,298		406,476		346,843		229,062		176,392		4,508,907
Total Other Generation	\$	461,755	\$	417,069	\$	461,755	\$	387,279	\$	432,185	\$	418,243	\$	381,550		390,298	\$	406,476 \$	5	346,843		229,062	\$	176,392	\$	4,508,907
Net Power Cost	\$	116,715,359	\$	113,232,882	\$	125,876,401	\$	119,801,499	\$	122,410,245	\$ 1	123,261,822	\$	233,167,813		026,830	\$ 1	53,359,289	127,	106,128	\$	129,259,908		153,157,648	\$	1,752,375,823

Exhibit PAC/102

Application No. 23-09-___ Exhibit No. PAC/103-C Witness: Ramon J. Mitchell

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICORP 2024 ECAC

Projected NPC Comparison to Prior ECAC

[PUBLIC VERSION]

Application No. 23-09-___ Exhibit No. PAC/104 Witness: Ramon J. Mitchell

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICORP 2024 ECAC

2024 California-allocated NPC

Exhibit PAC/104 PacifiCorp California 2024 Forecast Net Power Costs

	CY 2024	2017		CY 2024
	Total	Protocol	California	California
Description	Company	Factor	Factor %	Allocated
Sales for Resale (Account 447)				
Existing Firm Sales PPL	-	SG	1.580%	-
Existing Firm Sales UPL	-	SG	1.580%	-
Post-merger Firm Sales	417,265,960	SG	1.580%	6,594,615
Total Revenue	417,265,960			6,594,615
Purchased Power (Account 555)	-			
Existing Firm Demand PPL	27,788,625	SG	1.580%	439,181
Existing Firm Demand UPL	9,200,052	SG	1.580%	145,401
Existing Firm Energy	86,683,767	SE	1.490%	1,291,828
Post-merger Firm	1,321,880,919	SG	1.580%	20,891,461
Other Generation	1,321,000,919	SG	1.580%	20,031,401
Seasonal Contracts	-	SG	1.580%	
Total Purchased Power	1,445,553,362	30	1.500 /6	22,767,871
Total Furchased Fower	1,440,000,002			22,101,011
Wheeling (Account 565)	-			
Existing Firm PPL	19,834,453	SG	1.580%	313,471
Existing Firm UPL	-	SG	1.580%	-
Post-merger Firm	138,790,535	SG	1.580%	2,193,493
Non-firm	12,819,126	SE	1.490%	191,040
Total Wheeling Expense	171,444,113			2,698,004
Fuel Expense (Accounts 501, 503 and 547)	-			
Fuel Consumed - Coal	518,160,290	SE	1.490%	7,722,020
Fuel Consumed - Gas	101,188,427	SE	1.490%	1,507,987
Steam From Other Sources	4,323,390	SE	1.490%	64,430
Natural Gas Consumed	666,999,084	SE	1.490%	9,940,130
Simple Cycle Combustion Turbines	28,608,869	SE	1.490%	426,351
Cholla/APS Exchange	-	SE	1.490%	
Total Fuel Expense	1,319,280,060	02	1.10070	19,660,919
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-			,,•.•
CY 2024 Net Power Cost	2,519,011,575			38,532,179

Application No. 23-09-___ Exhibit No. PAC/105-C Witness: Ramon J. Mitchell

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICORP 2024 ECAC

Direct Testimony of Ramon J. Mitchell

[PUBLIC VERSION]

Unit Cycling CONFIDENTIAL

This scenario analyzes cycling of three of the largest Company owned coal units (Hunter 3 and Huntington 1 and 2)

This analysis is the cycling of particular coal units during all times of the year Test Period is 2024



Please refer to Page 4 ("Explanation") for a description of the increase to net power costs resulting from cycling coal units when market prices are substantially higher than coal generation costs

Time Cycling CONFIDENTIAL

This scenario analyzes cycling during the light load months of Spring (March-May) and Fall (Oct-Nov)

This analysis is the cycling of all Company owned coal units during particular times of the year Test Period is 2024



Please refer to Page 4 ("Explanation") for a description of the increase to net power costs resulting from cycling coal units when market prices are substantially higher than coal generation costs

All Cycling CONFIDENTIAL

This scenario analyzes cycling all Company owned coal units

This analysis is the cycling of all Company owned coal units during all times of the year Test Period is 2024



Please refer to Page 4 ("Explanation") for a description of the increase to net power costs resulting from cycling coal units when market prices are substantially higher than coal generation costs

