In the Matter Of:

In Re: RMP - Sustainable Transportation and Energy Plan Act

HEARING PROCEEDINGS, DOCKET NO. 16-035-36

November 30, 2016

Job Number: 342069

1	BEFORE THE	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH
2		
3		ter of the Application) Docket No. 16-035-36 ountain Power to
4	Implement I	Programs Authorized) tainable Transportation)
5	and Energy	
6		
7		HEARING PROCEEDINGS
8		
9	TAKEN AT:	Utah Public Service Commission
10		Hearing Room 451 160 East 300 South
11	DATE:	Salt Lake City, Utah November 30, 2016
12	TIME: REPORTER:	9:00 a.m. Mary R. Honigman, R.P.R.
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		Job Number: 342069

		Page 2
1	APPEARANCES	
2	CHAIRMAN: THAD LEVAR	
3	COMMISSIONERS:	
4	JORDAN WHITE	
5	DAVID CLARK	
6	FOR THE DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES: Justin Jetter	
7	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor	
8	Salt Lake City, Utah 84114	
9	FOR THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER SERVICES: Rex Olsen	
10	ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor	
11	Salt Lake City, Utah 84114	
12	FOR ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER: Daniel Solander, Esq.	
13	1407 West North Temple, Suite 320	
14	FOR UTAH CLEAN ENERGY	
15	Sophie Hayes, Esq. 1014 Second Avenue	
16	Salt Lake City, Utah 84103 (801)363-4046	
17	FOR WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES	
18	Jennifer Gardner, Esq. 150 South 600 East, Suite 2A	
19	Salt Lake City, Utah 84102 (801) 487-9911	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION	Page	3
2	WITNESS	PAGE	
3	IAN ANDREWS EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Solander	6	
4	DOUGLAS MARX		
5	EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Solander EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Olsen	14, 126 20	
6	JAMES CAMPBELL	0.5	
7	EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Solander STEVEN MCDOUGAL	26	
9	EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Solander EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Jetter	31, 45 45	
10	EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Olsen	42	
11	ROBERT DAVIS EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Jetter	52 59	
12	EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Solander DAVID THOMSON	59	
13	EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Jetter	63	
14	CHERYL MURRAY EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Olsen	67	
15	DANIEL MARTINEZ EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Olsen	71	
17	BELA VASTAG EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Olsen	79, 88	
18	EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Solander	86	
19	SARAH WRIGHT EXAMINATION BY: Ms. Hayes	97	
20	EXAMINATION BY: Mr. Solander KENNETH WILSON	111	
22	EXAMINATION BY: Ms. Gardner	118	
23			
24			
25			

1	Page 4 PROCEEDINGS
2	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Good morning. We're
3	here for Public Service Commission Docket 16-035-36
4	in the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain
5	Power to implement programs authorized by the
6	Sustainable Transportation and Energy Plan Act.
7	This is the hearing on Phase One of this docket and
8	as noticed in the schedule. Why don't we start with
9	appearances. For the Utility?
10	MR. SOLANDER: Thank you, Chairman
11	LeVar. Daniel Solander, representing Rocky Mountain
12	Power. I have with me at counsel table Steve
13	McDougal, who will be one of the Company's witnesses
14	today.
15	MR. JETTER: Good morning. I'm
16	Justin Jetter, and I'm here representing the Utah
17	Division of Public Utilities today. With me at
18	counsel table is Division witness Bob Davis, and the
19	Division also intends to call David Thomson as an
20	additional witness today.
21	MR. OLSEN: Rex Olsen on behalf of
22	the Office of Consumer Services. And at the table
23	with me is Bela Vastag, and we will also be calling
24	Danny Martinez and Cheryl Murray as well.
25	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.

Page 5 1 Ms. Hayes? 2 MS. HAYES: Good morning. Sophie 3 Hayes on behalf of Utah Clean Energy, and we will be 4 calling Ms. Sarah Wright as our witness. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: 5 Thank you. 6 MS. GARDNER: Good morning. Jennifer Gardner representing Western Resource Advocates, and 7 we will be calling Kenneth Wilson as our witness. 8 9 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. appears to be all the appearances we have this 10 11 morning. Does anyone have any preliminary matters 12 before we move on with the Utilities presentation? 13 Mr. Solander? 14 MR. SOLANDER: I just have a 15 question. We filed with the application several 16 exhibits that aren't necessarily part of the Phase One proceeding, so I don't know if it's cleaner to 17 enter the application and all of the exhibits into 18 19 the record or if you would like me to, as we go 20 through, move the exhibits that correspond to the 21 individual witnesses' testimony today. 2.2 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: That might be the 23 cleanest way to go because look around the room and 24 see if any other party wants to weigh in on the 25 I'm not seeing that anybody has any issue.

Page 6 1 preference, but since we have some testimony that is 2 not relevant to today's hearing, it might be cleaner 3 just to introduce them as the witnesses present them. Any other preliminary matters? Okay. Mr. Solander. 5 MR. SOLANDER: Rocky Mountain Power 6 would like to call Ian Andrews as its first witness 7 in support of the Clean Coal Research Projects. 8 9 IAN ANDREWS, having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was 10 11 examined and testified as follows: 12 EXAMINATION 13 BY MR. SOLANDER: Good morning, Mr. Andrews. 14 0. Good morning. 15 Α. 16 Could you please state and spell your name 0. for the record. 17 My name is Ian Andrews. I-a-n 18 Α. A-n-d-r-e-w-s. 19 20 And by whom are you employed? Q. 21 Α. Rocky Mountain Power. I'm the director of 2.2 resource development. And as the directer of resource 23 0. development, did you prepare and file in this 24 proceeding direct testimony and Exhibit B to the

25

Page 7 Company's application which it titled The Clean Coal 1 2 Program? 3 Α. T did. 4 MR. SOLANDER: At this time, I'd move that the prefiled testimony of Mr. Andrews and 5 Exhibit B to the Company's application be moved into 6 the record. 7 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I'll ask anyone who 8 9 has an objection to that motion to indicate to me. 10 I'm not seeing any, so that motion is granted. 11 MR. SOLANDER: And I'd also move the 12 entry of the application into the record as well. 13 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I'll ask if anyone 14 has any opposition to that, and I'm not seeing any 15 so that motion will be granted also. BY MR. SOLANDER: 16 17 After you filed the testimony in this 0. 18 proceeding, did you have to opportunity to participate in technical conferences with the 19 20 parties? 21 Α. We did. We had a technical conference on 2.2 October 18 on the two topics we'll discuss today. And at the end of that technical 23 0. conference, did you believe that there were any 24 outstanding questions from the parties that have yet 25

Page 8 to be answered? 1 2. Α. I believe we answered all the questions that were asked. 3 4 And have you prepared a summary of your 0. testimony that you would like to share with the 5 Commission? 6 Α. I have. 8 Q. Please, proceed. I apologize for reading this, but I don't 9 want to miss any points. So pursuant to our STEP 10 legislation, the Company is requesting approval to 11 12 apply \$5 million in STEP funding over a five-year 13 period to investigate, analyze and research clean 14 coal technology. 15 As defined in the legislation, clean coal technology means a technology that may be 16 researched, developed, or used for reducing 17 emissions or the rate of emissions from a thermal 18 electric generating plant that uses coal as a fuel 19 20 source. To meet that objective, the Company 21 proposes to allocate these funds across a number of 22 projects that focus on the capture, reduction, and sequestration of carbon dioxide and the reduction of 23

Funding will go toward these specific

nitrogen oxides, also known as NOx.

24

25

Page 9 projects that will be performed or assisted by Utah 1 2 universities, Utah technology firms that process 3 woody waste and CO2 capture technologies that may 4 result in lower capture costs in comparison to traditional methods. 5 The selected projects are intended to meet 6 multiple objectives. And these are the four 7 8 objectives: To demonstrate projects that result in measurable emission reductions; to invest in 9 promising technologies and applications that may 10 11 advance technologies when fully developed and 12 applied at utility scale that will allow for coal 13 for our generating resources to operate with reduced carbon dioxide emissions; provide funding and 14 opportunities for industry targeted areas of 15 research that can be performed by Utah's 16 universities; and to promote Utah's clean energy 17 18 technologies. 19 We have seven projects that are proposed 2.0 under the Clean Coal Research Program. The two that 21 I'll discuss today -- which were the Phase One 22 projects that we submitted on our October 18 23 meeting -- are the application of a neural network control system at Huntington Unit 2 for the 24 25 reduction of NOx and the implementation of a utility

Page 10 scale demonstration of an alternative for decreasing 1 2 NOx emissions without the use of Selective Catalytic 3 Reduction System, also known as an SCR. Both of 4 these projects were presented at our technical conference on October 18th. 5 The first project I'd like to discuss 6 7 briefly is approximately a \$1 million project that would be applied over the five-year period, and that 8 9 is for an advanced neural network control system at Huntington Unit 2. For this project, it is proposed 10 11 to install a neural network optimization control 12 system on that unit with the objective of targeting 13 NOx reductions followed by a reduction in other emissions associated with combustion. Subsequent to 14 this effort will be an additional objective to 15 balance those reductions with unit efficiency 16 17 improvements. Along with combustion optimization, there are other plant processes that may benefit 18 19 from a neural network optimization system. For this 20 project, the University of Utah will partner with 21 Rocky Mountain Power and the software provider to 2.2 install, demonstrate, and fundamentally research artificial intelligence technology to improve 23 24 emissions from this unit. If successful, this would 25 be applicable to similar boilers at the Hunter and

Page 11 1 Huntington plants. 2 The second project that we're proposing is 3 approximately a \$1.4 million project for utility scale demonstration of alternative NOx emission 4 control technologies. This particular clean coal 5 research project is proposed to perform one or more 6 slipstream or full-scale demonstration tests of one 7 or more NOx emission control technologies at the 8 Huntington plant. The objective of this test 9 program will be to determine if there are one or 10 11 more emerging NOx control technologies, either on a 12 standalone or combined basis, that could achieve NOx emission rates similar to those expected with an SCR 13 system and at lower cost. The STEP Clean Coal 14 research monies would be used to fund all or a 15 portion of these NOx emission demonstrations. 16 17 In order to identify which technologies will be tested, a request for proposal process will 18 be conducted in calendar year 2017. Criteria that 19 20 will be used for the technologies will include: 21 assessment of whether the technology can be 22 installed at full-scale; previous operational 23 experience; permitting impacts; economics; an 24 assessment of the long-term reliability of the 25 technology; and the ability of the underlying

1	Page 12 technology company to provide commercially viable
2	performance warranties or guarantees. Prior to the
3	distribution of the RFP, a request for information
4	would be issued to determine levels of interest,
5	identify technology consolidation or partnering
6	companies, and prepare a short list of potential
7	technology providers for the RFP.
8	So that summarizes the two projects we
9	have in mind.
10	Q. Does that conclude your testimony?
11	A. It does.
12	Q. Thank you. Mr. Andrews is available for
13	questions from the Commission or the other parties.
14	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
15	Mr. Jetter?
16	MR. JETTER: No questions for the
17	
	Division. Thank you.
18	Division. Thank you. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen?
18	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen?
18 19	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen? MR. OLSEN: No questions from the
18 19 20	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen? MR. OLSEN: No questions from the Office.
18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen? MR. OLSEN: No questions from the Office. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes?
18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen? MR. OLSEN: No questions from the Office. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes? MS. HAYES: No questions. Thank you.
18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen? MR. OLSEN: No questions from the Office. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes? MS. HAYES: No questions. Thank you. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.

1	Page 13 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White,
2	do you have any questions?
3	COMMISSIONER WHITE: I don't now, but
4	are we going to have an opportunity for potential
5	I mean, I guess part of the question with respect to
6	some of the clean coal technology OMAG costs, I just
7	want to make sure that we have the right or the
8	ability if necessary to come back to
9	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Is there any
10	objection to keeping the witnesses in the room
11	throughout the hearing if there's any need for
12	further questions?
13	MR. SOLANDER: Absolutely not. Thank
14	you.
15	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Okay. So do you
16	have any questions at this point?
17	COMMISSIONER WHITE: No, I don't.
18	Thanks.
19	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark?
20	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions.
21	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I don't either.
22	Thank you, Mr. Andrews. And if we have questions
23	later, we'll ask you to return. Mr. Solander?
24	MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. Rocky
25	Mountain Power would call Mr. Douglas Marx in
1	

Page 14 support of the Utah Battery and Solar Project. 1 2 DOUGLAS MARX, 3 having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 4 5 EXAMINATION BY MR. SOLANDER: 6 7 0. Good morning. 8 Α. How are you doing? Well, thank you. Could you please state 9 0. your name and spell it for the record. 10 11 Douglas Marx. D-o-u-q-l-a-s and M-a-r-x. Α. 12 Q. And by whom are you employed and in what 13 capacity? I'm employed by Rocky Mountain Power. 14 the director of engineering standards and technical 15 services. 16 17 And as the director of engineering 0. standards and technical services, did you prepare a 18 testimony and a confidential Exhibit D that were 19 20 filed in this docket? 21 Α. I did. 22 Q. Do you have any corrections or additions 23 to your testimony or the exhibit at this time? 24 I do not. Α. 25 I'd like to move the MR. SOLANDER:

Page 15

- 1 admission of Mr. Marx's testimony and confidential
- 2 Exhibit D, which was labeled as Solar and Energy
- 3 Storage Program.
- 4 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I'll ask any party
- 5 that objects to that to indicate to me. I'm not
- 6 seeing any so that motion is granted.
- 7 BY MR. SOLANDER:
- 8 Q. Thank you. And, Mr. Marx, did you have
- 9 the opportunity to prepare a summary of your
- 10 testimony that you'd like to share with the
- 11 Commission today?
- 12 A. I did, yes.
- 13 Q. Please proceed.
- 14 A. Pursuant to the STEP legislation, the
- 15 Company is requesting authorization to use \$5.5
- 16 million of the STEP funding to install a stationary
- 17 battery system, to be installed on the 12.5 kilovolt
- 18 distribution circuits connected to a Company-owned
- 19 substation in Utah. In addition, the company
- 20 proposes to utilize an additional \$1.95 million from
- 21 Blue Sky community funds to install a large-scale,
- 22 company-owned solar project in conjunction with the
- 23 battery installation. The battery storage and solar
- 24 technology is expected to defer or eliminate the
- 25 need for traditional capital investments and will

Page 16 reduce the loading on the distribution power 1 2 transformer, improve voltage conditions, and 3 mitigate costs associated with connection on the 69 4 kilovolt bus at the substation. The program will provide a number of 5 benefits to the Company's customers, particularly 6 7 those in the immediate area of the project. The benefits include: (1) Reducing load on the 8 9 distribution power transformer at the substation, ensuring the voltage in the area does not drop below 10 11 ANSI standards; (2) providing high-speed reactive 12 power support to ensure load rejection in the area 13 does not impact voltage levels; (3) deferring the need for traditional capital investment in the form 14 of poles and wires; (4) enabling the Company to 15 obtain firsthand operational experience with control 16 algorithms and efficiency levels associated with 17 energy storage and in combination with solar; 18 (5) enabling the Company to become familiar with and 19 20 utilize innovative technologies to provide customers 21 with solutions to power quality issues; and last, 22 providing an opportunity for the Company to meet 23 requests from its Blue Sky customers for physical 24 "steel in the ground" renewable facilities in the form of solar generation. The Company anticipates 25

Page 17 that it will implement similar projects in the 1 2 future, and its experience with battery storage and 3 solar will continue to provide dividends by giving 4 the Company experience with and the opportunity to implement future projects more efficiently. 5 There are no limitations or risks to the 6 7 applicability or technological feasibility of the battery/solar solution for this project. This is a 8 solution that continues to mature and has been 9 10 proven in many installations across the country. 11 Due to the lack of operational data available at the 12 time of the project proposal, the only uncertainty 13 with this solution is the total number of operations that will be required of the battery on an annual 14 basis. 15 Since the initial study, Rocky Mountain 16 Power has completed the installation of appropriate 17 metering at the substation, and continuous data will 18 While only limited data is soon be available. 19 20 available for 2016, full data will become available 21 during 2017 and beyond, prior to the installation of 2.2 the battery. The new metering will provide all of 23 the required data for proper determination of the 24 battery operational metrics. 25 The Company consistently implements

Page 18 reliability and power quality enhancements on its 1 2 transmission and distribution systems to mitigate 3 operational and performance problems. Recognizing 4 that energy storage and renewable energy will be major contributors to grid modernization, the 5 Company has identified a logical location to pilot a 6 range of technologies -- battery storage and solar, 7 metering, et cetera. This project enables us to 8 9 correct a voltage issue for our customers in the area using an innovative technology in lieu of 10 11 traditional infrastructure and concurrently provides 12 a platform to objectively study and enhance the 13 operational performance of a technology that will begin to permeate the system as more renewable and 14 distributed generation systems are connected to the 15 grid now and in the future. 16 Thank you. Can you explain what the 17 0. primary goal of voltage correction measures are? 18 19 Α. The primary application is to ensure that 20 the voltage levels delivered to our end-use 21 customers fall within the ANSI standards and control 22 standards. It's the end-use customer where our 23 focus is. The voltage will change on the system, but we are trying to ensure that the end-use 24 customer gets a good quality voltage. 25

Page 19 1 And what would happen if the Company made 0. 2 engineering decisions on how to achieve that and 3 other engineering and system balancing decisions based on how the costs would be allocated? 4 When we design systems, we do it to 5 optimize the performance of the system. If we did 6 it based on economic allocations, it would lead us 7 to a less -- a suboptimal -- condition in our design 8 of our systems. For example, let's take a voltage 9 problem and do it in the state of Idaho. 10 11 state of Idaho, our allocation on transmission 12 levels is around 6 percent. So if I have a voltage 13 problem, I can choose to do a capacitor correction or regulation at either the distribution level or 14 the transmission level. So if I do it at the 15 distribution level, paying a 600K bar cap bank on a 16 17 pole is relatively inexpensive. I take it, I bring that up to the distribution level -- a larger 18 capacitor -- do it on the 12 KUB bus -- it's not 19 2.0 much more expensive than doing a pole -- but once I 21 move that to the transmission side of the bus still 2.2 within the same perimeter of the fence line, I've 23 just increased my cost by about three times in that 24 installation. 25 So what you look at is, if I did it based

Page 20 1 on allocations and used a 6 percent allocation, in 2 Idaho I'd probably spend money on the high side bus, 3 because I've got 15 times more money to spend than I 4 do on the low side bus. But what that does is it impacts my capital budgets. We've got a limited 5 capital area and it, thus, is going to push the 6 rates up for all the customers across all of our 7 service territories in all states we serve. 8 So when 9 we design, we look for conditions that economically drive good engineering decisions, not looking at how 10 11 the allocation drives those engineering decisions. 12 MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. That 13 concludes my questions for Mr. Marx. He's available 14 for questions from the Commission and the parties. 15 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. 16 Jetter? 17 MR. JETTER: No questions. 18 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Mr. 19 Olsen? 2.0 EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. OLSEN: 22 Q. I guess I'd like to just follow up on what 23 I understood the last statement you made. You said that there are economic considerations that would 24 drive these -- any of these decisions, which makes 25

Page 21 1 sense, but that those economic decisions are not in 2 some way tied to the interjurisdictional allocation. Is that --3 4 Α. That's correct. MR. OLSEN: That's all. Thank you. 5 6 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. 7 Ms. Hayes? MS. HAYES: No questions, thanks. 8 9 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Gardner? 10 11 MS. GARDNER: No questions. Thank 12 you. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark, 13 14 do you have anything at this point? 15 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White? 16 17 COMMISSIONER WHITE: The discussion about, you know, allocation, one particular question 18 I had is what is a precise issue driving the need 19 for this voltage support? And let me tell you what 20 21 kind of prompted this question. It was actually 22 from Mr. McDougal's rebuttal testimony where he 23 talks about the missed opportunity to investigate the impact of distributed energy resources on Utah 24 customers. Help me understand what is actually 25

Page 22 1 driving the need for this voltage support on this 2 circuit. 3 THE WITNESS: There's three primary 4 factors that drive voltage problems. It's the impedance of the system -- and that's multiplied by 5 the length of the line -- and the primary thing is 6 the current flow on the conductors. So what you 7 have is a load condition -- got to be careful; I 8 don't want to name the substation. So at the 9 substation, I have a voltage condition that I need 10 11 to correct because of the load out on the 12 distribution network. So two ways I can correct 13 that voltage; one is to change my conductors, increase them in size to lower the impedance. 14 other one is to reduce the load. So when you look 15 at the peak levels, they only happen for short 16 periods of time during the year, even though we 17 build our system to handle those, because we don't 18 know when that is going to occur. With this 19 20 technology, we can take in a very flexible, dynamic 21 design to just answer the question of when those 22 peaks occur. 23 When you increase your conductors, you do this based on some forecasts of expected load 24 growth. So you hear the question, well, let's look 25

Page 23 at the economics of increasing that line because 1 2 that line will last for fifty years. Well, you know 3 what? The wire in there will probably last for a 4 hundred years, but it depends on the load growth of when I might have to re-conductor that. 5 6 this area, if we get some unexpected load growth, I may be back re-conductoring that sooner than I would 7 have if I use a scalable, short-term technology that 8 9 I can rapidly implement without significant changes. So the big driver here is the load at 10 11 the distribution level for short periods of time 12 during the year is creating voltage problems back 13 into the system of the distribution level, power transformer, even on the transmission; it's a ripple 14 15 effect. So do I increase my conductors or do I reduce my load? So we're seeing here that there's a 16 17 technology we can do at a lower initial cost to hit that for short periods of time in the year. 18 19 scalable, and we can do that more incrementally over 2.0 time as load grows or doesn't appear, depending on 21 how good our crystal balls are at the time we make 2.2 the installation. Does that help? 23 COMMISSIONER WHITE: That helps. 24 Thank you. 25 Can I ask a COMMISSIONER CLARK:

Page 24 1 follow-up question or two? Recognizing that you 2 don't have a crystal ball, but that you have some 3 history with the requirements of the particular 4 distribution system -- or part of your distribution system -- how often do you expect to call on the 5 power that's stored, and for how long would it be 6 called on when you need it? Just your general sense 7 8 of what your expectations might be. In this area, there's 9 THE WITNESS: 10 two times during the year where we see it: In the 11 dead of winter when we have a lot of heating load and in the middle of summer when we have a lot of 12 13 cooling load. And it's going to be for typically 14 anywhere from an hour to four hours per day, for generally 30 to 45 days in each period, depending on 15 local climate conditions at the time we need it. 16 17 So with this project, also, what we're looking at is by building the solar next to 18 19 the battery, we can actually control this to say, 20 okay, what happens in these different "what if" 21 scenarios? What happens if I get to a point where 22 I've got more generation in a small area than I do 23 have actual load? Am I able to take that, store it 24 and release it at another time? So we can do a lot 25 of "what if" scenarios with this technology by

Page 25 having control of the two. So as time goes on and 1 2 the load grows, it will change. It could become 3 more or less until such time that we do have 4 significant growth that may require other technologies to solve those issues. 5 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: And given the solar profile of this area, you expect that in the 7 winter the system would operate sufficiently or, in 8 9 other words, there would be enough regeneration of the batteries to satisfy the needs of --10 11 THE WITNESS: In the winter 12 condition, it actually works out really good. The 13 concern of the initial -- we did a fairly small solar installation, so we may have to augment some 14 15 of that battery charging at night with other resources. But, like I said, we did this -- we 16 basically put metering up for a very short period of 17 18 time to give us the granular data so we can make 19 some assumptions to see would this technology work 2.0 or not. So as the new metering goes in and we start 21 to see that coming in, we can refine that a little 2.2 bit tighter. But I think we're going to be okay 23 with just what we've got for the solar and the install battery that it can take care of that 24 charging for that. So that local generation will 25

Page 26 get released right back into the immediate area. 1 2 There is not enough solar generation there to permeate back into my system at all. It will get 3 4 consumed there by the local load in one way or the other. We're just going to try to shift the peak 5 from the middle of the day generation to the evening 6 when the load does occur. 7 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. That 9 concludes my questions. 10 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Anything else for 11 this witness? 12 MR. JETTER: No, thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Solander? 14 MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. Rocky Mountain Power would like to call James Campbell as 15 its third witness. 16 17 JAMES CAMPBELL, having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was 18 examined and testified as follows: 19 2.0 EXAMINATION 21 BY MR. SOLANDER: 22 Q. Good morning, Mr. Campbell. 23 Α. Good morning. Could you please state and spell your name 24 0. 25 for the record?

Page 27 James Campbell, J-a-m-e-s C-a-m-p-b-e-l-1. 1 Α. 2 Q. And what is your current position with Rocky Mountain Power? 3 4 I'm the legislative policy adviser. And as part of your duties as a 5 Q. legislative policy adviser, did you prepare 6 testimony and Exhibit E to the application, which is 7 entitled Gadsby Emissions Curtailment Program? 8 I did. 9 Α. Do you have any additions or corrections 10 0. to that testimony that you would like to make at 11 12 this time? 13 Α. T do not. 14 Q. And did you prepare a summary of your testimony that you'd like to share with the 15 Commission? 16 17 T did. Α. 18 Please proceed. Q. 19 Α. Thank you. Pursuant to Senate Bill 115, 20 the Company is requesting approval for up to 21 \$500,000 in STEP funding over a five-year period to 2.2 cover the economic loss of curtailing the operation 23 of Gadsby Power Plant, units 1 through 3, during periods of winter air quality events as defined by 24 the Utah Division of Air Quality. 25

Page 28 The Gadsby Power Plant is located in the 1 2 Salt Lake PM2.5 Non-attainment area. The power plant will be curtailed after a minimum of 48-hour 3 4 notification from the Division Of Air Ouality of an impending air quality event. An air quality event 5 is defined as when the Salt Lake non-attainment 6 7 areas' ambient air conditions are predicted by DEQ to be 25 micrograms per cubic meter for PM2.5. 8 9 Gadsby units 1 through 3 typically do not operate in the winter. However, in the last five 10 11 years, units 1 through 3 have been dispatched in the 12 winter, including during periods of extremely high 13 ambient pollution. Since the units are only dispatched when they are economic to operate, there 14 15 is economic impact to not operate. The Company 16 proposes using a market proxy to determine the 17 replacement of power costs for not operating. Company proposes using the Four Corners market hub 18 as the proxy, or if the Commission chooses, market 19 20 pricing at either the Palo Verde or Mid-C market. 21 If the method of calculating the replacement power 22 is not approved as part of the Gadsby Curtailment 23 Program, then the potential unrecoverable costs 24 would be an unacceptable risk for the Company and 25 would likely not proceed with implementing the

Page 29 1 program. 2 The Company proposes budgeting a total of 3 \$500,000 for the Gadsby Curtailment Program, and 4 once the budget is exhausted, the program will end. If Gadsby is not scheduled to operate during an air 5 quality event, then no action is taken and there is 6 no economic loss and no replacement costs will be 7 requested. Since Gadsby does not always dispatch in 8 9 the winter and air quality events last roughly three 10 weeks a year, it is believed that \$500,000 is a 11 sufficient budget to cover the cost of the Gadsby 12 Curtailment Program. 13 Does that conclude your summary? Q. 14 Α. It does. MR. SOLANDER: I move the admission 15 16 of Mr. Campbell's direct testimony and Exhibit E to the application at this time. 17 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. I'll ask 18 19 anyone who objects to that to indicate to me. 20 not seeing any, so that motion is granted. 21 MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. Mr. 2.2 Campbell is available for questions to the parties and the Commission. 23 24 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. 25 Mr. Jetter?

	Page 30
1	MR. JETTER: No questions.
2	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Mr.
3	Olsen?
4	MR. OLSEN: No questions from the
5	Office. Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes?
7	MS. HAYES: No questions.
8	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Gardner?
9	MS. GARDNER: No questions.
10	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White?
11	COMMISSIONER WHITE: Is there any
12	reason or preference between the three; the Four
13	Corners, the Palo Verde, or the Mid-C? What was, I
14	guess, the rationale for choosing one or the other?
15	THE WITNESS: Mr. McDougal addressed
16	this issue in his rebuttal testimony. Is it okay if
17	I refer to him in that?
18	COMMISSIONER WHITE: That's fine.
19	That's all I have.
20	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark?
21	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions.
22	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I don't have any.
23	Thank you, Mr. Campbell.
24	MR. SOLANDER: Rocky Mountain Power
25	would like to call Mr. Steven McDougal as its final

Page 31 1 witness today. 2 STEVEN MCDOUGAL, 3 having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 4 5 EXAMINATION BY MR. SOLANDER: 6 Good morning, Mr. McDougal. 7 0. Α. Good morning. 8 Would you please state and spell your name 9 0. for the record? 10 11 A. Yes. My name is Steven McDougal, 12 S-t-e-v-e-n M-c-d-o-u-g-a-l. 13 And what is your current position with Q. 14 Rocky Mountain Power? 15 I'm currently employed as the director of Α. 16 revenue requirement. And as the director of revenue 17 0. 18 requirement, did you prepare and cause to be filed 19 in this docket supplemental and rebuttal testimony, 20 as well as Attachment 1 to the Company's 21 application, which is the proposed tariff sheets? 2.2 Α. Yes. 23 0. And does your rebuttal testimony contain seven exhibits; is that correct? 24 25 I believe so. Let me look real quick. Α.

