BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for approval of the Power Purchase Agreement between PacifiCorp and Pavant Solar, LLC

Docket No. 14-035-46

HEARING PROCEEDINGS ~~~~~ TAKEN AT: Public Service Commission Hearing Room 403 160 East 300 South Salt Lake City, Utah Tuesday, July 8, 2014 DATE: TIME: 10:02 a.m. **REPORTED BY:** Scott M. Knight, RPR

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 | 2 |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | APPEARANCES | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | THE HEARING OFFICER: JORDAN A. WHITE | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | FOR DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES: | |
| 6 | JUSTIN C. JETTER, ESQ., | |
| 7 | ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL | |
| 8 | 160 East 300 South | |
| 9 | Fifth Floor | |
| 10 | Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | FOR OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES: | |
| 13 | KEVIN M. McDONOUGH, ESQ., | |
| 14 | ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL | |
| 15 | 160 East 300 South | |
| 16 | Second Floor | |
| 17 | Salt Lake City, Utah 84114 | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | FOR ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER: | |
| 20 | DANIEL E. SOLANDER, ESQ., | |
| 21 | ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER | |
| 22 | 201 South Main Street | |
| 23 | Suite 2300 | |
| 24 | Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

| | Hearing Proceedings | 07/08/14 | 3 |
|----|---------------------|----------|---|
| 1 | INDEX | | |
| 2 | WITNESS | Page | |
| 3 | BRUCE W. GRISWOLD | | |
| 4 | EXAMINATION | 6 | |
| 5 | BY MR. SOLANDER | | |
| 6 | CHARLES E. PETERSON | | |
| 7 | EXAMINATION | 9 | |
| 8 | BY MR. JETTER | | |
| 9 | BELA BASTAG | | |
| 10 | EXAMINATION | 11 | |
| 11 | BY MR. McDONOUGH | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 4 |
|----|--|
| 1 | Hearing Proceedings |
| 2 | July 8, 2014 |
| 3 | PROCEEDINGS |
| 4 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead and go on the |
| 5 | record. |
| 6 | Good morning. This is the time and place noticed for |
| 7 | Commission consideration of application of Rocky Mountain Power for |
| 8 | approval of the power purchase agreement between PacifiCorp and |
| 9 | Pavant Solar, LLC, Docket No. 14-035-46. My name is Jordan White. |
| 10 | And the commissioners have asked that I act as presiding officer for |
| 11 | this hearing. |
| 12 | I'm going to go ahead and take appearances. We'll go |
| 13 | ahead over here and start on the right. |
| 14 | MR. McDONOUGH: Kevin McDonough with the Utah |
| 15 | Attorney General's Office appearing on behalf of the Office of |
| 16 | Consumer Services. |
| 17 | MR. JETTER: Justin Jetter for the Utah Division of |
| 18 | Public Utilities. And with me is Charles Peterson. |
| 19 | MR. SOLANDER: Daniel Solander on behalf of Rocky |
| 20 | Mountain Power. And with me at counsel table is Bruce Griswold, who |
| 21 | will be the Company's witness in this matter. |
| 22 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Before we go ahead |
| 23 | and proceed, are there any matters of housekeeping, etc.? I know |
| 24 | there were some confidential portions of theor the application and |
| 25 | the PPA itself, but is there anything else we need to deal with? Yeah, |

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 5 | |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | if there is something you wanted to discuss or cross-examine, etc., on | |
| 2 | the confidentiality, just give us a heads-up well in advance so we can | |
| 3 | inform the court reporter and deal with it appropriately. | |
| 4 | Okay. Since this is | |
| 5 | MR. SOLANDER: Can I ask now this be admitted into | |
| 6 | the record? | |
| 7 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Sure. Why don't we go ahead | |
| 8 | andI was just going to go ahead and recommend you proceed. Why | |
| 9 | don't you go ahead and take care of the documents you want to have | |
| 10 | admitted now? | |
| 11 | MR. SOLANDER: Sure. The only documents we would | |
| 12 | seek to have admitted are the Company's application and I guess the | |
| 13 | replacement PPA, including the new page 11 that was filed with the | |
| 14 | Commission on June 5. And that is the correct and final version of the | |
| 15 | PPA. | |
| 16 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Are there any | |
| 17 | objections to those documents being received? | |
| 18 | They're received. | |
| 19 | This is your application. You can go ahead and proceed. | |
| 20 | MR. SOLANDER: Okay. We would call Mr. Bruce | |
| 21 | Griswold as the Company's witness. | |
| 22 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Go ahead and raise your right | |
| 23 | hand. Do you solemnly swear to tell the whole truth and nothing but | |
| 24 | the truth? | |
| 25 | THE WITNESS: I do. | |

