

Proposed Approach for EEI Budget Adjustments and Scenario Results Due to Energy Efficiency FY2011 Capital Overspend

Background

BPA expects that FY2011 capital costs for energy efficiency will exceed the authorized \$115 million budget. However, BPA intends to keep the total capital spending on energy efficiency from FY2010 – FY2014 at or under the IPR budget set at \$459 million to facilitate achievement of public power's share of the 6th Power Plan's target.

At the August 4th customer meeting the Administrator proposed building a proposal around providing FY 2012 Energy Efficiency Incentive (EEI) amounts that are unchanged from those numbers that were previously communicated to customers and consistent with a spending level of \$115 million in FY 2011. Adjustments would be considered for the FY 2013 and/or FY2014 EEI amounts. At the meeting BPA discussed two distinct approaches:

1. **Level Impact Scenario**—the overspend is proportionally spread across all utilities equally; and,
2. **Equity Impact Scenario** – the solution would apply Post-2011 philosophy to FY 2011 by the overspend being paid by specific utilities that spend proportionally more in FY2011.

BPA committed to engage with a group of customers defined by the Public Power Council (PPC) to work out the details for an approach moving forward. The following attempts to balance the views heard at the August 4th meeting and to set a framework for a solution prior to knowing what the overspend amount will be. While it is designed to create a basis for discussion and be illustrative, BPA remains open to other approaches and changes to reflect views that emerge from the dialogue with the PPC group. The attached scenarios and numbers will vary from the final data depending on the final FY2011 total and also by individual utilities' spend.

Proposed Approach to Manage Overspend – Hybrid Impact Scenario Starting Baseline

- *Budget Level.* BPA has established an FY 2011 budget of \$115 million
- *Overspend Amounts are Unknown.* BPA and the customers do not yet know the size of the overspend challenge and may not to have full information until November 2011.

Step 1. Apply the *Level Impact* approach to 50% of the total spending above the current budget (\$115m).

Step 2. Apply *Equity Impact* approach to 50% of the spending above the current budget. This equity approach would be calculated as noted below.

Proposed Calculation for Equity Impact:

Equity would be defined as the dollar amount the utility would have received from the FY 2011 ECA budget if the budget amount was based on the 2012 Tier 1 Cost Allocator (TOCA). This calculation would establish an equity threshold for each customer. Customers that spend less than or equal to their equity threshold would see no further adjustment to their EEI under Step 2.

Customers that exceed their equity threshold would experience reductions to their EEI. Each customer's share of the reductions for Step 2 would be proportional to the dollar amount that particular customer exceeded the equity threshold.

Additional Funding Requests in FY2011

There have been a handful of requests for additional funding in ECA contracts for FY2011 since BPA put a hold on processing new requests. There are a number of customers (~19) that communicated to BPA that they would need additional funds in FY2011. Because those customers were relying on information provided by BPA staff that they would be provided with these funds, there is a pressing reason to evaluate whether or not BPA should add these dollars to those utilities' FY2011 budget.

In June and early July of this year, Energy Efficiency Representatives (EERs) contacted customers to inquire about the status of their ECA implementation budget. There were ~19 utilities that requested/indicated they would need addition BPA funds. It is expected that the total amount needed will not exceed ~\$4.0 million. If a customer requested funds, but has the potential to have a negative balance in the Hybrid scenario, they will not receive the additional funds (this excludes Grant from receiving additional funds).

By using this approach, BPA can limit the exposure of adding new funding to those utilities that indicated to BPA in June or July that they needed additional funds. BPA requests specific feedback on this approach. The attached scenarios assume this additional funding is added.

Scenario Specifics

Disclaimer/Caveat

Please be aware that the attached scenarios are based on a number of assumptions which use the best information that BPA had available at the time of constructing the scenarios. The scenarios are for illustrative purposes to show orders of magnitude. The FY2011 spending forecast by utility is based on information assembled in June/July of this year and is the most current that is available. The scenarios are intended to provide a broad overview and will change as specific information is updated (i.e. when the exact amount spent by each utility in FY2011 is known).

