

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

- BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH -

---

In the Matter of Rocky Mountain)  
Power's Proposed Revisions to )  
Electric Service Schedule ) DOCKET NO. 15-035-T06  
No. 37, Avoided Cost Purchases )  
from Qualifying Facilities. )

---

HEARING TRANSCRIPT

Salt Lake City, Utah

Monday, September 14, 2015

Before: Thad LeVar

Commission Chair

Reported by: Daren S. Bloxham, RPR No. 000335

Job no. 259811

1 Hearing transcript taken at Utah Public Service  
2 Commission, located at 160 East 300 South,  
3 4th Floor, Salt Lake City, Utah, on September 14,  
4 2015, at 9:00 a.m., before Daren S. Bloxham,  
5 Certified Court Reporter, in and for the State of  
6 Utah.

7

8 A P P E A R A N C E S

9 FOR THE UTAH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION:

10 Thad LeVar, Commission Chair  
11 David Clark, Commissioner  
12 Jordan A. White, Commissioner

12 FOR ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER:

13 Yvonne Hogle, ESQ.  
14 ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER  
15 201 S. Main, Ste. 2400  
16 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
17 Telephone: (801) 220-4050

16 FOR THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES:

17 Patricia E. Schmid, Esq.  
18 ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE  
19 160 East 300 South, Ste. 500  
20 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114  
21 Telephone: (801) 366-0353

20 FOR THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES:

21 Robert Moore, Esq.  
22 OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES  
23 170 S. Main, Ste. 400  
24 Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
25 Telephone: (801) 533-8383

24

25

1	I N D E X	Page 3
2	WITNESS: BRIAN DICKMAN	
3	EXAMINATION	PAGE
4	By: Ms. Hogle	6
5	By: Commissioner Clark	17
6	By: Commissioner LeVar	22
7	WITNESS: ABDINASIR ABDULLE	
8	EXAMINATION	PAGE
9	By: Ms. Schmid	10
10	By: Commissioner Clark	17
11	By: Commissioner LeVar	22
12	WITNESS: BELA VASTAG	
13	EXAMINATION	PAGE
14	By: Mr. Moore	14
15	By: Commissioner Clark	17
16	By: Commissioner LeVar	22
17		
18	E X H I B I T S	
19	DESCRIPTION	PAGE ADMITTED
20	Brian Dickman's direct testimony and attached	7
21	Exhibits A through H	
22	Division memorandums	11
23	Comments of Bela Vastag	15
24		
25		

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 --oOo--

3 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Good morning. We are  
4 here for the time and place for the Public Service  
5 Commission hearing in the matter of Rocky Mountain  
6 Power's Proposed Revisions to Electric Service,  
7 Schedule No. 37, avoided cost purchases from qualified  
8 facilities, Public Service Commission Docket  
9 No. 15-035-T06.

10 We'll take appearances at this point from the  
11 applicant.

12 MS. HOGLE: Good morning, Your Honor.  
13 Yvonne Hogle on behalf of Rocky Mountain Power. And  
14 with me on the phone today is our witness, Mr. Brian  
15 Dickman.

16 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: He's on the phone now?

17 MS. HOGLE: Yes. And behind me is  
18 Bob Lively, who's the regulatory affairs manager for  
19 the State of Utah.

20 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Okay. Thank you.  
21 Division of Public Utilities?

22 MS. SCHMID: Good morning. Patricia E.  
23 Schmid with the Utah Attorney General's Office  
24 representing the Division of Public Utilities. And  
25 with me is the division's witness is Dr. Abdinasir

1 Abdulle. And would you like me to spell that for the  
2 court reporter?

3 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Please.

4 MS. SCHMID: A-B-D-I-N-A-S-I-R, and the last  
5 name is A-B-D-U-L-L-E. Thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Thank you. For the  
7 Office?