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 | 6 |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Be seated. |] |
| 2 | Let me ask this: The parties plan on doing any | |
| 3 | cross-examination of the witnesses? Otherwise, we can just allow the | |
| 4 | witnesses to sit next to counsel; otherwise, we probably don't haveif | |
| 5 | we don't have any intention of doing any cross. Okay. Then, you're | |
| 6 | welcome just to go ahead and sit next to Mr. Solander. | |
| 7 | BRUCE W. GRISWOLD, being first duly sworn, was | |
| 8 | examined and testified as follows: | |
| 9 | EXAMINATION | |
| 10 | BY-MR.SOLANDER: | |
| 11 | Q. Could you please state and spell your name for the | |
| 12 | record? | |
| 13 | A. Yeah. It's Bruce W. Griswold. B-R-U-C-E, W, | |
| 14 | G-R-I-S-W-O-L-D. | |
| 15 | Q. And what is your current position within PacifiCorp? | |
| 16 | A. I'm director of short-term origination and QF contracts. | |
| 17 | Q. And as part of those responsibilities, did you negotiate | |
| 18 | the power purchase agreement between Pavant Solar, LLC, and | |
| 19 | PacifiCorp? | |
| 20 | A. Yes, I did. | |
| 21 | Q. Could you please provide a brief summary of the Pavant | |
| 22 | project and the PPA? | |
| 23 | A. Yes. The proposed Pavant Solar project is a 50- | |
| 24 | megawatt AC solar photovoltaic project using single-axis tracking | |
| 25 | technology. The proposed project will be built on approximately 400 | |

| | | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 | 7 |
|----|--|---|---|
| 1 | acres of lan | d in Millard County adjacent to the Pavant substation and | |
| 2 | is expected to be commercial operation on December 31, 2015. | | |
| 3 | | The expected annual energy deliveries from the project | |
| 4 | are consiste | ent with a single-axis tracking project at the expected | |
| 5 | capacity fac | tor in southern Utah. | |
| 6 | | The PPA is a 20-year agreement, has terms and | |
| 7 | conditions c | onsistent with the previous Schedule 38 solar PPA that | |
| 8 | was approve | ed by the Commission. | |
| 9 | Q. | And how were the prices for this project calculated? | |
| 10 | Α. | Prices were determined in accordance with the | |
| 11 | Commissior | orders in Docket 12-035-100. | |
| 12 | Q. | And is there anything materialmaterially different about | |
| 13 | this PPA from other solar PPAs that have recently been approved by | | |
| 14 | the Commis | sion? | |
| 15 | Α. | No. | |
| 16 | Q. | Do you believe that it's in the public interest for the | |
| 17 | Commissior | to approve this agreement? | |
| 18 | Α. | Yes, I do. | |
| 19 | | MR. SOLANDER: Mr. Griswold is available for questions | |
| 20 | from the Commission or from the parties. | | |
| 21 | | THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. | |
| 22 | | Mr. McDonough. | |
| 23 | | MR. McDONOUGH: (Moves head from side to side.) | |
| 24 | | THE HEARING OFFICER: Mr. Jetter. | |
| 25 | | MR. JETTER: I have no questions. | |

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 |
|----|---|
| 1 | THE HEARING OFFICER: I have one question. I'll just |
| 2 | go ahead and wait for the other witnesses to provide testimony, get |
| 3 | back to you. |
| 4 | Okay. Mr. Jetter. |
| 5 | MR. JETTER: Thank you. The Division would like to |
| 6 | swear in Mr. Peterson. |
| 7 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Do you solemnly swear to tell |
| 8 | the whole truth and nothing but the truth? |
| 9 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 10 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Please be seated. |
| 11 | CHARLES E. PETERSON, being first duly sworn, was |
| 12 | examined and testified as follows: |
| 13 | EXAMINATION |
| 14 | BY-MR.JETTER: |
| 15 | Q. Mr. Peterson, would you please state your name and |
| 16 | occupation for the record? |
| 17 | A. Charles E. Peterson, P-E-T-E-R-S-O-N. I'm a technical |
| 18 | consultant with the Division of Public Utilities. |
| 19 | Q. And have you reviewed the application filed by Rocky |
| 20 | Mountain Power in this docket, as well as the original and the |
| 21 | amended PPA agreement that's been filed? |
| 22 | A. Yes, I have. |
| 23 | Q. And did you create the action request response filed by |
| 24 | the Division, dated June 10, 2014? |
| 25 | A. Yes. |
| | |

