

| Date: | February 15, 2010 |
|-------|--|
| То: | Don Jones Jr. |
| From: | Brian Hedman |
| Re: | Utah Self Direction Cost Effectiveness |

The tables below present the assumptions and cost effectiveness findings for the Utah portfolio based on costs and saving contained in a spreadsheet titled "SD cost recovered - comm and industrial Jan 2003 - Dec 2009 + CE inputs rev 111809+ rev 021310". This cost effectiveness analysis was conducted with the eastside system IRP decrement and load shape.

Cost Effectiveness Assumptions

The discount rate is the system average used in the 2008 IRP. PacifiCorp also provided the values for line losses and the residential retail energy rate.

| - | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Parameter | Value | | |
| Discount Rate | 7.4% | | |
| Line Loss | 9.72% | | |
| Industrial Energy Rate (\$/kWh) | \$0.0441 | | |
| Net to Gross Ratio | 80% | | |
| Measure Life | 10 years | | |

Table 1: Inputs

| Measure | Savings | Customer Incentive | Administrative Cost | Measure Cost |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 2003-December 2009 | 57,361,094 | \$9,597,155 | \$1,088,642 | \$11,996,448 |
| 2010-2011 | 22,477,635 | \$4,210,668 | \$532,500 | \$5,263,335 |
| Total | 79,838,729 | \$13,807,823 | \$1,621,142 | \$17,259,783 |

Table 2: Self Direction Measure Costs and Savings

Results

The cost-effectiveness of the residential insulation measures was calculated using Cadmus' Demand Impact and Cost Effectiveness model. The model distributes the assumed annual kWh savings across the year based on hourly system load shapes for Utah. Each of these hourly saving values is multiplied by the associated hourly avoided-costs from PacifiCorp's IRP decrement values. The products are then compared on a net present value basis. This approach accurately Don Jones Jr. February 15, 2010 Page 2

captures the hourly differences in the value of a kWh during the year.

| | Costs | Benefits | Net Benefit | Ratio |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------|
| Total Resource Cost Test (TRC) + Conservation Adder | \$10,685,799.95 | \$27,540,910.69 | \$16,855,110.74 | 2.577 |
| Total Resource Cost Test (TRC) No Adder | \$10,685,799.95 | \$25,037,191.53 | \$14,351,391.58 | 2.343 |
| Utility Cost Test (UCT) | \$10,685,797.00 | \$24,612,031.11 | \$13,926,234.11 | 2.303 |
| Rate Impact Test (RIM) | \$27,235,245.84 | \$24,612,031.11 | (\$2,623,214.73) | 0.904 |
| Participant Cost Test (PCT) | \$2.95 | \$19,261,462.80 | \$19,261,459.85 | n/a |

Table 3: 2003-December 2009 (65% 2008 IRP Decrement)

Table 4: 2010-2011 (65% 2008 IRP Decrement)

| | Costs | Benefits | Net Benefit | Ratio |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------|
| Total Resource Cost Test (TRC) + Conservation Adder | \$4,743,168.00 | \$10,792,237.30 | \$6,049,069.30 | 2.275 |
| Total Resource Cost Test (TRC) No Adder | \$4,743,168.00 | \$9,811,124.81 | \$5,067,956.81 | 2.068 |
| Utility Cost Test (UCT) | \$4,743,168.00 | \$9,644,520.59 | \$4,901,352.59 | 2.033 |
| Rate Impact Test (RIM) | \$11,228,268.69 | \$9,644,520.59 | (\$1,583,748.11) | 0.859 |
| Participant Cost Test (PCT) | \$0.00 | \$7,547,836.00 | \$7,547,836.00 | n/a |

Table 5: Total 2003-2011 (65% 2008 IRP Decrement)

| | Costs | Benefits | Net Benefit | Ratio |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|-------|
| Total Resource Cost Test (TRC) + Conservation Adder | \$15,428,967.95 | \$38,333,147.98 | \$22,904,180.03 | 2.484 |
| Total Resource Cost Test (TRC) No Adder | \$15,428,967.95 | \$34,848,316.35 | \$19,419,348.40 | 2.259 |
| Utility Cost Test (UCT) | \$15,428,965.00 | \$34,256,551.70 | \$18,827,586.70 | 2.220 |
| Rate Impact Test (RIM) | \$38,463,514.54 | \$34,256,551.70 | (\$4,206,962.84) | 0.891 |
| Participant Cost Test (PCT) | \$2.95 | \$26,809,298.81 | \$26,809,295.86 | n/a |