8 MR. MOORE: Robert Moore for the Office of  
9 Consumer Services. I have with me Bela Vastag, a  
10 utility analyst with the Office.

11 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Okay. I do not see any  
12 other participants present to make an appearance. Any  
13 preliminary matters before we go forward then? Let me  
14 ask this question then since it goes to the issue of  
15 whether we'll take the three witnesses as a panel or do  
16 each individually. Do the parties present intend any  
17 cross-examination of any of the three presentations?

18 Then I think what it makes sense to do is  
19 have all three presentations, and then there may be  
20 some questions from the Commission. But I think it  
21 might make sense to get all three on the record first,  
22 and then we'll go forward if we have any questions.

23 So Ms. Hogle, we'll go to you.

24 MS. HOGLE: Thank you, Your Honor. The  
25 company calls Mr. Brian Dickman, who is on the phone.

1 He needs to be sworn.

2 --oOo--

3 BRIAN DICKMAN,

4 having been first duly sworn to tell the  
5 truth, was examined and testified as follows:

6 EXAMINATION

7 BY MS. HOGLE:

8 Q. Good morning, Mr. Dickman. Can you please  
9 state and spell your name and place of employment for  
10 the record?

11 A. Yes. Good morning. My name is Brian  
12 Dickman, D-I-C-K-M-A-N. And I am the Director of Net  
13 Power Costs and Load Forecasting for PacifiCorp.

14 Q. And in that capacity, did you prepare or  
15 cause to prepare -- cause to be prepared your direct  
16 testimony and attached Exhibits A through H?

17 A. Yes, I did.

18 Q. So if I were to ask you the questions and  
19 your testimony again here today, would your answers be  
20 the same?

21 A. Yes, they would.

22 Q. And in that capacity, did you also prepare or  
23 cause to prepare -- cause to be the prepared the reply  
24 comments the company filed September 9th, 2015?

25 A. Yes, I did.

1           **Q.    And are you adopting those reply comments as**  
2           **your own here today?**

3           A.    Yes.

4           **Q.    Do you have any changes to the reply comments**  
5           **that you'd like to make?**

6           A.    No.

7                   MS. HOGLE:  At this time, we'd like to move  
8           for the admission as evidence into the record Mr. Brian  
9           Dickman's direct testimony and attached Exhibits A  
10          through H, as well as the reply comments.

11                   COMMISSIONER LeVAR:  Any objection from the  
12          Division or the Office?

13                   MS. SCHMID:  None.

14                   MR. MOORE:  No objection.

15                   COMMISSIONER LeVAR:  Okay.  They'll be  
16          entered into evidence.  Thank you.

17                   MS. HOGLE:  Thank you.

18           **Q.    (By Mr. Hogle) Mr. Dickman, do you have a**  
19           **short summary that you'd like to give to the**  
20           **commissioners and parties here today?**

21           A.    Yes, I do.  Good morning, Commissioners.  
22          Thank you for particularly letting me appear by phone  
23          today.  On April 30th, 2015, the company filed its  
24          annual update to Schedule 37, avoided cost practices.  
25          This filing was required to update Schedule 37 prices

1 to reflect the 2015 Integrated Resource Plan filed  
2 earlier on March 31st.

3 In addition to updating the inputs to the  
4 Schedule 37 prices, the company proposed to change the  
5 method for calculating Schedule 37 avoided costs.  
6 Specifically, we proposed to no longer include capacity  
7 costs related to the deferral of a simple cycle  
8 combustion turbine or SCCT.

9 During the sufficiency period, the 2015 IRP  
10 calls for the company to utilize front office  
11 transactions or FOPs, which represent short-term firm  
12 wholesale market purchases, and use those to meet our  
13 capacity needs during this deficiency period.

14 The company also proposed to differentiate  
15 Schedule 37 prices during this deficiency period based  
16 on the relationship of Palo Verde on- and off-peak  
17 market prices.