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 9 | |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | Q. And is everything in that action request response still | |
| 2 | accurate and a reflection of the Division's analysis today? | |
| 3 | A. Yes. | |
| 4 | MR. JETTER: We'd like to move to enter this in the | |
| 5 | record. | |
| 6 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Are there any objections? | |
| 7 | MR. SOLANDER: No objection. | |
| 8 | THE HEARING OFFICER: They're received. It's | |
| 9 | received. | |
| 10 | MR. JETTER: Thank you. | |
| 11 | BY MR. JETTER: | |
| 12 | Q. And do you have some comments that you'd like to make | |
| 13 | on record today? | |
| 14 | A. Yes, just one or two. The Division would note that this | |
| 15 | power purchase agreement has terms and conditions that are | |
| 16 | consistent with what the Division had recommended in a previous | |
| 17 | docket in which the Division would hope and expect that future PPAs, | |
| 18 | solar PPAs would contain relative to the online | |
| 19 | prospective online dates and other milestones. And the Division notes | |
| 20 | that this PPA is consistent with the recommendations that the Division | |
| 21 | had made in the previous docket that's mentioned in the Division | |
| 22 | memo. | |
| 23 | And given those facts and the Division's determination | |
| 24 | that the PPA is consistent with Commission orders, particularly in | |
| 25 | 12Docket No. 12-035-100 that Mr. Griswold recently cited. | |

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 | 10 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | The Division recommends approval of this PPA as being | |
| 2 | just and reasonable and in the public interest. | |
| 3 | Q. Thank you. And just one last question: Are you aware | |
| 4 | or have you been made aware, through the Division, of any opposition | I |
| 5 | to approval of this application? | |
| 6 | A. I'm unaware of any opposition. | |
| 7 | MR. JETTER: Thank you. I have no further questions. | |
| 8 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. | |
| 9 | Any cross? | |
| 10 | MR. McDONOUGH: No cross. | |
| 11 | The Office would like to call Mr. Bela Bastag. | |
| 12 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Do you solemnly swear to tel | I |
| 13 | the whole truth and nothing but the truth? | |
| 14 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | |
| 15 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Be seated. | |
| 16 | BELA BASTAG, being first duly sworn, was examined | |
| 17 | and testified as follows: | |
| 18 | EXAMINATION | |
| 19 | BY-MR.McDONOUGH: | |
| 20 | Q. Mr. Bastag, would you please state your full name and | |
| 21 | business title for the record? | |
| 22 | A. My name is Bela Bastag. It's B-E-L-A, B-A-S-T-A-G. I | |
| 23 | am a utility analyst. And I work for the Office of Consumer Services. | |
| 24 | Q. And, Mr. Bastag, on behalf the Office, did you prepare | |
| 25 | comments in this docket that were submitted on or about June 10 of | |

| | | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 | 1 |
|----|----------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | this year? | | |
| 2 | Α. | Yes. | |
| 3 | Q. | Do you have a summary of the Office's position in this | |
| 4 | matter? | | |
| 5 | Α. | Yes. I have a very brief statement. | |
| 6 | Q. | Will you please proceed? | |
| 7 | Α. | The Office reviewed the PPA and materials provided by | |
| 8 | the Company | y through discovery. And it appears that the terms and | |
| 9 | conditions o | f the PPA are | |
| 10 | adhere to the | e Commission's orders on avoided cost pricing. And, | |
| 11 | therefore, th | e Office recommends approval that the Commission | |
| 12 | approve this | power purchase agreement. That concludes my | |
| 13 | statement. | | |
| 14 | | MR. McDONOUGH: Mr. Bastag is available for | |
| 15 | cross-examination. | | |
| 16 | | MR. JETTER: I have no questions. | |
| 17 | | MR. SOLANDER: No questions. Thank you. | |
| 18 | | THE HEARING OFFICER: Did you want to deal with the | ; |
| 19 | receipt in evidence of his | | |
| 20 | | MR. McDONOUGH: We'd move for admission. | |
| 21 | | THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objections to receipt? | |
| 22 | | MR. SOLANDER: No. | |
| 23 | | THE HEARING OFFICER: They're received. | |
| 24 | | Okay. I did have one question. And this question's | |
| 25 | probably dire | ected to Mr. Griswold and perhaps Mr. Solander. This is | |

