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DECEMBER 6, 2010

## PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BOYER: This is the time and place duly noticed for the hearing on the settlement stipulation in Docket No. 10-035-89, captioned: In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power For Alternative Cost Recovery For Major Plant Additions of the Populus to Ben Lomond Transmission Line and the Dunlap I Wind Project.

And for the record, we've had a preliminary discussion off the record discussing two issues. The first of which is the necessity to substitute an exhibit to the stipulation. So it will be an amendment to the stipulation.

And we'll -- Rocky Mountain Power will address that in just a moment. And the second thing is the admission of prefiled direct testimony in this matter.

So we'll deal with those things first. And then our intent will be to proceed by hearing witnesses supporting the stipulation. And then any opposing, if any opposing. And then those proponents will have the last word if there are opponents to the settlement stipulation.

So let's turn first to the Exhibit 2
substitution, or however we're gonna call that. And we'll turn to Ms. Hogle to address that, please.

MS. HOGLE: Good morning Commissioners. My name is Yvonne Hogle, and I have here with me David L. Taylor, who are here behalf of the Company. And I will let Mr. Taylor address the Exhibit 2 modification.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Okay. We should have taken appearances before we actually get into the nitty-gritty. Why don't we do that. Beginning with you, Ms. Hogle.

MS. HOGLE: Okay. This is Yvonne Hogle.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: For?
MS. HOGLE: For Rocky Mountain Power.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you.
Ms. Schmid?
MS. SCHMID: Patricia E. Schmid, with the Attorney General's Office, Division of Public Utilities.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you.
Mr. Proctor?
MR. PROCTOR: Paul Proctor, on behalf of the Utah Office of Consumer Services.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you Mr. Proctor.
Mr. Dodge?

MR. DODGE: Gary Dodge, on behalf of UAE.
MR. REEDER: And I'm Bob Reeder, for a group of industrial customers whose names appear as a part of this record that are known as UIEC.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Reeder.
MS. HAYES: Sophie Hayes for Utah Clean Energy. And although we intervened, we have taken -Utah Clean Energy has taken no position on this stipulation.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Hayes.
All right. Let's hear now from Mr. Taylor regarding Exhibit 2 to the stipulation.

MR. TAYLOR: Do I need to be sworn first?
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Yes, you do.
(Mr. Taylor was sworn.)
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you. Please be seated.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. What we're proposing is that Exhibit 2 that was attached with the stipulation that was filed last week be replaced with a Revised Exhibit 2. This simplifies the rate design and the tariff sheets that will be provided to customers. And will simplify the bills that customers get as a result of the three rate changes that are coming out of this docket.

Exhibit 2 carried those rate changes all the way out to cents per kilowatt hour or dollars per kW charges. And since there are multiple kilowatt hour charges and kW charges on customers' bills and there are three different rate changes there could be as many as 9 or 12 line items on an individual customer's bill as a result of these changes.

This simplifies it down to only three line items, while producing the same bills for customers. So all parties involved think this is an improvement and a simplification, without any change to the net impact to customers.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Taylor.
Do we have a motion, Ms. Hogle?
MS. HOGLE: Yes, excuse me. Rocky Mountain
Power moves for the addendum to the settlement agreement in Docket 10-035-89 be entered into the record.

MR. REEDER: No objection.
MR. DODGE: No objection.
MS. SCHMID: No objection.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Mr. Proctor?
MR. PROCTOR: No objection.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Very well. Then the
Exhibit 2, the Amended Exhibit 2 will be admitted into
evidence and substituted in the -- as an attachment to the settlement stipulation.
(Exhibit No. 2 was admitted.)
CHAIRMAN BOYER: And that brings us to the direct testimony. It has been suggested that we admit the -- all of the prefiled direct testimony in this case. I guess we -- Mr. Dodge, do you want to make that motion?

MR. DODGE: I will make that motion. I move that all of the prefiled direct testimony and exhibits filed in this docket be admitted in the record without the need to call the witnesses or cross ex -- and that all parties waive cross examination.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Are there any objections to admitting the prefiled direct testimony, together with exhibits?

MS. SCHMID: No objection.
MS. HOGLE: No objection.
MR. REEDER: No objection.
MR. PROCTOR: Mr. Boyer, so long as there's also a waiver of summaries.

MR. DODGE: And a waiver of summaries.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Together with a waiver of summaries.

MR. PROCTOR: I would have no objection to
that.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Very well. Any objection to that? Okay. Very well then. The direct prefiled testimony, together with exhibits, are all admitted into evidence without summaries.
(All prefiled direct testimony and exhibits were admitted.)

CHAIRMAN BOYER: And now let's hear from the witnesses supporting our approval of the settlement stipulation. Shall we start with the Company?

MS. HOGLE: Certainly. DAVID L. TAYLOR,
called as a witness, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. HOGLE:
Q. Mr. Taylor, can you please state your name and your position with Rocky Mountain Power for the record?
A. My name is David L. Taylor. I'm employed by Rocky Mountain Power as the manager of regulatory affairs for the State of Utah.
Q. And can you tell us what the purpose of your testimony is today?
A. Yeah. I will briefly review the history of
events that led up to the stipulation and the key elements of the stipulation that's being presented before the Commission today.

This stipulation was entered into by Rocky Mountain Power, the Utah Division of Public Utilities, the Office of Consumer Services, the UAE intervention group, and the Utah Industrial Energy Consumers. These five groups will be represented as "the parties" as we discuss about the stipulation.

I'll also reconfirm Rocky Mountain Power's support for the stipulation and our belief that the stipulation is in the public interest.
Q. And can you recount the key events that led to the agreement among the parties, please?
A. On August 3, 2010, Rocky Mountain Power filed with the Commission an application in Docket 10-035-89 under the Major Plant Addition Statute. That application requested alternative cost recovery for major plant additions related to the Populus to Ben Lomond transmission line and the Dunlap I wind project. These are collectively referred to throughout the stipulation as the "MPA II Projects."

The application also requested that rates change on or about January 1, 2011, for the following items: Number 1, a rate increase of approximately
$\$ 38.99$ million on an annual basis for the MPA II Projects.

Also to change rates on January 1 for approximately $\$ 30.8$ million for the Ben Lomond to Terminal transmission project and the Dave Johnson Generation Unit 3 environmental improvement projects. These are referred to as MPA I projects. And that is consistent with the stipulation and Commission order that was entered in Docket 10-035-13.