18 Rather than imputing capacity costs based on  
19 fictitious SCCT, avoided costs during this deficiency  
20 period should be calculated using the GRID model,  
21 including the value of FOPs that can be displaced by QF  
22 as proposed by the company.

23 The company's proposed changes result in  
24 avoided cost prices that best represent the costs that  
25 will actually be avoided when a QF is added to our



1 system. The Division of Public Utilities and the  
2 Office of Consumer Services filed comments that were  
3 generally supportive of the company's filing. However,  
4 the Renewable Energy Coalition filed public comments  
5 arguing that the sufficiency period represented in our  
6 filing was too long and did not adequately compensate  
7 QFs.

8 REC argued that during the sufficiency  
9 period, Schedule 37 avoided cost prices should include  
10 capacity costs related to environmental upgrades as  
11 some of our existing coal-fired generation facilities,  
12 and that existing QFs renewing their contracts should  
13 receive a capacity payment regardless of the company's  
14 future resource needs.

15 As mentioned by Ms. Hogle on September 9th,  
16 the company filed reply comments demonstrating that  
17 REC's proposals would not accurately reflect costs that  
18 can actually be avoided by the company. And those  
19 proposals should be rejected by the Commission.

20 I recommend that the Commission approve the  
21 company's filing, update Schedule 37 prices, including  
22 the change to eliminate the SCCT from the sufficiency  
23 period. That concludes my summary.

24 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Anything further?

25 MS. HOGLE: The company rests its case.

1 Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Okay. Thank you.

3 Ms. Schmid?

4 MS. SCHMID: Thank you. The Division would  
5 like to call Dr. Abdinasir Abdulle as its witness. May  
6 he please be sworn.

7 --oOo--

8 ABDINASIR ABDULLE,  
9 having been first duly sworn to tell the  
10 truth, was examined and testified as follows:

11 --oOo--

12 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Thank you. You had  
13 already decided to stay where you are, but that makes  
14 the most sense considering where we are this morning.

15 THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you.

16 EXAMINATION

17 BY MS. SCHMID:

18 **Q. Good morning. Could you please state your**  
19 **full name, employer, and business address for the**  
20 **record?**

21 A. My name is Abdinasir Abdulle. And I work for  
22 the Division of Public Utilities as a utility analyst.  
23 My address is in this building, 160 East 300 South in  
24 Salt Lake.

25 **Q. In your -- in connection with your employment**

1 as a utility analyst, have you worked on behalf of the  
2 Division in this docket?

3 A. Yes, I did.

4 Q. Did you prepare or cause to be prepared under  
5 your direction comments the Division filed July 16th,  
6 2015, entitled "15-035-T06 in the matter of Rocky  
7 Mountain Power's Proposed Revisions to Electric Service  
8 Schedule No. 37, Avoided Cost Purchases from Qualifying  
9 Facilities," and also the Division's comments filed  
10 September 9th, 2015, in reply to the comments of the  
11 Renewable Energy Commission?

12 A. Renewable Energy Coalition. Yes, I did.

13 Q. Do you adopt those comments as your testimony  
14 today?

15 A. Yes, I do.

16 Q. Do you have any changes or corrections that  
17 you need to make to those?

18 A. No.

19 MS. SCHMID: With that, the Division asks  
20 that its filed memorandums be admitted as evidence in  
21 this docket.

22 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Thank you. Any  
23 objection from the applicant or from the Office?

24 MS. HOGLE: No.

25 MR. MOORE: No.

1 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Thank you. They'll be  
2 entered.

3 MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

4 **Q. (By Ms. Schmid) Dr. Abdulle, do you have a**  
5 **short summary to give today?**

6 A. Yes.

7 **Q. Please proceed.**

8 A. Thank you, Commissioners, for giving me the  
9 opportunity to speak before you. The company has filed  
10 updates on the Schedule 36 consisting of some routine  
11 updates and some non-routine updates. Those  
12 non-routine updates were the ones that were just  
13 outlined by Mr. Dickman.