Page 32

- 1 Yes.
- Q. Do you have any additions or corrections
- 3 to your testimony or the exhibits attached thereto
- 4 at this time?
- 5 A. No, I do not.
- 6 MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. I'd move
- 7 the admission of Attachment 1 to the Company's
- 8 application, RMP supplement testimony filed by Steve
- 9 McDougal, and RMP rebuttal testimony of Steven
- 10 McDougal and the exhibits thereto at this time.
- 11 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. I'll ask
- 12 any party who objects to indicate. I'm not seeing
- 13 any, so that motion is granted.
- 14 BY MR. SOLANDER:
- 15 Q. Thank you. Have you prepared a summary of
- 16 both your supplemental and rebuttal testimony that
- 17 you'd like to share today?
- 18 A. Yes, I have. Before we get started, I was
- 19 thinking I had one exhibit on my direct testimony
- 20 also. I attached the Utah STEP Pilot Program
- 21 instructions, which I believe was an exhibit. Just
- 22 when you moved for admission --
- MR. SOLANDER: Thank you for that
- 24 clarification. I'd also move the admission that I
- 25 did not have it tabbed as a separate exhibit.

```
Page 33
 1
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR:
                                     Any objection from
 2
     anyone? I'm not seeing any. That motion is
 3
     granted.
 4
                    MR. SOLANDER: Thank you.
               As mentioned, I filed both supplemental
 5
     and rebuttal testimony in this proceeding. I'll
 6
     provide a brief summary of both filings.
 7
               In my supplemental testimony, I basically
 8
     cover three items. First, I cover the proposed
 9
     changes in accounting for the Utah Demand Site
10
11
     Management, or DSM programs. Basically, effective
12
     January 1st, 2017, PacifiCorp will begin to defer
13
     the monthly DSM expenditures. Each monthly deferral
     will carry a ten-year amortization period.
14
     difference between the DSM expenditures and the
15
16
     amortization expenses related to the deferred DSM
     expenditures will create a regulatory asset.
17
     very similar, almost identical, to how we do all
18
19
     other capital assets.
2.0
               The second item I discuss is the
21
     accounting related to the new plant accelerated
22
     depreciation fund, which is, that the difference
     between the customer collections from the surcharge
23
24
     attributable to DSM programs and the monthly
25
     amortization expense from the monthly deferred DSM
```

Page 34 expenditures will create a plant accelerated 1 2 depreciation fund for a regulatory liability that 3 may be used to depreciate thermal generation plants 4 as described in my testimony. Consistent with the legislation, the 5 Commission needs to determine that the accelerated 6 7 depreciation is in the public interest. Therefore, the Company will make a filing with the Commission 8 9 requesting the use of the funds and response to environmental regulation or for another purpose the 10 11 Company believes is in the public interest. 12 final authorization to use the funds will come from 13 the Commission. 14 Third, I discuss the Company's proposed 15 STEP accounting and reporting, which I then clarified in my rebuttal testimony. In my rebuttal 16 17 testimony, I discussed various issues raised by the DPU, the Office, and the Utah Clean Energy. 18 testimony includes a background on the Company 19 20 decision to propose the Solar and Energy Storage 21 Program as part of STEP. As mentioned by 22 Mr. Douglas Marx, the Company projects that by 2019 the distribution load in the designated area will 23 24 reach a point that will cause nominal voltage on the 25 transmission lines serving the area of this project

Page 35 to drop below the required industry standards. 1 2 evaluating solutions to this problem, the Company 3 considered both transmission and distribution fixes. 4 The Company analyzes all of these investment option decisions based on total Company results. 5 Some parties proposed and mentioned 6 7 looking at the Utah allocated portions. But by looking at the Utah allocated costs as discussed by 8 9 the parties, only a portion of the transmission costs would be included in the analysis, creating an 10 11 incorrect investment comparison that could lead to 12 suboptimal decisions for the Company and its 13 customers. The Company agrees that the benefits of 14 the Solar and Energy Storage Program should be 15 passed to Utah customers through the EBA. This will be done similar to the treatment of the Black Cap 16 Solar Program in Oregon, such that Utah will be 17 credited for the market value of the solar 18 19 production as described in my testimony. No other 20 adjustments, other than those described above, are 21 needed to give Utah the benefit of the Solar and 2.2 Energy Storage Program. 23 The second item I discussed was Blue Sky 24 funding. The Company believes the use of Blue Sky 25 funding should be approved and is consistent with

Page 36 the purpose of the Blue Sky Program. The energy 1 2 generated by the solar installation should benefit 3 all Utah customers and not just select community 4 organizations. The administrative costs to create a grant program that applies credits to customer bills 5 would require additional funding, including the 6 7 creation of a new rate schedule, billing system modifications, and ongoing program management, none 8 9 of which were contemplated or requested in the 10 Company's application. 11 Third, I discuss the Gadsby Emissions 12 Curtailment Program. I describe the Company's 13 proposed accounting and measurement of the costs associated with the Gadsby Emissions Curtailment 14 15 Program. The Company's proposal provides a 16 reasonable, quantifiable, and transparent approach 17 to determining the replacement power costs for the Gadsby Emission Curtailment Program. This is also 18 consistent with the approach used for Utah's benefit 19 2.0 related to the Solar and Energy Storage Program. 21 Fourth, I provided tariff sheet 2.2 modifications. And the last item, I provided additional details on the Company's proposed STEP 23 24 accounting and reporting plan. 25 BY MR. SOLANDER:

Page 37 1 And did you have a final request and Q. 2 recommendation? 3 Α. As supported by the Company's Yes. 4 application in this docket, the testimony of the Company witnesses accompanying the application and 5 in my testimony, the Company recommends that the 6 7 Commission find as follows: (1) The Company has properly evaluated the Solar Energy and Storage 8 9 Program; (2) the Company proposed accounting treatment will properly allocate to Utah customers 10 11 the benefits of the Solar Energy and Storage Program 12 through the EBA; (3) it is appropriate to allow Blue 13 Sky funding for the solar portion of the Solar 14 Energy and Storage Program; (4) it is not 15 appropriate or feasible to establish a grant program to benefit community service organizations based on 16 17 the kilowatt hours generated by the solar portion of the Solar and Energy Storage Program; (5) the 18 19 replacement power costs resulting from operation of 20 the Gadsby Emissions Curtailment Program should be 21 calculated using the Four Corners trading market; 2.2 (6) the various tariff sheets filed with my supplemental testimony reflecting the modifications 23 24 and needed corrections addressed by the parties are

approved; and (7) the Company-proposed reporting

25

Page 38 1 plan provides all appropriate STEP reporting 2 information. 3 The Company further respectfully 4 recommends the Commission approve all issues under consideration in Phase 1 of this docket as outlined 5 in my rebuttal testimony and the application and 6 testimony of other Company witnesses in this docket. 7 8 Q. Does that conclude your summary? Yes, it does. 9 Α. 10 Mr. McDougal, does the Company support the Q. 11 alternative proposal put forth by Ms. Wright on 12 behalf of UCE for creating a creditor grant program 13 with the energy generated by the Solar and Battery 14 Storage Program? 15 No, we do not. Α. 16 And why not? Q. 17 One, there isn't excess energy, as Α. 18 mentioned by Mr. Marx. The energy will all be used 19 there locally. Two, as I mentioned in my summary 20 and my testimony, the solar program is going to 21 benefit all Utah customers, not just select 22 customers, and, therefore, we believe that the benefit should flow to all Utah customers through 23 the EBA by giving them that market benefit. 24 And my final question, if the Commission 25 Q.

- 1 ordered that the cost of the Solar and Battery
- 2 Storage Program were to be system allocated, would
- 3 the Company be more or less likely in the future to
- 4 pursue distributed generation projects?
- 5 A. Less likely, because what we would be
- 6 saying is that those kind of decisions should be
- 7 based upon allocations. And if you look at
- 8 allocations, the distributed generation are a
- 9 situs-type program, and they're benefiting systems
- 10 that should be directly allocated to that state.
- MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. That
- 12 concludes my questions for Mr. McDougal. He is
- 13 available for cross-examination or questions from
- 14 the Commission.
- 15 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
- 16 Mr. Jetter?
- 17 EXAMINATION
- 18 BY MR. JETTER:
- 19 Q. I've just got a few questions. Good
- 20 morning, Mr. McDougal.
- 21 A. Good morning.
- Q. Just looking at page three of your
- 23 rebuttal testimony, you described the Solar
- 24 Generation Program. Looking at line 64.
- 25 A. Okay.

- 1 Q. You had described it as a program to
- 2 "solve the voltage issue on the transmission system
- 3 caused by distribution load in the area." Is that
- 4 accurate?
- 5 A. That is correct.
- 6 Q. And is it fair to say that transmission
- 7 voltage problems requiring re-conductoring or
- 8 upgrades are practically always caused by increased
- 9 demand on the distribution system?
- 10 A. Yes. I think that was described by Mr.
- 11 Marx earlier.
- 12 Q. Okay. And you have said that the
- 13 investment decision should be made without regard to
- 14 the allocation model; you should be choosing the
- 15 lowest cost alternative; is that correct?
- 16 A. That is correct.
- 17 Q. And would it then be fair to expect the
- 18 similar protections for Utah customers to the extent
- 19 that transmission upgrades in other states might be
- 20 offset by local projects similar to this?
- 21 A. I'm not sure I completely understand the
- 22 question, so I'll try to answer. If I don't get it
- 23 right, correct me. But I think that all of your
- 24 decisions can be done both ways, and it's just like,
- 25 you know, a DSM program can help to eliminate

- 1 transmission issues and so can other items. We
- 2 treat those all similar where they are
- 3 situs-allocated.
- 4 Q. And I guess my question is, as a
- 5 representative looking out to some extent for the
- 6 interests of Utah customers, it would be fair then
- 7 for Utah customers to expect the Company to make
- 8 similar decisions in other states without regard to
- 9 allocation?
- 10 A. Correct. And that is what the Company
- 11 does. As I mentioned in my testimony, we look at
- 12 the decisions based upon a total Company view. We
- don't say that, in Mr. Marx's example, a
- 14 transmission upgrade in Idaho where they only get
- 15 allocated 6 percent, but if they could move
- 16 43 percent to Utah, you don't want to make that
- 17 decision based upon how Idaho has allocated the cost
- 18 and make Utah try to bear additional costs when they
- 19 make a suboptimal decision.
- Likewise, we expect that in all states, to
- 21 look at what's the best for the system. It's the
- 22 only way that a combined system is going to be
- 23 optimized.
- Q. I think it would also be fair, probably,
- 25 in this specific instance to indicate that or to

Page 42 reach the conclusion that this particular project is 1 2 going to cost Utah customers more than it would were it system-allocated. That's accurate, isn't is? 3 4 Yes, that is. Α. 5 MR. JETTER: Okay. That's all of my 6 questions. Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Mr. Olsen? 8 9 EXAMINATION BY MR. OLSEN: 10 11 Thank you. Good morning, Mr. McDougal. Q. 12 Α. Good morning. 13 So based on what I understand is the Q. testimony that you have provided -- both you and 14 Mr. Marx -- these kinds of decisions regarding 15 distribution solutions or -- well, I guess what you 16 guys are characterizing as transmission solutions --17 are not new to the system. Thousands of miles of 18 both distribution and transmission lines, so these 19 20 come up more than once, I guess. 21 Α. Yes. 22 Q. So do you know or are you aware of whether 23 or not you have a breakdown by regulatory jurisdiction about how frequently -- if it's a 24 transmission, a circumstance here -- where it's a 25

- 1 transmission-related issue where you say it is
- 2 driven by distribution when the Company has elected
- 3 to make a transmission decision as opposed to a
- 4 distribution application as you've done here. Do
- 5 you have any sense of how frequently those two types
- 6 of decisions are made?
- 7 A. No, I don't. That would be -- you know,
- 8 the engineering group would look at what is the most
- 9 optimal decision, and I don't have any information
- 10 on that universe of decisions.
- 11 Q. You have described some of the processes
- 12 that you went through here. Can you just help me
- 13 understand with a little bit more specificity the
- 14 factors that go into deciding whether or not you
- 15 make a distribution decision versus a transmission
- 16 decision?
- 17 A. I'll give it at a high level, because the
- detailed decisions are not made by me; they're made
- 19 by the engineering group and the others who really
- 20 know the system and know what the options are. But
- 21 what I do know is they will look at the range of
- 22 options that are available and choose the one that
- 23 fixes the problem and does so in the most economical
- 24 way possible.
- Q. And just to -- thank you. Just to get --

Page 44 I want to make sure I understood something in your 1 2 summary testimony that you just provided -- you were saying that consideration of the system allocation 3 4 could lead to suboptimal decisions. Is that what 5 your concern was? 6 Α. Yes. 7 But that's not necessarily the case, that Q. it would lead to a suboptimal decision? 8 As a full system, if everybody were to 9 look at allocations, it would, in my opinion. 10 11 Because of the examples of -- especially in the 12 smaller states. If you can choose a decision 13 that -- Idaho is one of our smaller states close to us -- if you can choose a decision that you only get 14 allocated 6 percent as opposed to a hundred percent, 15 16 Idaho would naturally choose the 6 percent. And it could lead to suboptimal decisions --17 18 Q. It could. 19 -- if those opportunities arise, which, as 2.0 described by Mr. Marx, there are those decisions. 21 MR. OLSEN: Thank you. I have no 2.2 further questions. 23 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes? 24 MS. HAYES: No. Thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Gardner?

	Page 45
1	MS. GARDNER: No. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Any redirect?
3	EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. SOLANDER:
5	Q. Just one, quickly. In that last example
6	as described by Mr. Olsen, what would happen to
7	overall system costs if each state made the decision
8	to sub-optimally assign or sub-optimally solve
9	problems by creating transmission instead of
10	distribution level investments?
11	A. It would raise the overall costs, because
12	if the project was in Utah, Utah would only bear
13	43 percent, and 57 percent could get shifted to
14	other states. But if it's an overall more expensive
15	option for the system, the same thing would happen
16	in Oregon and Wyoming. They would make these
17	decisions that might cost more, and Utah would have
18	to bear 43 percent of those decisions from the
19	states of Idaho and Oregon and Wyoming.
20	MR. SOLANDER: Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Was
22	there any re-cross, Mr. Jetter?
23	EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. JETTER:
25	Q. Just briefly. Just in relation to that

Page 46 question, in this case, can you describe why it 1 2 would be unfair to also expect Utah to -- if Utah is paying a 100 percent of the costs of this, would it 3 4 be unreasonable for Utah to expect to retain 100 percent of the benefits if it's also situs 5 6 assigned? 7 Α. That is correct. As it's described in my 8 testimony and my summary, we are proposing to do that through looking at the market value and putting 9 it into the EBA where we say here is the value of 10 11 this energy that's being produced and give that 12 value to Utah. 13 And so is it fair to summarize that as 0. 14 meaning that the value that you're looking at is only the output of the solar facility and battery at 15 market rates and not adding any additional value for 16 Utah customers for deferring the expense of upgrade 17 18 to a facility? 19 Α. Correct. 2.0 MR. JETTER: Okay. Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Any other re-cross, 2.2 Mr. Olsen? 23 MR. OLSEN: No. Thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes? 25 MS. HAYES: No. Thank you.

1	Page 47 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: No other re-cross?
2	Ms. Gardner?
3	MS. GARDNER: No.
4	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White,
5	any questions for Mr. McDougal?
6	COMMISSIONER WHITE: Just a couple.
7	To this issue, in terms of allocation, putting aside
8	the initial question from an engineering perspective
9	of how to address a problem based upon least cost,
10	et cetera, is there bearing or relationship between
11	a state-driven policy or statute that drives a
12	project? And does that have any is that part of
13	the equation all in terms of how a project is ever
14	allocated?
15	THE WITNESS: It's only an issue
16	with related to the 2017 protocol, it does talk
17	about state-specific initiatives should be situs
18	allocated to those states starting the initiatives.
19	And that was done within the 2017 protocol largely
20	because of environmental or other restrictions or
21	other programs that you know, as a general rule,
22	things and decisions within a state result in those
23	costs being borne by that state, not moved to
24	others.
25	COMMISSIONER WHITE: The follow-up
I	

Page 48 question, just the one I had for Mr. Marx earlier, 1 2 which is is there anything, you know, specific as to 3 the choice to use the Four Corners pricing hub for 4 purposes of the replacement power or -- it sounds like from the testimony that the Company, the 5 difference between the three -- was there some 6 reason or rationale driving the decision to choose 7 Four Corners? 8 THE WITNESS: In talking with our 9 system dispatch and the people who run the system, 10 11 they said that the market hub that most closely 12 resembles market prices in the state of Utah is Four 13 Corners. It's the closest proxy; it's the one that's really used a lot for the balancing on this 14 15 side of the system. 16 COMMISSIONER WHITE: I have no further questions. 17 Thank you. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark? 18 19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thanks. 2.0 seems to me that one of issues in front of us is 21 that we have a relatively new technical approach to 2.2 an old problem, the problem being the load in the 23 given distribution area creating the need for 24 transmission augmentation. So one question I have 25 is, I quess, is that -- I mean, tell me if you

```
Page 49
     disagree with that characterization but -- assuming
 1
 2
     it's roughly accurate, have you used this approach
 3
     at other locations in the PacifiCorp system?
 4
                    THE WITNESS: I'm not aware of any
 5
     time we have used this approach.
                                       This is more of a
     new approach that's available, that by starting it
 6
     we're going to gain more information, we're going to
 7
     gain experience on how this can benefit and, you
 8
 9
     know, if everything works out as what we hope, this
     is something that could spread. But it's something
10
11
     that we need to make that initial decision to move
12
     forward. And let's, you know, try to prove out what
13
     can be accomplished through this kind of a program.
                    COMMISSIONER CLARK:
14
                                         And because of
15
     the allocation consequences of this planning
     decision versus an election to augment the
16
     transmission system in some way, I hear in the
17
     questions that you have been asked the desire for
18
     some kind of confirmation that the same decision
19
2.0
     rules will apply in other jurisdictions when you've
21
     faced this same kind of issue. What are your
2.2
     feelings about that? Can you confirm for us that
23
     you will continue to be consistent in how you look
     at deploying this technological approach, assuming
24
25
     that it proves beneficial in this instance?
```

Page 50 1 THE WITNESS: Yes. You know, as 2 described by Mr. Marx and others, we're going to 3 look at all of our decisions based upon what's most 4 economic and what's best for the area. And if this works in other areas of the Company, we would 5 definitely propose it, if it works out and it's the 6 most economical. 7 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: In your rebuttal 9 testimony, at line 81, you use the phrase 10 "suboptimal system operating results and increased 11 overall costs." So my question is, is there an 12 operational element to this, too, that -- in other 13 words, what I think you would view as an improper consideration of the cost allocation consequences in 14 15 the decision-making process, would that drive 16 suboptimal -- not just increase costs or suboptimal financial results -- but suboptimal operating 17 18 results? And I just want to understand what you 19 mean by that phrase. 2.0 THE WITNESS: By operating results, 21 I'm talking about our operating and maintenance 22 expenses, or our expenses as far as how we operate 23 the system. 24 COMMISSIONER CLARK: There wouldn't 25 be a reliability risk or some other kind of risk

	Page 51
1	that would be also
2	THE WITNESS: Not that I'm aware of.
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: part of this
4	equation?
5	THE WITNESS: No.
6	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Those are all my
7	questions. Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I don't have any
9	further ones, so thank you, Mr. McDougal.
10	Mr. Solander?
11	MR. SOLANDER: That's concludes Rocky
12	Mountain Power's direct case. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
14	Mr. Jetter?
15	MR. JETTER: Can I request maybe a
16	15-minute recess?
17	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Sure. We'll
18	reconvene at ten after. Thank you.
19	(A brief recess was taken.)
20	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Okay. We're back on
21	the record. And I'll just comment to Rocky Mountain
22	Power, in terms of follow-up questions from the
23	Commissioners, we would like to ask Mr. McDougal to
24	remain around for the rest of the hearing, but I'm
25	not sure there's a need for the other Company

- 1 witnesses. If there's any interest in releasing
- 2 those witnesses rather than keeping them for the
- 3 whole hearing, we'll let that be your discretion.
- 4 And we'll go to Mr. Jetter.
- 5 MR. JETTER: The Division -- I'm
- 6 sorry, are we ready? The Division would like to
- 7 call and have sworn in Mr. Bob Davis.
- 8 ROBERT A. DAVIS,
- 9 having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was
- 10 examined and testified as follows:
- 11 EXAMINATION
- 12 BY MR. JETTER:
- 13 Q. Good morning, Mr. Davis.
- 14 A. Good morning.
- 15 Q. Would you please state your name and
- 16 occupation for the record?
- 17 A. I'm a utility analyst for the Division of
- 18 Public Utilities.
- 19 Q. Thank you. In the course of your
- 20 employment with the Division, and with respect to
- 21 matters that you have testified to so far in this
- 22 docket, did you create and cause to be filed with
- 23 the Commission DPU witness Robert A. Davis direct
- 24 testimony filed on November 9th, 2016, along with
- 25 rebuttal testimony filed on November 23rd, 2016?

Page 53 1 Α. Yes. 2 Q. Do you have any edits or corrections you'd 3 like to make to this? 4 Α. I do not. And if you were asked the same questions 5 that are contained in those prefiled testimonies 6 today, would your answers be the same? 7 They would. 8 Α. MR. JETTER: I move at this time to 9 enter into the record direct and rebuttal testimony 10 11 from DPU witness Robert A. Davis. 12 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: If any parties 13 object to that, please indicate to me. I'm not 14 seeing any, so the motion is granted. BY MR. JETTER: 15 16 Thank you. And, Mr. Davis, have you Q. prepared a brief statement today? 17 I have. 18 Α. 19 Q. Please go ahead. 2.0 Good morning. The Division reviewed the Α. 21 Company's application for implementation of the STEP 22 programs and categories of programs as contained in the Commission's Phase One order in this docket. 23 The Company has presented information about the 24 programs to stakeholders throughout several 25

Page 54 technical conferences and data requests. 1 2 After consideration of the proposed 3 programs, including Phase One of the STEP program, 4 the Division recommends that the Company be granted approval of the following: (1) Establishing a line 5 item charge on customer bills for the funding of the 6 7 STEP program. This category also includes establishing a regulatory liability account to 8 depreciate thermal generation plant; revising tariff 9 Schedules 193 and 195; revising the Utah Solar 10 11 Incentive Program (USIP) Schedule 107, which will 12 close the USIP program to new customers at the end 13 of December 2016; and approving implementation of the Company's Electric Vehicle infrastructure 14 15 incentive program; (2) approval of the Solar and Storage Program; (3) approval of the Gadsby Emission 16 17 Curtailment Program; (4) approval of the Clean Coal Technology Program for NOx reduction using Neural 18 19 Networks and Advanced Catalytic Reduction (SCR) 20 applications. 21 The Division recommends that the Company 2.2 be required to report its progress and actual 23 expenditures on these programs throughout the pilot 24 at least annually through reports and/or technical 25 conferences so the Division and other stakeholders

Page 55 have the opportunity to review the STEP initiatives. 1 2 The Division recommends the approval of 3 this phase of the proceeding be subject to the 4 accounting treatment and reporting requirements as outlined by the Company through discussions during 5 the technical conferences, other meetings with the 6 Company, testimony and exhibits. Mr. David Thomson 7 will address the Division's review of the Phase One 8 9 accounting treatment of the STEP program and revised 10 tariff sheets that are being recommended for 11 implementation. Schedule 107 has been revised to 12 end the Utah Solar Incentive Program December 31st, 13 Tariff Sheet No. 107 has been revised to remove the 2017 Program Incentive Level and 14 15 Available Capacity. 16 The Company is proposing to correct a 17 transmission voltage issue in Central Utah with a stationary battery storage system along with a solar 18 facility funded entirely by Utah customers through 19 2.0 the STEP program. The battery and solar project 21 will provide valuable training to Company personnel 2.2 which will provide benefits to all customers as 23 distributed energy resources increase on the system. 24 The Division believes that Company personnel need to 25 gain as much understanding of distributed energy

Page 56 resources as possible. The Division's concern lies 1 2 in the benefits spread to all the Company's 3 customers as a result of avoiding the transmission 4 system upgrades that would otherwise be allocated systemwide through the multi-state protocol. 5 using the STEP funds for this project, the Solar and 6 7 Storage Program is funded by Utah customers alone. The Division recommends that at a minimum, the 8 direct cost savings of the project be retained by 9 10 Utah customers. The Division proposes that the 11 benefits flow through the EBA at the market value of 12 the output to the grid. The Division is also 13 supportive of Utah Clean Energy's request that if funding, in part or full, is used from Blue Sky 14 15 customers for the solar array, then the Blue Sky 16 Program should receive those same proportions of the 17 net benefits from the system, provided the administrative costs do not outweigh the benefits. 18 Using the EBA as a mechanism for Utah customers to 19 2.0 retain the benefits would be easier to administer. 21 Additionally, under the Division's proposal, Blue 2.2 Sky customers would get a benefit through the EBA 23 adjustment plus knowing Blue Sky funds were used for 24 a renewable project. 25 The Division is supportive of the Office

Page 57 of Consumer Services' treatment of Operation, 1 2 Maintenance, Administrative and Other (OMAG) 3 expenses relating to the STEP program. The Division 4 does not believe unknown or known OMAG expenses should be borne by customers to support the pilot 5 program outside of those covered by the STEP 6 funding. The Division supports the Office's 7 recommendation that OMAG expenses should be 8 9 identified during the STEP pilot program and included in STEP funding. If STEP OMAG expenses are 10 11 not included in STEP funding, then they should be 12 removed from rates in the next general rate case. 13 In conclusion, the Division recommends 14 that the Commission approve the programs under 15 consideration in Phase One of this proceeding, 16 subject to the proposed reporting requirements, accounting treatment, tariff sheet revisions, and 17 other concerns with the Solar and Storage program 18 19 and OMAG expense treatment. 20 Thank you. I'd like to clarify a few Q. 21 things. As witnesses from the Company testified 22 earlier today -- and I'd like to clarify the 23 position of the Division with respect to the recommendation for approval of this project -- is 24 25 it -- was the Division's recommendation to capture

- 1 benefits through the EBA -- let me rephrase that
- 2 question.
- 3 Does the Division object to the decision
- 4 of the Company in this case to build this facility
- 5 on the demand side of the system if it's the lowest
- 6 cost alternative?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. And can you describe, kind of briefly, why
- 9 the Division recommended the EBA treatment?
- 10 A. The Division believes that if Utah
- 11 customers are going to bear the 100 percent of the
- 12 cost of this, then they should receive the benefits
- 13 from it.
- 14 O. Okay. And do you think that the EBA
- 15 treatment that captures the market value of the
- 16 kilowatt hours delivered from this project into the
- 17 system captures the full benefit that is being
- 18 provided by this project?
- 19 A. Probably not. But based on the
- information that we have currently, it's probably
- 21 the best way to do it.
- Q. Okay. And in light of that, is it still
- 23 the Division's recommendation that the Commission
- 24 approve this project with the modifications that you
- 25 have recommended in your brief opening statement?

Page 59 1 Α. Yes. 2 MR. JETTER: Thank you. I have no 3 further questions. And Mr. Davis is available for 4 questions from other parties or the Commission. 5 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Mr. Olsen? 6 7 MR. OLSEN: Thank you. No. 8 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes, any 9 questions for Mr. Davis? MS. HAYES: No. Thank you. 10 11 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. 12 Ms. Gardner? 13 MS. GARDNER: No. Thank you. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. 14 Mr. Solander? 15 16 MR. SOLANDER: One moment. 17 EXAMINATION BY MR. SOLANDER: 18 19 Q. Just one question, Mr. Davis. With your recommendation regarding the STEP OMAG coming from 20 21 the STEP funding, is it your recommendation at the 22 end of the pilot program period that the OMAG would 23 then be in base rates after the five years? 24 I think my position is that any OMAG Α. No. expenses that are outside of the STEP programs that 25

Page 60 are either known or unknown at this time would not 1 2 be included in base rates. So you're saying they would not be 3 Q. 4 collected by the Company after the five-year pilot 5 program period? No. I don't think if the expenses, if 6 Α. they're outside of the projects, I don't believe 7 they should be collected. It's an additional burden 8 9 to the customers. I guess what I'm asking is, is the ongoing 10 Q. 11 OMAG cost -- for instance, of the Solar and Battery 12 Storage program -- will continue after the five-year 13 period? 14 I understand your question better now. Thanks. Those would probably, in my opinion, would 15 16 probably be okay to collect those. 17 MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. No further 18 questions. 19 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Any redirect? 2.0 MR. JETTER: No redirect at this 21 time. Thanks. 2.2 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark? No questions. 23 COMMISSIONER CLARK:

CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White?

