



January 11, 2012

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING AND OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

Public Service Commission of Utah Heber M. Wells Building, 4th Floor 160 East 300 South Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Attention: Julie P. Orchard

Commission Secretary

Re: Demand-side management report supplementary filing pursuant to Commission

order in Docket No. 10-035-57

On November 1, 2011, Rocky Mountain Power ("Company") filed its 2011 Demand Side Management ("DSM") Semi-Annual Forecast Report ("Report") containing forecast expenditures for approved DSM programs and projected energy and capacity acquisition targets for calendar year 2012. The Report also includes the Company's actual Schedule 193 balancing account results for January 2011 through September 2011, along with the projected Utah DSM expenditures and revenues through December 2012.

On December 21, 2011 the Public Service Commission of Utah ("Commission") ordered the Company to prepare a supplemental filing that explains how the calendar year 2012 projected savings, in both MWs and MWH, for each Utah DSM program can be reconciled with corresponding targets in the 2011 IRP Preferred Portfolio for calendar year 2012.

Supplemental Attachment 1 provides a comparison of how the calendar year 2012 projected savings, in both MWs and MWH, for each Utah DSM Class 1 program listed in the Report's Attachment A can be reconciled with the corresponding targets in the 2011 IRP Preferred Portfolio for calendar year 2012. A direct reconciliation for Class 2 savings between the program forecast provided in Attachment A and the 2011 IRP Preferred Portfolio for calendar year 2012 is not directly available. Unlike Class 1 resources, Class 2 resources are not provided to or selected in the IRP modeling by program. Rather, Class 2 resource potential is identified in the Company "Assessment of Long-Term, System-Wide Potential for Demand-Side and Other Supplemental Resources" through an analysis of numerous sector specific energy efficient enduse measures. The potential for these measures are then consolidated for IRP modeling efficiency into bundled products or supply curves representing discrete resource options of a particular quantity, availability, and cost (including administration costs). The IRP selects Class 2 resources based on the attractiveness of each DSM supply curve compared to competing supply-side or other resource alternatives available to the model. As a result, the 2011 IRP selected supply curves are comprised of end-use measure sets, not by programs, to arrive at the Class 2 savings within the 2011 IRP's Preferred Portfolio for calendar year 2012 making the Public Service Commission of Utah January 11, 2012 Page 2

reconciliation between what was selected and how we intend to acquire the resources not readily available.

Since the IRP represents and selects resources on a capacity basis, it is necessary for Class 2 DSM resources to be converted from MWH (energy) to MWs (capacity) in the development of the Class 2 DSM supply curves. This is achieved by weighting the load shapes of the individual end-use measures that are bundled within each of the nine Class 2 supply curves developed. The IRP model then compares Class 2 resource to other alternative supply side options and by way of the DSM resources selected (which curves and the resources within each curve it picks) provides the Company an overall weighted MW hour to MW conversion factor based on the end-use efficiencies or opportunities selected. As describe in more detail in the Company's revised "2010 Annual Energy Efficiency and Peak Reduction Report – Utah" it's this conversion factor that the Company assumes in converting residential energy efficiency energy savings (both forecasted and actual) to a capacity impact on the system, and is also relied upon for forecasting the impact of commercial and industrial programs savings prior to actual project by project calculations that are used for reporting actual results in the Company's annual report.

Class 1 DSM

The 2012 forecast for the Cool Keeper program acknowledges a reduction incorporated in the Company's agreement with its third party vendor. The IRP selections were based on potential identified, year on year availability over the planning horizon will be preserved as the delivery particulars are resolved.

The 15 MW difference in irrigation load control is due to a difference in reporting conventions, the two values represent the same value for the purposes of the program forecast report and IRP resource selection. The IRP reporting convention is based on realized impact of a Class 1 product at dispatch. The value provided in Attachment A is based on participating program load necessary to achieve the impact assumed within the IRP. Based on a recent impact evaluation of the 2009 and 2010 Idaho irrigation load control program, it's assumed that 52 MWs of participating load equates to 37 MWs of realized load at dispatch – roughly a 70 percent realization rate. ¹

One addition Class 1 product selected in the 2011 IRP Preferred Portfolio for implementation in Utah, but not included in the list of programs in Attachment A, is commercial curtailment. The IRP selected 43 MWs for introduction in 2012, pending regulatory review and approval. The November 1, 2011 program forecast for 2012 by program only contains forecasts for programs already approved by the Commission, consistent with forecasting assumptions related to tariff rider reviews and adjustments.

Class 2 DSM

The 2012 Class 2 resource selections in the 2011 IRP (229,500 MWH and 47 MW) is less than the 2012 Class 2 resource forecast provided by the Company in our November 1, 2011 Utah forecast (250,000 MWH and 51 MW). The 2011 IRP resource modeling was completed in mid-2010 and was based on resource opportunities believed achievable across each year of the 20

¹ MWs associated with Cool Keeper are based on "pay for performance" and therefore are not adjusted for realization rates.

Public Service Commission of Utah January 11, 2012 Page 3

year planning horizon. Some variability between IRP selections and near term market forecasts on an annual basis is to be expected given the use of ramp rates and customer driven variances in program activity/ investment. The Company's 2012 Class 2 forecast provided in Attachment A (250,000 MWH) is based on current program level forecasts provided by our delivery vendors as well as Company forecasts informed by measurable commercial and industrial efficiency projects at various stages of completion, as well as prospective new projects, all expected to be realized in 2012. Actual results for 2011 will be close to 243,000 MWH, an increase over the Company's initial 2011 Class 2 forecast in Utah of 211,016 MWH (forecast provided in the November 1, 2010 filing). The 2011 results, as well as 2012 forecast is not meant to suggest that the Company has under represented Class 2 DSM opportunities in Utah but rather is setting out to acquire those opportunities at a rate faster than that assumed in each of the Company's last two IRP Preferred Portfolios – an appropriate behavior under a responsible resource planning process.

This filing is intended to satisfy the Commission order for supplementary information to the Semi-Annual Forecast Report.

It is respectfully requested that all formal correspondence and staff requests regarding this matter be addressed to:

By E-mail (preferred): datarequest@pacificorp.com

dave.taylor@pacificorp.com

By regular mail: Data Request Response Center

PacifiCorp

825 NE Multnomah Blvd., Suite 2000

Portland, OR 97232

Inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to Dave Taylor, Utah regulatory affairs manager, at (801) 220-2923.

Sincerely,

Carol L. Hunter Vice President, Services

cc: Division of Public Utilities
Office of Consumer Services
Utah Clean Energy
Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Western Resource Advocates