14 The Division reviewed that, the application  
15 of the company, including the appendices that came with  
16 it which were illustrating the mathematical proof of  
17 what they were looking for and what they were  
18 proposing. The Division did not find any problems with  
19 the calculations or the concepts behind to justify  
20 their proposed listing.

21 Consequently, the Division recommended  
22 approval of that given the fact that this was  
23 determined by the Division that it is reasonable and in  
24 the public interest.

25 Later on, Renewable Energy Coalition filed

1 their own comments proposing certain additional things  
2 and also recommended the Commission not to accept the  
3 proposal of the change in the methodology for -- by the  
4 company.

5 The Division reviewed item by item the  
6 proposals put forward by the Renewable Energy Coalition  
7 and looked into the justifications that they provided,  
8 which were mainly that it violates the principles and  
9 the state laws.

10 And there were other things that they were  
11 saying that should be considered in the methodology to  
12 ensure that the avoided costs numbers will be fair for  
13 the qualifying facilities. The Division reviewed  
14 those, concluded that there was no evidence put forward  
15 to justify whatever they were proposing the inclusion  
16 of certain things.

17 Based on that, the Division is proposing that  
18 the proposals put forward by the Renewable Energy  
19 Coalition not be accepted by the Commission. In  
20 conclusion, the Division stands by and recommends that  
21 the proposals put forward by the company be accepted as  
22 they are. Thank you.

23 MS. SCHMID: Thank you. That's everything  
24 from the Division.

25 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Okay. Thank you. We'll

1 move ahead to the Office. Thank you.

2 MR. MOORE: The Office calls Bela Vastag and  
3 asks for him to be sworn.

4 --oOo--

5 BELA VASTAG,  
6 having been first duly sworn to tell the  
7 truth, was examined and testified as follows:

8 EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. MOORE:

10 Q. Can you please state your name, employment,  
11 and place of employment.

12 A. My name is Bela Vastag. I'll spell that for  
13 you. First name B-E-L-A, last name V as in Victor  
14 A-S-T-A-G. I'm a utility analyst, and I work for the  
15 Office of Consumer Services. And our offices are here  
16 in this building at 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City.

17 Q. Did you prepare, participate in preparing, or  
18 have prepared under your direction the July 16th  
19 initial comments in this Docket 15-035-T06 and the  
20 reply September 9th comments in this docket?

21 A. Yes, I did.

22 Q. Do you adopt these comments as your  
23 testimony?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Would you have any changes to make with this

1     **docket?**

2             A.     No changes.

3             MR. MOORE:   Your Honors, we would move to  
4     have these comments admitted as evidence.

5             COMMISSIONER LeVAR:   Any objection from the  
6     applicant or the Division?

7             MS. SCHMID:   No.

8             MS. HOGLE:   None.

9             COMMISSIONER LeVAR:   Thank you.   They'll be  
10    entered.

11            **Q.     (By Mr. Moore) Have you prepared a summary of**  
12    **your testimony today?**

13            A.     Yes, I have.

14            **Q.     Would you like to read that into the record?**

15            A.     Yes, please.   Good morning.   In its  
16    December 30th, 2014, order in the previous Schedule 37  
17    update filing, Docket No. 14-035-T04, this Commission  
18    stated, and I'll quote, "We await the presentation of  
19    evidence in future Schedule 37 proceedings describing  
20    any alternative approach for valuing avoided capacity  
21    costs and peak and off-peak avoided costs during the  
22    period of resource sufficiency."

23            Therefore, in this current docket,  
24    15-035-T06, the company has presented an alternate  
25    approach for valuing peak and off-peak avoided costs as

1 requested by the Commission.