COMMISSIONER WHITE: One question.

24

25

Page 61 This question may be more properly addressed by 1 2 Mr. Vastag or Martinez, but with respect to the OMAG 3 costs, if I recall, the Office addressed this 4 specifically with respect to the Clean Coal Technology program. Is it the Division's position 5 6 that those are applicable to all STEP OMAG --THE WITNESS: Yes, that would be our 7 8 position. 9 COMMISSIONER WHITE: Thanks. That's 10 all I've got. 11 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: A couple of 12 clarifying questions. First, does the proposed 13 reporting program presented in Mr. McDougal's 14 rebuttal satisfy your concerns with respect to 15 reporting? 16 THE WITNESS: I believe so. I mean, it's kind of dynamic, so we'll see how that goes. 17 But I think it does address -- and our other 18 witness, Mr. David Thomson, will address that a 19 20 little bit as well. 21 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I'd like to follow 2.2 up or to ask your thoughts on a question that Commissioner White asked Mr. McDougal earlier. 23 you look at the Solar and Battery Storage Project, 24 how would you describe the similarities or 25

```
Page 62
 1
     differences between that project and something, for
 2
     example, that were built in another state solely to
 3
     satisfy that state's RPS or solely to satisfy a
 4
     legislative directive in another state?
                                  Like, for example, the
 5
                    THE WITNESS:
 6
     Black Cap Solar where it was built specifically to
     address the portfolio standard versus this, which is
 7
     tackling a transmission problem?
 8
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Yes, for allocation
 9
10
     purposes.
11
                    THE WITNESS: They're different.
                                                       The
12
     weird thing about the solar and storage is it is at
     the distribution level, but it is correcting a
13
14
     transmission problem.
15
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.
                                                         Ι
     think that's all I have.
16
17
                    COMMISSIONER CLARK: Can I ask one
18
     more? And I think you have probably said it
     somewhere, Mr. Davis, but just to refresh me, the
19
20
     use of the Four Corners price as a reference in
21
     relation to the Gadsby replacement power, what is
22
     your view of that? Would you refresh me as to
23
     whether or not the Division's position is that's
24
     appropriate?
25
                    THE WITNESS: I think we're okay with
```

Page 63 that. It's based on lower costs, so we made the 1 2 assumption that the Company would use the lowest 3 cost, whether that's Four Corners or one of the 4 others. 5 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thanks. That's 6 all my questions. 7 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Mr. Jetter? 8 9 MR. JETTER: Thank you. The Division would like to call and have sworn in Mr. David 10 11 Thomson. 12 DAVID THOMSON, 13 having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was examined and testified as follows: 14 15 EXAMINATION 16 BY MR. JETTER: 17 Good morning, Mr. Thomson. Would you 0. 18 please state your name and occupation for the 19 record? 2.0 My name is David Thomson. T-h-o-m-s-o-n. Α. 21 That's without a "P." And I work for the Division 2.2 of Public Utilities as a technical consultant. Thank you. In the course of your 23 Q. employment, have you had the opportunity to review 24 the filings made by the Company in this docket that 25

Page 64 1 are relevant to the testimony that you have 2 prefiled? 3 Α. I have. 4 0. And did you create and cause to be filed with the Commission DPU witness David Thomson 5 Direct, dated November 9th, 2016 along with DPU 6 Exhibit 2.1 which is also titled Exhibit A? 7 Α. 8 Yes. 9 0. Do you have any corrections or changes that you would like to make to that? 10 11 Α. No. 12 Q. And if you're asked the same questions 13 that were asked and answered in your prefiled direct testimony today, would you have the same answers? 14 15 Α. Yes. 16 MR. JETTER: Thank you. I'd like to move at this time to enter the direct testimony and 17 Exhibit A or DPU Exhibit 2.1 Direct for Mr. Thomson 18 into the record. 19 2.0 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. If any 21 party objects to that motion, please indicate to me. 22 I'm not seeing any, so that motion is granted. 23 BY MR. JETTER: 24 0. Thank you. Mr. Thomson, do you have a brief opening statement you'd like to give? 25

Page 65 I do. Thank you. Good morning, 1 Α. 2 Commissioners, and thank you for the opportunity to summarize the Divisions review of the Company's 3 4 proposed STEP accounting and certain proposed STEP tariff sheets and schedules. 5 In its direct testimony, the Division 6 accepted the Company's proposed reporting plan. 7 In 8 its rebuttal testimony, Mr. Steven R. McDougal 9 provided an update on the Company's STEP reporting plan, including the recommended additional reporting 10 11 requirements supported by the Company. The Division 12 will accept the reporting plans as outlined in 13 Mr. McDougal's direct testimony and rebuttal 14 testimony. 15 The Division supports the Company's proposal to cancel Schedule 195 and call it Schedule 16 17 The Division also supports the proposed changes made by the Company to Electric Service 18 Schedules Sheet B.1 and Schedule 80. 19 In his 20 rebuttal testimony, Mr. McDougal accepted the 21 Division's recommendations that the carrying charge 22 by updated annually. He also accepted the 23 Division's recommendation that Schedule 195, which 24 is now 196, include the term pilot program and that 25 it make no other program period of five years. The

Page 66 1 Division knows that these changes were made to the 2 new proposed Schedule 196. 3 The Company also, during rebuttal, made a 4 change to the cost adjustment percentages on proposed Schedule 196. They were updated to reflect 5 the price change on November 1, 2016 per Schedule 94 6 Energy Balancing Account pilot program. 7 It appears to the Division that the revised sheets as discussed 8 9 above support the Company's application implementing programs authorized by the STEP. 10 11 Finally, the overall accounting process 12 proposed by the Company in its implementation of 13 S.B. 115 has been reviewed by the Division. After review at this time, nothing came to the Division's 14 attention that would indicate the overall accounting 15 16 process as proposed by the Company as improper or 17 inadequate. And that concludes my summary. 18 MR. JETTER: Thank you. I have no 19 further questions for Mr. Thomson. And he's 20 available for questions. 21 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Mr. Olsen? 2.2 MR. OLSEN: Nothing at this time. 23 24 Thank you. 25 Ms. Hayes? CHAIRMAN LEVAR:

1	Page 67
	MS. HAYES: No. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Gardner?
3	MS. GARDNER: No questions.
4	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Solandar?
5	MR. SOLANDER: No questions.
6	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White,
7	any questions?
8	COMMISSIONER WHITE: No questions.
9	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Clark?
10	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions.
11	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you,
12	Mr. Thomson.
13	MR. JETTER: Those were the only two
14	witness from the Division. So I guess that
15	concludes our testimony today.
16	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
17	Mr. Olsen?
18	MR. OLSEN: Thank you. The Office
19	would like to call Cheryl Murray, please.
20	CHERYL MURRAY,
21	having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was
22	examined and testified as follows:
23	EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. OLSEN:
25	Q. Could you state your name and business

7			1	1			employed?
	annrage	277	D77	\mathbf{w}	יווסעד	ם ידי	
_	addt epp	and	209	MATICIL	you	\perp	CTIID TO A CO !

- 2 A. My name is Cheryl Murray. My business
- 3 address is 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- 4 I'm a utility analyst with the Office of Consumer
- 5 Services.
- 6 Q. Did you file any prefiled testimony in
- 7 this docket?
- 8 A. Yes. On November 9, 2016, I submitted ten
- 9 pages of direct testimony.
- 10 Q. Are there any changes that you would
- 11 propose to that testimony at this time?
- 12 A. No.
- MR. OLSEN: I would ask then at this
- 14 time that her direct testimony filed on November 9th
- 15 be admitted.
- 16 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: If there is any
- 17 objection to that motion, please indicate to me.
- 18 I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted.
- 19 BY MR. OLSEN:
- 20 Q. Thank you. And what was the purpose of
- 21 that testimony that you filed?
- 22 A. My testimony introduced two other Office
- 23 witnesses, Bela Vastag and Danny Martinez, and
- 24 identified the specific areas of Company's filing to
- 25 be addressed by each of them. I also addressed some

Page 69 1 of the Company's proposed changes to three tariffs; 2 Schedule 107, Utah Solar Incentive Program; Schedule 3 195, Solar Incentive Program Cost Adjustment; and Schedule 193, Demand Side Management Cost 4 5 Adjustment. 6 Q. And have you prepared a summary of your testimony? 7 8 Α. Yes. Could you please provide that summary? 9 0. In my direct testimony, I identified 10 Α. 11 necessary corrections or clarifications on tariff 12 sheets 107.4, 107.1, and 195.2. The Office also 13 noted that the Company's proposed changes to Schedule 195 are so extensive, even including the 14 15 tariff title, that it amounts to a completely new tariff. For this reason, as well as ease of 16 reference, over time the Office recommended that the 17 Company should be required to cancel Schedule 195 18 and create a new tariff with a new schedule number 19 2.0 for the STEP surcharge tariff. In the rebuttal 21 testimony of Company witness Steven R. McDougal, 22 filed November 23, 2016, the Company agreed to all of the recommendations made by the Office related to 23 24 Schedule 107 and Schedule 195, including creating a new tariff, Schedule 196 for the STEP surcharge. 25

1	Page 70 In addition to the recommendations related
2	to the tariffs discussed above, the Office also
3	noted that with the Company's plan to capitalize the
4	annual DSM cost as a DSM regulatory asset and
5	amortize them over a ten-year period, a sizable
6	regulatory asset will likely build up over that
7	period. While we did not recommend any
8	modifications to the DSM accounting provisions
9	proposed by the Company at this time, we stated that
10	the Office may address this issue in a future
11	proceeding.
12	In his summary, Mr. McDougal asked that
13	the Commission specifically approve the reporting
14	plan presented by the Company. Office witnesses
15	Mr. Martinez and Mr. Vastag will address reporting
16	in their summaries. But the Office requests that in
17	its order on Phase One of this docket that the
18	Commission specify that they are not approving
19	reporting related to issues to be heard in Phase
20	Two.
21	That concludes my summary.
22	MR. OLSEN: Thank you. Ms. Murray is
23	available for questions from the parties or the
24	Commission.
25	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.

	Page 71
1	Mr. Jetter, do you have any questions?
2	MR. JETTER: No questions.
3	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes?
4	MS. HAYES: No questions. Thank you.
5	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Gardner?
6	MS. GARDNER: No questions. Thank
7	you.
8	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Solander?
9	MR. SOLANDER: No questions.
10	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions.
11	Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White?
13	COMMISSIONER WHITE: No questions.
14	Thank you.
15	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you,
16	Ms. Murray. Mr.Olsen?
17	MR. OLSEN: Thank you. The Office
18	would now like to call Mr. Danny Martinez and ask
19	that he be sworn.
20	DANNY MARTINEZ,
21	having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was
22	examined and testified as follows:
23	EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. OLSEN:
25	Q. Mr. Martinez, could you please state your

- 1 name for the record, where you work, and what your
- 2 position is?
- 3 A. Yes. My name is Danny Martinez. I am a
- 4 utility analyst for the Office of Consumer Services.
- 5 My business address is 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake
- 6 City, Utah 84111.
- 7 Q. And as part of your duties as a utility
- 8 analyst, did you have occasion to review the STEP
- 9 filing under consideration here today?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And as part of that, did you file or cause
- 12 to be filed direct testimony on November 9th, 2016?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 O. And did you file or cause to be filed
- 15 rebuttal testimony on November 23rd, 2016?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. Are there any changes that you'd like to
- 18 make to that testimony at this time?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 MR. OLSEN: I would ask that the
- 21 testimony -- that the direct rebuttal testimony --
- 22 be admitted at this time.
- 23 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: If any party has an
- 24 objection, please indicate to me. I'm not seeing
- 25 any, so that motion is granted.

Page 73

1 BY MR. OLSEN:

- Q. Thank you. Mr. Martinez, have you
- 3 provided a summary for the Commission at this time?
- 4 A. Yes, I have.
- 5 Q. Could you please proceed?
- 6 A. Yes. Good morning, Commissioners. My
- 7 testimony addresses the Phase One Clean Coal
- 8 projects, related to NOx emissions reduction and the
- 9 Gadsby Curtailment program. Since the Commission's
- 10 scheduling order allows for live surrebuttal
- 11 testimony, I will include a brief response to the
- 12 Company's rebuttal testimony in this summary.
- 13 With respect to the Phase One Clean Coal
- 14 projects, the Office raised concerns regarding
- 15 reporting requirements and OMAG expenses. In
- 16 rebuttal testimony, the Company proposed more
- 17 specific reporting for all of the STEP programs.
- 18 The company's proposal adequately addresses the
- 19 Office's concerns regarding reporting requirements
- 20 and addresses the Office's reporting
- 21 recommendations.
- 22 Regarding OMAG expenses, the Office agrees
- 23 with the Division that those costs need to be
- 24 identified and quantified and included in the
- 25 Company's STEP budget. The Office contends that the

Page 74 Company should reserve STEP funds from funds 1 2 authorized by the Legislature to be used for OMAG 3 expenses rather than seek recovery outside of the 4 STEP line item charge for the years during which 5 STEP is in place. With respect to the Gadsby Curtailment 6 Program, my testimony indicated that Company did not 7 sufficiently explain how the value of curtailment 8 9 replacement power cost is calculated and why the Four Corners hub would be appropriate to use as a 10 11 market proxy. I further recommended that the 12 Commission approve the Gadsby Curtailment Program 13 without specifically authorizing the method of calculation for replacement power costs. 14 the Office recommended that the Commission require 15 additional supporting information in the annual EBA 16 17 filing if the Company seeks STEP funds for Gadsby Curtailment in that year. 18 In rebuttal testimony, Mr. McDougal 19 2.0 opposed this recommendation. He indicated that 21 determining actual replacement costs would be 22 burdensome and potentially controversial, and 23 recommended that the Commission approve the use of 24 the formula that he presented and the Four Corners 25 hub as the appropriate market proxy to use in

Page 75 1 replacement cost calculation. However, Mr. McDougal 2 also offered to include in future reporting 3 requirements a justification in a future EBA filing 4 if the Company proposes to use a different hub in the future. He agreed to use a different market hub 5 as proxy if ordered by the Commission. 6 My testimony did not oppose the 7 replacement power cost estimate or the use of a 8 market proxy; rather, I was concerned that the 9 filing was confusing and did not sufficiently 10 11 explain the process. The detailed explanations were 12 all obtained through the discovery process. 13 clear, the Office agrees with Mr. McDougal that the formula provided in response to OCS 3.4 and his 14 15 rebuttal testimony is a reasonable estimation for 16 curtailment replacement power costs. 17 However, the Office contends that insufficient evidence has been presented in this 18 19 proceeding to determine the appropriate hub to be 20 used as a market proxy. Further, it is clear that 21 the Company would like to be able to justify a 22 change in what hub is used if appropriate in future years. For these reasons, the Office continues to 23 24 recommend that the Commission require the Company to 25 justify what market should be used as a market proxy

Page 76 price if it requests STEP funds to reimburse the 1 2 Gadsby curtailment costs in a future EBA proceeding. 3 To clarify our position, the Office supports the 4 Commission approving the Gadsby Curtailment Program and the general method of calculation of replacement 5 power costs but requests that the issue of the 6 appropriate hub be addressed in each relevant future 7 8 EBA proceeding. The Office still recommends the Commission 9 require an additional filing requirement for the 10 11 Company in its annual EBA filing if it seeks STEP 12 funds for Gadsby curtailment in that year. 13 That's the conclusion of my summary. Thank you. Mr. Martinez 14 MR. OLSEN: 15 is available for questions from the parties or the Commission. 16 17 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Mr. 18 Jetter? 19 MR. JETTER: No questions. 2.0 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes? 21 MS. HAYES: No questions. 2.2 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Gardner? 23 MS. GARDNER: No questions. 24 you. 25 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.

	Page 77					
1	Mr. Solander?					
2	MR. SOLANDER: No questions.					
3	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White?					
4	COMMMISSIONER WHITE: So my					
5	understanding and that was helpful, the					
6	clarification on the curtailment power costs is					
7	the Office is not necessarily opposed to using one					
8	of those three Mid-C, Four Corners, or Palo					
9	Verde it's just that they want to reserve the					
10	right to address justification. It's not that they					
11	want to actually use the actual costs; they're okay					
12	with the proxy. They want to be able to address one					
13	of those three proxies at the time.					
14	THE WITNESS: That's correct. Yes.					
15	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark?					
16	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I want to					
17	express appreciation also for the clarification					
18	because I had a few questions that I can eliminate					
19	now. But I am still interested to know or					
20	understand better the extent to which the Office					
21	specifically objects to Four Corners as the					
22	identified market proxy hub.					
23	THE WITNESS: We didn't my intent					
24	was not to object specifically to the Four Corners.					
25	We just didn't understand why that specific hub was					

Page 78 chosen over other hubs that could have been. 1 And so 2 that was the intent of trying to figure out which 3 one would be the appropriate hub. We didn't see 4 that in the application by the Company, and so we asked discovery on that, and that's where we got our 5 6 response. In one of the responses, they said it was 7 just basically a geographical proximity. 8 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thanks very 9 much. 10 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Just one follow-up 11 In your opinion, does that provide to that. 12 sufficient certainty to the utility to make 13 curtailment decisions if there's not certainty on which of the three hubs might be the proxy in the 14 next EBA case? 15 THE WITNESS: I think the choice of 16 17 the hub, given the formula the Company put forth as described in Mr. McDougal's testimony as well as my 18 19 own, there needs to be a market proxy in place for 2.0 the calculations to work. Again, we're not 21 concerned which one it is as long as it's one that 2.2 is prudent for determining those costs. I think in 23 my testimony I indicated we would presume that would be the least cost purchase of power that would be 24 25 used in that calculation.

```
Page 79
 1
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
                                                  That's
 2
     all I have. Thank you, Mr. Martinez.
                                             Mr. Olsen?
 3
                    MR. OLSEN: Thank you. The Office
 4
     would like to call Mr. Bela Vastag.
 5
                         BELA VASTAG,
 6
     having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was
 7
             examined and testified as follows:
 8
                         EXAMINATION
     BY MR. OLSEN:
 9
10
               Mr. Vastag, could you please state your
11
     name for the record, your place of employment, and
12
     what you do, what your position is?
13
               Yes. My name is Bela Vastaq. I'll spell
14
     that for the court reporter. B-e-l-a, last name
     V-a-s-t-a-g. I'm a utility analyst for the Utah
15
     Office of Consumer Services, and my business address
16
     is here in this building, 160 East 300 South.
17
18
               And as part of your work as a utility
          Q.
     analyst for the Office of Consumer Services, did you
19
     have occasion to review the filing under
20
21
     consideration -- the STEP filing under consideration
22
     here today?
23
          Α.
               Yes.
               And did you file or cause to be filed
24
     direct testimony on November 9th, 2016 and rebuttal
25
```

Page 80 testimony on November 23, 2016 in response to that 1 2 filing? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Are there any corrections or revisions you'd like to make at this time? 5 6 Α. I have no changes to my testimony. MR. OLSEN: The Office would move 7 that those filings be admitted into evidence at this 8 time. 9 10 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Ιf anyone objects to that motion, please indicate to 11 12 me. And the motion is granted. 13 BY MR. OLSEN: 14 0. Mr. Vastag, have you prepared a summary of your testimony? 15 16 Yes, I have. Α. 17 Would you please provide the summary now? Q. My testimony in this proceeding has 18 Α. 19 addressed the Company's proposed Solar and Energy 20 Storage technology project, which I usually refer to 21 as the solar/battery project. This project falls 2.2 under the Innovative Utility Programs section of the 23 Sustainable Transportation and Energy Plan or STEP Act. So in other words, the solar/battery project 24

is a research and development or an R&D project.

25

Page 81 Research and development projects are not 1 2 always successful, and this is a risk that one 3 assumes when pursuing an R&D project. However, the 4 risk is worth taking if this solar battery R&D project gives the Company some knowledge that will 5 enable it to provide service to its customers in the 6 future in a more effective and less costly manner. 7 8 Utah ratepayers are funding the entire solar/battery project. Therefore, given the 9 inherent risks of an R&D project, the Office 10 11 believes that the solar/battery project would only 12 be in the interest of Utah ratepayers if the R&D 13 knowledge could be used for the benefit of rate payers in the future. Unfortunately, the Office 14 15 sees a barrier to this technology being used in the future. This barrier is caused by -- the barrier is 16 caused by how the costs of such a project would be 17 allocated. Because the Company's solar/battery 18 19 project is on the distribution side of the system, 2.0 all of the costs would be assigned to Utah even 21 though the project is solving a problem on a 2.2 transmission line. The costs associated with 23 transmission assets are allocated among all the 24 states that Rocky Mountain Power's parent company, 25 PacifiCorp, serves. As described in my written

- 1 testimony, the Utah-allocated costs of a
- 2 transmission solution to the transmission line
- 3 problem are significantly lower than the
- 4 Utah-allocated costs of the solar/battery project.
- 5 The solar/battery project that is at issue today
- 6 would be funded according to the STEP Act, but in
- 7 the future, an implementation of this technology
- 8 would have its costs allocated through a different
- 9 process, usually a general rate case including a
- 10 Multi-State Protocol or MSP-type process.
- 11 Therefore, the Office sees cost allocation as a
- 12 barrier to the future use of this R&D knowledge
- 13 because a state jurisdiction may not approve another
- 14 solar/battery project where all the costs are
- 15 state-assigned when an alternative transmission
- 16 based solution would be cheaper because its costs
- 17 were allocated among all PacifiCorp states.
- 18 Therefore, the Office does not recommend
- 19 that the Commission authorize this project unless
- 20 the Company can propose a solution to this cost
- 21 allocation problem or this barrier. This cost
- 22 allocation method that they would propose or the
- 23 solution to the cost problem would need to be
- 24 incorporated in any future implementation of the
- 25 solar/battery technology. If the proposed

- 1 solar/battery project is authorized by the
- 2 Commission, the Office supports the concept from the
- 3 Utah Division of Public Utilities that the value or
- 4 benefit of the energy from the solar facility be
- 5 credited back to Utah through the EBA. Also, if the
- 6 project is authorized, the Office does not oppose
- 7 Utah Clean Energy's proposal for a Blue Sky grant
- 8 program based on the output of a Blue Sky funded
- 9 solar facility, that is, as long as the energy from
- 10 the solar facility is valued at the Company's
- 11 avoided costs and also the costs of running the
- 12 grant program are charged to the Blue Sky program.
- 13 That concludes my summary statement.
- MR. OLSEN: Mr. Vastag, as you know,
- 15 the order allowed for the possibility of live
- 16 surrebuttal. Would you like to provide any of that
- 17 at this time?
- 18 THE WITNESS: Yes. Today I'd like to
- 19 respond to Rocky Mountain Power witness Steven R.
- 20 McDougal. Mr. McDougal's rebuttal testimony was
- 21 filed on November 23rd.
- 22 BY MR. OLSEN:
- 23 Q. Thank you. Would you please proceed then
- 24 with the surrebuttal?
- 25 A. Yes. In his rebuttal testimony, Mr.

Page 84 1 McDougal states that the Company does not agree with 2 the Office's approach in evaluating project costs on 3 a state allocated basis. He says that the Company 4 analyzes all transmission and distribution investment options on a total Company basis. 5 This implies that the Company is regularly making 6 7 transmission versus distribution investment decisions, like the one it proposes to make for this 8 solar/battery project, without consideration of the 9 cost allocation impacts on the various 10 11 jurisdictions. This raises a red flag for the 12 Office and indicates that in the future, state 13 jurisdictions need to devote more resources in 14 future rate cases to evaluating the Company's investments and situs assigned distribution assets. 15 Furthermore, going forward, the Company should be 16 17 required to provide a comprehensive explanation of how decisions are made for both transmission and 18 distribution investments including how it evaluates 19 2.0 the tradeoffs between a transmission versus a 21 distribution solution. This explanation should also 2.2 explore how these investment decisions distort or do not distort the Multi-State Protocol or MSP 23 24 allocation process. 25 In another area, if the solar/battery

Page 85 project is to be authorized, Mr. McDougal also 1 2 states in his rebuttal testimony that the energy benefits that Utah would receive from the project 3 4 should be calculated using the same methodology as for the Black Cap solar project in Oregon. 5 the Company does not provide sufficient detail in 6 this docket for parties to understand how the Black 7 Cap benefits are calculated and credited back to 8 9 If the Commission authorizes this project and approves such a benefit crediting program, the 10 11 Commission should require the Company to submit a 12 compliance filing. In this filing, it should show 13 how the Oregon crediting system is done for the Black Cap project and allow parties to submit 14 15 comments on the Company's filing to ensure that the accounting is done in a way that properly credits 16 Utah ratepayers. 17 Finally, Mr.McDougal implies in his 18 rebuttal testimony that a demand-side management or 19 20 DSM program could be implemented in an area to solve 21 a transmission line loading problem and notes that 22 DSM program costs are situs assigned. However, this 23 is not a fair analogy to the proposed solar/battery project because DSM programs reduce load in the 24 state that they are implemented in, which in turn 25

```
Page 86
    reduces the state's share of system costs that are
 1
 2
    allocated based on load.
 3
               That concludes my surrebuttal testimony.
 4
                    MR. OLSEN: Thank you. Mr. Vastag is
 5
    available for questions from the parties or the
    Commission.
 6
 7
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
    Mr. Jetter, any questions for Mr. Vastag?
8
9
                    MR. JETTER: No questions.
10
    you.
11
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Ms.
12
    Hayes?
13
                    MS. HAYES: No questions.
14
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
15
    Gardner?
16
                   MS. GARDNER: No questions. Thank
17
    you.
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Solander?
18
19
                         EXAMINATION
2.0
    BY MR. SOLANDER:
21
          Q. Yes. Thank you. Good morning, Mr.
22
    Vastag.
23
         Α.
              Good morning.
              You would agree, wouldn't you, with
24
          Q.
25
    Mr. Marx's assertion that if the Company is incented
```

- 1 either way, one way or another, to make system or
- 2 situs investments, that it could lead to suboptimal
- 3 planning decisions?
- 4 A. There is that possibility, yes.
- 5 Q. Now, let's -- you were here when Mr. Marx
- 6 was testifying earlier?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. So you heard his hypothetical about the
- 9 same exact Solar and Energy Storage project in Idaho
- 10 instead of in Utah?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Now, if that project was built on the
- 13 distribution side in Idaho, would the Office accept
- 14 if 43 percent of the cost of that project was
- 15 assigned to Utah and recommended the Company be
- 16 allowed recovery of 43 percent of the total cost of
- 17 that project in its next rate case?
- 18 A. Well, that hypothetical is really
- 19 impossible to answer without a lot more detail.
- 20 Q. No, that's the exact same project we're
- 21 presenting today.
- 22 A. Well, if there was a process in place as
- 23 we propose, you know, for future projects, then of
- 24 course we would agree, because we would have been
- 25 involved in the process to determine how that would

- 1 work.
- Q. So you're saying that you would support,
- 3 in the future, if transmission level and if
- 4 distribution investments to solve a transmission
- 5 problem were made in Idaho, you would support 43
- 6 percent of the cost being assigned to Utah?
- 7 A. Yes. A good example would be there are
- 8 several expensive transmission projects being
- 9 proposed in Idaho and Wyoming -- and Utah Gateway
- 10 comes to mind -- and if there was a less expensive
- 11 distribution solution, then we would see, you know,
- 12 merit in postponing or not investing in billions of
- dollars of transmission, yes.
- MR. SOLANDER: One moment, please.
- 15 No further questions. Thank you.
- 16 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Any redirect?
- 17 MR. OLSEN: Yes, if I may.
- 18 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 19 BY MR. OLSEN:
- 20 Q. Mr. Vastag, in your response to
- 21 Mr. Solander's question, you spoke about the
- 22 process. Is that a proposed process that the Office
- 23 is suggesting? A comprehensive review of all facts
- 24 and circumstances regarding any of those kinds of
- 25 decisions that would go on in the future with an

Page 89 opportunity to review and evaluate the specific 1 2 facts and circumstances of those decisions that are made in this jurisdiction? 3 4 Yes. I would say that would be the beginning of the process so we could understand what 5 the factors are. And, then, of course, out of that 6 should come some method or way to handle these 7 distribution versus transmission decisions where 8 state allocation is a problem and where a state such 9 10 as Idaho may not approve a solar/battery project 11 when it's going to shoulder a hundred percent of the 12 costs when its allocated costs would be 6 percent. 13 And to your knowledge, a robust process as Ο. you're describing now is not in existence at this 14 time? 15 16 No, it's not. This is new a new area of Α. analysis. 17 18 MR. OLSEN: Thank you. I have nothing further. 19 2.0 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Any 21 recross, Mr. Solander? 2.2 MR. SOLANDER: No. Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark? 24 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions.

