



State of Utah Department of Commerce Division of Public Utilities

FRANCINE GIANI
Executive Director

THOMAS BRADY
Deputy Director

CHRIS PARKER
Director, Division of Public Utilities

GARY HERBERT
Governor

SPENCER J. COX
Lieutenant Governor

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 5, 2014

TO: Public Service Commission

FROM: Division of Public Utilities
Chris Parker, Division Director
Marialie Martinez, Customer Service Manager
Erika Tedder, Office Specialist

RE: Rod Stephens v. Rocky Mountain Power
Docket No. 14-035-52

Recommendation: Schedule Hearing

Complaint Analysis:

On the 17th of March, 2014, Mr. Rod Stephens emailed the Division of Public Utilities (Division) to file an informal complaint claiming that he had been unsuccessful at resolving issues to upgrade service with Rocky Mountain Power (RMP). Mr. Stephens stated that he owns a lot in a 3-lot subdivision, and that his lot has an existing power pole with a transformer. Mr. Stephens claims that because he is a new residential customer building in a subdivision where secondary service is available at the lot line, it is RMP's obligation to upgrade the existing transformer (as per RMP's Electric Service Regulation No. 12, Section 2(e)).

Company Response:

Autumn Braithwaite, RMP's Regulatory Analyst, responded to Mr. Stephens's informal complaint on March 21st, 2014. Ms. Braithwaite stated that RMP's Electric Service Regulation No. 12, Section 2(e) does not apply to Mr. Stephens since he has not built in a subdivision where secondary service is available. After further investigation, Ms. Braithwaite responded on the 26th of March, 2014, and advised that the transformer currently in place would not adequately serve Mr. Stephens's lot. In addition, since Mr. Stephens built on a lot that no developer has paid to have secondary service to the lot

line, the Company would be willing to provide an allowance of \$1100 toward the costs he would incur to upgrade (as per Regulation 12, Section 2(a)).

DPU Comments & Recommendation:

Based on the differences of interpretations of RMP's Electric Service Regulation No. 12, because it is vague as to how it applies to Mr. Stephens's situation, and because the mediation between the parties did not result in a resolution, the Division believes that a hearing should be set so that testimony and evidence of both sides can be evaluated by the Commission.