| 1 of the PPA itself. And look into the second-to-last recital. Let me know when you get there. It's the one essentially referring to the revised protocol. JustI'm just going to go ahead and read it. I just have a question on it. Is everyone there? Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter- jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract' under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the | | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 1 | 12 |
|---|----|--|----|
| 3 are in the "Recital" section. 4 MR. SOLANDER: What section? 5 THE HEARING OFFICER: The "Recital" section on page 6 1 of the PPA itself. And look into the second-to-last recital. Let me 7 know when you get there. It's the one essentially referring to the 8 revised protocol. JustI'm just going to go ahead and read it. I just 9 have a question on it. Is everyone there? 10 Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter- 11 jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract' 12 under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised 13 Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource 14 unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost 15 PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable 16 resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs 17 basis." 18 I guess my question is justand this is a potential 19 question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you 10 know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 20 pursuant to stipulation approved by the Commission that was | 1 | actually on page 1 of the revised, I guess, or the April 24 version. I | |
| 4MR. SOLANDER: What section?5THE HEARING OFFICER: The "Recital" section on page61 of the PPA itself. And look into the second-to-last recital. Let me7know when you get there. It's the one essentially referring to the8revised protocol. JustI'm just going to go ahead and read it. I just9have a question on it. Is everyone there?10Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter-11jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract'12under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised13Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource14unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost15PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable16resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs17basis."18I guess my question is justand this is a potential19question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you20know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the212010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted22pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the23intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 2 | don't know if you have a copy or not, or the other parties, but these | |
| 5THE HEARING OFFICER: The "Recital" section on page61 of the PPA itself. And look into the second-to-last recital. Let me7know when you get there. It's the one essentially referring to the8revised protocol. JustI'm just going to go ahead and read it. I just9have a question on it. Is everyone there?10Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter-11jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract'12under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised13Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource14unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost15PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable16resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs17basis."18I guess my question is justand this is a potential19question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you20know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the212010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted22pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the23intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 3 | are in the "Recital" section. | |
| 1 of the PPA itself. And look into the second-to-last recital. Let me know when you get there. It's the one essentially referring to the revised protocol. JustI'm just going to go ahead and read it. I just have a question on it. Is everyone there? 10 Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter-jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract' under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submittee pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 4 | MR. SOLANDER: What section? | |
| know when you get there. It's the one essentially referring to the revised protocol. JustI'm just going to go ahead and read it. I just have a question on it. Is everyone there? Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter- jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract' under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submittee pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 5 | THE HEARING OFFICER: The "Recital" section on page | |
| revised protocol. JustI'm just going to go ahead and read it. I just have a question on it. Is everyone there? Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter- jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract' under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 6 | 1 of the PPA itself. And look into the second-to-last recital. Let me | |
| 9 have a question on it. Is everyone there? 10 Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter- 11 jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract' 12 under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised 13 Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource 14 unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost 15 PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable 16 resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs 17 basis." 18 I guess my question is just and this is a potential 19 question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you 20 know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 21 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted 22 pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the 23 intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 7 | know when you get there. It's the one essentially referring to the | |
| 10Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter-11jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract'12under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised13Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource14unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost15PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable16resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs17basis."18I guess my question is justand this is a potential19question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you20know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the212010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted22pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the23intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 8 | revised protocol. JustI'm just going to go ahead and read it. I just | |
| 11jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract'12under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised13Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource14unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost15PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable16resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs17basis."18I guess my question is justand this is a potential19question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you20know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the212010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted22pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the23intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 9 | have a question on it. Is everyone there? | |
| under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submittee pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 10 | Okay. It says, "Whereas, for purposes of inter- | |
| Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submittee pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 11 | jurisdictional cost allocations, this agreement is a 'New QF Contract' | |
| unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 12 | under the PacifiCorp Inter-Jurisdictional Cost Allocation Revised | |
| PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 13 | Protocol and, as such, its costs are allocated as a system resource | |
| resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs basis." I guess my question is justand this is a potential question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 14 | unless any portion of the cost of this Agreement exceeds the cost | |
| 17basis."18I guess my question is justand this is a potential19question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you20know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the212010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted22pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the23intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 15 | PacifiCorp would have otherwise incurred acquiring comparable | |
| 18I guess my question is justand this is a potential19question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you20know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the212010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted22pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the23intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 16 | resources, in which case such excess costs shall be assigned on situs | |
| question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 20 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 17 | basis." | |
| know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the 20 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 18 | I guess my question is justand this is a potential | |
| 21 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted 22 pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the 23 intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 19 | question for clarificationthe first, the revised protocol. And, you | |
| pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 20 | know, as many of you are aware, we have the current protocols, the | |
| 23 intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | 21 | 2010 protocol method approved by the Commission that was submitted | |
| | 22 | pursuant to stipulation approved on February 3, 2012. Was that the | |
| 24 how should we deal with that? We have the currently approved, you | 23 | intent, I guess? And if it was, I guess the question's howyou know, | |
| | 24 | how should we deal with that? We have the currently approved, you | |
| 25 know, protocol pursuant to the 2012 agreement, but this one is maybe | 25 | know, protocol pursuant to the 2012 agreement, but this one is maybe | |