25

Thank you.

	1	Page 90 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White?						
	2	2 COMMMISSIONER WHITE: I want to						
	3	circle back on this concept of, I guess, the						
	4	compensation for the generation from the solar						
	5	panels. Maybe I'm confusing this, but are you						
	6	talking about the gross generation from those panels						
	7	or is that netted out for what's utilized for						
	8	station power and batteries?						
	9	9 THE WITNESS: Honestly, we haven't						
	10	delved into the details. We agree on a high level,						
11 you know, at a high level on the concept that Uta								
	12	2 Clean Energy proposes. We were just concerned that						
	13	3 the value of the grant program may be overvalued if						
	14	4 it was based on a retail-type rate.						
	15	COMMMISSIONER WHITE: And the avoided						
	16	costs, I mean, is that something you would consider						
17 just as a, you know, like the Schedule 37 feed								
	18	a Schedule 38 or a separate proceeding to determine						
	19	whatever the avoided cost of that specific						
	20	THE WITNESS: I suggested in my						
	21	testimony since this facility would be of the size						
	22	that falls under Schedule 37, that we could just use						
	23	the Schedule 37 as simply as the price.						
	24	COMMMISSIONER WHITE: And earlier you						
	25	were discussing the concept I think I heard you						
	i							

Page 91 correctly about, you know, this an R&D project, and 1 2 tell me if I'm mischaracterizing this -- is the 3 concept you were -- is the concept that because 4 there's going to be lessons learned and potential intellectual property that flow from this project to 5 that, if Utah were to pay for that, they should 6 somehow be able to capture, or is that going to be, 7 you know, a benefit to all states, and so there 8 should be some kind of inverse relationship between 9 10 those two? 11 THE WITNESS: No, the concept was R&D 12 projects are unknown whether or not they will work, 13 so if we are going to invest Utah funds, we should 14 at least have the opportunity to use them -- you know, the knowledge of the technology that we've 15 16 gained from such a project -- to benefit the entire system, to benefit -- if Utah, again, or other 17 jurisdictions, and we're just concerned that if this 18 19 cost allocation question comes up in other states, 20 they may not approve of such a project and we've 21 lost, you know, the benefit of that knowledge in 22 that case. 23 COMMMISSIONER WHITE: One final 24 question. I asked this -- and Chairman LeVar asked it in a different way earlier -- but I'm wondering 25

Page 92 if you have a position on whether there's a 1 2 distinction between this type of project that flows 3 out of a legislative directive and something like, 4 for example, an RPS related project from another Is there a distinction or is that not a 5 factor in how projects are being allocated within a 6 7 system? THE WITNESS: We really didn't 8 9 consider it from that perspective. In my opinion, I think an RPS project would be a different type of 10 11 RPS related project because it would be a mandated 12 policy related project. To meet a specific goal 13 and, in this case, the choice of an innovative technology project, there are potentially many 14 candidates for this project; not just this project. 15 16 COMMMISSIONER WHITE: That's all I've 17 got. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I don't have 18 19 anything, so thank you Mr. Vastag. Mr. Olsen, do 20 you have any else? 21 MR. OLSEN: Nothing further at this 2.2 time. Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. I wonder if you could indulge one question I have, follow up 24 25 for Rocky Mountain Power before we move to Ms.

Page 93 Wright's testimony. While I see that Mr. Campbell 1 2 is still in the room, I don't know if this question 3 is best for him or Mr. McDougal, but I would just 4 like to ask Rocky Mountain Power if -- based on Mr. Martinez's clarifications, I think we heard in 5 his testimony what your position is on the Gadsby 6 curtailment with respect to certainty if there were 7 certainty of the use of a proxy, but not certainty 8 until a following EBA docket of -- which of the 9 10 three proxies were going to be used. 11 MR. SOLANDER: I think 12 Mr. McDougal -- I don't know if you want to re-call 13 him --14 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: He can just answer 15 from the stand. MR. MCDOUGAL: I think we would be 16 okay determining the proxy, but what I don't think 17 we would be okay with is making it an issue that we 18 have to re-litigate every EBA. One of the things we 19 2.0 would like is certainty to know that we're using a 21 certain proxy and that not every time it's the 2.2 lowest of the three and we're not picking and 23 choosing. We would prefer to have the certainty of a known proxy, and we would prefer for it to be 24 determined in this proceeding. If it's not, as long 25

Page 94 1 as it is going to be one proxy and not change every 2 time, we would be okay with it. 3 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. That 4 answers my question. Any other follow-ups while we're doing this? 5 6 COMMISSIONER CLARK: I appreciate, 7 Chairman LeVar, that you've raised this, because I 8 wanted to pursue the same general subject area. 9 Could you explain why or what challenges would exist 10 for the Company if the process was simply that when 11 there's a curtailment that you then look to the 12 lowest of, say, the three hubs that have been 13 mentioned -- Mid-C, Four Corners, and Palo Verde -and use the lowest of those at that time? Are there 14 technical challenges there that I don't -- I'd like 15 to understand if --16 17 THE WITNESS: No, there are not 18 technical challenges to that. Because we know the 19 prices of all three, but in reality from a planning 20 perspective and from an actual perspective, what 21 we're saying is let's use a market price hub as the 22 proxy. If we assume that we're getting the 23 replacement power from Mid-C or from Four Corners, I 24 think we ought to be consistent because the system is going to operate the same. It's going to pull 25

Page 95 replacement from that same hub all the time. 1 It's 2 not going to say, you know, let's always use the 3 lowest; there's transmission constraints, there's 4 other issues. And that's why we believe Four Corners is the best because of its proximity to the 5 load that we're using, its proximity to Gadsby. 6 that's why I think we ought to use one hub. 7 shouldn't change back and forth because in reality, 8 we're not changing the way we serve the load. 9 10 COMMISSIONER CLARK: That helps me 11 understand. So it's not just a matter of -- I mean, 12 your decision as to where you go for the replacement 13 power isn't going to be driven solely by the prices at the hub. There's a number of factors that you'll 14 15 be considering. Is that what you're saying? 16 THE WITNESS: That's correct, because we're continually trading at multiple hubs, not 17 just, you know, at one hub. And we do it because of 18 19 constraints of where we can find the power. 2.0 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. That 21 concludes my questions. 2.2 COMMMISSIONER WHITE: One final 23 follow-up on that concept. Is there a reason that the Company couldn't utilize a blended proxy rate? 24 25 In other words, if there's really no specific -- it

- 1 sounds like in the testimony, there was a choice
- 2 between Palo Verde, Mid-C, and Four Corners. And if
- 3 you're looking for consistency, would that be more
- 4 complicated or less complicated than just picking
- 5 one of those three?
- 6 THE WITNESS: I had not thought of
- 7 that option, but there would not be a lot of
- 8 additional complexity. We would just have to throw
- 9 the three prices into a spreadsheet and take a third
- 10 of each of whatever the proposed methodology is.
- 11 Like I said, we would like to have it determined
- 12 ahead of time so that we don't have that fight in
- every EBA, saying, well, let's use this proxy this
- 14 year and another proxy the next year. I don't see
- 15 there would be a lot of additional work putting all
- 16 three and taking an average.
- 17 COMMMISSIONER WHITE: That's all the
- 18 questions I have.
- 19 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you,
- 20 Mr. McDougal. Ms. Hayes?
- 21 MS. HAYES: Thank you. Utah Clean
- 22 Energy will call Sarah Wright to the stand, and she
- 23 needs to be sworn.
- 24 SARAH WRIGHT,
- 25 having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was

	Page 97						
1	examined and testified as follows:						
2	EXAMINATION						
3	BY MS. HAYES:						
4	Q. Good morning.						
5	A. Good morning.						
6	Q. Will you please state your name, position,						
7	and business address for the record?						
8	A. Certainly. My name is Sarah Wright. I'm						
9	the executive director and founder of Utah Clean						
10	Energy, which is located at 1014 2nd Avenue, Salt						
11	Lake City, Utah 84103.						
12	Q. Is your mike on?						
13	A. I think so.						
14	Q. Did you file direct testimony in this						
15	docket on November 9th, 2016 marked as Utah Clean						
16	Energy Exhibit 1.0?						
17	A. Yes.						
18	Q. To the best of your knowledge, is						
19	everything in your testimony true and correct?						
20	A. Yes.						
21	MS. HAYES: At this point, I would						
22	like to move the admission of this testimony.						
23	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Please						
24	indicate to me if there's any objection to that						
25	motion. And the motion is granted.						

1 BY MS. HAYES:

- Q. Thank you. Will you please provide a
- 3 summary of your direct testimony?
- 4 A. Yes. Utah Clean Energy is generally
- 5 supportive of Rocky Mountain Power's pilot project
- 6 to utilize solar and storage to avoid distribution
- 7 and transmission upgrades. We believe that in
- 8 addition to the deferral benefits, the project will
- 9 help the Company and others to understand the
- 10 potential of these technologies. We support this
- 11 study to further utilize "non-wires" alternatives
- 12 and options in transmission and distribution system
- 13 planning and maintenance.
- 14 So while Utah Clean Energy is supportive
- of the project, we offer some recommendations for
- 16 the Commission's consideration with regard to the
- 17 solar component of the project. First, because
- 18 solar PV is an extremely cost effective resource,
- 19 there is likely no need to utilize Blue Sky funds to
- 20 pay for this project. I have been involved in
- 21 shaping and the early promotion of the Blue Sky
- 22 Program since 2001. And to date, the benefits from
- 23 the program have flowed to Blue Sky customers or
- 24 grant recipients that were deemed worthy of the Blue
- 25 Sky grant project. The Company's proposal to have

Page 99 the benefits flow to all ratepayers is a significant 1 2 deviation from the Blue Sky Program. However, should the Commission authorize the use of Blue Sky 3 4 funds, I recommend that a grant program similar to the workings of the Solar Subscriber Program be 5 developed, the main differences being (1) that the 6 program is funded by Blue Sky funding; (2) that 7 customers receive a bill credit based upon solar 8 energy rate as determined in the Solar Subscriber 9 Program, and (3) that the benefits flow to 10 11 recipients deemed worthy by the Blue Sky grant 12 program, such as food banks, homeless shelters, et 13 cetera. Specifically, I propose that the value of 14 15 the energy credit established in the Solar Subscriber be utilized as an offset on grant 16 17 recipients' bills. And I understand this portion of my proposal was not very clear, so I'll trying to 18 clarify that now before providing live surrebuttal. 19 2.0 In my proposal, I gave the example of a 21 200-kilowatt hour monthly block that could be 22 awarded to community service organizations. And rather than offsetting 200-kilowatt hours of usage 23 directly, a set value for those 200-kilowatt hours, 24 25 as established in the Solar Subscriber docket, would

Page 100 be used to offset the energy portion of a customer's 1 2 bills. So in the Subscriber Solar docket, an energy 3 value was used as a component of the Solar 4 Generation Block Charge. Also included in that charge was marketing and administrative costs. 5 Given that my proposal is a grant program, it is not 6 appropriate to include a credit for those marketing 7 and administrative charges in the bill credit. 8 9 my proposal is to compensate grant recipients with an energy value associated with the kilowatt hours 10 11 generated by the granted capacity of the solar PV 12 facility -- I know this is probably confusing -- as 13 an offset to the energy portion of the grantee's rate as determined by the Solar Subscriber Program. 14 15 And, finally, in my direct testimony, I made a statement about the importance of using this 16 pilot project as an opportunity to learn about 17 allocating costs associated with distributed or 18 non-wires transmission alternatives across 19 20 jurisdictional lines. And that's been a common 21 theme today. 22 Q. Does that conclude your summary of your 23 direct testimony? 24 Α. Yes.

25

Q.

Did parties file rebuttals to your direct

				_
te	St	ı m	റമ	7.
L C	\mathbf{p}		\sim 1.	Ly i

1

- 2 A. Yes. The Division -- yes. The Division
- 3 and the Office did not oppose my proposal for a Blue
- 4 Sky grant program and provided additional questions
- 5 and recommendations. The Company does not support
- 6 my recommendations.
- 7 Q. Will you review the Division's response to
- 8 your proposal?
- 9 A. Yes. The Division's primary response with
- 10 regard to the solar facility is that the market
- 11 value of the energy output flow to Utah ratepayers
- 12 via the EBA. This recommendation would ensure that
- 13 benefits flow to Utah ratepayers. The Division
- 14 highlighted some additional details that, if
- 15 addressed in my proposal, could permit both the
- 16 Division's and Utah Clean Energy's recommendations
- 17 to be implemented.
- 18 First, the Division proposes allocating
- 19 Blue Sky grants based on capacity rather than
- 20 energy, then using the actual energy output to
- 21 allocate bill offsets proportionately to grant
- 22 recipients. In a way, customers cannot by credited
- 23 for more energy than is actually produced by the
- 24 facility. This is similar to how the Solar
- 25 Subscriber is structured for customers with interval

- 1 meters now where customers receive one kilowatt
- 2 blocks, and their bills are offset by the actual
- 3 energy generated by the solar facility.
- 4 Second, the Division proposes that grants
- 5 have a limited duration. The Division notes that
- 6 grant recipients under Utah Clean Energy's proposal
- 7 are not leveraging their own funds, unlike other
- 8 Blue Sky grant recipients, nor are they responsible
- 9 for ongoing operations, maintenance, or capital
- 10 expenses. The Division proposes the length of the
- 11 pilot period as the duration of the grant period.
- 12 Finally, the Division makes some
- 13 additional comparisons between the Subscriber Solar
- 14 and Utah Clean Energy's Blue Sky grant program.
- 15 Q. Would you please respond as to Division's
- 16 recommendations?
- 17 A. Well, firstly, I sincerely appreciate the
- 18 Division's thoughtful recommendations on my
- 19 proposal. I'm not opposed to allocating grants
- 20 based upon capacity and offsetting bills based on
- 21 actual generation. It is an appropriate way to
- 22 protect ratepayers from the potential negative
- 23 impact of granting more energy PV system produces.
- 24 However, I am concerned that it would increase the
- 25 administrative burden of the program, and I think

- 1 there's a simple way to decrease administrative
- 2 burden while simultaneously avoiding oversubscribing
- 3 the PV system.
- 4 The grant program could withhold capacity
- 5 from the system -- say 10 percent of the PV system
- 6 capacity -- thereby providing a cushion to protect
- 7 ratepayers in --
- 8 MR. SOLANDER: Your Honor, I'm going
- 9 to object. This isn't rebutting. This is direct
- 10 testimony that wasn't filed as direct testimony.
- 11 This isn't rebutting any assertion made by the
- 12 Division. It's just additional detail that could
- 13 have been included in Ms. Wright's direct testimony.
- 14 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Well, let's see if
- 15 Ms. Hayes wants to respond to the objection.
- MS. HAYES: Well, it's a fair
- 17 objection. It is a sincere response to -- I mean, a
- 18 sincere attempt to respond to the Division's
- 19 rebuttal testimony. And I will leave it to the
- 20 Commission to decide.
- 21 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Let me ask
- 22 Mr. Jetter to weigh in on this.
- 23 MR. JETTER: I don't think that the
- 24 Division has a ton of passion on the nuance of this
- 25 and, I guess, this is something that I think would

- 1 show up in the surrebuttal potentially, so I don't
- 2 think I have any objection to Ms. Wright providing
- 3 her proposal to the extent that it's, I guess,
- 4 limited to a response to our critique or
- 5 suggestions. I know that's kind of a long-winded
- 6 answer, but I suppose my real answer is we don't
- 7 object to the question.
- 8 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen or Ms.
- 9 Gardner, do either of you have any input or any
- 10 interest in this objection?
- 11 MS. GARDNER: No, we have nothing to
- 12 add.
- 13 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen?
- 14 MR. OLSEN: I believe that it seems
- 15 to be a logical consequence of surrebuttal to
- 16 provide alternatives, so we would not object to the
- 17 continuation of that.
- 18 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I think the
- 19 objection is well noted. This does tend to seem
- 20 like the type of thing that generally would be
- 21 allowed in a written surrebuttal, the kind of thing
- 22 we typically see, so we'll allow a little more
- 23 leeway on this issue. Ms. Wright?
- 24 A. Thank you. So with this cushion, if the
- 25 PV system -- but if the PV system generates energy

- 1 in excess of the granted energy, then the market
- 2 value could flow through the EBA to all ratepayers,
- 3 and this would ensure that benefits stay in Utah.
- 4 And regarding the Division's
- 5 recommendations to set a time limit on the grant,
- 6 I'm also not opposed to this recommendation.
- 7 However, given that the project will not come online
- 8 until 2018, I recommend setting a duration longer
- 9 than the STEP pilot period, perhaps five to ten
- 10 years from the online date of the project, with a
- 11 review of the grant program scheduled as part of the
- 12 Blue Sky Program and in determination of whether the
- 13 program should be continued, continued with
- 14 modifications, or discontinued.
- 15 BY MS. HAYES:
- 16 Q. Will you please describe the Office's
- 17 response to your proposal?
- 18 A. Yes. The Office sees merit in the concept
- 19 of using the output of the Blue Sky funded project
- 20 for the benefit of the Blue Sky Program instead of
- 21 for the benefit of all ratepayers. However, the
- 22 Office is concerned with the complexity of the
- 23 program and the potential administrative costs, as
- 24 well as whether the compensation level is too high.
- 25 As I indicated before, my initial proposal was not

- 1 clear, and the Office and Division responded as
- 2 though I was proposing a kilowatt hour for kilowatt
- 3 hour credit as compensation. The Office proposed
- 4 compensation at Schedule 37 avoided cost rates. The
- 5 Office also proposed that administrative costs be
- 6 charged to the Blue Sky Program.
- 7 Q. What is your response to the Office's
- 8 recommendations?
- 9 A. I support charging the administrative
- 10 costs to the Blue Sky Program. And perhaps the
- 11 simplest and least costly way to administer this
- 12 program would be an annual bill credit awarded at
- 13 the beginning of the year based upon the projected
- 14 energy output associated with the awarded capacity
- 15 grant. A credit based on the determined value of
- 16 the energy could be applied to the grant recipient's
- 17 bill and thus carried forward every month for which
- 18 the value remains. This greatly decreases the
- 19 administrative burden. And it may take up to
- 20 multiple months to use this credit.
- 21 And with regard to the matter of
- 22 compensation, there are currently three options
- 23 before the Commission: Utah Clean Energy's proposal
- 24 to use the energy value that was recently
- 25 established in the Solar Subscriber docket; DPU's

- 1 proposal to use the market value of the solar
- 2 output; or OCS's proposal to value using Schedule 37
- 3 avoided costs.
- 4 Given that the project does not come
- 5 online until 2018, if the Commission finds merit in
- 6 Utah Clean Energy's recommendation to create a Blue
- 7 Sky grant program for the energy output of the solar
- 8 facility, I believe there is time to evaluate these
- 9 options.
- 10 Q. Will you describe the Company's response
- 11 UCE's proposal?
- 12 A. Yes. Steve McDougal, in his rebuttal
- 13 testimony, raises two primary concerns. First, Mr.
- 14 McDougal argues that the energy generated by the
- 15 solar facility is not excess generation that can be
- 16 counted on for use in a grant program because it is
- 17 needed to reduce loading on the distribution
- 18 circuit. Second, Mr. McDougal argues that the grant
- 19 program will create an administrative burden.
- 20 Q. What is your response?
- 21 A. With regard to the administrative burden,
- 22 I believe it is appropriate to charge the Blue Sky
- 23 Program with the cost of administering this grant
- 24 program. The Blue Sky Program already has the
- 25 infrastructure for managing the grant program, and

Page 108 1 the Subscriber Solar Program already has the billing 2 infrastructure. 3 And regarding Mr. McDougal's other 4 assertion that the PV system is not excess generation, I accept and applaud that the energy 5 from the solar PV system will be used in conjunction 6 with battery storage to provide system benefits to 7 avoid transmission and distribution upgrades in the 8 project area. However, the fact that the energy 9 from the PV system will work in conjunction with 10 11 batteries to reduce line loading is not mutually 12 exclusive to providing energy benefits to Utah ratepayers through the Blue Sky Program. 13 sure if I articulated that well -- is not mutually 14 exclusive to the energy having value for use in the 15 16 Blue Sky grant Program. 17 If you consider a Subscriber Solar 18 project, if it's built on an area of the system that provides benefits and reduces line loading, that 19 20 isn't mutually exclusive to providing those energy 21 benefits to the Subscriber Solar program. 2.2 So they're very much two different issues, 23 and my proposal is that the energy benefits funneled by Blue Sky customers be conveyed to deserving 24 grantees, such as food banks, homeless shelters, 25

- 1 et cetera, to a grant program operated from the Blue
- 2 Sky Program. And that they're not -- because
- 3 they're providing line benefits and system benefits
- 4 doesn't mean that the energy benefits can't go to
- 5 the Blue Sky grant program.
- 6 Q. What is your recommendation to the
- 7 Commission based on your review of the party's
- 8 positions?
- 9 A. I recommend that if Blue Sky funds are
- 10 used for this project, that the Commission approve
- 11 the creation of a Blue Sky grant program for the
- 12 energy output associated with the solar facility.
- 13 The grant should be awarded the same way other Blue
- 14 Sky grants are awarded but with grant recipients
- 15 receiving bill credits based on the value of the
- 16 energy produced from their granted capacity
- 17 allocation.
- 18 Utah Clean Energy recommends that the
- 19 energy value be based upon the energy value and the
- 20 Commission-approved Solar Subscriber Program.
- 21 Grants can be time limited but should not last less
- 22 than five years from the online date of the solar
- 23 facility, with a review prior to the expiration date
- 24 of the grant within the Blue Sky docket to determine
- 25 whether the current grant program should continue in

- 1 its current form, be modified, or end.
- 2 Grants could be awarded based on capacity
- 3 allocations, but bill credits should be allocated
- 4 based on either actual generation or estimated
- 5 generation. If there is concern that using
- 6 estimated generation may result in granting more
- 7 energy than is produced by the system, the program
- 8 could limit its grant allocation to a portion of
- 9 system capacity, reserving a cushion to protect
- 10 ratepayers in the event that the system does not
- 11 produce as projected.
- 12 Administrative costs should be charged to
- 13 the Blue Sky Program, and I recommend that the
- 14 Commission set up a technical conference or a Blue
- 15 Sky work group meeting to receive comments on this
- 16 program, elements and design, and compensation prior
- 17 to the online date of the solar facility.
- 18 Q. Do you have any other recommendations for
- 19 the Commission?
- 20 A. Yes. I recommend that the Commission host
- 21 a technical conference on distribution-sited,
- 22 non-wires transmission alternatives and cost
- 23 allocation issues. Given that one of the main
- 24 objectives of this pilot program -- that one of the
- 25 main objectives of this pilot program is

```
Page 111
     educational, it would be a missed opportunity not to
 1
 2
     try to learn how to replicate projects without
     stumbling over this critical cost allocation issue.
 3
 4
          0.
               Does that conclude your summary,
     surrebuttal testimony and conclusions?
 5
 6
          Α.
               Yes. Thank you very much.
 7
                    MS. HAYES: Ms. Wright is now
     available for questions.
8
 9
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
    Ms. Gardner, do you have any questions for
10
11
    Ms. Wright?
12
                    MS. GARDNER: No. Thank you.
13
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen, do you?
14
                    MR. OLSEN: No questions. Thank you.
15
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
16
    Mr. Jetter?
17
                    MR. JETTER: I have no questions.
18
     Thank you.
                    CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Solander?
19
2.0
                         EXAMINATION
21
    BY MR. SOLANDER:
22
          Q.
               Yes, thank you. Would you agree that your
23
    proposed grant program is essentially setting up an
     offsite or virtual net metering program?
24
               I would disagree. It's very similar to
25
          Α.
```

- 1 your Solar Subscriber Program.
- Q. But the energy generated in one area by
- 3 this project would then by used to offset usage by
- 4 other parties.
- 5 A. Just as it is in your Solar Subscriber
- 6 Program.
- 7 O. Who would determine who receives the
- 8 benefits of your grant program?
- 9 A. The Blue Sky Program has a current grant
- 10 program, and I'm not sure how you decide on the
- 11 grant recipients, but a number of applications are
- 12 received every year. And the Company, I assume,
- 13 unless you have a committee that works with you,
- 14 determines the grant recipients.
- 15 Q. Do you have any idea who you would want to
- 16 be eligible for this program?
- 17 A. It could be very similar to the grant
- 18 recipients that you now give. Community
- 19 organizations, schools apply, churches apply, a
- 20 number of different -- and as a company, you could
- 21 set up a steering committee to decide. You know, I
- 22 think that food banks and, you know, homeless
- 23 shelters would be an excellent idea.
- Q. So more administrative costs?
- 25 A. No. Just it's just a matter of

- 1 applying -- just as they do now, they apply for
- 2 grants and the Company reviews those proposals, and
- 3 they make a decision on who should receive those
- 4 grants.
- 5 Q. Isn't this awfully similar to a
- 6 repackaging of the USEP program?
- 7 A. No. Do understand the grant program that
- 8 you currently have for the Blue Sky grant program?
- 9 Q. Yes. I participate in it.
- 10 A. No, the Blue Sky grant program.
- 11 Q. Yes. I participate in the evaluation
- 12 phase, so yes.
- 13 A. I don't see it as a repackaging. I see
- 14 that it is a grant program, but the companies are
- 15 not putting the solar on site. You are granting the
- 16 energy just as you would through the Subscriber
- 17 Solar.
- 18 Q. How is it then a public benefit to the
- 19 Solar Energy Storage program if the benefits are
- 20 repackaged to benefit a select group of customers?
- 21 A. The benefits of this -- the main benefits
- 22 of this -- this is a small solar project; it's 650
- 23 kilowatts. The main benefits are in the
- 24 transmission deferral.
- Q. Are you aware of whether the Commission

1	has ever previously ordered the Company to implement
2	a program that it didn't propose and didn't support
3	and for which the costs are totally speculative?
4	A. I'm not aware. I've been involved with
5	the Blue Sky Program for a long time, and you have
6	done grant programs for a long time.
7	MR. SOLANDER: Thank you.
8	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Is that all you
9	have, Mr. Solander?
10	MR. SOLANDER: It is. Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Any redirect?
12	MS. HAYES: No. Thank you.
13	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White,
14	anything for Ms. Wright?
15	COMMISSIONER WHITE: You may have
16	described this but I may have missed it.
17	THE WITNESS: It's confusing. I'm
18	sorry.
19	COMMISSIONER WHITE: It was helpful.
20	With respect to the output, were you saying you're
21	talking, like, gross generation or talking, like, a
22	net excess based upon what's the generation left
23	after the use of the batteries or what's the
24	THE WITNESS: There are two different
25	issues. I would say gross, you would probably do

Page 115 something for line losses, to remove line losses, 1 2 but it would be the gross generation because this 3 project is providing dual benefits. Energy is a 4 secondary benefit, whereas the primary benefit, as Mr. Marx explained, is to reduce the peak loading on 5 the grid. And so it's providing that benefit, but 6 then there's also an added energy benefit. So it's 7 just a matter of because you sited that project in a 8 9 location, it provides benefits. Just like if you built a Solar Subscriber project in a location that 10 11 provided grid benefits, those kilowatt hours would 12 still be available for the Solar Subscriber Program. 13 COMMISSIONER WHITE: One other question -- and I understand you probably don't have 14 15 the calculations readily available, but, I mean, what are we talking about in terms of -- and I know 16 there's three different concepts. There's the 17 Schedule 37 and some other compensation. Is there 18 any kind of rough estimate of what the total 19 20 value -- based upon your gross generation -- of what 21 that would be in terms of dollars? 2.2 THE WITNESS: I could probably 23 quickly do it. I looked at the total in my direct 24 testimony; I calculated the total output, I believe. Sophie, if you're looking at it and you can point me 25

```
Page 116
 1
     to the right page --
 2
                    MS. HAYES: My screen just went to
 3
     sleep.
 4
                    THE WITNESS: Okay. So the PV watts
     calculator online -- I just did that simple, online
 5
     calculation -- that showed the entire system would
 6
 7
     generate about 1,118,000-kilowatt hours a year.
     divide that annual output by 12, and let's see, let
 8
 9
     me -- sorry, I have to follow through my math
10
     again -- it would be approximately 466-200 kilowatt
11
     hour blocks. And I didn't really -- so we would
12
     multiply that times whatever value that the
13
     Commission determines -- the value and the
14
     Subscriber Solar program I think are part of a
15
     confidential docket, so I probably shouldn't say
16
     that right now -- avoided costs, Schedule 37, I'm
17
     not sure where that lands right now, but you would
     multiply 466 -- if someone has a calculator they can
18
     do this -- times 200 times the different values.
19
                                                        So
20
     it's not a huge value, but it could provide really
21
     meaningful benefits to organizations in Utah. And
22
     it would also align -- I think when people -- I
23
     mean, right now the Blue Sky Program is way
     overpriced, and when we filed our last comments, we
24
     said if the benefits still flow to the community,
25
```

Page 117 we're okay with it being overpriced. But if the 1 2 benefits are not going to flow to the community, I 3 think we need to reduce the Blue Sky price to maybe 4 \$.50 per kilowatt or block. But, sorry I don't have the math; I don't have a calculator. 5 6 COMMISSIONER WHITE: I quess the final question is, putting aside, I guess, the 7 philosophical benefits versus who should be 8 9 entitled, is there anything in your opinion that is contrary to the Blue Sky Program as written by law, 10 11 rule, et cetera, tariff, that would prohibit the use 12 of the funds for this project? 13 For the project? So there's nothing by law -- and I was involved in the changes that 14 15 allowed them to do demonstration projects or do 16 projects, but it was -- and I quess I failed in not saying that those benefits should flow to Blue Sky 17 customers or grant programs, because the law 18 definitely allows it. It's just a big deviation 19 20 from what Blue Sky customers have supported in the 21 past. 2.2 COMMISSIONER WHITE: Thank you. Ι 23 have no further questions. 24 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark? 25 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions.