Overview

The attached tables present three scenarios for managing future budget adjustments to utility EEI in order to absorb the impact of the FY11 capital budget overspend. The tables include assumptions and inputs required to calculate the scenarios.

Assumptions, Base Case and Inputs

The scenarios are based on the preliminary utility TOCAs for FY2012. In the Equity and Hybrid impact scenarios, this is the value used to retroactively calculate the relative proportion of FY11 budget each utility would have access to. For energy efficiency's use of TOCA, the raw preliminary percentages have been normalized to sum to 100%. The "base case" EEIs for

FY2013 are those has been communicated to utilities¹. This "base case" represents the EEI based on a \$115M FY2011 spend and an Energy Efficiency total capital budget in FY2013 of \$95m with ~\$73m going toward the EEI fund and ~\$22m funding BPA managed program costs. It is against this "base case" that each scenario is compared. The total spent in the scenarios is based on what utilities told BPA to expect them to spend for the year in June, but BPA's estimate has been lower because utilities in the past have not spent what they said they are going to spend.

Table 1 represents specific inputs required to calculate scenarios. Table 2 shows the FY2011 ECA Expenditures forecast which represents rough estimates, by utility, of total anticipated ECA invoicing for FY2011. The estimates shown here are now dated and may not reflect each utility's current high-confidence estimate of their total BPA-invoiced ECA expenditures.

Scenarios

Table 3 presents the results of three scenarios. Two of the scenario concepts were presented at the August 4th meeting. The third scenario is a hybrid approach, blending elements of the first two.

Level Impact Scenario - This scenario spreads the impact of any FY11 capital overspend across all customers, with 50% of the overspend coming from FY2013 EEI funds and 50% from FY2014 EEI funds. Essentially, the EEI fund is diminished to offset the overspend, but the TOCA allocation is applied directly against that smaller base.

Equity Impact Scenario - This scenario targets the impact of any FY11 capital overspend to the utilities who, in FY11, spent beyond the share they would have been allocated, if BPA had a TOCA based allocation mechanism in place.

Hybrid Impact Scenario - This scenario applies a portion of any FY11 overspend using the Level Impact approach and a portion using the Equity Impact approach. The default inputs in this sheet represent a 50% split between Level Impact and Equity Impact.

¹ FY2013 is used as the base case because it is expected that FY2012 EEI amounts will not be adjusted to account for the FY2011 overspend, but the overspend will be accounted for in FY2013 – FY2014.

Table 1: Inputs to form the three scenarios

Capital Budget Base Case	2011	2012	2013
BPA Capital Budget (as communicated May)	\$ 115,000,000	\$ 89,000,000	\$ 95,000,000
BPA-Managed Programs Costs	\$ 31,000,000	\$ 21,940,000	\$ 21,940,000
Utility Incentive Fund / Energy Efficiency Incentive Fund	\$ 84,000,000	\$ 67,060,000	\$ 73,060,000

Level Impact Scenario

Total Spent	\$ 158,212,978
Amount Over Budget	\$ 43,212,978
Percent of Adjustment used in 2013	50%
2013 Adjustment (1/2 of over-budget)	\$ 21,606,489
Revised 2013 Budget	\$ 73,393,511
Level-Impact 2013 EEI Fund	\$ 51,453,511

Equity Impact Scenario

All budget impacts are specific to utility's proportional spend.	
See scenario tab for impacts and calculations	
Percent of Adjustment used in 2013	50%

Hybrid Impact Scenario

Starting 2011 Budget	\$ 115,000,000
Total Spent	\$ 158,212,978
Proportion of level impact	50%
Levelized Impact Adjusted Budget	\$ 136,606,489
Difference: 2011 Spend less Levelized Impact in FY13-14	\$ 21,606,489
Percent of Adjustment used in 2013	50%
2013 Levelized Adjustment	\$ 10,803,244
Revised 2013 Budget for interim calculation	\$ 84,196,756
Hybrid Scenario 2013 EEI Fund	\$ 62,256,756
2011 Utility Incentive Fund - Increased to Levelized Impact	\$ 105,606,489