In addition, Rocky Mountain Power requested to stop the deferral from the MPA I projects, which has been occurring since July of 2010. And to begin collecting approximately $\$ 15.72$ million associated with the MPA I deferred balance. Again, that would begin on January 1, 2011.

Parties other than the Company filed direct testimony of ten witnesses on October 26, 2010. Each of those parties proposed adjustments and raised issues with the relief that was requested in the Rocky Mountain Power application.

And over the last several weeks the parties have met and engaged in settlement discussions. And based upon those discussions the parties have agreed to the terms and conditions that are set forth in the stipulation that's presented before you today.

The stipulation was filed and signed -signed and filed with the Commission on November 29, 2010. And while not all parties who have been involved in the case have signed the stipulation, we're not aware of any party who opposes the stipulation that's presented here today.
Q. Can you please describe the stipulation?
A. Yes. Let me walk through the, the major paragraphs of the stipulation and the terms that the parties have agreed to. Beginning with paragraph 7, which describes the revenue requirements. The parties have agreed, for this case only, that the following elements of this stipulation may apply just to this case.

That the Commission should enter an order, pursuant to the Major Plant Addition Statute, that approves the cost recovery of the MPA II Projects and the MPA I projects as follows:

That Utah's share of the revenue requirement associated with the MPA II Projects for prudentlyincurred capital costs and other reasonably projected costs, and savings, and benefits is $\$ 33.29$ million annually.

Utah's share and how that number was arrived is laid out in the table that's attached -- or
included in paragraph 7(c.) The table shows a number of small adjustments that align the revenue requirement calculations with the Company's most current projections of costs for those two projects, and a small adjustment for wheeling expense associated with the transmission line.

There's two items on that table that warrant a more detailed explanation. There is an adjustment for $\$ 5.57$ million associated with bonus depreciation. Paragraph 7(d) gives an explanation of the changes in tax law that brought that adjustment about and how it impacts this case.

The stipulation only addresses how that bonus depreciation legislation applies to the MPA II Projects in this docket.

The other item that's noticeable there is dealing with REC revenues. As you'll notice, there's no adjustment on that table to the projection of REC revenues that the Company included in its filing. However, there's a provision in the stipulation that I'll talk about later that allows for a true up of whatever those revenues associated with the RECs coming from Dunlap I prove to be that will be trued up to those actual amounts.

Moving on to the other paragraphs in the
stipulation. Paragraphs 8 through 12 were drafted carefully so as not to presume any outcome or influence the Commission's decision in any way in any open dockets that are currently sitting before the Commission. They're designed specifically just to address issues that are within the stipulation.

And that probably, that probably consumed the bulk of the negotiations in the drafting of the stipulation. To make sure that we could reach these agreements without giving any presumption or influence to the decisions that are pending before the Commission in other dockets.

But in paragraph 8 the parties agree that on January 1, 2011, that Utah's share of REC revenues that's included in base rates from the last general rate case is $\$ 9.9$ million. Now, that amount does not include the $\$ 0.76$ million associated with REC revenues coming from the Dunlap I project that will separately be included in the rates from the MPA II docket.

So combining those two amounts is
$\$ 10.66$ million of REC revenues that will be included in rates that, that the customers are now paying. And they will be con -- as of January 1, 2011, the amount in excess -- the REC revenues in excess of that amount will continue to be deferred in the REC balancing
account that was established in Docket 10-035-14.
And I'll explain a little more about the treatment of that deferral as I discuss paragraphs 9 through 12.

In paragraph 9 the parties agree that the \$3 million monthly customer sur-credit, as will be reflected in Schedule 98 we'll discuss later, should be established beginning January 1, 2011. This amount represents incremental REC revenues not currently reflected in base rates as of that time.

Schedule 98 is designed to achieve approximately $\$ 3$ million a month in a sur-credit on an average monthly basis, but the actual amount will vary based upon customer usage from month to month. The actual amount of the sur-credit that will be realized by customers will be booked against the deferred REC balance that was established in the docket I just addressed.

This $\$ 3$ million a month sur-credit is to be applied towards the final resolution of the REC revenue deferrals, whatever that resolution turns out to be. It's not intended to make any presumption as to what the final resolution of it will be that this Commission will make in the future.

As directed by future Commission order, the

Schedule 98 might be modified. It could be continued, it could be discontinued, or it could be adjusted in any way to reflect what that final Commission order turns out to be.

But absent any specific action on
Schedule 98, that schedule will terminate upon the effective rate date that new rates are set in the next Rocky Mountain Power general rate case. Subject to any specific conditions that are discussed later in the stipulation.

Paragraph 10. Then in light of the stipulation, UAE withdraws its request that the Commission determine, in this docket, the appropriate ratemaking treatment of any balance in the deferred REC balancing account.

Also, the stipulation renders moot the Company's motion in this docket to strike portions of UAE witness Kevin Higgins' testimony related to those issues. The parties request that, number one, they be excused from filing responses to that motion. And two, that the Commission take no action on the motion.

The parties, however, agree that no party is conceding any position or argument with respect to the issues raised in that motion or in anything else.

Going on to paragraph 11. The parties also
agree that the final disposition and ratemaking treatment of any balance in the deferred REC balancing account should be resolved in another appropriate docket.

The parties don't agree as to what the appropriate docket is, but the parties do support a prompt resolution of that issue. One or more parties may petition the Commission to request a resolution of that docket at any time. And they're certainly not precluded from that as a result of this stipulation.

Now, paragraph 12 only applies if the Commission determines in a future docket that all or any portion of the deferred REC balance should not be credited to customers. Including subject any portion of those, those REC revenues to a deadband or sharing band mechanism.

So in the case that the Commission decides not all should be passed back, the balancing account should be adjusted to reflect the Commission's decision subject to one -- these following conditions:

First, the parties agree that projected REC revenues associated with the Dunlap I project of the 0.76 million annually will be trued up to actual REC revenues attributable to Dunlap. And that difference will remain in the REC revenue for future treatment,
collection or return to customers.
Any carrying charge that's associated will continue to apply to that amount. And a hundred percent of that difference will be passed through to customers, whether or not there are deadbands or sharing bands that the Commission should adopt when it makes that final resolution.

And that will continue until January -- from January 1, 2011, until rates are set again in the next Rocky Mountain Power general rate case.

One or more parties may petition that the Commission, at that time, do a review of the methodology associated with how the REC revenues with Dunlap I were calculated, and how the amounts were placed in the REC deferred account balance.