Page 118 1 Thank you. 2 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. I don't 3 have anything else either, so Ms. Hayes? 4 MS. HAYES: No further questions. 5 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you, 6 Ms. Wright. 7 THE WITNESS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Gardner? 8 9 MS. GARDNER: Before I call my 10 witness, would anybody object to me moving so that 11 my witness's back isn't to me during direct? 12 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: No. I think we've 13 got two chairs right here. 14 KENNETH WILSON, having been first duly sworn to tell the truth, was 15 examined and testified as follows: 16 17 EXAMINATION BY MS. GARDNER: 18 Good morning. Will you please state your 19 0. 20 name, position, and business address for the record. 21 Α. My name is Kenneth Wilson. I'm 2.2 representing Western Resource Advocates. I'm an engineering fellow, and my office address is 2260 23 Baseline Road, Boulder, Colorado. 24 25 Thank you. And Mr. Wilson, did you file Q.

- 1 direct testimony as well as your CV in this docket
- on November 9, 2016 marked as WRA Exhibit 1.0 and
- 3 1.1 respectively?
- 4 A. Yes, I did.
- 5 Q. And to the best of your knowledge, is
- 6 everything in your testimony and CV still true
- 7 correct?
- 8 A. Yes, it is.
- 9 MS. GARDNER: I'd like to move the
- 10 admission of Mr. Wilson's testimony and CV into
- 11 evidence at this time.
- 12 CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. If any
- 13 party objects to the motion, please indicate to me.
- 14 And I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted.
- 15 BY MS. GARDNER:
- 16 Q. Mr. Wilson, at this time, will you please
- 17 summarize your direct testimony for the Commission?
- 18 A. Yes. Thank you. Commissioners, I'd like
- 19 to focus on some technical issues in this case. I
- 20 find the proposal by Rocky Mountain Power to be very
- 21 solid technically. This is a typical non-wire
- 22 solution to a voltage problem, and I have been
- 23 testifying in Nevada, Colorado, Arizona on similar
- 24 proposals by utilities there. We find these to be
- 25 very reasonable first steps for utilities to start

Page 120 testing battery storage technology. While that 1 2 technology is still a little expensive today, we 3 believe that within a few years it will be more 4 economical than typical wired solutions. And you've heard some testimony about non-wire solutions, but I 5 will just add to my testimony on that non-wire 6 7 solutions are being looked at in states all across the country. This is not a new solution. 8 9 technologies have been in use for five or six years. Each utility really needs to get some 10 11 experience with this technology to see how it works, 12 how do they manage, how do they operate a battery 13 storage system by itself with solar, with other distributed generation, because each utility system 14 15 is different. And I think maybe one misperception -- non-wire solutions can solve 16 17 problems that are strictly in the distribution grid; they don't have to be related to transmission. You 18 can avoid putting in a new transformer at a 19 20 substation, you can avoid re-conductoring feeders, 21 which are totally in the distribution side. 2.2 don't find it rings true to say that this would always involve an allocation issue because it would 23 24 always be on the transmission side. There are many 25 examples across the country where these non-wires,

Page 121 battery storage and solar solutions are being used 1 2 at the substation and feeder level and have nothing 3 to do with transmission. So I wanted to clear that 4 up a bit. We find this a very good use for STEP 5 We think that this type of pilot project was 6 funds. 7 contemplated and that the R&D purpose for this is quite sound. As I mentioned, the Company needs to 8 9 get experience. It's like you have a new type of car; you need to drive it, you need to drive it on 10 11 your roads in your neighborhood to see how it works, 12 how does it work for you, and that's very important. 13 And as I said, this will be an important choice that the Utility and the Commission needs to have in its 14 portfolio of solutions for distribution problems, 15 for transmission problems, for mixes of those 16 problems. And I would hate to see an allocation 17 issue stop a good project like this. 18 I have been involved in R&D for 40 years 19 2.0 in a variety of technologies and have evaluated 21 hundreds of projects, and I would say this is a very 2.2 good example of what we should be promoting as choices for utilities. 23 24 One other thing that I mention in my 25 testimony that I think needs to be added to the

Page 122 conversation are the additional benefits that a 1 2 battery storage system can bring to the customers in 3 Utah. While the Company is proposing this project 4 strictly to solve a voltage problem, as you heard in testimony earlier today, the battery will only be 5 used a couple of months a year for that purpose. 6 That leaves a large part of the year available to 7 8 use this battery storage system to solve other 9 problems and essentially to make money for the 10 customers of Utah. Two examples of that are energy 11 shifting. In a month like April when there's no 12 voltage problem, they could use the battery to store 13 up excess energy at night and then discharge it in the daytime when they would have had to add 14 15 additional generation into the mix. So that's a definite economic advantage. 16 17 And the second advantage or example is frequency regulation. The Company has to provide a 18 19 steady frequency of 60 Hertz 24-hours a day, seven 20 days a week to the second -- to the millisecond, 21 really. And a battery system has been shown to be 22 very good at helping to balance the frequency on the 23 system. And what I'm saying is that once the Company learns how to use this system to solve the 24 25 voltage problem, they can start using the same

- 1 battery to get economic benefits for the customers,
- 2 and that will be very important for this project;
- 3 but more so in the future, when batteries are much
- 4 cheaper and will be in the running to replace
- 5 (inaudible), to replace burning fuel wastefully,
- 6 just to do this frequency balancing. You can store
- 7 the excess energy and ramp the battery up and down
- 8 and balance the frequency. So there are a lot of
- 9 benefits to this project that I see, and it is
- 10 typical of other projects that I'm supporting in
- 11 other states. Thank you very much.
- 12 Q. Thank you. Does that conclude your
- 13 summary of your direct testimony?
- 14 A. It does.
- 15 Q. And did any parties file rebuttal to your
- 16 direct testimony?
- 17 A. They did not.
- 18 Q. Do you have any other recommendation that
- 19 you'd like to share with the Commission today?
- 20 A. I think all of my recommendations are in
- 21 my direct testimony.
- 22 Q. And finally, does that conclude your
- 23 summary and conclusions?
- 24 A. Yes, it does.
- MS. GARDNER: Mr. Wilson is now

1	Page 124 available for questions from the parties as well as
2	from the Commission.
3	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
4	Ms. Hayes, any questions?
5	MS. HAYES: No questions. Thank you.
6	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Mr.
7	Jetter?
8	MR. JETTER: I have no questions.
9	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen?
10	MR. OLSEN: No questions. Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Solander?
12	MR. SOLANDER: No questions. Thank
13	you.
14	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White?
15	COMMISSIONER WHITE: No questions.
16	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you.
17	Commissioner Clark?
18	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have a
19	question or two. If you're conversant enough with
20	battery technology to take these on, I'd be grateful
21	for your thoughts. The additional uses of the
22	battery capacity that you described, avoiding having
23	to transmit certain amounts of energy to that area
24	because it's been produced and stored and is
25	available in the month and days when it's not doing
1	

Page 125 its primary -- fulfilling its primary purpose -- is 1 2 that going to affect the longevity of the battery's 3 life in any material way as far as you know? 4 other words, if this battery were used ten months a year instead of two, have we reduced the life of the 5 battery by 5 or not at all or 50 percent or --6 7 THE WITNESS: That's an excellent question, because this is an issue that utilities 8 9 and commissions and the battery providers are 10 looking at across the country, and electric vehicles 11 is a good example of this. It turns out that if you 12 use battery storage, for instance, frequency 13 regulation, what you're going to do is set it kind of in the half-filled, and sometimes you have to 14 15 store energy because there's too much on the system, 16 sometimes you discharge. If you keep a battery around the 50 percent charged level, it lasts a lot 17 longer than if you deeply discharge and then fully 18 19 charge. And I don't think that your question on 20 cycles would concern me. I'd almost say that it's 21 better to use it than to let it sit, because, you 22 know, you'll be letting it sit there fully charged 23 in case you have a problem. I'd really rather see it used in a sensible way, and I would not worry 24 25 about the cycle issue. I have not see where that

	D 100
1	Page 126 has significantly reduced the life.
2	COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you.
3	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I don't have any
4	further questions, so thank you, Mr. Wilson.
5	Anything else, Ms. Gardner?
6	MS. GARDNER: No. Thank you.
7	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Any final matters
8	from any party?
9	MR. SOLANDER: Rocky Mountain Power
10	would request that we call Douglas Marx as a
11	rebuttal witness. I have three questions for him
12	just to clarify some issues that have been raised
13	during this session today.
14	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: We are at a point
15	where I probably ought to give our court reporter a
16	short break, so maybe a five-minute break and then
17	come back and do that.
18	MR. SOLANDER: That would be great.
19	Thank you.
20	(A brief recess was taken.)
21	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Solander?
22	MR. SOLANDER: Thank you. We'd like
23	to call Douglas Marx as our rebuttal witness.
24	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Okay. And you're
25	still under oath, Mr. Marx.

Page 127 1 EXAMINATION 2. BY MR. SOLANDER: Mr. Marx, were you here during 3 Q. 4 Mr. Vastaq's testimony regarding the Company's process for evaluating whether to make transmission 5 or distribution level decisions? 6 7 Α. Yes, I was. And can you describe for the Commission's 8 Q. 9 benefit the process that the Company uses to evaluate where to invest and what type of 10 11 investments to make? 12 Α. Yes. I'll give kind of a high level 13 overview, and I'll also answer a question that also came up with Commissioner Clark earlier, too. 14 15 When we look at system issues, we look at it kind of holistic, and we look for the least cost 16 economic decision to upgrade that. So we will look 17 at distribution, transmission investments from an 18 19 economic standpoint. 2.0 Two years ago, in 2014, we recognized that 21 these nontraditional investments would be coming 2.2 into their own in the near future, so inside our decision matrix for all of our planning, that's 23 actually one of the first line items our engineers 24 who are doing the planning are required to look at 25

Page 128 is will a nontraditional solution solve this. 1 2 they look at battery storage, they look at issues 3 like -- we have looked at electromechanical battery 4 systems, which are basically giant gyroscopes that we can use for frequency regulation, so that's part 5 of the decision matrix now in all states to look at. 6 Because as the costs started to come down -- and as 7 Mr. Wilson mentioned, they are coming down very fast 8 9 in the battery world -- as the energy densities get 10 greater, the costs are collapsing fast. So when you 11 look at the decision thing, unless there's a 12 physical component to require a conductor to be changed out, i.e., it's completely overloaded, you 13 may not do that if you can do something else to 14 relieve that. 15 So as we looked at this whole process, we 16 17 have looked at this in several concepts. We've looked at these in different states, different 18 areas, but this is the first project that came real 19 2.0 close to being a very economic decision. And it's 21 actually the first time it came down to be the 2.2 lowest first cost for a solution on a system. 23 again, we're talking here in this aspect about a 24 radial transmission line that does no other purpose 25 except to serve my distribution substation.

Page 129 1 So when you start to say how do I solve 2 this problem, we looked at many things. And one of 3 the alternatives in the testimony was basically 4 increasing another substation in the area. So we can put another substation in, we can expand the 5 transmission line, we can increase the regulation on 6 7 the distribution. So I think when we start to look at a fully optimized system, we look at it 8 9 holistically and not just say I've got a little problem. Do I solve with it the transmission 10 11 because I know my allocation levels are lower, or do 12 I do it on distribution because it's a lower cost. 13 I think you've got to do it on a full economic analysis over the life cycle of the 14 15 projects, too. And as I mentioned, the life cycles are tough because you're looking at some future 16 projections. And I know my estimates are pretty 17 much wrong as soon as the ink dries on the paper, so 18 that's kind of the problem you're looking at when 19 2.0 you're trying to do this kind of planning stuff. What we believe is with these newer 21 2.2 technologies, the battery technologies, electromechanical batteries, whether we use 23 24 synchrophasors on transmission lines, all of these 25 come into play when you're starting to do your

