Yvonne R. Hogle
Senior Counsel
One Utah Center
201 S. Main Street, Suite 2300
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
801.220.4050
801.220.3299 Fax

January 20, 2009

Public Service Commission of Utah
Heber M. Wells Building
160 East 300 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110

Attn: Ms. Julie Orchard
Commission Secretary

Re: Docket 08-035-95 – Follow-Up Information from January 5, 2009 Technical Conference

Dear Commissioners:

The purpose of this letter is to follow up with information that was requested in the January 5, 2009 technical conference held in Docket 08-035-95. Exhibit A, attached hereto, includes the questions that were asked that were not answered at the technical conference and the answers thereto for your convenience.

Please feel free to call me if you have any questions related to this matter.

Sincerely,

Yvonne R. Hogle

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER
A MIDAMERICAN ENERGY HOLDINGS COMPANY

EXHIBIT A

Question 1: Is there a difference in price depending on whether we use AFUDC or CWIP?

Response: It varies based on the short-term interest rate, but generally the AFUDC rate is less than return on rate base. With CWIP, the Company would have to be filing continual rate cases to get the CWIP in rate base so it becomes impractical unless the Company has a tracker mechanism.

Question 2: Provide a detailed breakdown of the owners' capital costs for Lake Side 2.

Response: See Attachment 1.

Question 3: What is used from a percentage basis for contingency?

Answer: See Attachment 1. The contingency is calculated as three percent of the total charges from the EPC contractor and the charges from the developer.

Question 4: What are the 2008 Business Analyses?

Answer: The assumptions for the 2008 business plan are the same as those of the 2007 IRP update, found at http://www.pacificorp.com/File/File82304.pdf

Question 5: What is the load forecast used in the 2012 RFP?

Answer: The load forecast used for the 2012 RFP evaluation is from the 2007 IRP (see chapter 40 which can be found at http://www.pacificorp.com/File/File74765.pdf Exhibit RMP 2.1 of the Lake Side 2 application uses the load forecast from the 2007 IRP update http://www.pacificorp.com/File/File82304.pdf.

Question 6: What other assumptions were used in the 2012 RFP?

Answer: The 2012 RFP analysis was based on the 2007 IRP, with the exception of the forward price curve that was locked down on June 22, 2007 (see page 2 of Exhibit RMP 2.2) just prior to receiving the bids. See response to question 5 for the link to the 2007 IRP and see Exhibit RMP 2.2 for documentation of the evaluation and assumptions.

Question 7: What are the expiring contracts and likelihood of renegotiations for the 900 MW loss?

Answer: See response to DPU Data Request 2.2a in Docket 08-035-95.