Explanation of calculations in Table 1**Level Impact Scenario**

- “Total Spent” is based on what utilities told BPA to expect them to spend for the year in June plus BPA managed program costs. Details are shown in Table 2, below.
- The “*Percent of Adjustment used in 2013*” represents that 50% of the FY2011 overspend (in this example \$43.2m) will be taken out of FY2013 EEIs and 50% will be taken out of FY2014.
- The “*Revised 2013 Budget*” (\$73.4m) is the 2013 “*BPA Capital Budget*” (\$95m) minus the “*2012 Adjustment*” (\$21.6m).
- The “*Level Impact 2013 EEI Fund*” is the “*Revised 2103 Budget*” (\$73.4m) minus the 2013 “*BPA-Managed Programs Costs*” (\$21.9m). This is the amount that is allocated on a TOCA basis to each utility in the Level Impact scenario.

Hybrid Impact Scenario

- The “*Total Spend*” amount is the sum of the FY2011 ECA Expenditures forecast by utility (\$127.2m; shown in Table 2, below) plus the FY2011 “*BPA-Managed Programs Costs*” (\$31m).
- The “*Proportion of level impact*” shows how much of the FY2011 overspend is treated using the Level Impact Scenario with the remainder being treated in the Equity Impact manner. In this example, the total overspend is \$43.2m. Half of the overspend (\$21.6m) is treated by Level Impact and half is treated with Equity Impact (\$21.6m).
- The “*Levelized Impact Adjusted Budget*” (\$136.6m) is the “*Total Spend*” minus the 50% of the overspend that is treated by the Equity Impact (\$21.6m).
- The “*2013 Levelized Adjustment*” (\$10.8m) is half of the “*Difference: 2011 Spend less Levelized Impact in FY13-14*”: the other half is assumed to be taken in FY2014.
- The “*Revised 2013 Budget for interim calculation*” is the 2013 “*BPA Capital Budget*” (\$95m) minus “*2013 Levelized Adjustment*” (\$10.8m).
- The “*Hybrid Scenario 2013 EEI Fund*” is the “*Revised 2013 Budget for interim calculation*” minus the 2013 “*BPA-Managed Programs Costs*” (\$21.9m).