2 For the sufficiency period, the company has  
3 eliminated from the Schedule 37 avoided cost  
4 calculation, the costs related to a simple cycle  
5 combustion turbine or SCCT. Instead, the capacity  
6 value the QF receives during the sufficiency period is  
7 based on the avoided front office transactions or FOTs.

8 The company has also shaped the flat monthly  
9 energy prices that are the output of the GRID model  
10 into on-peak and off-peak hourly prices. This shaping  
11 provides higher prices to QFs for energy delivered on  
12 peak, and also produces as a matter of fact 20-year  
13 levelized prices for tracking solar QF which are higher  
14 than the prices for a base load resource.

15 Therefore, the Office believes that these  
16 revisions to Schedule 37 pricing are appropriate and  
17 reflect the actual costs that could be avoided by the  
18 company. Thus, the Office recommends that the  
19 Commission should approve the Schedule 37 filing by the  
20 company.

21 And finally, in response to the comments that  
22 were filed by the Renewable Energy Coalition or REC,  
23 the Office recommends that the Commission reject the  
24 changes proposed by REC because they -- because REC has  
25 not demonstrated that their proposed changes represent



1 costs that are actually avoided as required by PURPA  
2 and FERC. That concludes my statement.

3 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Thank you.

4 MR. MOORE: The Office rests.

5 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Thank you. We'll go to  
6 Commissioner Clark. Do you have any questions for any  
7 of the three witnesses?

8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I  
9 do.

10 EXAMINATION

11 BY COMMISSIONER CLARK:

12 Q. First, to Mr. Dickman, if you could turn to  
13 the question that begins at the bottom of page 8 of  
14 your testimony, begins at about line 186.

15 A. I'm turning there.

16 Q. So the question is, "How did the company  
17 calculate Schedule 37 avoided costs -- I'm sorry --  
18 avoided capacity costs during the sufficiency period in  
19 this filing?"

20 And regarding your answer, I think I  
21 understand from it that in this case, you've included  
22 displacement of front office transactions as identified  
23 in the IRP.

24 And I want you to address how you treated  
25 this same subject in 14-035-T04, if you're aware and

1 acquainted with that docket. Do you have familiarity  
2 with the past immediately previous docket in this area?

3 A. I do.

4 Q. Okay. So in that docket, did the company  
5 include displacement of front office transactions in  
6 its application?

7 A. In the 14 -- the 2014 docket, the company  
8 used the GRID model to calculate the sufficiency period  
9 avoided costs. And the GRID model utilized market  
10 transactions. However, it did not include the blocked  
11 FOTs from the IRPs, which are representative of market  
12 transactions.

13 But -- so the two cases are a little bit  
14 different. The 2014 did not include the specific  
15 blocks from the IRPs, but it did go to the market or  
16 avoid market transactions to the extent the model does  
17 that on its own.

18 Q. So could you --

19 A. In the current case, the 2015 filing, the  
20 company did also include in the model the block FOT  
21 transactions from the IRPs, and those are displaced by  
22 the QF.

23 Q. Right. Thank you. So could you help me  
24 understand the difference between the market purchases  
25 that you've described and the GRID model's treatment of

1    **those in contrast to what's identified as front office**  
2    **transactions in your testimony in this docket?**

3            A.    Certainly.    The GRID model has the ability --  
4    has models within it a component that includes  
5    wholesale market hubs.    And we reference those as, for  
6    example, the Mid-Columbia hub, the Palo Verde hub.    And  
7    the model balances itself every hour utilizing  
8    transactions in the market.

9            The difference between what the model just  
10    does on its own, these balancing transactions, are that  
11    really it's a matter of granularity.    The GRID model  
12    can balance itself every hour in these markets to any  
13    fraction of a megawatt.    Whatever the model needs, it  
14    can go to the market and get it or avoid it with a QF.

15            On the other hand, the block FOTs that we  
16    refer to from the IRP are -- are represented in the IRP  
17    as two different products.    The one that we -- the one  
18    that is used in the preferred portfolio and used in our  
19    modeling in this case is a third quarter blocked  
20    transaction.

