

Public Service Commission

THAD LeVAR
Chair
DAVID R. CLARK
Commissioner
JORDAN A. WHITE
Commissioner

State of Utah

GARY R. HERBERT Governor

SPENCER J. COX Lieutenant Governor

July 9, 2015

Jeffrey K. Larsen, Vice President Regulation Rocky Mountain Power 201 South Main, Suite 2300 Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Re: Docket No. 15-035-56, In the Matter of Rocky Mountain Power's 2015 Avoided Cost Input Changes Quarterly Compliance Filing - 2015.Q1 Avoided Cost Input Changes

Dear Mr. Larsen:

On June 1, 2015, the Public Service Commission of Utah ("Commission") received Rocky Mountain Power's ("Company") avoided cost input changes for the first quarter of 2015, ("2015.Q1 Compliance Filing") pursuant to previous Commission orders in Docket No. 03-035-14, "In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp for Approval of an IRP-Based Avoided Cost Methodology for QF Projects Larger than One Megawatt" ("Avoided Cost Orders").

On June 22, 2015, the Utah Division of Public Utilities ("Division") filed its action request response memorandum detailing its investigation of the Company's 2015.Q1 Compliance Filing and recommending the Commission acknowledge the Company's filing as complying with Commission orders. On July 7, 2015, the Company filed reply comments summarizing the filings in this docket and noting the Division's effort and cooperation in evaluating the 2015.Q1 Compliance Filing.

Based on the Division's recommendation and the lack of opposition by any party, the Commission acknowledges the 2015.Q1 Compliance Filing.

The Commission notes the 2015.Q1 Compliance Filing precedes the recent settlement stipulation ("Stipulation") approved by the Commission on June 9, 2015, in Docket No. 14-035-140, "In the Matter of the Review of Electric Service Schedule No. 38, Qualifying Facilities Procedures, and Other Related Procedural Issues." Pursuant to the Stipulation, the Company will identify and explain new or updated avoided cost modeling assumptions in subsequent quarterly compliance filings and will classify these assumptions as either routine or non-routine. Parties will then have a

Correspondence from Gary L. Widerburg Docket No. 15-035-56 Page 2

period of time to request the Commission to determine whether any contested updates should be included in avoided cost pricing.

With the approval of the Stipulation and the procedures for challenging modeling assumptions now in place, the Commission does not intend to make affirmative acknowledgements for future uncontested quarterly compliance filings. Rather, unless the Commission is requested to address a challenged designation or assumption within the time period provided for in the Stipulation, the Commission assumes the Company will incorporate new or updated assumptions into avoided cost pricing without the need for further action by the Commission.

Sincerely,

/s/ Gary L. Widerburg Commission Secretary