One or more parties might petition the Commission for appropriate modifications to Schedule 98 to implement the Commission's order. And that could result in a collection of the balance from ratepayers or a refund of that balance to ratepayers.

Moving on now to rate spread and rate design associated with the stipulation in paragraph 13. The parties agree that the 30.8 million stipulated net revenue requirement from the MPA I docket, plus the 33.29 million stipulated revenue requirement from the

MPA II docket, for a total of $\$ 64.1$ million on annual basis, will be spread among customer classes as shown in Exhibit 1 attached to the stipulation. And collected through the revised -- through -- collected through Schedule 40 that's reflected as the prices shown in the Revised Exhibit 2 that was presented to the Commission this morning.

Schedule 40 will begin on January 1, 2011. It will terminate on the effective date of rates in the next general rate case of Rocky Mountain Power that incorporates the projects from MPA I and MPA II into that rate -- into those rates.

Now, there's a true up provision in the stipulation as well related to schedule 40 . The actual Schedule 40 rates that have been billed and collected from customers will be compared to $\$ 5.3$ million per month. And that's just the revenue requirement divided by 12 , times the number of months or fractions of months that Schedule 40 has been in effect.

Any over-collection will be refunded to customers. Any under-collection of that amount will be collected from customers through a sur-credit or surcharge in a subsequent month or months. Now, this true up applies only to this case.

The Company was agreeable to that in this case only because of the short period of time between when these rates will go into effect and rates from the next general rate case will most likely go into effect.

Moving on to paragraph 14. The parties agree that the $\$ 3$ million monthly sur-credit will be spread to customer classes as shown in Exhibit 1. And credited to customers through a new Schedule 98, as reflected in the prices in the Revised Exhibit 2.

Moving on to paragraph 15. The deferred revenue requirement from the MPA docket of the $\$ 15.72 \mathrm{million}--\quad$ that's the amount that's been deferred from July of 2010 through December of 2010 -it will be collected beginning January 1, 2011, over a period of approximately eight months.

It will be spread to customers according to -- as laid out in Exhibit 1. And collected through Schedule 97, with the prices shown in the Revised Exhibit 2. Schedule 97 will terminate when the deferred revenue from the MPA I docket plus carrying charges has been collected from customers. It's designed to collect exactly that amount of money.

Going on to paragraph 16. Paragraph 16 lays out the net -- the base net power costs that would be
reflected in customers' rates at $\$ 994.21$ million, or $\$ 17.07$ a megawatt hour. That amount should be approved and established by the Commission upon approval of this stipulation.

And that will represent a reduction from the base net power cost level that was established in the last rate case, reflecting the net power cost savings from these, these MPA I and II projects.

The value will serve as the basis in rates. That will be compared against any, any ECAM adjustment should the Commission approve that in a future docket. And there's a table there in paragraph 16 that shows the monthly calculation of net power costs. That could be compared to actual net power costs as they occur.

Paragraph 17 is -- spells out clearly that unless it's specifically resolved or required by this stipulation the stipulation does not waive, or compromise, or limit any argument or position that the parties have relating to matters that are -- have previously been determined, are currently pending before, or that may be filed with this Commission.

This doesn't limit the parties' arguments, or positions, or rights in any of those dockets in any way.

Specifically, the stipulation does not resolve any of the disputed issues that are currently before this Commission in the Dockets 09-035-15, which is the ECAM docket, and 10-035-14, which is the REC deferral docket.

And paragraph 18. The parties agree that the $\$ 33.29$ million reflects Utah's share of the projected net revenue requirement impact of those MPA II Projects, including prudently-incurred capital costs and other reasonably-projected cost savings and benefits.

While agreeing to that, the parties also agree that this does not preclude any party from advocating in a future proceeding that the share of cost that should be paid by Utah ratepayers for the MPA II Projects should be different.

Furthermore, the parties agree that all discovery in the MPA II docket relating to Populus to Ben Lomond transmission line may be used and relied on in a future proceeding without requesting that -those data requests again.

Paragraph 20, as in most stipulations, the parties have agreed to this stipulation as an aggregate package. Not all parties agree that each aspect of adjustment is warranted or supportable in
isolation of the others.
And the parties agree that the rate change proposed by this stipulation is just reasonable, and results in an end result that's in the public interest.

The remaining paragraphs of the stipulation just contain the general terms and conditions which are associated with most stipulations presented before this Commission. They represent the obligations of the parties both to the stipulation and to each other.
Q. Do you have any final comments on the Major Plant Addition II stipulation?
A. Yeah. First of all, I want to thank the parties for working together to reach an agreement that works for all parties. I restate the Company's support of the stipulation. It was negotiated in good faith by the parties to the stipulation.

And I believe this stipulation is in the public interest. And I recommend that the Commission approve the stipulation as filed. And that concludes my comments, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. Are there parties who wish to cross examine Mr. Taylor? I suspect not.

The Commission is gonna reserve questions
until we've heard from all of the witnesses supporting the stipulation. So let's turn now to the Division.

MS. SCHMID: Thank you. The Division's witness in support of the stipulation is Dr. William Powell. Could Dr. Powell please be sworn?

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Yes. Please stand,
Mr. Powell -- Dr. Powell.
(Dr. Powell was sworn.)
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you. Please be seated, Dr. Powell.

WILLIAM POWELL, Ph.D.,
called as a witness, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. SCHMID:
Q. Could you please state your full name and your employer for the record?
A. My name is William Powell. Most people know me as "Artie," A-r-t-i-e. Is -- can you hear?

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm the manager of the energy section for the Division of Public Utilities.
Q. (By Ms. Schmid) Have you been involved on behalf of the Division in this docket?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. What is the purpose of your testimony today?
A. The purpose of my testimony is to support the stipulation as presented.
Q. Do you have a statement that you would like to present?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Please proceed.
A. Okay. Good morning Commissioners. The Company has gone through the stipulation in quite a bit of detail, so I won't go back through each of the paragraphs. But I would like to point out just a couple of features of this stipulation that are key to the Division's support, and then make a general statement in support of the stipulation.

Mr. Taylor for the Company went through the REC revenue and the treatment of REC revenues as far as the stipulation is concerned. There's a $\$ 3$ million credit that will be credited to customers starting in January. This credit is based on what the mostcurrent estimates are for the REC revenues that will be -- or that will come into effect in the 2011 time frame.

Also along with that Mr. Taylor pointed out that the Dunlap REC revenues will be trued up. And are not subject to any sharing, or deadbands, or
anything like that that might come about out of the deferred REC revenue docket.

