BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain

Power for Authority to Revise Docket No. 15-035-27

Rates in Tariff Schedule 98, Renewable Energy Credits

Balancing Account

HEARING PROCEEDINGS

TAKEN AT:

Public Service Commission

Hearing Room 403 160 East 300 South Salt Lake City, Utah

DATE:

Wednesday, May 20, 2015

TIME:

9:00 a.m.

REPORTED BY: Scott M. Knight, RPR

50 West Broadway, Suite 900, Salt Lake City, UT 84101 801-983-2180

Page 1



1 2	APPEARANCES THE HEARING OFFICER: THAD LeVAR
3	COMMISSIONER: DAVID R. CLARK
4	FOR DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES:
5	PATRICIA E. SCHMID, ESQ., ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor
6	Salt Lake City, Utah 84114
7	FOR OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES:
8	CHERYL MURRAY, PRO SE
9	FOR ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER:
10	YVONNE R. HOGLE, ESQ., ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER
11	201 South Main Street, Suite 2300 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
12	Sail Lake City, Otali 64111
13	
14	* * *
1 4 15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



1	INDEX		
2	WITNESS	Page	
3	JOELLE STEWARD		
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION	6	
5	BY MS. HOGLE		
6	BRUCE W. GRISWOLD		
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. HOGLE	8	
8	JANA LYNN SABA		
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION	9	
10	BY MS. HOGLE EXAMINATION	13	
11	BY COMMISSIONER CLARK	10	
	EXAMINATION	14	
12	BY THE HEARING OFFICER		
13	BRENDA SALTER		
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. SCHMID	16	
15	STATEMENT OF CHERYL MURRAY		19
16			
17	* * *		
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
23 24			
2 4 25			
20			



PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

THE HEARING OFFICER: We're on the record. It is time and place for the hearing noticed in Docket No. 15-035-27, the Application of Rocky Mountain Power to Revise Rates in Tariff Schedule 98, Renewable Energy Credits Balancing Account. I'm Thad LaVar. And to my right is Commissioner David Clark. I'll be acting as the hearing officer today, and we'll start taking appearances from parties.

MS. HOGLE: Good morning, Commissioners and parties. My name is Yvonne Hogle and I'm here on behalf of Rocky Mountain Power. And with me here today is Ms. Jana Saba, who filed testimony and exhibits in support of the application and who will be providing a summary for the Commission this morning as well.

On the phone are also our other two witnesses who filed testimony and exhibits in this case: Ms. Joelle Steward and Mr. Bruce Griswold, I believe.

Thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

MS. SCHMID: Good morning. Patricia E. Schmid with the Attorney General's Office on behalf of the Division of Public Utilities. Brenda Salter is with me. She is the Division's witness in this matter.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.



3 4

5

6

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

MS. MURRAY: Cheryl Murray with the Office of Consumer Services. And I will be appearing without counsel today.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you. Okay. In this docket we had it scheduled--it called for--had an application by Rocky Mountain Power, and the schedule called for comments filed by the Division and subsequent comments filed by any other party.

The Applicant requested that we approve recovery of the deferral balance for the Renewable Energy Credits Balancing Account of 5.6 million to be collected in two annual installments. The Division submitted comments supporting that application, the Office also supporting that recovery on an interim basis. The Office also filed comments supporting recovery on an interim basis.

And the Division and Office also gave us a very courteous heads-up to an issue they'll be addressing in the next general rate case, which--we appreciate the heads-up.

> Have I summarized those positions correctly? MS. SCHMID: Yes.

THE HEARING OFFICER: And so in terms of where we go forward, we have three parties here present today. There's been no one else that has identified themselves on the phone or in the room, correct?

Okay. Well, we will start with the Applicant.



1	MS. HOGLE: Thank you, your Honor. All of Rocky
2	Mountain Power witnesses are prepared to be sworn in by the
3	Commission in order for them to give testimony.
4	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. I'll swear all three
5	of them in.
6	Ms. Saba, Mr. Griswold, and Ms. Stewardall three
7	of youdo you swear to tell the truth?
8	MS. SABA: I do.
9	MR. GRISWOLD: I do.
10	MS. STEWARD: I do.
11	MR. GRISWOLD: I do.
12	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. Go ahead.
13	MS. HOGLE: I would like to call first Ms. Joelle
14	Steward.
15	JOELLE STEWARD,
16	being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as
17	follows:
18	DIRECT EXAMINATION
19	BY MS. HOGLE:
20	Q Can you please state your name and place of
21	employment for the record?
22	A My name is Joelle Steward. I'm employed by
23	PacifiCorp.
24	THE REPORTER: I can't hear her very well.
25	THE HEARING OFFICER: Is there a way to increase