Table 2: FY2011 ECA Expenditures forecast

UTILITY		UTILITY	
	F11 Forecast		F11 Forecast
ASHLAND	\$ 236,119	MILTON-FREEWATER	\$ 478,372
ASOTIN PUD	\$ -	MISSION VALLEY POWER	\$ 485,887
BANDON	\$ 155,250	MISSOULA ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 1,077,943
BENTON CO. PUD #1	\$ 350,000	MODERN ELECTRIC WATER	\$ 218,623
BENTON REA	\$ 1,693,770	MONMOUTH	\$ 420,671
BIG BEND ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 1,222,203	NESPELEM VALLEY ELECTRIC	\$ 20,000
BLAINE	\$ 278,200	NORTHERN WASCO PUD	\$ 354,000
BONNERS FERRY	\$ 48,574	OHOP MUTUAL	\$ -
CANBY	\$ 100,624	OKANOGAN CO. PUD #1	\$ 640,309
CASCADE LOCKS	\$ 54,533	ORCAS POWER & LIGHT CO.	\$ 85,000
CENTRAL LINCOLN PUD	\$ 1,292,841	OREGON TRAIL ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 882,543
CENTRALIA, (CITY)	\$ 69,526	PACIFIC CO. PUD #2	\$ 1,307,854
CHENEY	\$ 50,000	PARKLAND P & L	\$ -
CHEWELAH	\$ 248,221	PEND OREILLE CO. PUD #1	\$ 807,508
CITY OF TROY	\$ 10,001	PENINSULA POWER & LIGHT INC.	\$ 2,059,762
CLALLAM CO. PUD #1	\$ 1,717,115	PLUMMER	\$ 150,000
CLARK CO. PUD #1	\$ 9,476,793	PNGC	\$ 6,221,363
CLATSKANIE PUD	\$ 750,000	PORT ANGELES	\$ 1,225,000
COLUMBIA BASIN COOP.	\$ 3,000	PORT OF SEATTLE	\$ -
COLUMBIA POWER COOP.	\$ 18,000	RAVALLI ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 132,243
COLUMBIA REA	\$ 823,524	RICHLAND	\$ 2,028,209
COLUMBIA RIVER PUD	\$ 1,590,304	SALEM ELECTRIC	\$ 1,008,845
Consolidated Irrigation District	\$ 25,000	SEATTLE	\$ 8,401,373
COULEE DAM	\$ -	SKAMANIA CO. PUD #1	\$ 604,343
COWLITZ CO. PUD #1	\$ 10,406,974	SNOHOMISH CO. PUD #1	\$ 10,721,250
ELLENSBURG	\$ 35,980	South Side Electric Inc	\$ -
ELMHURST MUTUAL	\$ -	SPRINGFIELD	\$ 1,662,377
EMERALD PUD	\$ 678,994	STEILACOOM	\$ -
ENERGY NORTHWEST	\$ 10,000	SUMAS	\$ 268,533
EUGENE	\$ 8,500,000	SURPRISE VALLEY ELECTRIC CORP.	\$ 3,000
FERRY CO. PUD #1	\$ 401,085	TACOMA	\$ 12,000,000
FLATHEAD ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 3,772,951	TILLAMOOK PUD	\$ 1,092,922
FOREST GROVE	\$ 591,411	Umpqua Indian Utility Cooperative	\$ -
FRANKLIN CO. PUD #1	\$ 4,172,162	UNITED ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.	\$ 251,338
GLACIER ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 365,739	VERA WATER & POWER	\$ 255,392
GRANT CO. PUD #2	\$ 5,841,816	VIGILANTE ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 122,998
GRAYS HARBOR CO. PUD #1	\$ 1,563,618	WAHIAKUM CO. PUD #1	\$ -
HARNEY ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 5,000	WASCO ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 36,000
Hermiston Energy Services	\$ 51,598	Wells Rural Electric Co.	\$ 316,000
HOOD RIVER ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 247,974	WHATCOM CO. PUD #1	\$ -
IDAHO CO. L & P COOP.	\$ 70,613	Yakama Nation	\$ 3,500
Idaho Energy Authority Pooling Group	\$ 1,613,000	Alder Mutual*	
INLAND POWER & LIGHT CO.	\$ 4,047,521	Drain, City of	
KITTITAS CO. PUD #1	\$ 97,000	Eatonville, City of	
KLICKITAT CO. PUD #1	\$ 185,067	Minidoka, City of	
KOOTENAI ELECTRIC COOP., INC.	\$ 984,651	Tanner Elec Coop	
LAKEVIEW L & P CO.	\$ 417,876	Jefferson County PUD #1	
LEWIS CO. PUD #1	\$ 1,171,017	U.S. Airforce Base, Fairchild	
LINCOLN ELECTRIC COOP. MONT	\$ 187,468	U.S. DOE Albany Research Center	
LOWER VALLEY ENERGY	\$ 1,352,233	U.S. DOE Richland Operations Office	
MASON CO. PUD #1	\$ 86,504	U.S. Naval Base, Bremerton	
MASON CO. PUD #3	\$ 1,252,793	U.S. Naval Station, Everett (Jim Creek)	
MCCLEARY	\$ 31,540	U.S. Naval Submarine Base, Bangor	
MCMINNVILLE	\$ 3,241,651	Subtotal ECA Expenditures	\$ 127,212,978
MIDSTATE ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 271,987	BPA-Managed Program Costs	\$ 31,000,000
MILTON (CITY)	\$ -	Total Expenditures	\$ 158,212,978

*Customers from Alder Mutual thru U.S. Naval Submarine Base, Bangor do not have an ECA with BPA.