The primary purpose for this was that there were three proposals in direct testimony on how to treat the incremental REC revenues associated with Dunlap. And the stipulation represents, in the Division's view, a fair or a reasonable compromise between those three positions. That -- those can be found in paragraphs 9 and 12.

Also, as Mr. Taylor pointed out, customers or ratepayers are getting the benefit of bonus depreciation as it was described in paragraph 7(d.) The law was signed, if I remember correctly, on September 27th. So it was after the Company's filing of the application would have been the Division's position in rebuttal testimony, and so we think this is a key feature of the stipulation.

Mr. Taylor also described the rate spread, and the amendment on the rate spread and rate design that was presented this morning. And the Division has reviewed that rate spread as -- and believes, again, that that's a reasonable way to spread the costs in this case.

Let me just state that the Division has independently reviewed the numbers and calculations
that underlie all the values that you can see or Mr. Taylor talked about this morning in the stipulation. In particular, Division auditors have reviewed and agree with the Company's bonus depreciation calculations.

Additionally, Division analysts reviewed the REC revenue, MPA I deferred amount of $\$ 15.7 \mathrm{million}$, and the rate spread and rate design, and agree with the values as depicted in the stipulation. Finally, Division analysts have reviewed and the Division supports the rate design contained in the stipulation as it was amended this morning.

Using the percentage increases as depicted in Amended Exhibit 2 avoids unnecessary complexity, as Mr. Taylor described. And the Division supports the stipulation as being a reasonable compromise of the issues raised in this case.

The stipulation allows for timely recovery of the costs associated with the major plant additions from MPA I and MPA II, but also recognizes offsetting REC revenues not currently reflected in rates.

Starting in January ratepayers will receive the benefits from the increase in REC revenues -- in this case a $\$ 3$ million monthly credit -- and the benefits arising from the extension of the bonus
depreciation allowance.
Additionally, as part of its review in this case the Division's consultants reviewed the net power cost values and models as filed by the Company, and found them to be consistent with prior Commission orders and reasonable as a base net power cost amount going forward starting in January.

Thus, the Division believes the stipulation is in the public interest, and recommends that the Commission adopt the stipulation as presented this morning. And that concludes my summary remarks at this time.

MS. SCHMID: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you, Dr. Powell.
Does anyone wish to cross examine Dr. Powell?
Okay. Mr. Proctor, do you have a witness supporting the stipulation?

MR. PROCTOR: Ms. Beck is the witness.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Ms. Beck, would you please rise and raise your right hand?
(Ms. Beck was sworn.)
MS. BECK: Good morning. My name is Michele Beck. I'm the director of the Office of Consumer Services. The Office has participated fully in both major plant filings that have led to the rate increase
requested to be implemented January 1, 2011.
The Office utilized both internal and outside expertise to review the reasonableness of the costs associated with the major plant additions, the impact on net power costs, the calculation of bonus depreciation, and the spread of these costs to the various customer classes.

Based on its analysis, the Office believes the settlement presented to the Commission today will result in just and reasonable rates for the residential and small commercial customers whose interests we represent.

The Office would also like to note just a couple of specific provisions that are critical for arriving at just and reasonable rates. The true-up type mechanism being implemented ensures that the Company will not over-collect for these new resources, and is in lieu of updating the billing determinants.

Also, the process for trueing up REC revenues associated with the new Dunlap wind plant provides protection that customers will be appropriately credited for these revenues. Something that had earlier been one of the Office's largest adjustments and greatest concerns.

I also note that the Office supports the

Revised Exhibit 2, in which new rates are based on an equal-percent increase applied to the demand in energy charges for each rate schedule, instead of a separate price for each demand in energy billing component. This results in the same impact on customers' monthly bills as what was originally submitted, with the benefit of fewer line item changes on the bills.

Given the rate protections that are included in this agreement, the Office recommends Commission approval.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you Ms. Beck.
Does anyone wish to cross examine Ms. Beck?
Thank you, Ms. Beck.
Mr. Dodge, have you a witness supporting the?
MR. DODGE: We do, Mr. Chairman, thank you.
Kevin Higgins is here to make a brief -- to offer brief testimony on behalf of UAE.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you.
MR. DODGE: He'll need to be sworn.
(Mr. Higgins was sworn.)
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you.
MR. DODGE: Please proceed.
MR. HIGGINS: Thank you. Good morning. UAE fully supports the settlement agreement. I believe it's a fair deal. I believe it's a good deal, in
light of the facts.
The -- in my direct testimony in this case I had raised five substantive issues with respect to the Company's MPA II filing. And I believe the settlement agreement adequately addresses each of those five issues, either by preserving the issue to be addressed at a future time or by dealing it with -- dealing with it directly in the terms of the agreement.

I would like to simply mention two of those issues right now and explain why UAE believes this is a, a fair resolution. One issue I had raised in my direct testimony pertained to recognizing the incremental REC revenues in rates at this time to mitigate the rate impact from the MPA II revenues. Or revenue requirement.

In my direct testimony in this proceeding I had focused on the 2010 REC revenues, or incremental REC revenues, but recognized that there would be additional incremental REC revenues that should accrue to customers in 2011.

I believe the settlement addresses the merits of mitigating the rate impact through REC revenues by recognizing $\$ 3$ million per month of 2010 REC revenues, while not presuming any ultimate outcome that the Commission may reach with respect to the appropriate
treatment of REC revenues.
At least in the meantime there will be a mitigation for customers with respect to those 2011 incremental REC revenues. And in the meantime, the issues that have been raised with respect to 2010 are preserved to be addressed at a future time.

Or actually the, the issues with respect to all incremental REC revenues are preserved to be addressed in another docket.

A second issue that I had raised that I believe the settlement addresses fairly was the issue of the appropriate billing determinants, which was mentioned by Ms. Beck a moment ago.

The settlement addresses that issue because it essentially sets a monthly revenue requirement target. And will provide for the ultimate true up for the appropriate revenue amount, irrespective of which billing determinants are used to recover those revenues in the intervening months.

And so because it, in essence, adopts a true up to ensure correct collection of the target revenue requirement, $I$ believe that is a creative and fair resolution of that issue. So with that, I conclude my summary in support of adopting the settlement agreement.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Higgins. Does anyone wish to cross examine Mr. Higgins?

Okay, thank you.
Mr. Reeder, have you had a witness supporting the stipulation?

MR. REEDER: I do not. I would simply note that we signed the stipulation and we support the stipulation, including Exhibit No. 2.