1	Page 130 analysis. And how quickly can you put them in and
2	at what cost can you put them in, and is there a
3	need to do it. Does that answer that?
4	MR. SOLANDER: I believe it does.
5	Mr. Marx is available for additional questions from
6	the Commission or the parties.
7	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Thank you. Mr.
8	Jetter?
9	MR. JETTER: I don't have any
10	additional questions.
11	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Mr. Olsen?
12	MR. OLSEN: No additional questions.
13	Thank you.
14	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Hayes?
15	MS. HAYES: No questions. Thank you.
16	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Ms. Gardner?
17	MS. GARDNER: Also no questions.
18	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner White?
19	COMMISSIONER WHITE: No questions.
20	Thanks.
21	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: Commissioner Clark?
22	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions.
23	Thank you.
24	CHAIRMAN LEVAR: I don't have
25	anything further either. Thank you. Anything
1	

```
Page 131
     further from any party before we adjourn? I'm not
 1
     seeing any indication, so we're adjourned. Thank
 2
     you all.
 3
                     (The hearing concluded at 11:55 a.m.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	Page 132
2	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
3	STATE OF UTAH)
4	COUNTY OF SUMMIT)
5	
6	I, Mary R. Honigman, a Registered
7	Professional Reporter, hereby certify:
8	THAT the foregoing proceedings were
9	taken before me at the time and place set forth in
10	the caption hereof; that the witness was placed
11	under oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and
12	nothing but the truth; that the proceedings were
13	taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter my
14	notes were transcribed through computer-aided
15	transcription; and the foregoing transcript
16	constitutes a full, true, and accurate record of
17	such testimony adduced and oral proceedings had, and
18	of the whole thereof.
19	I have subscribed my name on this
20	12th day of December, 2016.
21	1 pref tonigman
22	Mary R. Honigman
23	Registered Professional Reporter
24	
25	

	10 103:5	200 116:19	38 90:18	84111 72:6
\$	100 46:3,5 58:11	200-kilowatt 99:21,23,24	4	9
\$.50 117:4	1014 97:10	2001 98:22		
\$1 10:7 \$1.4 11:3	107 54:11 55:11,13 69:2, 24	2016 17:20 52:24,25 54:13 55:13 64:6	40 121:19 43 41:16 45:13, 18 87:14,16	9 68:8 119:2 94 66:6
\$1.95 15:20 \$5 8:12 \$5.5 15:15	107.1 69:12 107.4 69:12	66:6 68:8 69:22 72:12,15 79:25 80:1	88:5 45 24:15	9th 52:24 64:6 68:14 72:12 79:25 97:15
\$500,000 27:21 29:3,10	115 27:19 66:13 12 19:19 116:8	97:15 119:2 2017 11:19 17:21 33:12	466 116:18 466-200 116:10 48-hour 28:3	A
	12.5 15:17 15 20:3	47:16,19 55:14 2018 105:8 107:5	5	A-n-d-r-e-w-s 6:19 ability 11:25
(1) 16:8 37:7 54:5 99:6 (2) 16:11 37:9	15-minute 51:16	2019 34:22 2260 118:23	5 125:6 50 125:6,17	13:8 able 24:23 75:21 77:12
54:15 99:7 (3) 16:13 37:12 54:16 99:10	16-035-36 4:3 160 68:3 72:5 79:17	23 69:22 80:1 23rd 52:25 72:15 83:21	57 45:13	91:7 above 35:20 66:9 70:2
(4) 16:15 37:14 54:17	18 7:22 9:22 18th 10:5	24-hours 122:19	6 19:12 20:1	Absolutely 13:13
(5) 16:19 37:18 (6) 37:22	193 54:10 69:4 195 54:10	25 28:8 2nd 97:10	41:15 44:15,16 89:12	accelerated 33:21 34:1,6
(7) 37:25	65:16,23 69:3, 14,18,24	3	60 122:19 600K 19:16	accept 65:12 87:13 108:5
1	195.2 69:12 196 65:17,24	3 27:23 28:9,11	64 39:24 650 113:22	accepted 65:7, 20,22
1 27:23 28:9,11 31:20 32:7 38:5 66:6	66:2,5 69:25 1st 33:12	3.4 75:14 30 24:15	69 16:3	accompanying 37:5 accomplished
1,118,000- kilowatt 116:7	2	300 68:3 72:5 79:17	8	49:13 according 82:6
1.0 97:16 119:2	2 9:24 10:10	31st 55:12 37 90:17,22,23	80 65:19 81 50:9	account 54:8 66:7
	2.1 64:7,18	106:4 107:2 115:18 116:16	84103 97:11	accounting

				1
33:10,21 34:15	124:21	97:22 119:10	21,23 40:23	allow 9:12
36:13,24 37:9	Additionally	admitted 68:15	41:2,20 42:5	37:12 85:14
55:4,9 57:17			47:13 50:3	104:22
65:4 66:11,15	56:21	72:22 80:8	51:6 55:22	allawad 00.45
70:8 85:16	additions	advance 9:11	56:2 61:6,10	allowed 83:15
	14:22 27:10		62:16 63:6	87:16 104:21
accurate 40:4	32:2	advanced 10:9	69:22 73:17	117:15
42:3 49:2		54:19	75:12 79:2	allows 73:10
achieve 11:12	address 47:9	advantage	81:20,23	117:19
19:2	55:8 61:18,19	122:16,17	82:14,17 84:4	117.13
19.2	62:7 68:1,3	122.10,17	88:23 91:8	almost 33:18
across 8:21	70:10,15 72:5	adviser 27:4,6	92:16 94:19	125:20
17:10 20:7	77:10,12 79:16			
100:19 120:7,	97:7 118:20,23	Advocates 5:7	95:1 96:15,17	alone 56:7
25 125:10		118:22	99:1 105:2,21	along 10:17
	addressed	affect 125:2	114:8 120:7	52:24 55:18
Act 4:6 80:24	30:15 37:24		123:20 125:6	64:6
82:6	61:1,3 68:25	after 7:17 28:3	allocate 8:21	07.0
action 29:6	76:7 80:19	51:18 54:2	37:10 101:21	already 107:24
400011 23.0	101:15	59:23 60:4,12		108:1
actual 24:23	addresses	66:13 114:23	allocated 19:4	alog 4:40 00
54:22 74:21			35:7,8 39:2,10	also 4:19,23
77:11 94:20	73:7,18,20	again 78:20	41:15,17 44:15	7:11,15 8:24
101:20 102:2,	adequately	91:17 116:10	47:14,18 56:4	10:3 24:17
21 110:4	73:18	agree 84:1	81:18,23 82:8,	32:20,24 36:18
		86:24 87:24	17 84:3 86:2	41:24 46:2,5
actually 21:21,	adjustment	90:10 111:22	89:12 92:6	51:1 54:7
25 24:19 25:12	56:23 66:4		110:3	56:12 64:7
77:11 101:23	69:3,5	agreed 69:22	-11	65:17,22 66:3
add 104:12	adjustments	75:5	allocating	68:25 69:12
120:6 122:14	35:20	agrees 35:13	100:18 101:18	70:2 75:2
		73:22 75:13	102:19	77:17 83:5,11
added 115:7	administer	10.22 10.10	allocation	84:21 85:1
121:25	56:20 106:11	ahead 53:19	19:11 20:1,11	100:4 105:6
adding 46:16	administering	96:12	21:2,18 40:14	106:5 115:7
adding 40.10	107:23	air 07:04:05	41:9 44:3 47:7	116:22
addition 15:19	107.23	air 27:24,25	49:15 50:14	alternative
70:1 98:8	administrative	28:4,5,7 29:5,9	62:9 82:11,21,	10:1 11:4
	36:4 56:18	algorithms	22 84:10,24	38:11 40:15
additional 4:20	57:2 100:5,8	16:17	89:9 91:19	58:6 82:15
10:15 15:20	102:25 103:1		109:17 110:8,	30.0 oZ.13
36:6,23 41:18	105:23 106:5,	align 116:22	23 111:3	alternatives
46:16 60:8	9,19 107:19,21	all 5:10,18 8:2	120:23 121:17	98:11 100:19
65:10 74:16	110:12 112:24	11:15 17:22	120.20 121.17	104:16 110:22
76:10 96:8,15		20:7,8 21:5	allocations	
101:4,14	admission	26:3 30:19	19:7 20:1 39:7,	always 29:8
102:13 103:12	15:1 29:15	33:18 35:4	8 44:10 110:3	40:8 81:2 95:2
122:1,15	32:7,22,24	36:3 38:1,4,18,		120:23,24
		00.0 00.1,4,10,		
1	I	I	I	1

ambient 28:7,	anticipates	applies 36:5	April 122:11	assigned 46:6
13	16:25		area 16:7,10,12	81:20 84:15
among 81:23	anybody 5:25	apply 8:12 49:20 112:19	18:10 20:6	85:22 87:15
82:17	118:10	113:1	23:6 24:9,22	88:6
02.17	110.10	113.1	25:7 26:1 28:2	assisted 9:1
amortization	anyone 5:11	applying 113:1	34:23,25 40:3	
33:14,16,25	7:8,13 29:19	appreciate	48:23 50:4	associated
amortize 70:5	33:2 80:11	94:6 102:17	84:25 85:20	10:14 16:3,17
	anything 21:14		89:16 94:8	36:14 81:22
amounts 69:15	26:10 48:2	appreciation 77:17	108:9,18 112:2	100:10,18 106:14 109:12
124.23	92:19 114:14	//.1/	124:23	100.14 109.12
analogy 85:23	117:9 118:3	approach	areas 9:15 50:5	assume 94:22
analysis 35:10	126:5	36:16,19 48:21	68:24	112:12
89:17	anywhere	49:2,5,6,24		assumes 81:3
	24:14	84:2	areas' 28:7	
analyst 52:17		appropriate	argues 107:14,	assuming
68:4 72:4,8	apologize 8:9	17:17 37:12,15	18	49:1,24
79:15,19	appear 23:20	38:1 62:24	arise 44:19	assumption
analyze 8:13	appearances	74:10,25	alise 44.19	63:2
analyzes 35:4	4:9 5:10	75:19,22 76:7	Arizona 119:23	assumptions
84:4		78:3 100:7	around 5:23	25:19
	appears 5:10	102:21 107:22	19:12 51:24	
and/or 54:24	66:7	approval 8:11	125:17	attached 32:3,
Andrews 6:7,9,	applaud 108:5	27:20 54:5,15,	FC:45	20
14,18 7:5		16,17 55:2	array 56:15	Attachment
12:12 13:22	applicability 17:7	57:24	articulated	31:20 32:7
annual 17:14		approve 38:4	108:14	attempt 103:18
70:4 74:16	applicable	57:14 58:24	artificial 10:23	_
76:11 106:12	10:25 61:6	70:13 74:12,23		attention 66:15
116:8	application 4:4	82:13 89:10	aside 47:7	attributable
	5:15,18 7:1,6,	91:20 109:10	117:7	33:24
annually 54:24 65:22	12 9:23 18:19	approved	assertion	augment 05:44
05.22	27:7 29:17	28:22 35:25	86:25 103:11	augment 25:14 49:16
another 24:24	31:21 32:8	37:25	108:4	
34:10 62:2,4	36:10 37:4,5		assessment	augmentation
82:13 84:25	38:6 43:4	approves	11:21,24	48:24
87:1 92:4	53:21 66:9 78:4	85:10	·	authorization
96:14	/ 0.4	approving	asset 33:17 70:4,6	15:15 34:12
ANSI 16:11	applications	54:13 70:18	70.4,0	authorize
18:21	9:10 54:20	76:4	assets 33:19	82:19 99:3
answers 53:7	112:11	approximately	81:23 84:15	
64:14 94:4	applied 9:12	10:7 11:3	assign 45:8	authorized 4:5
	10:8 106:16	116:10		66:10 74:2
				83:1,6 85:1
	l	l		

authorizes	51:20 83:5	17:15 84:3,5	92:6 99:6	109:3,4 112:8
85:9	85:8 90:3 95:8	batteries 25:10	117:1 120:7	113:19,21,23
authorizing	118:11 126:17	90:8 108:11	121:1	115:3,9,11
74:13	background	114:23 123:3	Bela 4:23	116:21,25
74.13	34:19	114.25 125.5	68:23 79:4,5,	117:2,8,17
available 12:12	34.19	battery 14:1	13	122:1 123:1,9
17:11,19,20	balance 10:16	15:17,23 17:2,	13	best 41:21 50:4
20:13 29:22	122:22 123:8	14,22,24 18:7	believe 7:24	
39:13 43:22		24:19 25:15,24	8:2 31:25	58:21 93:3
49:6 55:15	balancing 19:3	38:13 39:1	32:21 38:22	95:5 97:18
59:3 66:20	48:14 66:7	46:15 55:18,20	57:4 60:7	119:5
70:23 76:15	123:6	60:11 61:24	61:16 95:4	better 60:14
86:5 111:8	ball 24:2	81:4 108:7	98:7 104:14	77:20 125:21
115:12,15	Dan 24.2	120:1,12 121:1	107:8,22	
122:7 124:1,25	balls 23:21	122:2,5,8,12,	115:24 120:3	between 30:12
122.7 124.1,20	hank 10:16	21 123:1,7	110.24 120.0	33:15,23 47:10
Avenue 97:10	bank 19:16	124:20,22	believed 29:10	48:6 62:1
average 06:46	banks 99:12	125:4,6,9,12,	believes 34:11	84:20 91:9
average 96:16	108:25 112:22	125.4,0,9,12,		92:2 96:2
avoid 98:6		10	35:24 55:24	102:13
108:8 120:19,	bar 19:16	battery's 125:2	58:10 81:11	1 47.04
20	barrier 81:15,		below 16:10	beyond 17:21
	16 82:12,21	battery/solar	35:1	big 23:10
avoided 83:11	10 02.12,21	17:8		117:19
90:15,19 106:4	base 59:23	bear 41:18	beneficial	
107:3 116:16	60:2	45:12,18 58:11	49:25	bill 27:19 99:8
avoiding 56:3	based 10:4.7	·	benefit 10:18	100:8 101:21
103:2 124:22	based 19:4,7,	bearing 47:10	35:21 36:2,19	106:12,17
103.2 124.22	25 22:24 35:5	become 16:19	37:16 38:21,	109:15 110:3
awarded 99:22	37:16 39:7	17:20 25:2	23,24 49:8	hilling 26:7
106:12,14	41:12,17 42:13	17.20 25.2	56:22 58:17	billing 36:7 108:1
109:13,14	47:9 50:3	before 5:12		100.1
110:2	58:19 63:1	32:18 92:25	81:13 83:4	billions 88:12
	82:16 83:8	99:19 105:25	85:10 91:8,16,	
aware 42:22	86:2 90:14	106:23 118:9	17,21 105:20,	bills 36:5 54:6
49:4 51:2	93:4 99:8		21 113:18,20	99:17 100:2
113:25 114:4	101:19 102:20	begin 18:14	115:4,6,7	102:2,20
awfully 113:5	106:13,15	33:12	benefiting 39:9	bit 25:22 43:13
amidily 110.0	109:7,15,19	beginning 89:5		61:20 121:4
	110:2,4 114:22	106:13	benefits 16:6,8	01.20 121.7
В	115:20	100.10	35:13 37:11	Black 35:16
	Pacalina	behalf 4:21 5:3	46:5 55:22	62:6 85:5,7,14
B -o-La 70:14	Baseline	38:12	56:2,11,17,18,	blanded 05:04
B-e-l-a 79:14	118:24	halma 40:44	20 58:1,12	blended 95:24
B.1 65:19	basically 25:17	being 46:11	85:3,8 98:8,22	block 99:21
	33:8,11 78:7	47:23 48:22	99:1,10 101:13	100:4 117:4
back 13:8 23:7,	,	55:10 58:17	105:3 108:7,	
12 26:1,3	basis 11:12	81:15 88:6,8	12,19,21,23	blocks 102:2
			, -,,	
	I	I	I	I

116:11	bring 19:17	76:5 78:25	101:19 102:20	caused 40:3,8
Blue 15:21	122:2	116:6	103:4,6 106:14	81:16,17
16:23 35:23,24	budget 29:4,11	calculations	109:16 110:2,9	Central 55:17
36:1 37:12	73:25	78:20 115:15	124:22	
56:14,15,21,23			capital 15:25	certain 65:4
83:7,8,12	budgeting 29:2	calculator	16:14 20:5,6	93:21 124:23
98:19,21,23,24	budgets 20:5	116:5,18 117:5	33:19 102:9	Certainly 97:8
99:2,3,7,11		calendar 11:19	'4 1' 70 0	
101:3,19	build 22:18		capitalize 70:3	certainty
102:8,14	58:4 70:6	call 4:19 6:7	capture 8:22	78:12,13 93:7,
105:12,19,20	building 24:18	13:25 24:5	9:3,4 57:25	8,20,23
106:6,10	79:17	26:15 30:25	91:7	cetera 18:8
107:6,22,24	h!!(00-0 0	52:7 63:10	00041100	47:10 99:13
108:13,16,24	built 62:2,6	65:16 67:19	captures	109:1 117:11
109:1,5,9,11,	87:12 108:18	71:18 79:4 96:22 118:9	58:15,17	Chairman 4.0
13,24 110:13,	115:10	126:10,23	car 121:10	Chairman 4:2,
14 112:9	burden 60:8	120.10,23	oorbon 9:22	10,25 5:5,9,22
113:8,10 114:5	102:25 103:2	called 24:7	carbon 8:23 9:14	7:8,13 12:14, 18,21,23 13:1,
116:23 117:3,	106:19 107:19,	calling 4:23	9.14	9,15,19,21
10,17,20	21	5:4,8	care 25:24	15:4 20:15,18
Bob 4:18 52:7	burdensome	3.4,0	careful 22:8	21:6,9,13,16
	74:22	came 66:14	Caleiui 22.0	26:10,13
boilers 10:25	74.22	Campbell	carried 106:17	29:18,24 30:2,
borne 47:23	burning 123:5	26:15,17,22	carry 33:14	6,8,10,20,22
57:5	bus 16:4 19:19,	27:1 29:22		32:11 33:1
1 4 40 0	21 20:2,4	30:23 93:1	carrying 65:21	39:15 42:7
both 10:3	·		case 44:7 46:1	44:23,25 45:2,
32:16 33:5,7	business	Campbell's	51:12 57:12	21 46:21,24
35:3 40:24	67:25 68:2	29:16	58:4 78:15	47:1,4 48:18
42:14,19 84:18 101:15	72:5 79:16	can't 109:4	82:9 87:17	51:8,13,17,20
101.15	97:7 118:20		91:22 92:13	53:12 59:5,8,
Boulder		cancel 65:16	119:19 125:23	11,14 60:19,
118:24	С	69:18	04.44	22,24 61:11,21
break 126:16		candidates	cases 84:14	62:9,15 63:7
	C-a-m-p-b-e-l-l	92:15	Catalytic 10:2	64:20 66:21,25
breakdown	27:1	cannot 101:22	54:19	67:2,4,6,9,11,
42:23	41.1	Carmot 101.22	ootogorics	16 68:16 70:25
brief 33:7	calculated	cap 19:16	categories 53:22	71:3,5,8,12,15
51:19 53:17	37:21 74:9	35:16 62:6	33.22	72:23 76:17,
58:25 64:25	85:4,8 115:24	85:5,8,14	category 54:7	20,22,25 77:3,
73:11 126:20	calculating	capacitor	cause 31:18	15 78:10 79:1
	28:21	19:13,19	34:24 52:22	80:10 86:7,11,
briefly 10:7		·	64:4 72:11,14	14,18 88:16
45:25 58:8	calculation	capacity 14:13	79:24	89:20,23 90:1 91:24 92:18,23
	74:14 75:1	55:15 100:11	1 3.2 1	31.24 32.10,23
1				

93:14 94:3,7	123:4	61:12	9:12,20 11:5,	59:4 64:5
96:19 97:23	Cheryl 4:24	Clark 13:19,20	14 13:6 54:17	70:13,18,24
103:14,21	67:19,20 68:2	21:13,15 23:25	61:4 73:7,13	73:3 74:12,15,
104:8,13,18	07.19,20 00.2	25:6 26:8	collect 60:16	23 75:6,24
111:9,13,15,19	choice 48:3	30:20,21	Conect 00.10	76:4,9,16
114:8,11,13	78:16 92:13	48:18,19 49:14	collected 60:4,	82:19 83:2
117:24 118:2,	96:1 121:13	50:8,24 51:3,6	8	85:9,11 86:6
5,8,12 119:12	choices 121:23	60:22,23 62:17	collections	99:3 103:20
124:3,6,9,11,	CHOICES 121.23	63:5 67:9,10	33:23	106:23 107:5
14,16 126:3,7,	choose 19:13	71:10 77:15,16	33.23	109:7,10
14,21,24	43:22 44:12,	78:8 89:23,24	Colorado	110:14,19,20
chairs 118:13	14,16 48:7	94:6 95:10,20	118:24 119:23	113:25 116:13
Cilairs 110.15	chooses 28:19	117:24,25	combination	119:17 121:14
challenges	Chooses 26.19	124:17,18	combination 16:18	123:19 124:2
94:9,15,18	choosing	124:17,10	10.10	Commission's
change 18:23	30:14 40:14	120.2	combined	53:23 73:9
22:13 25:2	93:23	clean 5:3 6:8	11:12 41:22	98:16
66:4,6 75:22	ahaaca 70:4	7:1 8:13,15	oombustis	
94:1 95:8	chosen 78:1	9:17,20 11:5,	combustion	Commission-
34.1 33.0	churches	14 13:6 34:18	10:14,17	approved
changes 23:9	112:19	54:17 56:13	come 13:8	109:20
33:10 64:9	airala 00:0	61:4 73:7,13	34:12 42:20	Commissioner
65:18 66:1	circle 90:3	83:7 90:12	89:7 105:7	13:1,3,17,19,
68:10 69:1,13	circuit 22:2	96:21 97:9,15	107:4 126:17	20 21:13,15,
72:17 80:6	107:18	98:4,14 101:16	00.10	16,17 23:23,25
117:14		102:6,14	comes 88:10	25:6 26:8
changing 95:9	circuits 15:18	106:23 107:6	91:19	30:10,11,18,
Changing 90.9	circumstance	109:18	coming 25:21	20,21 47:4,6,
characterizatio	42:25	cleaner 5:17	59:20	25 48:16,18,19
n 49:1	. ,	6:2		49:14 50:8,24
characterizing	circumstances		comment	51:3,6 60:22,
42:17	88:24 89:2	cleanest 5:23	51:21	23,24,25 61:9,
72.17	City 68:3 72:6	clear 75:13,20	comments	23 62:17 63:5
charge 54:6	97:11	99:18 106:1	85:15 110:15	67:6,8,10
65:21 74:4		121:3	116:24	71:10,12,13
100:4,5 107:22	clarification		oommeneielle	77:3,15,16
125:19	32:24 77:6,17	climate 24:16	commercially	78:8 89:23,24
charged 83:12	clarifications	close 44:13	12:1	90:1 94:6
106:6 110:12	69:11 93:5	54:12	Commission	95:10,20
125:17,22			4:3 8:6 12:13	114:13,15,19
	clarified 34:16	closely 48:11	15:11 20:14	115:13 117:6,
charges 100:8	clarify 57:20,	closest 48:13	27:16 28:19	22,24,25
charging	22 76:3 99:19		29:23 34:6,8,	124:14,15,17,
25:15,25 106:9	126:12	CO2 9:3	13 37:7 38:4,	18 126:2
	ala wife -!	coal 6:8 7:1	25 39:14 52:23	
cheaper 82:16	clarifying	8:14,15,19	57:14 58:23	
		,,,,,,,		
		Services 8		1

Commissioner	21,24 76:11	17:17	86:3 95:21	16:3
s 51:23 65:2	78:4,17 81:5,	completely	conclusion	consequence
73:6 119:18	24 82:20 84:1,	40:21 69:15	42:1 57:13	104:15
commissions	3,5,6,16 85:6,	70.21 00.10	76:13	107.10
125:9	11 86:25 87:15	complexity	70.10	consequences
120.0	94:10 95:24	96:8 105:22	conclusions	49:15 50:14
committee	98:9 101:5	compliance	111:5 123:23	consider 90:16
112:13,21	112:12,20	85:12	concurrently	92:9 108:17
COMMMISSIO	113:2 114:1	00.12	concurrently 18:11	92.9 106.17
1	121:8 122:3,	complicated	10.11	consideration
NER 77:4 90:2,	18,24	96:4	condition 19:8	38:5 44:3
15,24 91:23 92:16 95:22	company's		22:8,10 25:12	50:14 54:2
	4:13 7:1,6 16:6	component		57:15 72:9
96:17	31:20 32:7	98:17 100:3	conditions	79:21 84:9
common	34:14 36:10,	comprehensive	16:2 20:9	98:16
100:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	84:17 88:23	24:16 28:7	
	12,15,23 37:3		conducted	considerations
community	53:21 54:14	concept 83:2	11:19	20:24
15:21 36:3	56:2 65:3,7,9,	90:3,11,25		considered
37:16 99:22	15 66:9 68:24	91:3,11 95:23	conductors	35:3
112:18 116:25	69:1,13 70:3	105:18	22:7,13,23	
117:2	73:12,18,25	concepts	23:15	considering
companies	80:19 81:18	115:17	conference	95:15
12:6 113:14	83:10 84:14		7:21,24 10:5	consistency
	85:15 98:25	concern 25:13	110:14,21	96:3
company 8:11,	107:10	44:5 56:1	110.14,21	30.0
20 12:1 15:15,	company-	110:5 125:20	conferences	consistent
19 16:15,19,	owned 15:18,	concorned	7:19 54:1,25	34:5 35:25
22,25 17:4,25	22	concerned	55:6	36:19 49:23
18:6 19:1		75:9 78:21	confidential	94:24
27:20 28:15,	Company-	90:12 91:18		consistantly
18,24 29:2	proposed	102:24 105:22	14:19 15:1	consistently
34:8,11,19,22	37:25	concerns	116:15	17:25
35:2,4,5,12,13,	comparison	57:18 61:14	confirm 49:22	consolidation
24 37:5,6,7,9	9:4 35:11	73:14,19		12:5
38:3,7,10 39:3	3. 4 33.11	107:13	confirmation	
41:7,10,12	comparisons		49:19	constraints
43:2 48:5 50:5	102:13	conclude	confusing	95:3,19
51:25 53:24	oomrenests	12:10 29:13	75:10 90:5	consultant
54:4,21 55:5,7,	compensate	38:8 100:22	100:12 114:17	63:22
16,21,24 57:21	100:9	111:4 123:12,		
58:4 60:4 63:2,	compensation	22	conjunction	consumed
25 65:11,18	90:4 105:24	concludes	15:22 108:6,10	26:4
66:3,12,16	106:3,4,22	20:13 26:9	connected	Consumer
69:18,21,22	110:16 115:18	39:12 51:11	15:18 18:15	4:22 57:1 68:4
70:9,14 73:16		66:17 67:15	10.10 10.10	72:4 79:16,19
74:1,7,17 75:4,	completed	70:21 83:13	connection	12.713.10,13
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		70.2100.10		
	I	I	I	I

_				ileariieyereb
contain 31:23	Corners 28:18	costly 81:7	create 33:17	curtailed 28:3
contained	30:13 37:21	106:11	34:1 36:4	curtailing
53:6,22	48:3,8,13	costs 9:4 13:6	52:22 64:4	27:22
•	62:20 63:3	16:3 19:4	69:19 107:6,19	
contemplated	74:10,24 77:8,	28:17,23 29:7	creating 23:12	curtailment
36:9 121:7	21,24 94:13,23	35:8,10 36:4,	35:10 38:12	27:8 28:22
contends	95:5 96:2	13,17 37:19	45:9 48:23	29:3,12 36:12,
73:25 75:17	correct 18:9	41:18 45:7,11	69:24	14,18 37:20
73.23 73.17	21:4 22:11,12	46:3 47:23		54:17 73:9
continually	31:24 40:5,15,	50:11,16 56:18	creation 36:7	74:6,8,12,18
95:17	16,23 41:10	61:3 63:1	109:11	75:16 76:2,4,
continuation	46:7,19 55:16	73:23 74:14,21	credit 99:8,15	12 77:6 78:13
104:17	77:14 95:16	75:16 76:2,6	100:7,8 106:3,	93:7 94:11
104.17	97:19 119:7	77:6,11 78:22	12,15,20	cushion 103:6
continue 17:3		81:17,20,22	12,10,20	104:24 110:9
49:23 60:12	correcting	82:1,4,8,14,16	credited 35:18	107.27 110.3
109:25	62:13	83:11 84:2	83:5 85:8	customer
oontineed	correction	85:22 86:1	101:22	18:22,25 33:23
continued	18:18 19:13	89:12 90:16	oroditing	36:5 54:6
105:13	10.10 19.13	100:5,18	crediting	au atamaria
continues 17:9	corrections	105:23 106:5,	85:10,13	customer's
75:23	14:22 27:10	10 107:3	creditor 38:12	100:1
	32:2 37:24	110:12 112:24		customers
continuous	53:2 64:9	114:3 116:16	credits 36:5	16:6,20,23
17:18	69:11 80:4	114.5 110.10	85:16 109:15	18:9,21 20:7
contrary	04.4	counsel 4:12,	110:3	21:25 35:13,15
117:10	correctly 91:1	18	Criteria 11:19	36:3 37:10
	correspond	counted		38:21,22,23
contributors	5:20	counted 107:16	critical 111:3	40:18 41:6,7
18:5		107:16	critique 104:4	42:2 46:17
control 9:24	cost 11:14	country 17:10	_	54:12 55:19,22
10:9,11 11:5,8,	19:23 23:17	120:8,25	cross-	56:3,7,10,15,
11 16:16 18:21	29:11 39:1	125:10	examination	19,22 57:5
24:19 25:1	40:15 41:17	1 47.0	39:13	58:11 60:9
	42:2 45:17	couple 47:6	crystal 23:21	81:6 98:23
controversial	47:9 50:14	61:11 122:6	24:2	99:8 101:22,25
74:22	56:9 58:6,12	course 52:19		102:1 108:24
conversant	60:11 63:3	63:23 87:24	cubic 28:8	113:20 117:18,
124:19	66:4 69:3,4	89:6	current 22:7	20 122:2,10
127.10	70:4 74:9 75:1,		27:2 31:13	123:1
conversation	8 78:24 82:11,	court 79:14	109:25 110:1	
122:1	20,21,23 84:10	126:15	112:9	CV 119:1,6,10
conveyed	87:14,16 88:6	cover 27:22		cycle 125:25
108:24	90:19 91:19	29:11 33:9	currently 31:15	
100.24	98:18 106:4		58:20 106:22	cycles 125:20
cooling 24:13	107:23 110:22	covered 57:6	113:8	
	111:3			

	40:13 41:17,19 43:3,9,15,16	definite 122:16 definitely 50:6	describing 89:14	deviation 99:2 117:19
D-o-u-g-l-a-s	44:8,12,14 45:7 48:7	117:19	deserving 108:24	devote 84:13
14:11	49:11,16,19 58:3 95:12	delivered 18:20 58:16	design 19:5,8	difference 33:15,22 48:6
Daniel 4:11 Danny 4:24	113:3 decision-	delved 90:10	20:9 22:21 110:16	differences 62:1 99:6
68:23 71:18,20 72:3	making 50:15	demand 33:10 40:9 58:5 69:4	designated 34:23	different 24:20
data 17:11,18, 19,20,23 25:18	decisions 19:2,3 20:10, 11,25 21:1	demand-side 85:19	desire 49:18	62:11 75:4,5 82:8 91:25 92:10 108:22
54:1	35:5,12 39:6 40:24 41:8,12	demonstrate 9:8 10:22	detail 85:6 87:19 103:12	112:20 114:24 115:17 116:19
date 98:22 105:10 109:22,	42:15 43:6,10, 18 44:4,17,20	demonstration	detailed 43:18 75:11	120:15
23 110:17 dated 64:6	45:17,18 47:22 50:3 78:13	10:1 11:4,7 117:15	details 36:23	dioxide 8:23 9:14
David 4:19	84:8,18,22 87:3 88:25	demonstration s 11:16	90:10 101:14 determination	direct 6:25 29:16 32:19
55:7 61:19 63:10,12,20 64:5	89:2,8 decrease	depending	17:23 105:12	51:12 52:23 53:10 56:9
Davis 4:18	103:1	23:20 24:15 depends 23:4	determine 11:10 12:4 28:16 34:6	64:6,13,17,18 65:6,13 68:9,
52:7,8,13,23 53:11,16 59:3,	decreases 106:18	deploying 49:24	75:19 87:25 90:18 109:24	14 69:10 72:12,21 79:25
9,19 62:19 63:8	decreasing 10:1	depreciate	112:7	97:14 98:3 100:15,23,25
day 24:14 26:6 122:19	deemed 98:24 99:11	34:3 54:9 depreciation	93:25 96:11	103:9,10,13 115:23 118:11 119:1,17
days 24:15 122:20 124:25	deeply 125:18	33:22 34:2,7	99:9 100:14 106:15	123:13,16,21
daytime	defer 15:24 33:12	DEQ 28:7 describe 36:12	determines 112:14 116:13	directer 6:23 directive 62:4
122:14 dead 24:11	deferral 33:13	46:1 58:8 61:25 105:16	determining 36:17 74:21	92:3
December	98:8 113:24 deferred 33:16,	107:10 described 34:4	78:22 93:17	directly 39:10 99:24
54:13 55:12 decide 103:20	25	35:19,20 39:23 40:1,10 43:11	developed 8:17 9:11 99:6	director 6:21 14:15,17
112:10,21 deciding 43:14	deferring 16:13 46:17	44:20 45:6 46:7 50:2	development 6:22,24 80:25	31:15,17 97:9 disagree 49:1
decision 34:20	defined 8:15 27:24 28:6	78:18 81:25 114:16 124:22	81:1	111:25

discharge	24:4 34:23	63:25 68:7	duly 6:10 14:3	19,22 58:1,9,
122:13 125:16,	35:3 40:3,9	70:17 85:7	26:18 31:3	14 74:16 75:3