Table 3: Scenario Impact Summary

UTILITY	BASE CASE				Hybrid as %		
	2013 EEI	Level Impact	Equity Impact	Hybrid Impact	Level as % of BaseCase	Equity as % of BaseCase	of BaseCase
ASHLAND	\$ 215,266	\$ 151,604	\$ 215,266	\$ 183,435	70%	100%	85%
ASOTIN PUD	\$ 6,352	\$ 4,473	\$ 6,352	\$ 5,413	70%	100%	85%
BANDON	\$ 77,480	\$ 54,567	\$ 51,165	\$ 54,992	70%	66%	71%
BENTON CO. PUD #1	\$ 2,080,444	\$ 1,465,181	\$ 2,080,444	\$ 1,772,813	70%	100%	85%
BENTON REA	\$ 712,209	\$ 501,583	\$ 363,679	\$ 435,769	70%	51%	61%
BIG BEND ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 650,909	\$ 458,412	\$ 461,182	\$ 482,225	70%	71%	74%
BLAINE	\$ 93,014	\$ 65,506	\$ 23,635	\$ 41,126	70%	25%	44%
BONNERS FERRY	\$ 56,581	\$ 39,848	\$ 56,581	\$ 48,214	70%	100%	85%
CANBY	\$ 216,026	\$ 152,140	\$ 216,026	\$ 184,083	70%	100%	85%
CASCADE LOCKS	\$ 23,594	\$ 16,616	\$ 12,685	\$ 14,854	70%	54%	63%
CENTRAL LINCOLN PUD	\$ 1,621,651	\$ 1,142,070	\$ 1,621,651	\$ 1,381,861	70%	100%	85%
CENTRALIA, (CITY)	\$ 259,233	\$ 182,569	\$ 259,233	\$ 220,901	70%	100%	85%
CHENEY	\$ 168,244	\$ 118,488	\$ 168,244	\$ 143,366	70%	100%	85%
CHEWELAH	\$ 30,255	\$ 21,307	\$ (57,023)	\$ (29,216)	70%	-188%	-97%
CITY OF TROY	\$ 21,675	\$ 15,265	\$ 21,675	\$ 18,470	70%	100%	85%
CLALLAM CO. PUD #1	\$ 808,692	\$ 569,532	\$ 496,855	\$ 549,921	70%	61%	68%
CLARK CO. PUD #1	\$ 3,238,907	\$ 2,281,045	\$ 913,027	\$ 1,491,910	70%	28%	46%
CLATSKANIE PUD	\$ 948,051	\$ 667,678	\$ 948,051	\$ 807,864	70%	100%	85%
COLUMBIA BASIN COOP.	\$ 128,898	\$ 90,778	\$ 128,898	\$ 109,838	70%	100%	85%
COLUMBIA POWER COOP.	\$ 34,145	\$ 24,047	\$ 34,145	\$ 29,096	70%	100%	85%
COLUMBIA REA	\$ 400,933	\$ 282,363	\$ 257,789	\$ 280,191	70%	64%	70%
COLUMBIA RIVER PUD	\$ 602,186	\$ 424,098	\$ 240,493	\$ 323,995	70%	40%	54%
Consolidated Irrigation District	\$ 2,423	\$ 1,707	\$ (6,615)	\$ (3,679)	70%	-273%	-152%
COULEE DAM	\$ 21,539	\$ 15,169	\$ 21,539	\$ 18,354	70%	100%	85%
COWLITZ CO. PUD #1	\$ 5,478,293	\$ 3,858,163	\$ 3,858,073	\$ 4,047,553	70%	70%	74%
ELLENSBURG	\$ 255,094	\$ 179,653	\$ 255,094	\$ 217,374	70%	100%	85%
ELMHURST MUTUAL	\$ 342,636	\$ 241,306	\$ 342,636	\$ 291,971	70%	100%	85%
EMERALD PUD	\$ 544,333	\$ 383,354	\$ 523,697	\$ 463,844	70%	96%	85%
ENERGY NORTHWEST	\$ 27,921	\$ 19,664	\$ 27,921	\$ 23,793	70%	100%	85%
EUGENE	\$ 2,670,867	\$ 1,880,995	\$ 476,322	\$ 1,048,982	70%	18%	39%
FERRY CO. PUD #1	\$ 124,081	\$ 87,386	\$ 19,206	\$ 46,745	70%	15%	38%
FLATHEAD ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 1,711,707	\$ 1,205,493	\$ 981,414	\$ 1,115,484	70%	57%	65%