Critical to our support are three paragraphs: 17, 19, and 26, as outlined by Mr. Taylor. That testimony be admitted. That testimony can be used in subsequent proceedings. And the broad non-priority. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you, Mr. Reeder.
And Ms. Hayes, you've already indicated that you do not have a witness here today.

And I don't see any other parties in the hearing room, so let's hear -- see if the Commissioners have any questions.

Commissioner Allen?
COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Thank you. Perhaps Mr. Taylor can answer a question I have about this bonus depreciation. That was an extension of an existing bonus depreciation, correct? Was it already
in place during -- earlier in the year? Do you know?
MR. TAYLOR: It was -- until that was
extended it had not been applied to any investment made in 2010.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Okay. So if it applies to MPA I -- II but not I, is it because there was an install date or there was a cap that you hit? How wouldn't that have affected MPA I, or what -- have we already seen that, or did -- did it just not affect the deferral account?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I'm gonna be over the tips of my skis here a bit. But the bonus depreciation will affect the deferment -- deferred income taxes on a going-forward basis. It will apply to those assets associated with MPA I as they're included in the base rates in the next general rate case.

The adjustment here only applies to the projects in MPA II.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Okay. And just for my own curiosity, are we gonna see this extended into 2011? Is this still gonna be an issue before us, or does it have a sunset date?

MR. TAYLOR: Now you've gone even beyond me.
COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Maybe some other party. Anyone who has their accounting hat on? I'm just
curious.
DR. POWELL: Well, I certainly don't have an accounting hat, but my understanding is consistent with what Mr. Taylor was just describing. This was a law that was in effect in 2009, but expired. And then throughout the year -- this year, 2010, I guess there was some debate in Congress about extending that.

And finally around September 27th the law was signed so that bonus depreciation applied to assets for 2010. So that it, it was not in effect when we went through MPA I. It, it was signed after the Company filed its testimony in this case, MPA II. And then it's being reflected in the stipulation only as it applies to the MPA II Projects.

Now, the Division has been meeting with the Company. And we're trying to determine what the impact of the bonus depreciation as it might apply to any assets for 2010 and what the appropriate ratemaking treatment will be for that.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: You just answered my next question, thank you.

DR. POWELL: Okay.
MR. TAYLOR: Commissioner Allen, if I may?
COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Yes.
MR. TAYLOR: To continue beyond 2010 would
take additional congressional action.
COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Oh, okay.
MR. TAYLOR: So as it sits now it just applies to assets going into service in 2010.

COMMISSIONER ALLEN: That's helpful, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOYER: Commissioner Campbell?
COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: First of all just let me commend the parties for coming to agreement on this. Let me also say that I think the explanations were very thorough. So my questions are actually more tangential, since we have you under oath and I have chance to just ask.

Since these rates are effective January 1, I got in this morning and read a couple memos from the Division and the Committee as it relates to the DSM tariff rider and suggestions about rate changes on January 1.

Has the Company come to a conclusion or position on whether they intend to change rates as it relates to the DSM tariff rider as well on January 1st?

MR. TAYLOR: I know that we are planning to file for a change in rates in the next -- this week or next week. I'm not certain what effective date we're
gonna request. Generally we request at least a 30 -30 days from the time of that filing. But I know we are planning to file for a change.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: And has this -- I know this is a loose tie, since we're talking about a transmission project. But has the Company done any analysis -- are you aware that FERC has asked NERC to change the definition of a bulk electric system from 200 down to a hundred kV?

And has the Company done any analysis as far as what that will do to cost allocation among the states based on your transmission system?

MR. TAYLOR: I don't know the answer to the first question. If, if they did change the distinction so that some things that are currently considered transmission lines become distribution lines? That would have an impact on jurisdictional allocations, yes.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Right. And I think it actually goes the other way, where they would take what we might consider distribution today and make them transmission.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, today anything that's 46 kV and above is considered a transmission --

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Transmission in your
system.
MR. REEDER: There's a distinction you may want to draw with respect to that, though. In the FERC order they had directed WECC and the other regional entities to expand the definition of a bulk electric system to a bright line. So it applies to registration compliance, but not necessarily the definition over transmission and jurisdictional rates.

I would expect it would be more in the reliability rein that you would see the costs occur, as the costs to comply with the NERC standards as opposed to a lower level of voltage equipment. But I would not expect it to affect the change in what is the difference between transmission and distribution as it exists in the Federal Power Act. They're two different acts they're working under.

COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Okay. Well, my questions have been asked and answered. You will have noticed that we had scheduled a public witness hearing for 11:30 today when the case was fully at issue. And we determined last week not to cancel that, just on the off chance that members of the public might have comment on that.

So unless there is something further we need
to deal with at this moment, we'll recess until 11:30. We'll reconvene then and let you know what we're gonna do.

MR. DODGE: Mr. Chairman, you won't mind if some of us don't show up at 11:30?

CHAIRMAN BOYER: No, I won't mind.
MR. REEDER: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: I wish you could extend me the same courtesy.

MR. REEDER: Go ahead then.
CHAIRMAN BOYER: Thank you.
We'll be in recess, then, until 11:30.
(A recess was taken from 9:45 to 11:31 a.m.)
CHAIRMAN BOYER: This is the time and place duly noticed for the hearing of testimony from public witnesses in Docket 10-035-89. In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power For Alternative Cost Recovery For Major Plant Additions of the Populus to Ben Lomond Transmission Line and the Dunlap I Wind Project.

And we are informed Ms. Murray of the Office of Consumer Services is here and kindly agreed to take a role of all those witnesses wanting to give testimony, and it appears the list is blank. There's no one here.

So, since there's no professors how long do we have to wait? All right. Well, no one has shown, and I expect that they won't show. So.

We have had an opportunity -- of course we've read the pleadings in the case, and we've analyzed the stipulation, and we've had an opportunity to discuss the stipulation with our colleagues on staff. And we have deliberated and determined to approve the stipulation as written.

We will prepare the order. Ordinarily we'd ask one of the parties to prepare the order, but in this case our expert and very aggressive staff has pretty much worked out the order except for the decision points and so we will be able to get this order out very quickly. We understand the January 1 timeline, and so we'll bear that in mind as we work through this.

And we want to compliment you on the good work that you've done, the cooperation you've manifest in reaching this stipulation. And the summaries this morning were very helpful to us.

So with that, we are adjourned. Thank you all.
(The hearing was adjourned at 11:33 a.m.)