21            So it's an on-peak I should say, so it's a --  
22    for all on-peak hours, we assume that the company will  
23    buy in the market.    And so that's represented in the  
24    GRID model as a single transaction over all on-peak  
25    hours, and the quantity is as specified in the IRP.

1           So, for example, the Palo Verde market hub or  
2   the New Columbia market hub, the IRP calls for a  
3   certain quantity of purchases on peak during the third  
4   quarter. So we model those in GRID as such, a big  
5   block transaction. And the model then balances itself  
6   around that as well. It's -- that transaction may  
7   cause there to be excess energy in certain hours, and  
8   the model would have to sell that off.

9           Anyway, in this case, we've included those  
10   block transactions in the model. And then when we  
11   assume that a QF is brought on to the system, we  
12   partially displace that block in the size of the QF.  
13   And we reduce the level of purchases from the market,  
14   and then we let the model rebalance itself. And I  
15   think I described this as similar to what we currently  
16   do for the Schedule 38 PDDRR method.

17           **Q. Thank you, Mr. Dickman.**

18           **Now a question for Dr. Abdulle. Is it your**  
19   **view that the use of the block front office**  
20   **transactions that Mr. Dickman's described constitutes**  
21   **an appropriate way to identify avoided capacity costs**  
22   **and represent their displacement?**

23           A. The short answer is yes. According to the  
24   IRP, the company's use of front office transactions all  
25   were bringing qualifying facilities into the system.

1 It will avoid the most expensive costs.

2 And given the fact that it's in the model  
3 already, the front office transactions are in the  
4 model, then their avoidance represents the true avoided  
5 costs of the company. And we think that's the  
6 appropriate way to do it.

7 **Q. Thank you, Doctor.**

8 **Mr. Vastag, would you address the same**  
9 **question, please?**

10 A. Yes. The Office believes that the avoidance  
11 of the front office transaction is a measure of the  
12 capacity value that's being avoided. If I could point  
13 back to the 12-035-100 docket, this issue was addressed  
14 fairly extensively in that docket.

15 And the Office had the same opinion at that  
16 time. And we also hired a consultant, a power  
17 consultant, who analyzes the way the modeling is being  
18 done and agreed that the FOTs represented -- there was  
19 capacity value within the FOT, this block transaction.  
20 We continue to assert that that's the situation.

21 **Q. Thank you.**

22 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That concludes my  
23 questions.

24 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Thank you. Commissioner  
25 White, do you have any questions for any of the

1 witnesses?

2 COMMISSIONER WHITE: Thanks. I have no  
3 questions.

4 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: I just have a couple.

5 EXAMINATION

6 BY COMMISSIONER LeVAR:

7 Q. Mr. Dickman -- I'll wait for the microphone  
8 to get put by your phone. Forgive me if this was  
9 answered in your reply to Commissioner Clark. I just  
10 wanted to clarify.

11 You talked about the distinction between the  
12 balancing market purchases and the FOTs. Your  
13 testimony is that the FOTs and the GRID model reflect  
14 capacity, but that's not the case for the market  
15 balancing purchases, correct, or am I misunderstanding  
16 that?

17 A. I would say that's incorrect. The market  
18 transactions represent the company's ability to go to  
19 market and satisfy its capacity needs. The difference  
20 between the two, the so-called FOTs from the IRP and  
21 what the model would just do on its own, is really just  
22 one of granularity.

23 So the model can go to the market on its own  
24 in each hour up to fractions of a megawatt. And  
25 that's -- the company isn't always able to do that in

1 reality. And so the block FOTs are a nice  
2 representation of an on-peak product that is modeled in  
3 the IRP for capacity needs.

4 And that's why we believe it's also  
5 appropriate to include in the -- in the GRID model for  
6 avoided costs. So they both represent going to the  
7 market for capacity and energy.