FOREST GROVE	\$ 258,368	\$ 181,959	\$ 140,655	\$ 163,703	70%	54%	63%
FRANKLIN CO. PUD #1	\$ 1,239,390	\$ 872,858	\$ 120,648	\$ 419,534	70%	10%	34%
GLACIER ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 224,606	\$ 158,182	\$ 181,556	\$ 181,061	70%	81%	81%
GRANT CO. PUD #2	\$ 55,218	\$ 38,888	\$ (2,302,971)	\$ (1,498,617)	70%	-4171%	-2714%
GRAYS HARBOR CO. PUD #1	\$ 1,395,720	\$ 982,955	\$ 1,395,720	\$ 1,189,338	70%	100%	85%
HARNEY ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 238,093	\$ 167,680	\$ 238,093	\$ 202,886	70%	100%	85%
Hermiston Energy Services	\$ 132,533	\$ 93,338	\$ 132,533	\$ 112,936	70%	100%	85%
HOOD RIVER ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 137,154	\$ 96,593	\$ 101,258	\$ 104,324	70%	74%	76%
IDAHO CO. L & P COOP. 2	\$ 66,093	\$ 46,547	\$ 66,093	\$ 56,320	70%	100%	85%
Idaho Energy Authority Pooling Group	\$ 1,297,107	\$ 913,506	\$ 1,259,069	\$ 1,105,306	70%	97%	85%
INLAND POWER & LIGHT CO.	\$ 1,119,666	\$ 788,541	\$ (3,134)	\$ 305,556	70%	0%	27%
KITTITAS CO. PUD #1	\$ 97,793	\$ 68,872	\$ 97,793	\$ 83,332	70%	100%	85%
KLICKITAT CO. PUD #1	\$ 382,886	\$ 269,652	\$ 382,886	\$ 326,269	70%	100%	85%
KOOTENAI ELECTRIC COOP., INC.	\$ 534,640	\$ 376,528	\$ 385,632	\$ 400,403	70%	72%	75%
LAKEVIEW L & P CO.	\$ 346,844	\$ 244,269	\$ 342,756	\$ 295,556	70%	99%	85%
LEWIS CO. PUD #1	\$ 1,170,685	\$ 824,471	\$ 1,170,685	\$ 997,578	70%	100%	85%
LINCOLN ELECTRIC COOP. MONT	\$ 143,905	\$ 101,347	\$ 135,618	\$ 122,626	70%	94%	85%
LOWER VALLEY ENERGY	\$ 915,162	\$ 644,516	\$ 803,774	\$ 779,839	70%	88%	85%
MASON CO. PUD #1	\$ 95,595	\$ 67,324	\$ 95,595	\$ 81,460	70%	100%	85%
MASON CO. PUD #3	\$ 844,297	\$ 594,608	\$ 735,115	\$ 715,694	70%	87%	85%
MCCLEARY	\$ 44,396	\$ 31,266	\$ 44,396	\$ 37,831	70%	100%	85%
MCMINNVILLE	\$ 938,192	\$ 660,735	\$ 52,539	\$ 291,279	70%	6%	31%
MIDSTATE ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 492,359	\$ 346,750	\$ 492,359	\$ 419,555	70%	100%	85%
MILTON (CITY)	\$ 79,106	\$ 55,711	\$ 79,106	\$ 67,409	70%	100%	85%
MILTON-FREEWATER	\$ 101,082	\$ 71,188	\$ (46,015)	\$ (2,412)	70%	-46%	-2%
MISSION VALLEY POWER	\$ 383,939	\$ 270,394	\$ 366,125	\$ 327,167	70%	95%	85%
MISSOULA ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 282,918	\$ 199,249	\$ (23,289)	\$ 62,427	70%	-8%	22%
MODERN ELECTRIC WATER	\$ 278,139	\$ 195,883	\$ 278,139	\$ 237,011	70%	100%	85%
MONMOUTH	\$ 88,957	\$ 62,649	\$ (39,940)	\$ (1,686)	70%	-45%	-2%
NESPELEM VALLEY ELECTRIC	\$ 62,556	\$ 44,056	\$ 62,556	\$ 53,306	70%	100%	85%
NORTHERN WASCO PUD	\$ 647,492	\$ 456,005	\$ 647,492	\$ 551,749	70%	100%	85%