Explanation

Aurora performs net power costs forecasts using simulated look-ahead periods to create a temporal constraint on the cycling of generating units (this is referred to as the "look-ahead period", which is how many consecutive present and future days that are analyzed when determining whether to make startup or shutdown decisions). For example, for a seven-day look-ahead period that runs January 1st until January 7th, the decision on whether to commit (i.e., to startup or shutdown) a particular plant would be made for January 1st. A subsequent sevenday look-ahead period would begin on January 2nd and run through January 8th, with a commitment decision for January 2nd. Taken together, for each day of the year, the commitment decisions look at the current day, plus an extended number of days (the look-ahead period), to make an informed decision on whether startups or

However, look-ahead periods have a significant impact on the cycling of resources, these impacts can often result in increased NPC. By having a limited look-ahead period, the model has no knowledge of system conditions occurring after that specific look-ahead period. With high startup costs, high market prices, and increased volatility of generation from variable energy resources (VERs), Aurora can make uneconomic shutdown decisions that it otherwise would have avoided had the model had the functionality for a look-ahead capability greater than 7 days. This tendency of uneconomic decisions increases the greater the discrepancy

For example, consider the following. For commitment decisions on January 7th with a look-ahead period of 7 days (January 7th – January 13th), if Aurora determines that the cost of a coal resource's generation is greater than the cost of power available for purchase from the market, the coal resource will be shutdown (if economic cycling is permitted). Next, on the subsequent look-ahead period that begins on January 8th with a 7-day period (January 8th – January 14th), if Aurora determines a need for additional generation due to loss of generation from VERs on January 14th, re-starting the coal resource in this period may be uneconomic due to the start-up costs.

However, if the model had not shut down the coal resource on January 7th and instead operated the coal resource at its minimum generation level, then the commitment decisions made on January 8th would be better informed since the model has no other economic alternatives to replace the reduced generation from VERs on January 14th. Not allowing the economic cycling of units can result in better solutions (less costly), because the costs of running coal resources at minimum generation levels are often less than the cost of market purchases in

Appendix CONFIDENTIAL

This Appendix provides additional discussion for how economic cycling can increase NPC in Aurora.

For the purposes of this example assume that: Aurora is using a 7-day look-ahead period; there is a coal-fired resource named X with a dispatch cost of \$30/MWh, a startup cost of \$50,000, a minimum operating level of 100 MW, a maximum operating level of 500 MW, and a minimum up-time of 7 days; and a market that offers unlimited energy at a price that varies each day.

First, consider an example where the coal-fired resource is economically shut down during the first look-ahead period. On January 7th, coal-fired resource X is online at the minimum operating level of 100 MW with a look-ahead period of 7 days (January 7th – January 13th), and market prices are \$25/MWh across the look-ahead period. In this example, the cost of generation from coal-fired resource X across the look-ahead period (100MW * 168hrs * \$30/MWh = \$504,000) is more than the cost of market purchases (100 MW * 168hrs * \$25/MWh = \$420,000). Therefore, Aurora would conclude that the economic decision is to shut down the resource.

Now consider the subsequent look-ahead period where this coal-fired resource remains shutdown after comparing the resource to other market alternatives. On January 8th with a look-ahead period of 7 days (January 8th – January 14th), there is a need for additional energy due to the loss of a 100 MW resource on January 14th, and the market price on January 14th is \$50/MWh, and falls to \$25/MWh on January 19th and remains at that price until January 22nd. In this example, the loss of the 100 MW resource is covered by market purchases and therefore market purchases from January 14th – January 22nd would cost \$600,000 (200MW * 24hrs * \$50/MWh + 100MW * 144hrs * \$25/MWh = \$600,000), while starting-up and operating coal-fired

However, if coal-fired resource X had not been shutdown to begin with, the cost of operating the coal-fired resource across that January 14th – January 22nd time period would have been \$576,000 (200MW * 24hrs * \$30/MWh + 100MW * 144hrs * \$30/MWh = \$576,000). This is a lower cost outcome compared to the shutdown and resulting market purchases that otherwise would have been avoided if the resource could have continue to operate (\$576,000 to continue operating the coal plant, compared to \$600,000 for shutting down the unit and purchasing market power).

By having a limited look-ahead period, the model has no knowledge of system conditions occurring after the look-ahead period. Hence when the model cycles coal resources, it makes shutdown decisions that would otherwise been avoided if the look-ahead period were greater than the available seven days (for example, one year long). These shutdown decisions are often uneconomic in retrospect, and this is often expected because: 1) Aurora does not allow for the look-ahead period to be greater than 7 days; 2) like Aurora, in actual operations there is a look-ahead period of 2-3 days beyond which the expected system conditions are either not know or substantially uncertain; and 3) startup costs present a high hurdle rate to overcome when considering the economics of repeatedly shutting down and starting up coal-fired resources.

Application No. 23-09-___ Exhibit No. PAC/106-C Witness: Ramon J. Mitchell

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICORP 2024 ECAC

Coal Volumes

[PUBLIC VERSION]