8 Q. Okay. Thank you. That's helpful. Just one  
9 more question for you, Mr. Dickman. Could you describe  
10 what -- what process you went through to choose the use  
11 of the Palo Verde market as a way to align the prices  
12 with on- and off-peak pricing? What was -- what was  
13 the process in choosing that methodology.

14 A. So just to make sure I heard you correctly,  
15 describe why the company chose to use the Palo Verde  
16 market to shape the on- and off-peak prices?

17 Q. Yes. That's the question.

18 A. Okay. It's -- we decided to do it really  
19 because it's the most straightforward way to take the  
20 output of the GRID model, which most routinely reports  
21 on a monthly basis. So it was -- it's a representation  
22 of these monthly flat avoided costs that are reported  
23 by GRID and then shaping them into these buckets based  
24 on the value that is perceived by the market.

25 The Palo Verde market is relatively close to

1 the Utah service territory that we're talking about and  
2 generally provides a signal to -- as to the value of  
3 energy and capacity during on- and off-peak hours.

4 So it was a matter of taking the routine  
5 reporting out of the GRID model, which again is just a  
6 flat monthly amount, and trying to find the most  
7 straightforward and transparent way to get into the  
8 same sort of shape that we see in the market that sends  
9 the right price signal to the QFs at the company.

10 Q. Thank you, Mr. Dickman.

11 I'd like to ask a follow-up question to  
12 Dr. Abdulle and to Mr. Vastag. If both of you could  
13 explain your process in coming to the conclusion that  
14 that Palo Verde model is a reasonable path to -- to  
15 peak and off-peak pricing and Schedule 37.

16 Start with Dr. Abdulle, please.

17 A. In deciding that, frankly, we did not compare  
18 how using Palo Verde as compared to others would affect  
19 the results. We did not do that. However, we looked  
20 at Palo Verde from the proximity point of view in terms  
21 of territorial proximity, and we thought that would be  
22 a proper way to -- to -- proper market value to use to  
23 shape a price that is similar to it. And that's all we  
24 did. And we did not compare it with others.

25 Q. Thank you, Dr. Abdulle.



1 Mr. Vastag?

2 A. This shaping method we've run into a few  
3 times when we evaluated the QF PPAs that have come  
4 before the Commission. The company does something  
5 similar in shaping prices to be hourly for QF contracts  
6 in Schedule 38.

7 So the method seemed reasonable because I've  
8 seen it before. The use of Palo Verde honestly just  
9 makes sense because it's a very liquid market that's  
10 geographically near us. And it seemed reasonable  
11 because of that.

12 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Thank you. I don't have  
13 any other questions. Are there any follow-ups from  
14 either of you?

15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Not from me.

16 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Okay. Go back to the  
17 applicant. Anything further this morning?

18 MS. HOGLE: Nothing further, Your Honor.  
19 Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER LeVAR: Okay. We will be  
21 adjourned. Thank you.

22 MS. SCHMID: Thank you.

23 (The proceedings concluded at 9:30 a.m.)

24

25

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2 STATE OF UTAH )

3 COUNTY OF UTAH )

4

5 I, Daren S. Bloxham, a Notary Public and  
6 Certified Shorthand Reporter, Registered Professional  
7 Reporter, hereby certify:

8 THAT the foregoing proceedings were taken  
9 before me at the time and place set forth in the  
10 caption hereof; that the witnesses were placed under  
11 oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing  
12 but the truth; that the proceedings were taken down by  
13 me in shorthand and thereafter my notes were  
14 transcribed through computer-aided transcription; and  
15 the foregoing transcript constitutes a full, true, and  
16 accurate record of such testimony adduced and oral  
17 proceedings had, and of the whole thereof.

18 I have subscribed my name on this 23rd day of  
19 September, 2015.

20

21



22

Daren S. Bloxham  
Registered Professional Reporter #335

23

24

25