UTILITY	BASE CASE				Hybrid as %		
	2013 EEI	Level Impact	Equity Impact	Hybrid Impact	Level as % of BaseCase	Equity as % of BaseCase	Hybrid as % of BaseCase
OHOP MUTUAL	\$ 108,051	\$ 76,096	\$ 108,051	\$ 92,074	70%	100%	85%
OKANOGAN CO. PUD #1	\$ 520,649	\$ 366,674	\$ 508,412	\$ 443,662	70%	98%	85%
ORCAS POWER & LIGHT CO.	\$ 263,094	\$ 185,288	\$ 263,094	\$ 224,191	70%	100%	85%
OREGON TRAIL ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 790,404	\$ 556,653	\$ 790,404	\$ 673,528	70%	100%	85%
PACIFIC CO. PUD #2	\$ 368,902	\$ 259,804	\$ (8,643)	\$ 92,609	70%	-2%	25%
PARKLAND P & L	\$ 148,669	\$ 104,702	\$ 148,669	\$ 126,685	70%	100%	85%
PEND OREILLE CO. PUD #1	\$ 252,106	\$ 177,549	\$ 28,828	\$ 86,040	70%	11%	34%
PENINSULA POWER & LIGHT INC.	\$ 760,315	\$ 535,462	\$ 278,623	\$ 391,974	70%	37%	52%
PLUMMER	\$ 41,965	\$ 29,554	\$ 936	\$ 12,206	70%	2%	29%
PNGC ³	\$ 5,547,238	\$ 3,906,719	\$ 5,547,238	\$ 4,726,979	70%	100%	85%
PORT ANGELES	\$ 874,665	\$ 615,995	\$ 794,522	\$ 745,330	70%	91%	85%
PORT OF SEATTLE	\$ 175,875	\$ 123,863	\$ 175,875	\$ 149,869	70%	100%	85%
RAVALLI ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 193,238	\$ 136,090	\$ 193,238	\$ 164,664	70%	100%	85%
RICHLAND	\$ 1,075,293	\$ 757,290	\$ 752,450	\$ 789,478	70%	70%	73%
SALEM ELECTRIC	\$ 418,965	\$ 295,062	\$ 208,850	\$ 253,002	70%	50%	60%
SEATTLE	\$ 5,572,736	\$ 3,924,676	\$ 4,826,213	\$ 4,711,652	70%	87%	85%
SKAMANIA CO. PUD #1	\$ 167,250	\$ 117,788	\$ 145	\$ 46,132	70%	0%	28%
SNOHOMISH CO. PUD #1	\$ 8,496,672	\$ 5,983,899	\$ 8,145,905	\$ 7,240,286	70%	96%	85%
South Side Electric Inc	\$ 69,661	\$ 49,060	\$ 69,661	\$ 59,360	70%	100%	85%
SPRINGFIELD	\$ 1,038,980	\$ 731,716	\$ 855,007	\$ 848,050	70%	82%	82%
STEILACOOM	\$ 51,147	\$ 36,021	\$ 51,147	\$ 43,584	70%	100%	85%
SUMAS	\$ 38,744	\$ 27,286	\$ (52,224)	\$ (23,629)	70%	-135%	-61%
SURPRISE VALLEY ELECTRIC CORP.	\$ 166,829	\$ 117,492	\$ 166,829	\$ 142,160	70%	100%	85%
TACOMA	\$ 4,204,764	\$ 2,961,263	\$ 1,311,227	\$ 2,019,977	70%	31%	48%
TILLAMOOK PUD	\$ 579,487	\$ 408,112	\$ 411,105	\$ 430,081	70%	71%	74%
Umpqua Indian Utility Cooperative	\$ 37,517	\$ 26,422	\$ 37,517	\$ 31,970	70%	100%	85%
UNITED ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC.	\$ 318,854	\$ 224,558	\$ 318,854	\$ 271,706	70%	100%	85%
VERA WATER & POWER	\$ 282,135	\$ 198,697	\$ 282,135	\$ 240,416	70%	100%	85%