18	42:16,19 43:2,	93:9 97:15	52:9 63:13	76:2,8,11
'	4,15 45:10	99:25 100:2	67:21 71:21	78:15 83:5
discontinued	48:23 62:13			
105:14		106:25 109:24	79:6 96:25	93:9,19 96:13
	81:19 84:4,7,	116:15 119:1	118:15	101:12 105:2
discovery	15,19,21 87:13	dollars 88:13	duration 102:5,	economic 19:7
75:12 78:5	88:4,11 89:8			
	98:6,12 107:17	115:21	11 105:8	20:24 21:1
discretion 52:3	108:8 120:17,	done 35:16	during 17:21	27:22 28:14,15
discuss 7:22	21 121:15	40:24 43:4	22:17 23:12	29:7 50:4
	21 121.10	47:19 85:13,16	24:10 27:23	122:16 123:1
9:21 10:6	distribution-	· ·		
33:20 34:14	sited 110:21	114:6	28:12 29:5	economical
36:11		Douglas 13:25	55:5 57:9 66:3	43:23 50:7
المحدد معا	divide 116:8	14:2,11 34:22	74:4 118:11	120:4
discussed		· ·	126:13	
34:17 35:8,23	dividends 17:3	126:10,23		economically
66:8 70:2	Division 4:17,	down 123:7	duties 27:5	20:9
diaguasia	18,19 12:17	40WH 120.7	72:7	economics
discussing		DPU 34:18		
90:25	27:25 28:4	52:23 53:11	dynamic 22:20	11:23 23:1
discussion	52:5,6,17,20	64:5,6,18	61:17	edits 53:2
	53:20 54:4,21,	04.0,0,10		Cuit3 55.2
21:17	25 55:2,24	DPU'S 106:25	_	educational
discussions	56:8,10,12,25		E	111:1
55:5	57:3,7,13,23	drive 20:10,25		
33.3	58:3,9,10 63:9,	22:4 50:15	each 24:15	effect 23:15
dispatch 29:8	21 65:6,11,15,	121:10	33:13 45:7	- # 1 00 · 4.4
48:10				effective 33:11
	17 66:1,8,13	driven 43:2	68:25 76:7	81:7 98:18
dispatched	67:14 73:23	95:13	96:10 120:10,	efficiency
28:11,14	83:3 101:2,13,	driver 00.40	14	10:16 16:17
	18 102:4,5,10,	driver 23:10	earlier 40:11	10:16 16:17
distinction	12 103:12,24	drives 20:11		efficiently 17:5
92:2,5	106:1	47:11	48:1 57:22	3
dictors 04:00		71.11	61:23 87:6	effort 10:15
distort 84:22,	Division's 55:8	driving 21:19	90:24 91:25	
23	56:1,21 57:25	22:1 48:7	122:5	either 11:11
distributed	58:23 61:5			13:21 19:14
	62:23 65:21,23	drop 16:10	early 98:21	28:20 60:1
18:15 21:24	66:14 101:7,9,	35:1	ease 69:16	87:1 104:9
39:4,8 55:23,			Case 03.10	110:4 118:3
25 100:18	16 102:15,18	DSM 33:11,13,	easier 56:20	
120:14	103:18 105:4	15,16,24,25		elected 43:2
allatulle estle	Divisions 65:3	40:25 70:4,8	East 68:3 72:5	alaati 10 10
distribution	DIVISIONS UU.U	85:20,22,24	79:17	election 49:16
12:3 15:18	docket 4:3,7		ED 4 05 15	electric 8:19
16:1,9 18:2	14:20 31:19	dual 115:3	EBA 35:15	54:14 65:18
19:14,16,18	37:4 38:5,7	Due 17:11	37:12 38:24	
22:12 23:11,13	52:22 53:23	Due 17:11	46:10 56:11,	125:10
·	32.22 33.23			
			200 220 1110	

element 50:12	46:11 55:23,25	entire 81:8	even 22:17	125:11
elements	66:7 80:19,23	91:16 116:6	23:14 69:14	examples
110:16	83:4,9 85:2	entirely 55:19	81:20	44:11 120:25
110.10	87:9 90:12	entinely 55.19	evening 26:6	122:10
eligible 112:16	96:22 97:10,16	entitled 27:8	evening 20.0	122.10
eliminate	98:4,14 99:9,	117:9	event 28:5 29:6	excellent
15:24 40:25	15 100:1,2,10,	entry 7:12	110:10	112:23 125:7
77:18	13 101:11,20,	entry 7.12	events 27:24	excess 38:17
17.10	23 102:3,23	environmental	29:9	105:1 107:15
emerging	104:25 105:1	34:10 47:20	29.9	108:4 114:22
11:11	106:14,16,24		every 93:19,21	
	107:7,14	equation 47:13	94:1 96:13	122:13 123:7
emission 9:9	108:5,9,12,15,	51:4	106:17 112:12	exclusive
11:4,8,13,16	20,23 109:4,	especially		108:12,15,20
36:18 54:16	12,16,18,19	44:11	everybody	
emissions	110:7 112:2		44:9	executive 97:9
8:18 9:14 10:2,	113:16,19	essentially	everything	exhausted
14,24 27:8	115:3,7	111:23 122:9	49:9 97:19	29:4
36:11,14 37:20	122:10,13	establish	119:6	
73:8	123:7 124:23	37:15		exhibit 6:25
	125:15		evidence 75:18	7:6 14:19,23
employed 6:20	Francisco FC:42	established	80:8 119:11	15:2 27:7
14:12,14 31:15	Energy's 56:13	99:15,25	exact 87:9,20	29:16 32:19,
68:1	83:7 101:16	106:25		21,25 64:7,18
employment	102:6,14	establishing	EXAMINATION	97:16 119:2
52:20 63:24	106:23 107:6	54:5,8	6:12 14:5	exhibits 5:16,
79:11	engineering	,	20:20 26:20	18,20 31:24
	14:15,17 19:2,	estimate 75:8	31:5 39:17	32:3,10 55:7
enable 81:6	3 20:10,11	115:19	42:9 45:3,23	02.0,10 00.7
enables 18:8	43:8,19 47:8	estimated	52:11 59:17	exist 94:9
eliables 10.0	118:23		63:15 67:23	existence
enabling		110:4,6	71:23 79:8	89:14
16:15,19	enhance 18:12	estimation	86:19 88:18	03.1 4
and 7:22 20:4	enhancements	75:15	97:2 111:20	expect 24:5
end 7:23 29:4	18:1		118:17	25:7 40:17
54:12 55:12		evaluate 89:1	examined 6:11	41:7,20 46:2,4
59:22 110:1	enough 25:9	107:8	14:4 26:19	ovnostations
end-use 18:20,	26:2 124:19	evaluated 37:8		expectations
22,24	ensure 16:12	121:20	31:4 52:10 63:14 67:22	24:8
	18:19,24 85:15		71:22 79:7	expected
energy 4:6 5:3	101:12 105:3	evaluates	97:1 118:16	11:13 15:24
9:17 15:2		84:19	31.1 110.10	22:24
16:18 18:4	ensuring 16:10	evaluating	example 19:9	avnand!t
21:24 34:18,20	enter 5:18	35:2 84:2,14	41:13 45:5	expenditures
35:14,22 36:1,	53:10 64:17		62:2,5 88:7	33:13,15,17
20 37:8,11,14,	JJ. 10 04. 17	evaluation	92:4 99:20	34:1 54:23
18 38:13,17,18		113:11	121:22 122:17	
	•	•	•	•

48:17 57:19 facility 46:15, 18 55:19 58:4 33:16 50:22 83:4,9.10 57:20.77:18 fifty 23:2 fifst 6:7,10 10:6 14:3 33:9 52:9 61:12 63:13 102:10 follow-up 24:1 47:25 51:22 78:10 95:23 100:6 14:3 33:9 52:9 61:12 63:13 102:10 follow-ups 92:4 10:10:6 14:3 33:9 52:9 61:12 63:13 100:12 20:10 follow-ups 92:4 10:10:6 14:3 33:9 52:9 61:12 63:13 100:12 20:11,14 79:24 97:14 100:25 98:17 101:18 100:17 79:6 96:25 98:17 101:18 100:13 118:25 118:25 123:15 119:25 118:25 123:15 119:25 118:25 123:15 119:25 118:25 123:15 119:25 118:25 123:15 119:25 119:25 118:25 123:15 119:25 119:25 118:25 123:15 119:25 119:25 119:25 110:17 121:9 122 123:12 123:15 123:15 119:29 119:20:24 119	expense 33:25	facilities 16:24	few 39:19	fine 30:18	116:9
expenses 18 55:19 58:4 120:3 fifty 23:2 first 6:7.10 47:25 51:22 78:10 95:23 33:16 50:22 33:4,9,10 59:25 60:6 10:10,24 10:21,14	46:17 57:19	facility 46:15,	57:20 77:18	firms 9:2	follow-up 24:1
33:16 50:22 83:4,9,10 109:21 100:12 109:21 100:12 109:21 100:12 109:21 100:12 109:21 100:12 109:23 100:10 109:12,23 109:12 23 109:12 23 110:17 109:12,23 110:17 109:12,23 110:17 78:10 99:23 94:4 100:00-ups 33:9 52:9 61:12 63:13 follow-ups 93:9 94:4 100:00-ups 93:9 61:12 63:13 followed 10:13 100:00-ups 93:9 61:12 63:13 followed 10:13 100:00-ups 93:9 98:17 101:18 93:9 67:21 71:21 followed 10:13 100:00-ups 93:9 67:21 71:21 followed 10:13 67:21 71:21 followed 10:13 93:9 67:21 71:21 followed 10:13 67:21 71:22 followed 10:13 93:9 67:21 10:25 followed 10:13 67:21 71:21 followed 10:13 67:21 71:22 followed 10:13 67:22 71:22 followed 11:3 67:21 71:22 follow	expenses		120:3	fi1 0-7 40	<u> </u>
57:3,4,8,10 90:21 100:12 90:21 100:12 fight 96:12 26:18 31:3 30:39 52:9 94:4 73:15,22 74:3 102:10 109:12,23 fighr 96:12 33:9 52:9 61:12 63:13 67:21 71:21 follow-ups 94:4 expensive 19:20 45:14 fact 108:9 97:14 100:25 98:17 101:18 following 54:5 93:9 experience 11:23 16:16 factors 22:4 43:14 89:6 32:8 33:5 107:13 118:15 follows 6:11 14:42 6:19 31:4 37:7 52:10 63:14 43:14 89:6 32:8 33:5 firstly 102:17 52:10 63:14 47:22 77:22 68:14.21 69:22 firstly 102:17 52:10 63:14 67:22 77:22 67:22 77:22 67:22 77:22 68:14.21 69:22 105:9 109:22 118:16 79:797:1 67:22 77:22 68:14.21 69:22 105:9 109:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 108:25 112:22 </td <td>l •</td> <td>83:4,9,10</td> <td>fifty 23:2</td> <td>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·</td> <td>78:10 95:23</td>	l •	83:4,9,10	fifty 23:2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	78:10 95:23
39:28 30:8 101:0,24 102:3 107:8,15 figure 78:2 33:9 52:9 94:4 61:2 63:13 62:2 61:2 63:13 62:2 13:3	57:3,4,8,10	90:21 100:12	field 00:40		fallow upo
102:10	59:25 60:6	101:10,24	11gnt 96:12		<u> </u>
Topic Topi	73:15,22 74:3	102:3 107:8,15	figure 78:2		94.4
expensive 110:17 72:11,14 79:24 79:6 96:25 93:9 19:20 45:14 fact 108:9 97:14 100:25 98:17 101:18 93:9 experience factors 22:4 43:14 89:6 118:25 123:15 107:13 118:15 119:25 11:23 16:16 factors 22:4 43:14 89:6 32:8 33:5 firsthand 16:16 13:4 37:7 17:2,4 49:8 35:14 32:8 33:5 firstly 102:17 52:10 63:14 19:23 facts 88:23 24,25 64:4 59:22 2;22 five 28:10 79:79:71 explain 18:17 failed 117:16 72:12,14 79:24 83:21 103:10 79:79:71 79:79:71 94:9 41:6,24 46:13 85:23 103:16 68:24 72:9 five-minute 106:9 108:25 112:22 explanation fall 18:21 79:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 five-minute 108:27:11 60:4,12 form 16:14,25 110:1 70:14 78:23 70:14 78:23 70:14 78:23 70:14 78:23 70:14 78:23 70:14 78:23 70:14 78:23 70:14 78:24 70:14 78:24 70:14 78:24 70:16 78:22 70:12 78:22 </td <td>102:10</td> <td></td> <td>file 6:04 60:6</td> <td></td> <td>followed 10:13</td>	102:10		file 6:04 60:6		followed 10:13
19:20 45:14 88:8,10 120:2 factor 92:6	avnensive	110:17			following 54:5
88:8,10 120:2 factor 92:6 118:25 123:15 107:13 118:15 follows 6:11 experience 11:23 16:16 factors 22:4 filed 5:15 7:17 firsthand 16:16 114:26:19 11:23 16:16 43:14 89:6 32:8 33:5 firstly 102:17 52:10 63:14 31:4 37:7 52:10 63:14 57:27 79:1 52:10 63:14 67:22 71:22 70:72 79:1 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 52:10 63:14 67:27 79:71 59:23 65:25 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 118:16 79:79 79:1 105:9 109:22 108:25:15 60:49 12 60:49 12 60:49 12 60:49 12 60:41 105:9 109:22 60:41 108:27:21 60:		fact 108:9	·		
experience factor 92:6 filed 5:15.7:17 119:25 follows 6:11 14:4 26:19 11:23 16:16 17:2,4 49:8 95:14 32:8 33:5 firsthand 16:16 31:4 37:7 52:10 63:14 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 79:11 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 79:11 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 79:11 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 79:11 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 67:22 71:22 79:11 67:22 71:22 79:79:11 67:22 71:22 79:79:11 68:14,21 69:22 72:12,14 79:24 79:10:9:10 79:10 79:11 79:19:19 79:19:19 79:19 79:19					33.3
Factors 22:4 43:14 89:6 71:23 16:16 71:24 49:8 120:11 121:9 95:14 32:8 33:5 73:22 52:22, 68:14 20:11 121:9 89:2 72:12,14 79:24 72:23 16:16 72:24 49:8 72:34 49:8 72:34 49:8 109:23 89:2 72:12,14 79:24 72:12,14 79:24 74:6,24 46:13 85:23 103:16 68:24 72:9 74:17 75:3,10 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 85:12,15 63:25 80:8 63:25 80:8 63:25 80:8 63:25 80:8 63:25 80:8 63:25 80:8 63:25 80:8 63:25 80:8 63:25 80:8 75:14 69:14 69:14 69:14 69:14 60:17 69:14 69:14 69:14 69:17 69:14 69:14 69:14 69:17 69:14 69:14 69:14 69:17 6eder 121:2 104:3 6eder 121:2 6eders 120:20 76:10,11 76:24 76:25 80:8 75:17 76:25 80:8 76:25 80:8 76:25 17:27 76:20 60:34 76:10,11 76:24 76:25 80:8 76:25 80:3 76:25 8	·	factor 92:6			
11:23 16:16 17:24 49:8 17:24 49:8 19:14 17:25 25:22, 17:25 25:22, 17:25 25:22, 17:25 25:22, 17:25 25:23 65:25 118:16 17:26 271:22 17:27 18:16 17:27 27:22 17:23 17:22 17:23 17:22 17:23 17:22 17:23 17:33		factors 22:4			
17:2,4 49:8 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:9 120:11 121:2 120:11 121:2 120:11 121:2 120:11 121:2 120:11 121:2 120:11 121:2 120:11 120:10 120:11 120:10 120:11 120:10 120:11 120:10 120:11 120:10 120:11 120:10 120:11 120:10 120:11 120:10 120:11 120:	l			tirsthand 16:16	
State Stat	· ·			firstly 102:17	
expiration 89:2 68:14,21 69:22 72:12,14 79:24 83:21 103:10 59:23 65:25 105:9 109:22 120:9 118:16 rylain 18:17 74:8 75:11 94:9 failed 117:16 fair 40:6,17 41:6,24 46:13 85:23 103:16 fair 40:6,17 41:6,24 46:13 85:23 103:16 filing 34:8 68:24 72:9 74:17 75:3,10 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 85:12,15 five-minute 126:16 70:8 27:21 60:4,12 70:8 27:21 60:4,12 70:8 27:21 60:4,12 70:8 27:21 60:4,12 70:8 27:21 60:4,12 70:8 27:21 60:4,12 70:8 27:21 60:4,12 70:8 27:21 70	120:11 121:9 	facta 00:00	1		_
toplain 18:17 failed 117:16 72:12,14 79:24 105:9 109:22 food 99:12 108:25 112:22 explained 41:6,24 46:13 85:23 103:16 filing 34:8 68:24 72:9 five-minute 126:16 forecasts 22:24 explanation 84:17,21 fall 18:21 76:10,11 five-year 8:12 form 16:14,25 110:1 explanations 75:11 falls 80:21 85:12,15 fixes 35:3 43:23 form 16:14,25 110:1 explanations 75:11 familiar 16:19 63:25 80:8 flag 84:11 formula 74:24 75:14 78:17 formula 74:24 75:14 78:17 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 84:16 106:17 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 60:14 85:12 117:7 99:1,10 101:11,13 105:2 116:25 117:2,17 101:11,13 105:2 116:25	expiration		·		
explain 18:17 failed 117:16 83:21 103:10 120:9 food 99:12 108:25 112:22 94:9 41:6,24 46:13 85:23 103:16 filing 34:8 68:24 72:9 five-minute 126:16 108:25 112:22 explanation 84:17,21 fall 18:21 74:17 75:3,10 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 fixes 35:3 form 16:14,25 110:1 explanations 75:11 90:22 fillings 33:7 63:25 80:8 flag 84:11 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 explore 84:22 feasibility 17:7 69:14 feasibility 17:7 feasible 37:15 flow 22:7 38:23 founder 97:9 extensive 69:14 feed 90:17 finally 66:11 85:18 100:15 102:12 123:22 flow 22:7 38:23 72:148:38, 12 62:20 63:3 extremely 28:12 98:18 feeders 120:20 finally 66:11 85:18 100:15 102:12 123:22 flows 92:2 fourth 36:21 feelings 49:22 feelings 49:22 find 37:7 95:19 flows 92:2 fourth 36:21 fings 107:5 finds 107:5 follow 20:22 123:68 125:12	109:23	09.2	I '		110.10
74:8 75:11 fair 40:6,17 116:24 filling 34:8 five-minute 126:16 108:25 112:22 explained 115:5 fairly 25:13 fairly 25:13 filling 34:8 68:24 72:9 74:17 75:3,10 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 85:12,15 five-year 8:12 10:8 27:21 60:4,12 form 16:14,25 110:1 10:1 10:1 10:1 10:1 10:1 10:1 10	ovolain 10:17	failed 117:16	· ·		food 99:12
94:9 41:6,24 46:13 85:23 103:16 filling 34:8 68:24 72:9 74:17 75:3,10 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 85:12,15 five-minute 126:16 forecasts 22:24 explanation 84:17,21 fall 18:21 falls 80:21 90:22 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 85:12,15 fixes 35:3 43:23 formula 74:24 75:14 78:17 explanations 75:11 po:22 familiar 16:19 filling 33:7 63:25 80:8 flag 84:11 flag 84:11 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 explore 84:22 express 77:17 feasibility 17:7 feasible 37:15 final 30:25 34:12 37:1 125:3 flag 84:11 126:7 founder 97:9 flow 22:7 38:23 56:11 91:5 99:1,10 101:11,13 105:2 116:25 117:2,17 founder 97:9 flour 9:7 24:14 28:18 30:12 37:21 48:3,8, 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 95:4 96:2 extremely 28:12 98:18 feeder 121:2 fellow 118:23 fence 19:22 final 37:7 95:19 119:20,24 120:22 121:5 flows 92:2 flows 92:2 Fourth 36:21 frequency 122:18,19,22 123:6,8 125:12		fair 40:6 17			108:25 112:22
explained 85:23 103:16 filing 34:8 68:24 72:9 74:17 75:3,10 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 85:12,15 five-year 8:12 10:8 27:21 60:4,12 10:8 27:21 60:4,12 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:1 10:1 10:8 27:21 10:21 10:21 10:8 27:21 10:21 10:21 10:8 27:21 10:8 27:21 10:21 10:21		'			forecasts
## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ##		1	_	126:16	
explanation fairly 25:13 74:17 75:3, 10 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 60:4,12 10:8 27:21 60:4,12 form 16:14,25 110:1 explanations 75:11 90:22 85:12,15 fixes 35:3 43:23 formula 74:24 75:14 78:17 explore 84:22 express 77:17 familiar 16:19 63:25 80:8 flag 84:11 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 extensive 69:14 feasibility 17:7 feasible 37:15 38:25 91:23 95:22 117:7 126:7 flow 22:7 38:23 56:11 91:5 99:1,10 10:111,13 105:2 116:25 17:2,17 four 9:7 24:14 28:18 30:12 37:21 48:3,8, 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 95:4 96:2 extermely 28:12 98:18 feeder 121:2 feeders 120:20 feelings 49:22 fellow 118:23 fence 19:22 final 37:7 95:19 119:20,24 120:22 121:5 finds 107:5 flows 92:2 focus 8:22 12:18,19,22 12	l •			five-vear 8:12	
explanation 84:17,21 fall 18:21 76:10,11 79:20,21 80:2 85:12,15 60:4,12 formula 74:24 75:14 78:17 explanations 75:11 go:22 filings 33:7 63:25 80:8 flag 84:11 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 explore 84:22 express 77:17 far 50:22 52:21 125:3 final 30:25 34:12 37:1 38:25 91:23 95:22 117:7 126:7 flexible 22:20 100 x 22:7 38:23 56:11 91:5 99:1,10 101:11,13 105:2 116:25 102:12 123:22 four 9:7 24:14 28:18 30:12 37:21 48:3,8, 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 95:4 96:2 exteremely 28:12 98:18 feeder 121:2 feelings 49:22 fellow 118:23 fence 19:22 finally 66:11 85:18 100:15 102:12 123:22 flowed 98:23 flows 92:2 Fourth 36:21 frequency 122:18,19,22 123:6,8 125:12 follow 20:22	115:5	fairly 25:13	1	,	
84:17,21 falls 80:21 79:20,21 80:2 fixes 35:3 formula 74:24 explanations 75:11 90:22 filings 33:7 falls 80:21 forward 49:12 explore 84:22 far 50:22 52:21 final 30:25 flag 84:11 forward 49:12 express 77:17 125:3 34:12 37:1 flow 22:7 38:23 founder 97:9 extensive 69:14 feasibility 17:7 95:22 117:7 99:1,10 101:11,13 28:18 30:12 extent 40:18 finally 66:11 85:18 100:15 105:2 116:25 17:2,17 126:20 63:3 follow 28:12 98:18 feeder 121:2 financial 50:17 flows 92:2 flows 92:2 feelings 49:22 find 37:7 95:19 119:20,24 flows 92:2 focus 8:22 fellow 118:23 fence 19:22 finds 107:5 follow 20:22 frequency	explanation	fall 18:21	· ·		110:1
explanations falls 80:21 85:12,15 fixes 35:3 75:14 78:17 explore 84:22 familiar 16:19 foilings 33:7 flag 84:11 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 express 77:17 far 50:22 52:21 125:3 final 30:25 34:12 37:1 38:25 91:23 95:22 117:7 126:7 flow 22:7 38:23 56:11 91:5 99:1,10 101:11,13 105:2 116:25 117:2,17 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:7 119:20,24 119:20 119:20 112:15 100 finds 107:5 follow 20:22 follow 20:22 follow 20:22			I '	·	formula 74:24
75:11 familiar 16:19 failings 33:7 flag 84:11 forward 49:12 84:16 106:17 explore 84:22 far 50:22 52:21 final 30:25 34:12 37:1 38:25 91:23 95:22 117:7 flow 22:7 38:23 56:11 91:5 99:1,10 101:11,13 105:2 116:25 117:2,17 four 9:7 24:14 28:18 30:12 37:21 48:3,8, 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 95:4 96:2 extent 40:18 41:5 77:20 104:3 feeder 121:2 feelings 49:22 fee	·		00.12,15		
explore 84:22 familiar 16:19 63:25 80:8 flag 84:11 84:16 106:17 express 77:17 far 50:22 52:21 final 30:25 34:12 37:1 flow 22:7 38:23 founder 97:9 extensive feasible 37:15 feasible 37:15 126:7 126:7 126:7 four 9:7 24:14 28:18 30:12 37:21 48:3,8, 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 95:4 96:2 extremely feeders 120:20 final 37:7 95:19 flows 92:2 Fourth 36:21 focus 82:2 focus 82:2 flows 92:2 flows 92:2 flows 92:2 flows 92:2 flows 92:2 focus 82:2 frequency 122:18,19,22 122:18,19,22 123:6,8 125:12 123:6,8 125:12		90:22	filings 33:7	43.23	formers 40.40
explore 84:22 far 50:22 52:21 final 30:25 flexible 22:20 founder 97:9 extensive feasibility 17:7 feasible 37:15 feasible 37:15 feasible 37:15 finally 66:11 56:11 91:5 99:1,10 99:1,10 99:1,10 101:11,13 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 105:2 116:25 117:2,17 102:12 123:22 flowed 98:23 flowed 98:23 Fourth 36:21 frequency 12:218,19,22 12:218,19,22 12:218,19,22 12:218,19,22 12:218,19,22 12:12 12:218,19,22 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:12 12:14	10.11	familiar 16:19	63:25 80:8	flag 84:11	
express 77:17 125:3 34:12 37:1 38:25 91:23 95:22 117:7 126:7 founder 97:9 extensive 69:14 feasible 37:15 126:7 feasible 37:15 126:7 flow 22:7 38:23 56:11 91:5 99:1,10 10:11,13 105:2 116:25 117:2,17 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:22 117:2,17 102:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:12 123:1	explore 84:22	far 50:22 52:21	final 30:25	flexible 22:20	
extensive feasibility 17:7 38:25 91:23 95:22 117:7 126:7 flow 22:7 38:23 56:11 91:5 99:1,10 101:11,13 100:11,13 105:2 116:25 117:2,17 102:12 123:22 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 102:12 123:12 117:7 117:12 117:1	express 77·17				founder 97:9
extensive feasibility 17:7 95:22 117:7 56:11 91:5 28:18 30:12 37:21 48:3,8, 28:18 30:12 37:21 48:3,8, 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 105:2 116:25 74:10,24 77:8, 105:2 16:25 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 95:4 96:2 Fourth 36:21 Fourth 36:21 Fourth 36:21 frequency 122:18,19,22 123:6,8 125:12 follow 20:22 123:6,8 125:12	•				four 9.7 24.14
69:14 feasible 37:15 126:7 99:1,10 37:21 48:3,8, extent 40:18 feed 90:17 finally 66:11 105:2 116:25 74:10,24 77:8, 104:3 feeder 121:2 feeders 120:20 financial 50:17 flowed 98:23 95:4 96:2 F feelings 49:22 find 37:7 95:19 flows 92:2 focus 8:22 frequency fellow 118:23 fence 19:22 finds 107:5 follow 20:22 follow 20:22		feasibility 17:7			
extent 40:18 feed 90:17 finally 66:11 105:2 116:25 12 62:20 63:3 104:3 feeder 121:2 finally 66:11 105:2 116:25 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 extremely 28:12 98:18 feeders 120:20 financial 50:17 flowed 98:23 95:4 96:2 feelings 49:22 find 37:7 95:19 flows 92:2 focus 8:22 frequency fellow 118:23 12 62:20 63:3 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 95:4 96:2 flows 92:2 focus 8:22 frequency 12 62:20 63:3 105:2 116:25 117:2,17 117:2,17 117:2,17 117:2,17 117:2,17 117:2,17 117:2,21 110:20:22 110:20:22 110:20:22 110:20:22 110:20:22 110:20:22 110:20:22 120:22	69:14	feasible 37:15	126:7	1	
41:5 77:20 85:18 100:15 117:2,17 74:10,24 77:8, 21,24 94:13,23 extremely 28:12 98:18 feeders 120:20 financial 50:17 flowed 98:23 95:4 96:2 F fellow 118:23 find 37:7 95:19 19:20,24 120:22 121:5 focus 8:22 18:23 119:19 122:18,19,22 123:6,8 125:12 follow 20:22	extent 40:18		finally 66:11	·	, ,
104:3 feeder 121:2 102:12 123:22 flowed 98:23 95:4 96:2 extremely 28:12 98:18 feeders 120:20 financial 50:17 flows 92:2 Fourth 36:21 fellow 118:23 fence 19:22 find 37:7 95:19 120:22 121:5 focus 8:22 18:23 119:19 122:18,19,22 123:6,8 125:12 follow 20:22	41:5 77:20	teed 90:17	_		74:10,24 77:8,
extremely feeders 120:20 financial 50:17 flowed 98:23 95:4 96:2 feelings 49:22 find 37:7 95:19 flows 92:2 Fourth 36:21 fellow 118:23 119:20,24 120:22 121:5 follow 20:22 122:18,19,22 finds 107:5 follow 20:22 123:6,8 125:12	104:3	feeder 121:2			21,24 94:13,23
F feelings 49:22 find 37:7 95:19 119:20,24 120:22 121:5 fence 19:22 finds 107:5 fellow 20:22 fe	extremely	foodore 120:20		flowed 98:23	95:4 96:2
F feelings 49:22 find 37:7 95:19 focus 8:22 frequency 12:18,19,22 finds 107:5 follow 20:22 frequency 12:6,8 125:12 frequency 12:6,8 12:6,8 125:12 frequency 12:6,8			financial 50:17	flows 92·2	Fourth 36:21
F fellow 118:23 fence 19:22 119:20,24 120:22 121:5 follow 20:22 frequency 122:18,19,22 123:6,8 125:12	20.12 00.10	feelings 49:22	find 37:7 95:19		
F 120:22 121:5 18:23 119:19 122:18,19,22 123:6,8 125:12 161low 20:22 123:6,8 125:12		fellow 118-23			
finds 107:5 follow 20:22	F		1	18:23 119:19	
TINGS 10/15		fence 19:22	finds 107:5	follow 20:22	123:6,8 125:12
	faced 49:21		iinas 107:5		

Index: frequently..guess

frequently	66:19 74:11	gave 99:20	giving 17:3	105:1 109:16
42:24 43:5	75:20 88:15	general 24:7	38:24	119:14
f==== 40.00	89:19 92:21	•	man 10.40	
front 48:20	98:11 117:23	47:21 57:12	goal 18:18	grantee's
fuel 8:19 123:5	118:4 126:4	76:5 82:9 94:8	92:12	100:13
	f	generally	goes 25:1,20	grantees
fulfilling 125:1	future 17:2,5	24:15 98:4	61:17	108:25
full 17:20 44:9	18:16 39:3	104:20		
56:14 58:17	70:10 75:2,3,5,		good 4:2,15	granting
	22 76:2,7 81:7,	generate 116:7	5:2,6 6:14,15	102:23 110:6
full-scale 11:7,	14,16 82:7,12,	generated 36:2	14:7 18:25	113:15
22	24 84:12,14	37:17 38:13	20:10 23:21	grants 101:19
fully 9:11	87:23 88:3,25	100:11 102:3	25:12 26:22,23	102:4,19
125:18,22	123:3	107:14 112:2	31:7,8 39:19,	109:14,21
·			21 42:11,12	110:2 113:2,4
fund 11:15	G	generates	52:13,14 53:20	
33:22 34:2	——	104:25	63:17 65:1	granular 25:18
fundamentally	0-4-1-0-2-2	generating	73:6 86:21,23	grateful 124:20
10:22	Gadsby 27:8,	8:19 9:13	88:7 97:4,5	
	23 28:1,9,22		118:19 121:5,	great 126:18
funded 55:19	29:3,5,8,11	generation	18,22 122:22	greatly 106:18