## C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF UTAH
COUNTY OF SALT LAKE
) ss.

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, KELLY L. WILBURN, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Registered Professional Reporter in and for the State of Utah.

That the proceedings were reported by me in stenotype and thereafter caused by me to be transcribed into typewriting. And that a full, true, and correct transcription of said proceedings so taken and transcribed is set forth in the foregoing pages, numbered 1 through 41, inclusive.

I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise associated with any of the parties to said cause of action, and that I am not interested in the event thereof.

SIGNED ON THIS 19th DAY OF December, 2010.

Kelly L. Wilburn, CSR, RPR Utah CSR No. 109582-7801
(December 6, 2010 - RMP - 10-035-89)

| \$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 6,36: 10,36: 18, \\ & 36: 25,37: 4 \end{aligned}$ | A | $23: 14$ | $\begin{gathered} \quad \text { answered }[2] \text { - } \\ 36: 20,39: 19 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 0.76[1]-15: 17 \\ & \$ 10.66[1]-15: 21 \\ & \$ 15.72[2]-12: 13 \\ & 21: 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2011 [13] - 11:24, } \\ 12: 15,15: 14,15: 23, \end{gathered}$ | A-r-t-i-e [1] - 25:19 <br> a.m [2] - 40:13, 41:24 <br> A.M [1] $-5: 1$ | affect [3]-35:9, | appear ${ }_{[1]}-7: 3$ |
|  | 16:8, 19:9, 20:8, |  | affected [1] - 35:8 | 6:9 |
|  | 21:15, 26:21, 30:1, |  | aggregate [1] - 23:24 | application [5] - |
|  | 32:20, 33:3, 35:21 | able [1]-41:14 | aggressive [1] - | 11:16, 11:18, 11:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{\$ 1 7 . 0 7}[1]-22: 2 \\ & \$ 33.29[2]-13: 22, \end{aligned}$ | 26 [2]-12:17, 34:11 | absent ${ }_{[1]}$ - 17:5 | 41:12 | 12:20, 27:15 |
|  | 27th [2]-27:14, 36:8 | according [1]-21:17 | ago [1] - 33:13 | Application [2]-5:6, |
| 23:7 | $29[1]-13: 2$ | account [1] - 35:10 | agree [15] - 15:13, | 40:17 |
| \$38.99 [1] - 12:1 |  | accounting [2] - | 16:5, 17:22, 18:1, | applied [4]-16:20, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5.57[1]-14: 9 \\ & \$ 994.21[1]-22: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 3 | 35:25, 36:3 | 18:5, 18:21, 19:23, | 31:2, 35:3, $36: 9$ |
|  |  | rue [1] - 32:19 | 21:6, 23:6, 23:13, | applies [8] - 14:14, |
| 0 | 3 [9]-11:15, 12:6, | achieve [1]-16:11 | 23:17, 23:24, 24:2, | 18:11, 20:25, 35:5, |
|  | 21:7, 26:17, 28:24, | action [3]-17:5, | agreeable [1]-21:1 | 39:6 |
|  |  | 17:21, 37:1 | agreed [5]-12:23, | apply [4]-13:13, |
| $09-035-15[1]-23: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30_{[2]}-38: 1,38: 2 \\ & 30.8[2]-12: 4,19: 23 \\ & 33.29[1]-19: 25 \end{aligned}$ | acts [1] - 39:16 | 13:10, 13:12, 23:23, | 19:3, 35:14, 36:17 |
|  |  | actual [6] - 14:24 | 40 | appropriate [8] - |
| 1 |  | 16:13, 16:15, 18:23, $20: 15,22: 14$ | agreeing [1] - 23:12 agreement 51 - | 17:13, 18:3, 18:6, <br> 19:17, 32:25, 33:12, |
| 1 [14] - 11:24, 11:25, |  | dendum [1] - 8:16 | 11:14, 24:14, 31:9, | 33:17, 36:18 |
|  |  | dition [1] - 12:10 | 32:8, 37:9 | appropriately [1] - |
| 12:3, 12:15, 15:14, | $\begin{gathered} 40[5]-20: 5,20: 8, \\ 20: 14,20: 15,20: 19 \end{gathered}$ | additional [2] | agreements [1] - $15: 10$ | 30:21 |
| 15:23, 16:8, 19:9, 20:8, $21: 15,30: 1$ , |  | Additionally [2] | ahead [1]-40:10 | $22: 4,31: 10$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 14,37: 18,41: 15 \\ & 10[1]-17: 11 \\ & \text { 10-035-13 }{ }_{[1]}-12: 9 \\ & \mathbf{1 0 - 0 3 5 - 1 4}[2]-16: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 46 [1] - 38:24 | 28:6, 29:2 | align [1] - 14:2 | approve [3]-22:11, |
|  |  | Additions [2]-5:8, | allocation [1] - 38:11 | 24:20, 41:8 |
|  | 5 | 40:18 | allocations [1] - | approved [1]-22:3 |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { additions [3] - 11:19, } \\ & \text { 28:19, 30:4 } \end{aligned}$ | 38:18 <br> allowance [1] - 29:1 | approves [1] - 13:17 argument [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:4 } \\ & \text { 10-035-89[4]-5:5, } \end{aligned}$ | 5.3 [1]-20:17 | address [4]-5:16, | allows [2] - 14:21, | 17:23, 22:19 |