VIGILANTE ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 195,789	\$ 137,887	\$ 195,789	\$ 166,838	70%	100%	85%
WAHAKIACUM CO. PUD #1	\$ 53,239	\$ 37,494	\$ 53,239	\$ 45,367	70%	100%	85%
WASCO ELECTRIC COOP.	\$ 142,490	\$ 100,350	\$ 142,490	\$ 121,420	70%	100%	85%
Wells Rural Electric Co.	\$ 1,018,698	\$ 717,432	\$ 1,018,698	\$ 868,065	70%	100%	85%
WHATCOM CO. PUD #1	\$ 285,416	\$ 201,008	\$ 285,416	\$ 243,212	70%	100%	85%
Yakama Nation	\$ 67,651	\$ 47,644	\$ 67,651	\$ 57,648	70%	100%	85%
Alder Mutual	\$ 5,825	\$ 4,102	\$ 5,825	\$ 4,964	70%	100%	85%
Drain, City of	\$ 22,872	\$ 16,108	\$ 22,872	\$ 19,490	70%	100%	85%
Eatonville, City of	\$ 35,824	\$ 25,229	\$ 35,824	\$ 30,527	70%	100%	85%
Minidoka, City of	\$ 1,257	\$ 885	\$ 1,257	\$ 1,071	70%	100%	85%
Tanner Elec Coop	\$ 117,353	\$ 82,647	\$ 117,353	\$ 100,000	70%	100%	85%
Jefferson County PUD #1	\$ 20,143	\$ 14,186	\$ 20,143	\$ 17,165	70%	100%	85%
U.S. Airforce Base, Fairchild	\$ 64,189	\$ 45,206	\$ 64,189	\$ 54,698	70%	100%	85%
U.S. DOE Albany Research Center	\$ 4,824	\$ 3,397	\$ 4,824	\$ 4,111	70%	100%	85%
U.S. DOE Richland Operations Office	\$ 279,313	\$ 196,710	\$ 279,313	\$ 238,011	70%	100%	85%
U.S. Naval Base, Bremerton	\$ 285,770	\$ 201,257	\$ 285,770	\$ 243,514	70%	100%	85%
U.S. Naval Station, Everett (Jim Creek)	\$ 15,466	\$ 10,892	\$ 15,466	\$ 13,179	70%	100%	85%
U.S. Naval Submarine Base, Bangor	\$ 211,142	\$ 148,700	\$ 211,142	\$ 179,921	70%	100%	85%
Subtotal - ECA Expenditures	\$ 51,453,511	\$ 51,453,511	\$ 51,453,511	\$ 51,453,511			
BPA-Managed Program Costs	\$ 21,940,000	\$ 21,940,000	\$ 21,940,000	\$ 21,940,000			
Total Capital Expenditure	\$ 73,393,511	\$ 73,393,511	\$ 73,393,511	\$ 73,393,511			
Subtotal - ECA Expenditures (only >0)	\$51,453,511	\$53,993,367	\$53,012,751				

of Utilities who can't pay back overspend
 # utilities who lose 25% or more of Base

9 6

35 34

In response to this proposal, BPA requests specific feedback:

1. Should BPA authorize more funds in FY2011 (up to ~\$4m)?
2. BPA anticipates providing FY 2012 EEI amounts that are unchanged from those numbers that were previously communicated to customers based on an EEI fund of ~\$67m, giving more near-term budget certainly to customers. This will provide more time to decide how EEI will be allocated in FY2013 – FY2014. Do you feel this is an appropriate course of action?
3. Which scenario (level, equity or hybrid) do you prefer? Or, do you have an alternative scenario?