Page 6



1	volume on the phone?
2	Sorry, Ms. Steward. The court reporter's having
3	trouble hearing.
4	THE WITNESS: My volume is all the way up.
5	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. We're good now.
6	BY MS. HOGLE:
7	Q I'm going to start again, Ms. Steward. Can you
8	please state your name and place of employment for the
9	record?
10	A My name is Joelle Steward. I'm employed by
11	PacifiCorp. My business address is 825 NE Multnomah Street,
12	Suite 2000, Portland, Oregon.
13	Q And in that capacity did you prepare direct
14	testimony and exhibits in support of the Company's
15	application?
16	A Yes, I did.
17	Q And do you have any changes to that testimony or
18	exhibits here today?
19	A No, I do not.
20	Q So if I were to ask you the questions in your
21	testimony again here today, would your answers be the same?
22	A Yes.
23	MS. HOGLE: Mr. Hearing Officer, I move for the
24	admission of the direct testimony and exhibits of Ms. Jana
25	Saba.



1	THE HEARING OFFICER: You mean Ms. Steward?
2	MS. HOGLE: Excuse me. Ms. Joelle Steward.
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objections?
4	Okay. They'll be received.
5	MS. HOGLE: Okay. Thank you. I would like to now
6	call Mr. Bruce Griswold.
7	BRUCE W. GRISWOLD,
8	being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as
9	follows:
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MS. HOGLE:
12	Q Can you please state your name, place of
13	employment, and address for the record?
14	A Yeah. My name is Bruce W. Griswold. My business
15	address is 825 NE Multnomah Street, Suite 600, Portland,
16	Oregon 97232. I'm employed by PacifiCorp as director of
17	short-term origination, qualifying
18	THE REPORTER: Sorry. Didn't hear the end of it.
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: I'm sorry. Can you repeat
20	the last part of your statement, Mr. Griswold?
21	THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. I'm employed by PacifiCorp
22	as the director of short-term origination and qualifying
23	facilities.
24	BY MS. HOGLE:
25	Q And in that capacity did you file direct testimony





1	and ex	xhibits in support of the application?
2	Α	I did.
3	Q	And do you have any changes to that testimony or
4	exhibi	ts here today?
5	Α	I do not.
6	Q	So if I were to ask you the questions in your
7	testim	ony again today, would your answers be the same?
8	Α	They would, yes.
9		MS. HOGLE: Mr. Hearing Officer, I move for the
10	admis	sion of the direct testimony and exhibits of Mr. Bruce
11	Griswo	old into the record.
12		THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objection?
13		Okay. They'll be entered. Thank you.
14		MS. HOGLE: I will call Ms. Jana Saba.
15	JANA	LYNN SABA,
16	being	first duly sworn, was examined and testified as
17	follow	s:
18	DIREC	CT EXAMINATION
19	BY MS	S. HOGLE:
20	Q	Would you please state your name, place of
21	emplo	yment, and position for the record?
22	Α	My name is Jana Lynn Saba. I am employed by Rocky
23	Mount	ain Power as the manager of revenue requirement. I am
24	locate	d at 201 South Main Street, Suite 2300, in Salt Lake
25	Citv. l	Jtah 84111.

Q And in that capacity, did you prepare direct
testimony and exhibits JLS-1, JLS-2, and JLS-3 in support of
the Company's application?
A Yes, I did.
Q And did you replace JExhibit JLS-1 in its
entirety filed with the Commission on March 24, 2015?
A Yes, I did.
Q Do you have any other changes to your testimony or
exhibits that you would like to make here?
A No, I do not.
Q So if I were to ask you here today the same
questions that are in your testimony and exhibits, with the
exception of JLS-1, would your answers be the same?
A Yes, they would.
MS. HOGLE: Mr. Hearing Officer, I move for the
admission of the direct testimony with exhibits of Jana
Saba, including JLS-1, filed March 24, 2015, and excluding
the original Exhibit JLS-1 filed with the application.
THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objections?
Okay. They'll be entered with the substitutions
described by counsel.
BY MS. HOGLE:
Q Ms. Saba, do you have a summary that you would
like to provide to the Commission and the parties here



25

today?

A Yes, I do.

Q Please proceed.

