1	Q.	Are you the same Mark R. Tallman who submitted direct testimony in this
2		proceeding on behalf of PacifiCorp dba Rocky Mountain Power ("the
3		Company")?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	Has any party questioned the prudence of the Merwin Fish Collector project
6		or is any party recommending a disallowance associated with the Merwin Fish
7		Collector project?
8	A.	No.
9	Purp	oose and Summary of Testimony
10	Q.	What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?
11	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to rebut the testimony of Mr. Richard S. Hahn filed
12		on behalf of the Division of Public Utilities ("DPU") related to six hydroelectric
13		capital projects comprising approximately \$13 million (total Company).
14	Q.	Please summarize your testimony.
15	A.	My testimony rebuts Mr. Hahn's recommendation to remove five additional
16		hydroelectric projects from the case and disallow approximately \$0.3 million (total
17		Company) associated with a hydro vehicle replacement project. My testimony
18		provides the documentation demonstrating the need associated with four of the five
19		added hydro investments. These investments are expected to be placed in service
20		during the March 2014 through June 2015 timeframe. The added hydro investment
21		consists of \$10.6 million (total Company) associated with these four hydro projects.
22		These projects were not included in the Company's original filing but were
23		provided to the DPU through discovery and included in the DPU's general plant

additions update. These projects were subsequently removed in Mr. Hahn'sadjustment.

26 Hydro Project Additions

27 Q. Please summarize the hydro project additions.

A. Five hydro projects additions were provided to the DPU through discovery and
included in the DPU's general plant additions update. These projects are listed in
Exhibit DPU 3.6 (page 1) and consist of \$12.3 million (total Company) in capital
expenditures.

32 Q. Do these added hydro projects have in-service dates during the May 2014 33 through June 2015 timeframe?

34 Four of the five added projects have in-service dates during the May 2014 through A. 35 June 2015 time frame. One of the five project additions (Soda Spillway Gate 36 Improvements) currently has a forecasted in-service date after June 2015; therefore, 37 the Company agrees it should be removed from the case. Removal of the Soda 38 Spillway Gate Improvements project removes \$1.7 million (total Company), 39 leaving \$10.6 million (total Company) associated with four added hydro projects. 40 The four added projects are the: Yale Upper Rock Block Stabilization; Swift Side 41 Nets Replacement; Swift Main Net Modifications; and Wallowa Falls Relicensing 42 projects.

43 Q. Does Mr. Hahn acknowledge that project additions are reasonable?

44 A. Yes. Mr. Hahn testifies that, since the status of projects in the filing requirements
45 is being updated, it is not unreasonable to also consider deleting some projects
46 whose schedules have changed and adding new projects.

Page 2 – Rebuttal Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

47

Q. Please summarize Mr. Hahn's recommendation.

A. Mr. Hahn testifies that, in response to data request DPU 35.4, the Company did not
 provide project schedules and documents demonstrating the need for these added
 projects. Mr. Hahn recommends that all such projects be removed from the
 proceeding until documentation has been provided, reviewed, and found to be
 adequate.

- Q. Did the Company provide documentation associated with the added hydro
 projects to the DPU?
- A. Yes. The Company inadvertently provided documentation to the DPU in response
 to DPU 35.1 instead of in response to DPU 35.4.
- 57 Q. Has the Company provided documentation associated with the added hydro
 58 projects in response to DPU 35.4?
- 59A.Yes. Through Confidential DPU 35.4 1st supplemental, the Company has provided
- 60 authorization documents, project schedules and technical assessments and studies,
- 61 where applicable, demonstrating the need for the added projects with in-service
- 62 dates during the May 2014 through June 2015 time period. This same information
- 63 is included in Confidential Exhibit RMP__(MRT-1R).
- 64 Hydro Vehicles 2015
- 65 Q. Please summarize the 2015 Hydro Vehicle Project.
- A. The Company has planned for the replacement of 13 vehicles utilized to operate
 hydro generation for a cost of \$0.7 million (total Company).

68 Q. Please summarize Mr. Hahn's recommendation.

A. Mr. Hahn testifies that the Company has not provided materials supporting the
specific cost estimate. Mr. Hahn recommends, based on a historical trend analysis,
the amount be reduced to \$0.4 million (total Company) unless the Company
provides documentation of specific vehicle replacements or explanation of how the
budgeted amount was developed.

74 Q. Has the Company provided documentation associated with the hydro vehicles 75 that Mr. Hahn's testimony addresses?

A. Yes. Through Confidential DPU 22.6 1st supplemental, the Company provided
records documenting how the \$0.7 million (total Company) budgeted amount was
developed and documentation of the associated vehicles. This same information is
included in Confidential Exhibit RMP___(MRT-2R).

80 Q. What do you recommend to the Commission?

A. I recommend the Commission reject Mr. Hahn's recommendation to remove all
added hydro projects listed in Exhibit DPU 3.6 (page 1). I recommend the
Commission include four added hydro projects¹ consisting of \$10.6 million of
investment in the Company's rate base. I also recommend the Commission reject
Mr. Hahn's recommendation to disallow approximately \$0.3 million (total
Company) associated with hydro vehicles budgeted for replacement in 2015.

87 Q. Does this conclude your rebuttal testimony?

88 A. Yes.

¹ Yale Upper Rock Block Stabilization; Swift Side Nets Replacement; Swift Main Net Modifications; and Wallowa Falls Relicensing.