| Hearing Proceedings | 07/08/14 |
|---------------------|----------|
|---------------------|----------|

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 |
|----|---|
| 1 | just a scrivener's error, etc., but I want to make sure we're not |
| 2 | approving an agreement that is referring to a protocol that's no longer |
| 3 | in effect. And I don't know if you want toI'm happy to go off the |
| 4 | record for a second. And I'm open to suggestions, but just pointed |
| 5 | that out. Why don't we go ahead and go off the record for a second, if |
| 6 | you want to chat amongst yourselves? |
| 7 | (A discussion was held off the record.) |
| 8 | MR. SOLANDER: It was the Company's intent that it |
| 9 | referenced the 2010 protocol, but we can submit an errata to this |
| 10 | page. It certainly was our intent that the protocol that's currently in |
| 11 | effect be applicable to this agreement. |
| 12 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Any comments from |
| 13 | theI guess, you know, I think that's fine. I guess I'm just trying to |
| 14 | think throughI don't want toyou know, I don't want to put ayou |
| 15 | know, a stick in the spokes of because, again, this is kind of a de |
| 16 | minimis issue, essentially, and I think that was the Company'sbut |
| 17 | does the Division or Office have thoughts on how we might deal with |
| 18 | this expeditiously, procedurally, what might be required to allow for |
| 19 | the Commission's consideration? |
| 20 | Why don't we go off the record for a second outside? |
| 21 | MR. JETTER: Can we just take a minute? |
| 22 | THE HEARING OFFICER: That's fine. |
| 23 | (A discussion was held off the record.) |
| 24 | THE HEARING OFFICER: This sounds like the parties |
| 25 | have had a chance to discuss. |
| | |

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 14 |
|----|---|
| 1 | MR. SOLANDER: Sure. And I think we can either |
| 2 | submit just a simple errata filing or we can file a motion if we need |
| 3 | Pavant Solar to be a party to the errata, if that makes sense |
| 4 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Uh-huh (affirmative). |
| 5 | MR. SOLANDER:or sign off on that. We can submit a |
| 6 | motion for acceptance of revised contract, something along those |
| 7 | lines. |
| 8 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Let me ask you thisthis is a |
| 9 | question, I guess, for the Division or Office: Is this something that |
| 10 | you think would need to be vetted pursuant to an action request or |
| 11 | would we need to open this up again for comment, etc.? Is this |
| 12 | something we can deal with more expeditiously, I guess? |
| 13 | MR. JETTER: I'm inclined to say we can do this just by |
| 14 | an errata to this agreement. |
| 15 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. So, you |
| 16 | MR. JETTER: I think our view of what was intended by |
| 17 | the term of this was the 2010 protocol. And, so, we would remain in |
| 18 | favor of approval so long as nothing else changes. |
| 19 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. That's |
| 20 | MR. JETTER: No other party has intervened, so I don't |
| 21 | anticipate any new parties being interested in that change. |
| 22 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. That'sdo you have |
| 23 | anything, Mr. McDonough? |
| 24 | MR. McDONOUGH: No. The Office concurs with the |
| 25 | Division. |
| | |