•

A Good morning, Commissioner Clark, Commissioner LeVar. On March 16th, 2015, Rocky Mountain Power filed its Annual Renewable Energy Credit Balance Account, or the RBA, seeking to recover the deferral balance from customers through Schedule 98 of approximately \$5.6 million to be collected over a period of two years with no carrying charges for the deferral period of January 1st, 2014, through December 31st, 2014. This amount will be added to the current amount being collected on that schedule that was approved in Docket No. 14-035-30, which was the 2014 RBA, the RBA filed last year.

The deferral account established in that filing was \$17 million and it was to be collected in three annual installments. So the \$5.6 million pending approval in this docket would be added to that amount, and then that full balance would be collected over two remaining years.

Myself, Mr. Bruce Griswold, and Ms. Joelle Steward filed testimony in support of the Company's application, describing the calculations. My testimony describes the calculation of the deferral amounts of REC revenue allocated to Utah ratepayers. Mr. Griswold's testimony presents a detailed accounting of total company REC revenue for calendar year 2014. And Ms. Steward's testimony addresses



the allocation of the RBA among customer classes and the resulting Schedule 98 rates in this case.

The \$5.6 million requested in this docket was calculated in a matter consistent with the previous RBA filings and the methodology set forth in the September 13th, 2011, stipulation, which resolved Docket No.--Docket Nos. 10-035-14 and 10-035-124, which were the rate case and a REC deferral docket.

The RBA deferral is calculated as the difference between actual REC revenue realized by the Company and REC revenue that is set in a general rate case for that same time period. In this RBA filing, the deferral period was calendar year 2014.

The Company respectfully requests that the Commission approve the Company's requested amount of--to collect \$5.6 million associated with this RBA filing on an interim basis beginning June 1st, 2015, which will be added to the \$11.1 million that is remaining from the 2014 RBA. And that balance will be collected over two years.

Thank you.

MS. HOGLE: The Company rests its case. Ms. Saba and Ms. Steward and Mr. Griswold are available for questions. Thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. Thank you.

Does the Division have any questions for any of



1	the Company witnesses?
2	MS. SCHMID: The Division does not.
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: As far as the Office?
4	MS. MURRAY: No, thank you.
5	THE HEARING OFFICER: Commissioner Clark, do you
6	have any questions?
7	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a question for
8	Mr. Griswold.
9	EXAMINATION
10	BY COMMISSIONER CLARK:
11	Q Can you hear me, Mr. Griswold?
12	A I can, yes.
13	Q In your testimony you stated that the November and
14	December estimatesor the revenues for those periods were
15	estimates and that a true-up would follow in the March-April
16	time frame. And I just wondered if you're able toand
17	aware of the new information regarding those periods.
18	A Yes. We provided those updates last week, those
19	for both November 2014 and December 2014. The two updates
20	are thethe revenues from that period provide an additional
21	\$363 in total REC revenue. I can't speak specifically to
22	the allocation to Utah, but it was very close to the
23	estimates originally provided in my testimony.
24	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Congratulations on your

estimates. Thank you. That--that concludes my question.



25

1	THE HEARING OFFICER: Nothing else?
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Nothing further.
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: And I also have one question
4	for Mr. Griswold. And it relates to your Exhibit BWG-1,
5	which is a confidential exhibit. So I'll first ask counsel
6	for the Company: If I want to ask about a certain number of
7	months in comparison to other months without identifying any
8	numbers, am I jumping into confidential question that we
9	need to deal with?
10	MS. HOGLE: I would ask Mr. Griswold to answer
11	that question. It does not appear to me that that would
12	cause us to stop streaming, oror handle that
13	confidentially if you're not going to be discussing amounts,
14	but II would like Mr. Bruce Griswold to further respond to
15	that question, please.
16	EXAMINATION
17	BY THE HEARING OFFICER:
18	Q Mr. Griswold, could you respond to that issue?
19	A I should be able to maybe discuss it ininat a
20	general level. It would depend on thekind of the specific
21	question you have.
22	Q Okay. Well, the question I have is: February,
23	March, and April are obviously significantly different from
24	the other months on the chart. And I was just wondering if
25	there's an explanation that would help us understand



this--this docket a little bit better.

•

A Sure. So, a lot of times when we're making sales--and recognizing that this table reflects actuals as they have received--as we have--the Company's received revenue and transferred those RECs through WREGIS, that would then go to the counterparty. And the market is such that a lot of times they will purchase up to the end of the year, fulfill some obligation, with the delivery of those RECs coming generally three months later or 90--actually, 90 days via WREGIS. And so you would see that a lot of times there would be sales done up through the end of 2013 that don't reflect revenues and transfers showing up for a few months later.