| 8:17, 11:16, 40:16 |  | 6:2, 6:6, 15:6 | 28:18 | arguments [1] - |
| 11 [1]-17:25 | 6 | addressed [4] - | Alternative [2]-5:7, | 22:23 |
| 11:30[4]-39:21, $40: 1,40 \cdot 5,40 \cdot 12$ | 6 [1] - 5:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 16:18, 32:6, 33:6, } \\ & 33: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 40:17 | arising [1]-28:25 <br> arrived [1]-13:24 |
| $40: 1,40: 5,40: 12$ |  | addresses [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { alternative [1] - } \\ & \text { 11:18 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{arrive}_{[1]}-13: 24 \\ & \operatorname{arrriving}_{[1]}-30: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11:33 [1] - 41:24 | 64.1 [1] - 20:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:13, 32:5, 32:21, } \\ & \text { 33:11, 33:14 } \\ & \text { adequately }[1]-32: 5 \\ & \text { adjourned }[2] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | amended [1] - 28:12 | Artie ${ }_{[1]}$ - 25:19 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 12[6] - 8:6, 15:1, } \\ \text { 16:4, 18:11, 20:18, } \end{gathered}$ | 7 |  | Amended [2]-8:25, 28:14 | aspect [1]-23:25 <br> assets [4]-35:14 |
| 27:9 |  |  | amendment [2] | 36:9, 36:18, 37:4 |
| 13 [1] - 19:22 | $7{ }^{[1]}-13: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:22, 41:24 } \\ & \text { adjusted }[2]-17: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 5:14, 27:19 | associated [16] - |
| 14[1]-21:6 | 7(c) [1] - 14:1 |  | amount [14]-15:16, | 12:13, 13:20, 14:5, |
| 15 [1]-21:11 | 7(d [2] - 14:10, 27:12 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 18:19 } \\ & \text { adjustment }[7] \text { - } \end{aligned}$ | 15:23, 15:24, 16:8, | 14:9, 14:22, 15:17, |
| 15.7 [1]-28:7 |  |  | 16:13, 16:15, 19:3, | 18:22, 19:2, 19:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16[3]-21: 24,22: 12 \\ & 17[2]-22: 16,34: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:5, 14:8, 14:11, } \\ & \text { 14:18, 22:10, 23:25, } \end{aligned}$ | 20:22, 21:13, 21:23, | 19:22, 24:8, 27:5, |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 14:18, 22:10, 23:25, } \\ & 35: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22: 2,28: 7,29: 6, \\ & 33: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 28:19, 30:4, 30:20, } \\ & 35: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 18[1]-23: 6 \\ & 19[1]-34: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $8[2]-15: 1,15: 13$ | 35:17 <br> adjustments [3] 12:18, 14:2, 30:23 admission [1]-5:17 admit [1] - 9:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 33:17 } \\ & \text { amounts [3] - 14:24, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 35:15 } \\ & \text { attached }[3]-7: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| 1st [1] - 37:22 | 9 |  | $15: 20,19: 14$ | $13: 25,20: 3$ |
| 2 |  |  | 38:7, 38:10 | Attorney ${ }_{[1]}$ - 6:18 |
|  | $9 \text { [4] - 8:6, 16:3, 16:5, }$ $27: 9$ | $9: 3,9: 11,10: 4,10: 7$ | 28:10 | 18:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 20[1]-23: 22 \\ & 200[1]-38: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $9.9 \text { [1] - 15:16 }$ | 34:12 | analyzed [1] - 41:5 <br> annual [2] - 12:1 | auditors [1] - 28:3 <br> August [1]-11:15 |
| 2009 [1] - 36:5 |  | admitting [1] - 9:15 <br> adopt [2]-19:6, | $\begin{gathered} \text { ann } \\ \text { 20:2 } \end{gathered}$ | average [1]-16:13 |
| 2010 [16]-5:1, | $\begin{aligned} & 98[6]-16: 7,16: 11, \\ & 17: 1,17: 6,19: 18, \end{aligned}$ | 29:10 | annually [2] - 13:23, | avoids [1]-28:14 |
| 11:15, 12:12, 12:17, | 21:9 | adopting [1] - 33:24 <br> adopts [1] - 33:20 | 18:23 | aware [2] - 13:5, 38:7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:3, 21:14, 32:17, } \\ & 32: 23,33: 5,35: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 9:03 [1]-5:1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { answer [2] - 34:23, } \\ & 38: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | advocating [1] - |  |  |