| 1 THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. Well, then, 2 why don'tyou can, I guess, decide what makes most sense practically 3 just to accomplish the 4 you know, whether it's an errata or whatever and just 5 and thenwith that, is there any other matters of housekeeping or any 6 other requests, etc., that we need to address? 7 Okay. With that, I appreciate everyone's time today. 8 And we're adjourned. And we'll issue an order. 9 MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. 11 (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) 12 13 14 15 15 16 16 17 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 24 25 | | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 15 |
|--|----|--|
| just to accomplish the you know, whether it's an errata or whatever and just and thenwith that, is there any other matters of housekeeping or any other requests, etc., that we need to address? Okay. With that, I appreciate everyone's time today. And we're adjourned. And we'll issue an order. MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) In the state of the | 1 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. All right. Well, then, |
| 4you know, whether it's an errata or whatever and just5and thenwith that, is there any other matters of housekeeping or any6other requests, etc., that we need to address?7Okay. With that, I appreciate everyone's time today.8And we're adjourned. And we'll issue an order.9MR. SOLANDER: Thank you.10THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.11(Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.)121314151514161717181920212122232324 | 2 | why don'tyou can, I guess, decide what makes most sense practically |
| 5and thenwith that, is there any other matters of housekeeping or any other requests, etc., that we need to address?7Okay. With that, I appreciate everyone's time today.8And we're adjourned. And we'll issue an order.9MR. SOLANDER: Thank you.10THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.11(Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.)12 | 3 | just to accomplish the |
| 6other requests, etc., that we need to address?7Okay. With that, I appreciate everyone's time today.8And we're adjourned. And we'll issue an order.9MR. SOLANDER: Thank you.10THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.11(Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.)12 | 4 | you know, whether it's an errata or whatever and just |
| 7Okay. With that, I appreciate everyone's time today.8And we're adjourned. And we'll issue an order.9MR. SOLANDER: Thank you.10THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.11(Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.)12.13.14.15.16.17.18.19.20.21.22.23.24. | 5 | and thenwith that, is there any other matters of housekeeping or any |
| And we're adjourned. And we'll issue an order. MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) And the second secon | 6 | other requests, etc., that we need to address? |
| 9 MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. 11 (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) 12 | 7 | Okay. With that, I appreciate everyone's time today. |
| 10 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. 11 (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) 12 . 13 . 14 . 15 . 16 . 17 . 18 . 19 . 20 . 21 . 22 . 23 . 24 . | 8 | And we're adjourned. And we'll issue an order. |
| 11 (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) 12 | 9 | MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. |
| 12 1 13 1 14 1 15 1 16 1 17 1 18 1 19 1 20 1 21 1 23 1 24 1 | 10 | THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. |
| 13 | 11 | (Proceedings adjourned at 10:17 a.m.) |
| 14 14 15 15 16 16 17 16 18 16 19 16 20 16 21 16 22 16 23 16 24 16 | 12 | |
| 15 | 13 | |
| 16 | 14 | |
| 17 | 15 | |
| 18 18 19 18 20 19 21 19 22 19 23 19 24 19 | 16 | |
| 19 | 17 | |
| 20 | 18 | |
| 21 1 22 1 23 1 24 1 | 19 | |
| 22 23 24 | 20 | |
| 23 24 | 21 | |
| 24 | 22 | |
| | 23 | |
| 25 | 24 | |
| | 25 | |

| | Hearing Proceedings 07/08/14 | 16 |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | CERTIFICATE | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings were | |
| 4 | taken before me, SCOTT M. KNIGHT, a Registered Professional | |
| 5 | Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah, residing at | |
| 6 | South Jordan, Utah; | |
| 7 | That the proceedings were reported by me in stenotype | |
| 8 | and thereafter caused by me to be transcribed into typewriting, and | |
| 9 | that a full, true, and correct transcription of said proceedings so taker | ۱ |
| 10 | and transcribed is set forth in the foregoing pages, inclusive. | |
| 11 | I further certify that I am not of kin or otherwise | |
| 12 | associated with any of the parties to said cause of action, and that I | |
| 13 | am not interested in the event thereof. | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Scott M. Knight, RPR | |
| 18 | Utah License No. 110171-7801 | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |