

**Errata to  
2003 Safety-Net CRAC Initial Power Rate Proposal  
Rate Design Testimony  
SN-03-E-BPA-10(E1)**

Page 7, Lines 19-20: Insert the following two questions.

*Q. Are you considering any other possible changes to respond to Parties' desire that BPA remain under strong cost-control pressure?*

A. Yes. BPA could agree that, for the purposes of calculating ANR for the SN CRAC, cost levels for specified categories of costs would be levels detailed in the SN CRAC Final Study, not the actual net cost levels. This would keep any increases in those net costs from causing an increase in the SN CRAC rates calculated under a variable design.

*Q. That would seem to preclude reducing the SN CRAC amounts if BPA's cost control is even more effective than planned. Is there a way to change that?*

A. Yes. ANR for the purposes of the SN CRAC could be defined to be based on the lower of actual cost levels or the levels detailed in the SN CRAC Final Study for specified categories of costs.

Page 15, Lines 21-22: Change the sentence from:

“It means that much of BPA’s revenue for May through September will not be received as cash by BPA.”

To:

“It means that much of BPA’s revenue for May through September will not be received as cash by BPA, but BPA cash payment obligations for the next fiscal year are reduced by the same amount. In effect, BPA’s receipt of much of the cash associated with May through September revenue is delayed until the next fiscal year.”