It also reflects sometimes the purchasing patterns of a lot of our counterparties and whether they're fulfilling a compliance obligation or some other market opportunity when we make the sale. But there's--there's no real rhyme or reason to why things don't show up in the early--in the early time frame.

THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you. That's a helpful explanation.

I don't have anything further.

MS. HOGLE: Thank you.

THE HEARING OFFICER: I guess we'll go to the Division. Ms. Schmid.



1	MS. SCHMID: Thank you. The Division would call
2	Ms. Brenda Salter as its witness. May she please be sworn?
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: Ms. Salter, do you swear to
4	tell the truth?
5	MS. SALTER: I do.
6	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
7	BRENDA SALTER,
8	being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as
9	follows:
10	DIRECT EXAMINATION
11	BY MS. SCHMID:
12	Q Good morning, Ms. Salter. Could you please state
13	your full name, employer, position, and business address for
14	the record?
15	A Yes. My name is Brenda Salter. I'm employed by
16	the Division of Public Utilities. I'm a technical
17	consultant for the Division. And my address is 16160 East
18	300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
19	Q Thank you. In connection with your employment at
20	the Division, have you participated in this docket?
21	A I have.
22	Q Did you participate in the preparation and filing
23	the Division's memorandum dated April 28, 2015?
24	A Yes, I did.
25	Q Is the Division's position today the same as it



1	was expressed in that filing?
2	A Yes, it is.
3	Q Do you adopt the Division's memorandum dated April
4	28th, 2015, as your testimony here today?
5	A Ido, yes.
6	MS. SCHMID: The Division would like to move for
7	the admission of the Division's April 28th, 2015, memorandum
8	in this docket.
9	THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objections?
10	MS. HOGLE: No.
11	THE HEARING OFFICER: It'll be entered.
12	BY MS. SCHMID:
13	Q Do you have a summary to provide today?
14	A Yes, I do.
15	Q Please proceed.
16	A Tariff Schedule 98 tracks the difference between
17	Renewable Energy Credit (REC) revenues included in rates and
18	actual REC revenues collected from the sale of RECs by the
19	Company. The variances between REC revenues included in
20	rates and actual REC revenues collected are identified and
21	deferred each month for one full calendar year. Annually on
22	March 15th, an RBA application is filed to present the
23	variances, including applicable carrying charges, with a 100
24	percent true-up for the difference between the amounts in
25	rates and actual sales occurring through Tariff Schedule 98.



The collection or credit under Tariff Schedule 98 is to be made annually, effective June 1st. The application under this docket is the fourth deferred RBA rate adjustment under the RBA.

This application requests collecting over a two-year period the 2015 RBA deferral balance of 5.6 million along with the remaining 2014 RBA deferral balance of 11.1 million for a total of 16.7 million. As an incentive to aggressively market RECs, the 2012 stipulation allowed the Company to retain 10 percent of REC sales made after June 1st, 2013. The Company proposes allocation of REC revenue across customer classes in a manner consistent with the approved rate spread found in Step 1 of the 2014 general rate case stipulation for the 2015 RBA deferral balance and Step 2 of the 2012 general rate case stipulation for the 2014 RBA deferral balance with two modifications for metered outdoor nighttime lighting and Special Contract 1.

The Division has performed a preliminary review of the filing and the corresponding Commission orders and has found that, in general, the Company has complied with the Commission's orders and recommends the change in Schedule 98 be approved on an interim basis. As outlined in the Commission's scheduling order dated March 24th, 2015, the Division will file its RBA audit report on July 9th, 2015.

The Division is concerned that the conditions



1	giving rise to the current RBA process no longer exist.
2	With the implementationimplementation of California's
3	SBX2-1, the Company is unable to sell bundled RECs into the
4	California market. The tens of millions of dollars sold
5	prior to 2012 were the result of contract bundled REC sales
6	made prior to California's SBX2-1 enactment and prior to the
7	Commission approved RBA. The Division is recommending that
8	the Commission consider canceling the Renewable Balancing
9	Account in the next general rate case.
10	That concludes my summary.
11	MS. SCHMID: Thank you.
12	Ms. Salter is now available for cross-examination
13	and questions from the Commission.
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
15	Ms. Hogle, any questions from the Applicant?
16	MS. HOGLE: I have none.
17	THE HEARING OFFICER: Ms. Murray, any questions?
18	MS. MURRAY: No, thank you.
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: Commissioner Clark?
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have no questions.
21	THE HEARING OFFICER: I have none. Thank you.
22	Ms. Murray, do you swear to tell the truth?
23	MS. MURRAY: I do.
24	THE HEARING OFFICER: You may testify.
25	CHERYL MURRAY,

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

MS. MURRAY: Thank you. My name is Cheryl Murray. I am a utility analyst with the Office of Consumer Services. My address is 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah. And I have a brief statement.