Kelly L. Wilburn, CSR, RPR
(December 6, 2010 - RMP - 10-035-89)

| B | 36:1 | $38: 8,38: 14,39: 13$ | 21:1, 26:9, 26:15, | 29:6, 38:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { balance }[8]-12: 14, \\ & \text { 16:17, 17:14, 18:2, } \\ & \text { 18:13, 19:15, 19:19, } \\ & \text { 19:20 } \\ & \text { balancing account } \end{aligned}$ | yer [1] -9:20 | 8:1, 8:5, 8:7, 14:10, | 16, 37:19, 38:6, | $22,14: 4,23: 9,$ |
|  | brief [2]-31:16 | 31: |  | 27:22, 28:19, 30 |
|  | briefly [1] - 10:25 | charges [5]-8:3 | 14:3, 17:17, 24:15, | couple [3] - 26:12, |
|  | bright ${ }_{[1]}$ - 39:6 brings [1] - 9:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:4, 21:22, } 31: 3 \\ & \text { classes [3] - 20:2 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 27:14, 28:4, 32:4 } \\ \text { compared [3] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 14,37: 15 \\ & \text { course }[1]-41: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & {[4]-15: 25,17: 15,} \\ & \text { 18:2, 18:18 } \\ & \text { base } 6]-15: 15, \\ & \text { 16:10, 21:25, 22:6, } \\ & \text { 29:6, } 35: 15 \end{aligned}$ | broad [1] - 34:13 | 21:8, 30:7 | 20:16, 22:10, 22:14 | sy [1] -40 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { brought }[1]-14: 11 \\ & \text { bulk }[3]-15: 8,38: 8 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | colleagues [1] - 41:7 | 28:14 | credit $[9]$ - 16:6, |
|  | 39: | lect [2]-21:23, | npliance [1] | 16:12, 16:15, 16:1 |
| Based [1] - 30:8 based [5] - 12:23, |  |  | com | $26: 19,28: 2$ |
|  | C | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 20:16, 20:23, 21:15, } \\ & 21: 18,21: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 41:18 } \\ & \text { comply }{ }_{[1]}-39: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { credited }[4]-18: 14, \\ 21: 9,26: 18,30: 22 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 38: 12 \\ & \text { basis [5] - 12:1, } \end{aligned}$ | calculated [1] - | collecting [1] - 12:13 <br> collection [5]-19:1, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { component [1] - } \\ & 31: 4 \end{aligned}$ | critical [1] - 30:14 <br> Critical [1] - 34:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16: 13,20: 2,22: 9, \\ & 35: 14 \end{aligned}$ | calculation [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 19,20: 21,20: 22, \\ & 33: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { compromise }[3] \\ 22: 19,27: 7.28: 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { cross }[5]-9: 12, \\ 24: 23,29: 15,31: \end{array}$ |
| bear [1]-41:16 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 22:13, } 30: 5 \\ \text { calculations } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { collectively [1] - } \\ & \text { 11:21 } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { con }[1]-15: 23$ | 34:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 29: 19,29: 21,31: 11, \\ & 31: 12,31: 13,33: 13 \end{aligned}$ | 14:3, 27:25, 28:5 | combining [1] | 17: | [1] - 9: |
|  | ncel [1]-39:22 | 15 | concerned [1] | uriosity [1] - 35:20 |
| BECK [1] - 29:22 <br> become [1] - 38:16 begin [3]-12:12, | cap [1] - $35: 7$ <br> capital [2]-13:21, | $\begin{array}{r} \text { coming [4] - } 7: 24 \\ 14: 23,15: 18,37: 9 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:17 } \\ & \text { concerns [1] - 30:24 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { curious }[1]-36: 1 \\ & \text { current }[2]-14: 4 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 12:15, } 20: 8 \\ & \text { beginning }[2]-16: 8, \end{aligned}$ | captioned [1] - 5:5 carefully [1]-15:2 | comment [1] - 39:24 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { concludes [2] } \\ & 24: 20,29: 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { customer [5] - 16:6, } \\ \text { 16:14, 20:2, 21:8, } \end{gathered}$ |
| 21:15 <br> Beginning [2] - 6:10, | carried [1]-8:1 | $24: 11,24: 2$ | 24:20, ${ }_{\text {conclusion }}{ }^{11]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16: 1 \\ & 30: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | carrying [2]-19:2, | commercial [1] | 37: | stomer's [1] - 8:6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:10 } \\ & \text { behalf }[5]-6: 5,6: 22 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21:21 } \\ & \text { case [17] - 9:7, 13:4, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 11 \\ & \text { Commiss } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { conditions }[4]- \\ 12: 24,17: 9,18: 2 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { customers [22] - } 7: 3, \\ 7: 22,7: 23,8: 9,8: 12, \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 7: 1,25: 24,31: 17 \\ & \text { belief }[1]-11: 11 \\ & \text { believes }[4]-27: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 13:12, 13:14, 14:12, | 11:3, 11:16, 12:8 | 24:7 | 15:22, 16:16, 18:14, |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 17,20: 25,21: 2, \\ & 27: 23,28: 17,28: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $13: 2,13: 15,15: 5$ | Congress [1] - 36:7 | 19:1, 19:5, 20:16 |
| 29:8, 30:8, $32: 10$Ben Lomond [5] | 29:3, 32:2, 36:12, | 17:3, 17:13, 17:21 | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{c} \\ \text { 37: } \end{gathered}$ | $21: 17,21: 22,26: 1$ |
|  | 39:21, 41:5, 41:12 | 18:8, 18:12, 18:17 | consider [1] - 38:21 | 27:10, 30:11, 30:2 |
| 5:8, 11:19, 12:4, 23:19, 40:19 | 1]-8:2 | 19:6, 19:12, 19:17 | considered | 32:20, 33:3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 23:19, 40:19 } \\ & \text { benefit [2] - 27:11, } \end{aligned}$ | certain [1]-37:25 <br> certainly [2]-18:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 7,22: 3,22: 11, \\ & 22: 22,23: 3,24: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 38:16, 38:24 } \\ & \text { consistent }[3]-12: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \quad \text { customers' }[3]-8: 4, \\ & 22: 1,31: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| ```31:7 benefits [4] - 13:22,``` | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 2 \\ & \text { Certainly }[1]-10: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 24:19, 24:25, 29:5, | 29:5, 36:3 |  |
|  |  | 29:10, 30:9, 31:9, | consultants | D |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 23:11, 28:23, 28:25 } \\ \text { between }[3]-21: 2, \end{gathered}$ | $31: 15,40: 4$ <br> CHAIRMAN BOYER | mmission's [3] | nsumed [1]-15:7 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 27:8, } 39: 14 \\ & \text { beyond }[2]-35: 23, \end{aligned}$$36: 25$ |  | $15: 3,18: 19,19: 18$ | Consumers [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { data }[1]-23: 21 \\ & \text { date }[5]-17: 7,20: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 6:15, 6:20, 6:24, 7:5, | Allen [10]-34:2 | $24:$ | 35:7, 35:22, 37:25 |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} 36: 25 \\ \text { bill }[1]-8: 7 \\ \text { billed }[1]-20: 15 \\ \text { billing }[4]-30: 18, \end{array}$ | $7: 10,7: 14,7: 16,8: 13$, $8: 22,8: 24,9.4,9: 14$, | 34:22, 35:5, 35:19, | contained [1] - 28:11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Dave Johnson [1] - } \\ & \text { 12:5 } \end{aligned}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8:22, 8:24, 9:4, 9:14, } \\ & 9: 23,10: 2,10: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 24,36: 20,36: 23 \\ & 36: 24,37: 2,37: 5 \end{aligned}$ | continue [4]-15:25, | 12:5 <br> David L. Taylor [3] - |
| $\begin{gathered} 31: 4,33: 12,33: 18 \\ \text { bills }[5]-7: 23,8: 4, \end{gathered}$ | $24: 22,25: 6,25: 9$ | 36:24, 37:2, 37:5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 19:3, 19:8, 36:25 } \\ & \text { continued }[1]-17: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $6: 4,10: 12,10: 20$ days [1] - 38:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 9,31: 6,31: 7 \\ & \text { bit }[2]-26: 10,35: 12 \end{aligned}$ | $31: 11,31: 18,31: 21$ | Campbell [6] - 37 $37: 8,38: 4,38: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { cooperation [1] - } \\ & 41: 19 \end{aligned}$ | deadband [1] - 18:15 |
|  | 34:1, 34:15, 37:7, | $38: 25,39: 1$ | correct [2] - 33:2 | deadbands [2] |
| blank [1]-40:24 | $39: 18,40: 6,40: 8$ | Commissioners [3] - | 34:25 | 19:5, 26:25 |
| Bob [1] - 7:2 bonus [11] - 14:9, | 40:11, 40:14 <br> chance [2] - 37:13, | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6:3, 26:8, 34:20 } \\ \text { Committee }[1] . \end{gathered}$ | orrectly [1] - 27:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { deal [4]-5:19, 31:25, } \\ & 40: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 14:13, 27:11, 28:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 23 \\ & \text { change }[10]-8: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 37:16 | cost [9]-11:18, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { dealing }[3]-14: 17 \text {, } \\ & 32: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 28: 25,30: 5,34: 24, \\ & 34: 25,35: 12,36: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 11:24, 12:3, 24:2, | Company [14] - 6:5, 10:10, 12:16, 14:19, | 13:17, 22:6, 22:7, | debate [1] - 36:7 |
|  |  |  | 23:10, 23:15, 29:4, | December [1] - |
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