The Office of Consumer Services is responsible for assessing impact of utility rate changes and regulatory actions upon residential and small commercial customers. And it's with that responsibility in mind that we have analyzed Rocky Mountain Power's request to revise rates in Tariff Schedule 98, Renewable Energy Credit Balancing Account.

With the assistance of our consultant, we have reviewed the application, exhibits, and testimony of Rocky Mountain Power, discovery responses, the Division of Public Utility's initial comments submitted on April 28th, 2015, and other relevant documents.

On May 12, 2015, the Office submitted initial comments on the matter. In those comments we recommended approval of the Company's request, including the allocation to customer classes, on an interim basis.

We--regarding the Division's suggestion that in the next GRC, they may propose elimination of the Schedule 98 balancing account, we suggested that at that time we will review what the--the potential implications of the



1	Division's proposal and we will provide substantive response
2	regarding cancellation or perhaps a modification of the RBA
3	in an appropriate future GRC, general rate case.
4	In the Office's judgment, allowing the proposed
5	98Schedule 98 rate adjustment on an interim basis pending
6	the Division's final audit and parties' comments and
7	recommendations is just and reasonable in result, and we
8	recommend Commission approval.
9	Based on our review, we recommend that the
10	Commission approve the proposed 98Schedule 98 on an
11	interim basis, as I've said. And that concludes my
12	statement. But I would ask that the Office's May 12
13	comments be admitted for the record in this docket.
14	THE HEARING OFFICER: Any objection from the
15	Applicant?
16	MS. HOGLE: No.
17	THE HEARING OFFICER: From the Division?
18	MS. SCHMID: No.
19	THE HEARING OFFICER: That will be entered. Thank
20	you.
21	Does that conclude your testimony, Ms. Murray?
22	MS. MURRAY: It does. Thank you.
23	THE HEARING OFFICER: Any questions from the
24	applicant?
25	MS. HOGLE: None.



1	THE HEARING OFFICER: From the Division?
2	MS. SCHMID: No.
3	THE HEARING OFFICER: Commissioner Clark?
4	MS. HOGLE: No questions.
5	THE HEARING OFFICER: And I have none. Thank you.
6	Nothing further.
7	MS. HOGLE: Yes, one more thing. The Company
8	requests that the Commission issue a bench order, given
9	there's no opposition and full support from the Division and
10	the Office of Consumer Services. I believe that also, given
11	the June 1 effective date for the interim rates, the Company
12	respectfully requests that the Commission issue a bench
13	order.
14	Thank you.
15	THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.
16	Can I ask the Division, the Office each if they
17	support a bench ruling in this matter?
18	MS. SCHMID: The Division supports a bench ruling
19	in this matter.
20	MS. MURRAY: The Office supports a bench ruling
21	also.
22	THE HEARING OFFICER: Okay. We will be in recess
23	for a very brief amount. We'll return shortly.
24	(Recess taken, 9:24-9:26 a.m.)
25	THE HEARING OFFICER: On the record.



1 Based on the testimony and comments submitted in 2 this docket, the Commission finds that the application and 3 proposed rates on an interim basis, effective June 1st, 4 2015, are just and reasonable. The Commission concludes 5 that approving the application and rates effective June 1st, 6 2015, on an interim basis is consistent with the relevant 7 statutes, rules, and Commission orders, and we approve the 8 application as filed subject to the Division audit and 9 review of that audit by any interested parties. This bench 10 ruling will be memorialized in a written order to be issued 11 shortly. 12 Anything further from any party? 13 MS. HOGLE: Thank you. MS. SCHMID: Nothing further from the Division. 14 15 Thank you. 16 MS. MURRAY: No, thank you. 17 THE HEARING OFFICER: Thank you all for your 18 participation today. We are adjourned. 19 (Proceedings concluded at 9:26 a.m.) 20 21 22 23 24 25



CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, SCOTT M. KNIGHT, a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State of Utah, residing at South Jordan, 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, 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



Scott M. Knight, RPR Utah License No. 110171-7801