56:7 82:6 83:8	36:11,14,18	16:25 18:15	125:11	
99:7 105:19	37:20 54:16	24:22 25:25	grant 36:5	grid 18:5,16
funding 8:12,	62:21 73:9	26:2,6 34:3	37:15 38:12	56:12 115:6,11
25 9:14 15:16	74:6,12,17	39:4,8,24 54:9	83:7,12 90:13	120:17
27:21 35:24,25	76:2,4,12 93:6	90:4,6 100:4	98:24,25 99:4,	gross 90:6
36:6 37:13	95:6	102:21 107:15	11,16 100:6,9	114:21,25
54:6 56:14	gain 49:7,8	108:5 110:4,5,	101:4,21	115:2,20
57:7,10,11	55:25	6 114:21,22	102:6,8,11,14	113.2,20
59:21 81:8		115:2,20	103:4 105:5,11	ground 16:24
99:7	gained 91:16	120:14 122:15	106:15,16	group 43:8,19
33.7	Gardner 5:6,7	geographical	107:7,16,18,	110:15 113:20
funds 8:21	12:24,25	78:7	23,25 108:16	110.13 113.20
15:21 34:9,12	21:10,11 30:8,		109:1,5,11,13,	grows 23:20
56:6,23 74:1,	9 44:25 45:1	getting 94:22	14,24,25 110:8	25:2
17 76:1,12	47:2,3 59:12,	give 25:18	111:23 112:8,	growth 20:05
91:13 98:19	13 67:2,3 71:5,	35:21 43:17	9,11,14,17	growth 22:25
99:4 102:7	6 76:22,23	46:11 64:25	113:7,8,10,14	23:4,6 25:4
109:9 117:12	86:15,16	112:18 126:15	114:6 117:18	guarantees
121:6	104:9,11	112.10 120.13		12:2
funneled	111:10,12	given 25:6	granted 7:10,	40.5
108:23	118:8,9,18	48:23 78:17	15 15:6 29:20	guess 13:5
100.23	119:9,15	81:9 100:6	32:13 33:3	20:22 30:14
further 13:12	123:25 126:5,6	105:7 107:4	53:14 54:4	41:4 42:16,20
38:3 44:22	·	110:23	64:22 68:18	48:25 60:10
48:17 51:9	Gateway 88:9	gives 91.5	72:25 80:12	67:14 90:3
59:3 60:17		gives 81:5	97:25 100:11	103:25 104:3
L				

117:6,7,16	93:5 120:5	hour 24:14	20:2 41:14,17	importance
guys 42:17	122:4	99:21 106:2,3	44:13,16 45:19	100:16
gayo 12.11	hearing 4:7 6:2	116:11	87:9,13 88:5,9	important
	13:11 51:24	hours 24:14	89:10	121:12,13
Н	52:3	37:17 58:16	idea 112:15,23	123:2
		99:23,24		
half-filled	heating 24:11	100:10 115:11	identical 33:18	impossible
125:14	help 21:25	116:7	identified 18:6	87:19
	23:22 40:25		57:9 68:24	improper
handle 22:18	43:12 98:9	However 28:10	69:10 73:24	50:13 66:16
89:7		75:1,17 81:3	77:22	
happen 19:1	helpful 77:5	85:5,22 99:2		improve 10:23
22:16 45:6,15	114:19	102:24 105:7,	identify 11:17	16:2
,	helping 122:22	21 108:9	12:5	improvements
happens	nciping 122.22	hub 28:18	immediate	10:17
24:20,21	helps 23:23	48:3,11 74:10,	16:7 26:1	10.17
hate 121:17	95:10	25 75:4,5,19,		inadequate
	here 4:3,16	22 76:7 77:22,	impact 16:13	66:17
having 6:10	23:10,16 42:25	25 78:3,17	21:24 28:15	inaudible
14:3 25:1	43:4,12 46:10	94:21 95:1,7,	102:23	123:5
26:18 31:3	72:9 79:17,22	14,18	impacts 11:23	123.3
52:9 63:13	87:5 118:13		20:5 84:10	incented 86:25
67:21 71:21	07.5 110.15	hubs 78:1,14	20.5 04.10	incentive
79:6 96:25	Hertz 122:19	94:12 95:17	impedance	54:11,15
108:15 118:15	high 20:2	huge 116:20	22:5,14	55:12,14 69:2,
124:22	28:12 43:17		impending	35.12,14 69.2,
Hayes 5:1,2,3	90:10,11	hundred 23:4	28:5	3
12:21,22 21:7,	105:24	44:15 89:11	20.5	include 11:20
8 30:6,7 44:23,	105.24	hundreds	implement 4:5	16:8 65:24
24 46:24,25	high-speed	121:21	17:1,5 23:9	73:11 75:2
59:8,10 66:25	16:11	121.21	114:1	100:7
67:1 71:3,4	highlighted	Hunter 10:25	implementatio	included 35:10
76:20,21	101:14	Huntington	n 9:25 53:21	57:10,11 60:2
86:12,13		9:24 10:10	54:13 55:11	73:24 100:4
96:20,21 97:3,	history 24:3	11:1,9	66:12 82:7,24	103:13
21 98:1	hit 23:17		00.12 02.1,24	
103:15,16	IIIL 23.17	hypothetical	implemented	includes 34:19
105:15,15	homeless	87:8,18	85:20,25	54:7
114:12 116:2	99:12 108:25		101:17	including
118:3,4 124:4,	112:22	1	implementing	28:12 36:6
5	Honestly 90:9		28:25 66:9	54:3 65:10
				69:14,24 82:9
hear 22:25	Honor 103:8	I-a-n 6:18	implements	84:19
49:17	hope 49:9	lan 6:7,9,18	17:25	
heard 70:19	110pe 49.9		implies 84:6	incorporated
87:8 90:25	host 110:20	Idaho 19:10,11	85:18	82:24
			00.10	
	1	I	l	1

Index: incorrect..kind

incorrect 35:11	initial 17:16	interest 12:4	issue 5:25 18:9	76:18,19 86:8,
increase	23:17 25:13	34:7,11 52:1	21:19 30:16	9 103:22,23
	47:8 49:11	81:12 104:10	40:2 43:1 47:7,	111:16,17
22:14,23 23:15	105:25		15 49:21 55:17	124:7,8
50:16 55:23		interested	70:10 76:6	
102:24	initiatives	77:19	82:5 93:18	jurisdiction
increased	47:17,18 55:1	interests 41:6	104:23 111:3	42:24 82:13
19:23 40:8	innovative	1111010313 41.0	120:23 121:18	89:3
50:10	16:20 18:10	interjurisdictio	125:8,25	jurisdictional
30.10	80:22 92:13	nal 21:2	120.0,20	100:20
increasing	00.22 92.13	into much 404.05	issued 12:4	100.20
23:1	input 104:9	interval 101:25	40.04	jurisdictions
_	· -	into 5:18 7:6,	issues 16:21	49:20 84:11,13
incrementally	install 10:11,22	12 23:13 26:1,	25:5 34:17	91:18
23:19	15:16,21 25:24	3 43:14 46:10	38:4 41:1	
indicate 7:9	installation	53:10 58:16	48:20 70:19	justification
15:5 29:19	15:23 17:17,21	64:19 80:8	95:4 108:22	75:3 77:10
32:12 41:25	19:24 23:22	90:10 96:9	110:23 114:25	justify 75:24
	25:14 36:2	119:10 96:9	119:19 126:12	justify 75:21,
53:13 64:21	25:14 36:2	119:10 122:15	itam 22:20	25
66:15 68:17	installations	introduce 6:3	item 33:20	Justin 4:16
72:24 80:11	17:10		35:23 36:22	
97:24 119:13		introduced	54:6 74:4	
indicated 74:7,	installed 11:22	68:22	items 33:9 41:1	K
20 78:23	15:17	inverse 91:9		
105:25	instance 41:25	iliverse 31.3		keep 125:16
100.20	49:25 60:11	invest 9:9	J	Reep 123.10
indicates		91:13		keeping 13:10
84:12	125:12		J-a-m-e-s 27:1	52:2
in dividual 5:04	instead 45:9	investigate	3-a-111-e-3 21.1	Kannath 5.0
individual 5:21	74:14 87:10	8:13 21:23	James 26:15,	Kenneth 5:8
indulge 92:24	105:20 125:5	investing	17 27:1	118:14,21
•		88:12		kilovolt 15:17
industry 9:15	instructions	00.12	January 33:12	16:4
35:1	32:21	investment	Jennifer 5:6	
inovnoncivo	insufficient	16:14 35:4,11		kilowatt 37:17
inexpensive	75:18	40:13 84:5,7,	Jetter 4:15,16	58:16 100:10
19:17	/ 5.16	22	12:15,16	102:1 106:2
information	intellectual		20:16,17 26:12	115:11 116:10
12:3 38:2 43:9	91:5	investments	29:25 30:1	117:4
49:7 53:24		15:25 45:10	39:16,18 42:5	
58:20 74:16	intelligence	84:15,19 87:2	45:22,24 46:20	kilowatts
	10:23	88:4	51:14,15 52:4,	113:23
infrastructure	intended 9:6	involve 120:23	5,12 53:9,15	kind 21:21 39:6
18:11 54:14	intended 3.0	11140146 120.23	59:2 60:20	49:13,19,21
107:25 108:2	intends 4:19	involved 87:25	63:8,9,16	50:25 58:8
inharant 04:40	intent 77:00	98:20 114:4	64:16,23 66:18	61:17 91:9
inherent 81:10	intent 77:23	117:14 121:19	67:13 71:1,2	
	78:2		07.10 71.1,2	104:5,21
	1	1	1	1

115:19 125:13	lead 19:7 35:11	15:4 20:15,18	19:12 22:16	limited 17:19
kinds 42:15	44:4,8,17 87:2	21:6,9,13,16	lovoroging	20:5 102:5
	100.47	26:10,13	leveraging	104:4 109:21
88:24	learn 100:17	29:18,24 30:2,	102:7	
knowing 56:23	111:2	6,8,10,20,22	liability 34:2	line 19:22 22:6
Kilowing 50.25	learned 91:4	32:11 33:1	54:8	23:1,2 39:24
knowledge	learned 91.4		04.0	50:9 54:5 74:4
81:5,13 82:12	learns 122:24	39:15 42:7	lies 56:1	81:22 82:2
89:13 91:15,21		44:23,25 45:2,		85:21 108:11,
97:18 119:5	least 47:9	21 46:21,24	lieu 18:10	19 109:3 115:1
37.10 113.3	54:24 78:24	47:1,4 48:18	116 405 0 5	13 103.3 113.1
known 8:24	91:14 106:11	51:8,13,17,20	life 125:3,5	lines 34:25
10:3 57:4 60:1		53:12 59:5,8,	126:1	42:19 100:20
93:24	leave 103:19	11,14 60:19,	light 50.00	12110 100120
93.24	1007	22,24 61:11,21	light 58:22	list 12:6
knows 66:1	leaves 122:7	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	like 5:19 6:7	
	leeway 104:23	62:9,15 63:7	8:5 10:6 14:25	little 25:21
KUB 19:19	166Way 104.23	64:20 66:21,25		43:13 61:20
	left 114:22	67:2,4,6,9,11,	15:10 20:22	104:22 120:2
		16 68:16 70:25	25:16 26:15	
L	legislation	71:3,5,8,12,15	27:11,15 30:25	live 73:10
	8:11,15 15:14	72:23 76:17,	32:17 40:24	83:15 99:19
labalad 45.0	34:5	20,22,25 77:3,	48:5 51:23	load 40:0 40
labeled 15:2		15 78:10 79:1	52:6 53:3	load 16:8,12
lack 17:11	legislative		57:20,22 61:21	22:8,11,15,24
100K 17.11	27:4,6 62:4	80:10 86:7,11,	62:5 63:10	23:4,6,10,16,
Lake 28:2,6	92:3	14,18 88:16		20 24:11,13,23
68:3 72:5		89:20,23 90:1	64:10,16,25	25:2 26:4,7
97:11	Legislature	91:24 92:18,23	67:19 71:18	34:23 40:3
07.11	74:2	93:14 94:3,7	72:17 75:21	48:22 85:24
lands 116:17		96:19 97:23	79:4 80:5	86:2 95:6,9
	length 22:6	103:14,21	83:16,18 84:8	00.2 95.0,9
large 122:7	102:10	-	90:17 92:3	loading 16:1
large-scale	lace 10:0 05:0	104:8,13,18	93:4,20 94:15	85:21 107:17
_	less 19:8 25:3	111:9,13,15,19	96:1,11 97:22	108:11,19
15:21	39:3,5 81:7	114:8,11,13	· ·	· ·
largely 47:19	88:10 96:4	117:24 118:2,	104:20 114:21	115:5
go:, 17.10	109:21	5,8,12 119:12	115:9 119:9,18	local 24:16
larger 19:18	lessens 04:4	124:3,6,9,11,	121:9,18	25:25 26:4
-	lessons 91:4	14,16 126:3,7,	122:11 123:19	
last 16:21	let 21:20 31:25	14,21,24	126:22	40:20
20:23 23:2,3	52:3 58:1	17,21,27		locally 38:19
28:10 29:9		level 19:14,15,	likely 28:25	.304
36:22 45:5	103:21 116:8	16,18 23:11,13	39:3,5 70:6	located 28:1
79:14 109:21	125:21	43:17 45:10	98:19	97:10
116:24	letting 125:22	55:14 62:13		
110.4	16ttilly 120.22		Likewise 41:20	location 18:6
lasts 125:17	Levar 4:2,11,	88:3 90:10,11	limit 105:5	115:9,10
	25 5:5,9,22	105:24 121:2		
later 13:23	7:8,13 12:14,	125:17	110:8	locations 49:3
l	1.0,10 12.14,		limitation o	1
law 117:10 14	10 21 22 12:1	lovole 40.4	Imitations	I IUUICAI 1x.P
law 117:10,14,	18,21,23 13:1, 9,15,19,21	levels 12:4 16:13,17 18:20	limitations 17:6	logical 18:6 104:15

Index: long..micrograms

long 24:6	31:12	manner 81:7	matters 5:11	means 8:16
78:21 83:9	made 19:1	many 17:10	6:4 52:21	measurable
93:25 114:5,6	20:23 40:13	92:14 120:24	126:7	9:9
long-term	43:6,18 45:7		mature 17:9	
11:24	63:1,25 65:18	marked 97:15		measurement
	66:1,3 69:23	119:2	may 8:16 9:3,	36:13
long-winded	84:18 88:5	market 28:16,	10 10:18 23:7	measures
104:5	89:3 100:16	18,19,20 35:18	25:4,14 34:3	18:18
longer 105:8	103:11	37:21 38:24	61:1 70:10	
125:18		46:9,16 48:11,	82:13 88:17	mechanism
123.10	main 99:6	12 56:11 58:15	89:10 90:13	56:19
longevity	110:23,25	74:11,25 75:5,	91:20 106:19	maat 0:20 0:6
125:2	113:21,23	9,20,25 77:22	110:6 114:15,	meet 8:20 9:6
leaked 445.00	maintanana	78:19 94:21	16	16:22 92:12
looked 115:23	maintenance 50:21 57:2	101:10 105:1	maybe 51:15	meeting 9:23
120:7			_	110:15
looking 20:10	98:13 102:9	107:1	90:5 117:3	
24:18 35:7.8	major 18:5	marketing	120:15 126:16	meetings 55:6
39:22,24 41:5	_	100:5,7	Mcdougal 4:13	mention
46:9,14 96:3	make 13:7		30:15,25 31:2,	121:24
115:25 125:10	23:21 25:18	Martinez 4:24	7,11 32:9,10	
	27:11 34:8	61:2 68:23	38:10 39:12,20	mentioned
loss 27:22 29:7	41:7,16,18,19	70:15 71:18,	42:11 47:5	33:5 34:21
losses 115:1	43:3,15 44:1	20,25 72:3	51:9,23 61:23	35:6 38:18,19
	45:16 49:11	73:2 76:14	65:8,20 69:21	41:11 94:13
lost 91:21	53:3 64:10	79:2	70:12 74:19	121:8
lot 24:11,12,24	65:25 72:18	Martinez's	75:1,13 83:20	merit 88:12
48:14 87:19	78:12 80:5	93:5	84:1 85:1 93:3,	105:18 107:5
96:7,15 123:8	84:8 87:1		12,16 96:20	103.10 107.3
125:17	113:3 122:9	Marx 13:25	107:12,14,18	meter 28:8
123.17	makes 20:25	14:2,11 15:8		metering
low 20:4	102:12	20:13 34:22	Mcdougal's	17:18,22 18:8
lower 9:4 11:14		38:18 40:11	21:22 61:13	25:17,20
22:14 23:17	making 84:6	42:15 44:20	65:13 78:18	111:24
	93:18	48:1 50:2 87:5	83:20 108:3	111.24
63:1 82:3	manage	115:5 126:10,	mean 13:5	meters 102:1
lowest 40:15	120:12	23,25	48:25 50:19	moth = 1,00,04
58:5 63:2	120.12	Marx's 15:1	61:16 90:16	method 28:21
93:22 94:12,14	management	41:13 86:25	95:11 103:17	74:13 76:5
95:3	33:11 36:8	41.13 00.23	109:4 115:15	82:22 89:7
	69:4 85:19	material 125:3	116:23	methodology
	managing	math 116:9		85:4 96:10
M	managing 107:25	117:5	meaning 46:14	
	107.23	U.111.3	meaningful	methods 9:5
M-a-r-x 14:11	mandated	matter 4:4	116:21	metrics 17:24
	92:11	95:11 106:21	110.21	
	JZ.11	00		
M-c-d-o-u-g-a-l	32.11	112:25 115:8		micrograms

Index: Mid-c..non-wire

				id-C., Holl-wire
28:8	36:8,22 37:23	motion 7:9,10,	84:23	96:23 120:10
Mid-c 28:20	58:24 70:8	15 15:6 29:20	multiple 9:7	121:8,14,25
30:13 77:8	105:14	32:13 33:2	95:17 106:20	negative
94:13,23 96:2	modified 110:1	53:14 64:21,22	95.17 100.20	102:22
34.13,23 30.2	inodined 110.1	68:17,18 72:25	multiplied 22:5	102.22
middle 24:12	moment 59:16	80:11,12 97:25	multiply	neighborhood
26:6	88:14	119:13,14	116:12,18	121:11
might 5:22 6:2	money 20:2,3	Mountain 4:4,	110.12,10	net 56:17
23:5 24:8	122:9	11 6:6,21	Murray 4:24	111:24 114:22
40:19 45:17		10:21 13:25	67:19,20 68:2	
78:14	monies 11:15	14:14 17:16	70:22 71:16	netted 90:7
	month 106:17	26:15 27:3	mutually	network 9:23
mike 97:12	122:11 124:25	30:24 31:14	108:11,14,20	10:9,11,19
miles 42:18		51:12,21 81:24	100.11,14,20	22:12
	monthly 33:13,	83:19 92:25		
million 8:12	24,25 99:21	93:4 98:5	N	Networks
10:7 11:3	months 106:20	119:20 126:9		54:19
15:16,20	122:6 125:4		name 6:16,18	neural 9:23
millisecond		move 5:12,20	14:10 22:9	10:9,11,19
122:20	more 11:6,8,11	7:4,11 14:25	26:24 31:9,11	54:18
	17:5 18:14	19:21 29:15	52:15 63:18,20	
mind 12:9	19:20 20:3	32:6,24 41:15	67:25 68:2	Nevada 119:23
88:10	23:19 24:22	49:11 53:9 64:17 80:7	72:1,3 79:11,	new 17:22
minimum 28:3	25:3 39:3 42:2,	92:25 97:22	13,14 97:6,8	25:20 33:21
56:8	20 43:13	119:9	118:20,21	36:7 42:18
	45:14,17 49:5,	119.9	naturally 44:16	48:21 49:6
mischaracterizi	7 61:1 62:18	moved 7:6	Haturally 44.10	54:12 66:2
ng 91:2	73:16 81:7 84:13 87:19	32:22 47:23	necessarily	69:15,19,25
misperception	96:3 101:23	moving 118:10	5:16 44:7 77:7	89:16 120:8,19
120:16	102:23 104:22		necessary	121:9
mics 9:10	110:6 112:24	Mr.mcdougal	13:8 69:11	next 24:18
miss 8:10	120:3 123:3	85:18	10.0 00.11	57:12 78:15
missed 21:23		Mr.olsen 71:16	need 13:11	87:17 96:14
111:1 114:16	morning 4:2,15		15:25 16:14	
mitigate 16:3	5:2,6,11 6:14,	MSP 84:23	21:19 22:1,10	night 25:15
18:2	15 14:7 26:22,	MSP-TYPE	24:7,16 48:23	122:13
	23 31:7,8	82:10	49:11 51:25	nitrogen 8:24
mix 122:15	39:20,21	0=1.10	55:24 73:23	
mixes 121:16	42:11,12	much 19:20	82:23 84:13	nominal 34:24
	52:13,14 53:20	55:25 78:9	98:19 117:3	non-attainment
model 40:14	63:17 65:1	108:22 111:6	121:10	28:2,6
modernization	73:6 86:21,23	123:3,11 125:15	needed 35:21	
18:5	97:4,5 118:19	120.15	37:24 107:17	non-wire
	most 43:8,23	multi-state	noods 05:10	119:21 120:5,
modifications	48:11 50:3,7	56:5 82:10	needs 25:10 34:6 78:19	6,16
			34.070.19	
1			1	1

				1 04 05
non-wires	objection 7:9	76:3,9 77:7,20	60:11 61:2,6	64:25
98:11 100:19	13:10 33:1	79:3,16,19	73:15,22 74:2	operate 9:13
110:22 120:25	68:17 72:24	80:7 81:10,14	once 19:20	25:8 28:10,14,
none 36:8	97:24 103:15,	82:11,18 83:2,	29:4 42:20	15 29:5 50:22
	17 104:2,10,19	6 84:12 87:13	122:23	94:25 120:12
noted 69:13	objective 8:20	88:22 101:3		
70:3 104:19	10:12,15 11:9	105:18,22	one 4:7,13 5:17	operated 109:1
notes 85:21		106:1,3,5	9:21 11:6,7,10	operating
102:5	objectively	118:23	21:18 22:13,15	28:17 50:10,
	18:12	Office's 57:7	26:4 30:14	17,20,21
nothing 66:14,	objectives 9:7,	73:19,20 84:2	32:19 38:17	
23 89:19 92:21	8 110:24,25	105:16 106:7	43:22 44:13	operation
104:11 117:13	,		45:5 48:1,13,	27:22 37:19
121:2	objects 15:5	offset 40:20	20,24 53:23	57:1
noticed 4:8	29:19 32:12	99:16 100:1,13	54:3 55:8	operational
HOUGG 4.0	64:21 77:21	102:2 112:3	57:15 59:16,19	11:22 16:16
notification	80:11 119:13	offsets 101:21	60:25 62:17	17:11,24 18:3,
28:4	obtain 16:16		63:3 70:17	13 50:12
November	Jotain 10.10	offsetting	73:7,13 77:7,	10 00.12
	obtained 75:12	99:23 102:20	12 78:3,6,10,	operations
52:24,25 64:6 66:6 68:8,14	occasion 72:8	offsite 111:24	21 81:2 84:8	17:13 102:9
69:22 72:12,15	79:20	Olisile 111.24	87:1 88:14	opinion 44:10
79:25 80:1	79.20	often 24:5	91:23 92:24	60:15 78:11
	occupation	old 48:22	93:19 94:1	92:9 117:9
83:21 97:15 119:2	52:16 63:18	010 40.22	95:7,18,22	92.9 117.9
119.2		Olsen 4:21	96:5 102:1	opportunities
NOX 8:24 9:25	occur 22:19,22	12:18,19	110:23,24	9:15 44:19
10:2,13 11:4,8,	26:7	20:19,21 21:5	112:2 115:13	
11,12,16 54:18	OCS 75:14	30:3,4 42:8,10	120:15 121:24	opportunity
73:8	0000 4070	44:21 45:6	ones 51:9	7:18 13:4 15:9
	OCS'S 107:2	46:22,23 59:6,	Olies 31.9	16:22 17:4
nuance 103:24	October 7:22	7 66:22,23	ongoing 36:8	21:23 55:1
number 8:21	9:22 10:5	67:17,18,24	60:10 102:9	63:24 65:2
16:5 17:13		68:13,19 70:22	online 105:7,	89:1 91:14
69:19 95:14	offer 98:15	71:17,24 72:20	10 107:5	100:17 111:1
112:11,20	offered 75:2	73:1 76:14	109:22 110:17	oppose 75:7
,		79:2,3,9 80:7,	116:5	83:6 101:3
	office 4:22	13 83:14,22	110.5	
0	12:20 30:5	86:4 88:17,19	only 17:12,19	opposed 43:3
	34:18 56:25	89:18 92:19,21	22:16 28:13	44:15 74:20
oath 126:25	61:3 67:18	104:8,13,14	35:9 41:14,22	77:7 102:19
	68:4,22 69:12,	111:13,14	44:14 45:12	105:6
object 53:13	17,23 70:2,10,	124:9,10	46:15 47:15	opposition
58:3 77:24	14,16 71:17	OMAC 40:0	67:13 81:11	7:14
103:9 104:7,16	72:4 73:14,22,	OMAG 13:6	122:5	
118:10	25 74:15	57:2,4,8,10,19	ononing FO:OF	optimal 43:9
	75:13,17,23	59:20,22,24	opening 58:25	
ļ .				

optimization	7:25	participate	percent 19:12	phase 4:7 5:16
10:11,17,19	7.25	7:19 113:9,11	20:1 41:15,16	9:21 38:5
10.11,17,19	outweigh	7.19 115.9,11	44:15,16	53:23 54:3
optimize 19:6	56:18	particular 11:5	45:13,18 46:3,	55:3,8 57:15
optimized	over 8:12 10:8	21:18 24:3	5 58:11 87:14,	70:17,19 73:7,
41:23	23:19 27:21	42:1	16 88:6 89:11,	13 113:12
	69:17 70:5,6	particularly	12 103:5	
option 35:4	78:1 111:3	16:6	125:6,17	philosophical
45:15 96:7			,	117:8
options 43:20,	overall 45:7,	parties 7:20,25	percentages	phrase 50:9,19
22 84:5 98:12	11,14 50:11	12:13 20:14	66:4	
106:22 107:9	66:11,15	29:22 35:6,9	perform 11:6	physical 16:23
	overpriced	37:24 53:12		picking 93:22
order 11:17	116:24 117:1	59:4 70:23	performance	96:4
53:23 70:17		76:15 85:7,14	12:2 18:3,13	
73:10 83:15	oversubscribin	86:5 100:25	19:6	pilot 18:6
ordered 39:1	g 103:2	112:4 123:15 124:1	performed 9:1,	32:20 54:23 57:5,9 59:22
75:6 114:1	overvalued	124.1	16	60:4 65:24
Orogon 25:17	90:13	partner 10:20	perhaps 105:9	66:7 98:5
Oregon 35:17 45:16,19 85:5,	own 78:19	partnering	106:10	100:17 102:11
9,13	102:7	12:5		105:9 110:24,
5,15			perimeter	25 121:6
organizations	oxides 8:24	party 5:24 15:4	19:22	
36:4 37:16		32:12 64:21	period 8:13	place 74:5
99:22 112:19	Р	72:23 119:13	10:8 24:15	78:19 79:11
116:21		126:8	25:17 27:21	87:22
others 43:19	D!6'	party's 109:7	33:14 59:22	plan 4:6 36:24
47:24 50:2	Pacificorp 33:12 49:3	naged 25:45	60:5,13 65:25	38:1 65:7,10
63:4 98:9	81:25 82:17	passed 35:15	70:5,7 102:11	70:3,14 80:23
othomusiae FC: 4	01.20 02.17	passion	105:9	planning 49:15
otherwise 56:4	pages 68:9	103:24	periods 22:17	87:3 94:19
outlined 38:5	Palo 28:20	past 117:21	23:11,18 27:24	98:13
55:5 65:12	30:13 77:8	-	28:12	
output 46:15	94:13 96:2	pay 91:6 98:20		plans 65:12
56:12 83:8		payers 81:14	permeate	plant 8:19
101:11,20	panels 90:5,6		18:14 26:3	10:18 11:9
105:19 106:14	parent 81:24	paying 19:16	permit 101:15	27:23 28:1,3
107:2,7 109:12	-	46:3	•	33:21 34:1
114:20 115:24	part 5:16 13:5	peak 22:16	permitting	54:9
116:8	24:4 27:5	26:5 115:5	11:23	plants 11:4
outoido 57:0	28:22 34:21		personnel	plants 11:1
outside 57:6	47:12 51:3	peaks 22:22	55:21,24	34:3
59:25 60:7 74:3	56:14 72:7,11 79:18 105:11	people 48:10	norenoctive	platform 18:12
14.3	116:14 122:7	116:22	perspective 47:8 92:9	plus 56:23
outstanding	110.14 122.1		94:20	pius 50.23
			97.20	
	I		I	

PM2.5 28:2	potentially	69:6 80:14	47:9 48:22	production
PM2.5. 28:8	74:22 92:14	present 6:3	62:8,14 81:21	35:19
	104:1	_	82:3,21,23	profile 25:7
point 13:16	power 4:5,12	presentation	85:21 88:5	-
21:14 24:21	6:6,21 10:21	5:12	89:9 119:22	program 7:2
34:24 97:21	13:25 14:14	presented 10:4	122:4,12,25	9:20 11:10
115:25 126:14	16:1,9,12,21	53:24 61:13	125:23	15:3 16:5 27:8
points 8:10	17:17 18:1	70:14 74:24	problems 18:3	28:23 29:1,3,4,
1 -	23:13 24:6	75:18	22:4 23:12	12 32:20 34:21
pole 19:17,20	26:15 27:3,23		40:7 45:9	35:14,17,22
poles 16:15	28:1,2,17,21	presenting	120:17 121:15,	36:1,5,8,12,15,
1 -	30:24 31:14	87:21	16,17 122:9	18,20 37:9,11,
policy 27:4,6	36:17 37:19	presume 78:23	proceed 0:0	14,15,18,20
47:11 92:12	48:4 51:22	_	proceed 8:8 15:13 27:18	38:12,14,20
pollution 28:13	62:21 74:9,14	previous 11:22	28:25 73:5	39:2,9,24 40:1, 25 49:13 54:3,
1 -	75:8,16 76:6	previously	83:23	7,11,12,15,16,
portfolio 62:7	77:6 78:24	114:1	03.23	17,18 55:9,12,
121:15	83:19 90:8		proceeding	14,20 56:7,16
portion 11:16	92:25 93:4	price 62:20	5:17 6:25 7:18	57:3,6,9,18
35:9 37:13,17	94:23 95:13,19	66:6 76:1	33:6 55:3	59:22 60:5,12
99:17 100:1,13	119:20 126:9	90:23 94:21	57:15 70:11	61:5,13 65:24,
110:8	Power's 51:12	117:3	75:19 76:2,8	25 66:7 69:2,3
	81:24 98:5	prices 48:12	80:18 90:18	73:9 74:7,12
portions 35:7		94:19 95:13	93:25	76:4 83:8,12
position 27:2	practically	96:9	PROCEEDING	85:10,20,22
31:13 57:23	40:8	prioing 20:20	S 4:1	90:13 98:22,23
59:24 61:5,8	precise 21:19	pricing 28:20 48:3	4.1	99:2,4,5,7,10,
62:23 72:2	_	40.3	process 9:2	12 100:6,14
76:3 79:12	predicted 28:7	primary 18:18,	11:18 50:15	101:4 102:14,
92:1 93:6 97:6	prefer 93:23,24	19 22:3,6	66:11,16	25 103:4
118:20		101:9 107:13	75:11,12 82:9,	105:11,12,13,
positions	preference 6:1	115:4 125:1	10 84:24	20,23 106:6,
109:8	30:12	prior 12:2	87:22,25 88:22	10,12 107:7,
	prefiled 7:5	17:21 109:23	89:5,13 94:10	16,19,23,24,25
possibility	53:6 64:2,13	110:16	processes	108:1,13,16,21
83:15 87:4	68:6		10:18 43:11	109:1,2,5,11,
possible 43:24		probably 20:2		20,25 110:7,
56:1	preliminary	23:3 41:24	produce	13,16,24,25
	5:11 6:4	58:19,20	110:11	111:23,24
postponing	prepare 6:24	60:15,16 62:18	produced	112:1,6,8,9,10,
88:12	12:6 14:18	100:12 114:25	46:11 101:23	16 113:6,7,8,
potential 12:6	15:9 27:6,14	115:14,22	109:16 110:7	10,14,19
13:4 28:23	31:18	116:15 126:15	124:24	114:2,5 115:12
91:4 98:10	propored 0:4	problem 19:10,	produces	116:14,23
102:22 105:23	prepared 8:4 32:15 53:17	13 35:2 43:23	102:23	117:10
	32.10 00.17		102.23	
			1	l

programs 4:5	12:8 17:1,5	propose 34:20	55:21,22 69:9	63:22 83:3
33:11,24 47:21	34:22 39:4	50:6 68:11	78:11 80:17	113:18
53:22,25 54:3,	40:20 60:7	82:20,22 87:23	81:6 83:16	pull 94:25
23 57:14 59:25	73:8,14 81:1	99:14 114:2	84:17 85:6	puii 94.25
66:10 73:17	87:23 88:8	proposed 9:19	98:2 104:16	purchase
80:22 85:24	91:12 92:6	10:10 11:6	108:7 116:20	78:24
114:6 117:18	111:2 117:15,	31:21 33:9	122:18	nurnage 24:10
progress 54:22	16 121:21	34:14 35:6	provided	purpose 34:10 36:1 68:20
progress 54.22	123:10	36:13,23 37:9	36:21,22 42:14	121:7 122:6
prohibit 117:11	promising 9:10	54:2 57:16	44:2 56:17	125:1
project 10:6,7,	_	61:12 65:4,7,	58:18 65:9	125.1
10,20 11:2,3,6	promote 9:17	17 66:2,5,12,	73:3 75:14	purposes 48:4
14:1 15:22	promoting	16 69:1,13	101:4 115:11	62:10
16:7 17:8,12	121:22	70:9 73:16		pursuant 8:10
18:8 24:17		80:19 82:25	provider 10:21	15:14 27:19
34:25 42:1	promotion	85:23 88:9,22	providers 12:7	
45:12 47:12,13	98:21	96:10 106:3,5	125:9	pursue 39:4
55:20 56:6,9,	prompted	111:23		94:8
24 57:24	21:21		provides 18:11	pursuing 81:3
58:16,18,24		proposes 8:21	36:15 38:1	
61:24 62:1	proper 17:23	15:20 28:16,18	108:19 115:9	push 20:6
80:20,21,24,25	properly 37:8,	29:2 56:10	providing	put 25:17
81:3,5,9,10,11,	10 61:1 85:16	75:4 84:8	16:11,22 99:19	38:11 78:17
17,19,21 82:4,		90:12 101:18	103:6 104:2	
5,14,19 83:1,6	property 91:5	102:4,10	108:12,20	putting 46:9
84:2,9 85:1,3,	proportionately	proposing	109:3 115:3,6	47:7 96:15
5,9,14,24 87:9,	101:21	11:2 46:8		113:15 117:7
12,14,17,20		55:16 106:2	provisions	120:19
89:10 91:1,5,	proportions	122:3	70:8	PV 98:18
16,20 92:2,4,	56:16	protect 102:22	proxies 77:13	100:11 102:23
10,11,12,14,15	proposal 11:18	103:6 110:9	93:10	103:3,5 104:25
98:5,8,15,17,	17:12 36:15	103.0 110.9	provimity 70.7	108:4,6,10
20,25 100:17	38:11 56:21	protections	proximity 78:7	116:4
105:7,10,19	65:16 73:18	40:18	95:5,6	
107:4 108:9,18	83:7 98:25	protocol 47:16,	proxy 28:16,19	
109:10 112:3	99:18,20	19 56:5 82:10	48:13 74:11,25	Q
113:22 115:3,	100:6,9 101:3,	84:23	75:6,9,20,25	
8,10 117:12,13	8,15 102:6,19		77:12,22	quality 16:21
121:6,18 122:3	104:3 105:17,	prove 49:12	78:14,19 93:8,	18:1,25 27:24,
123:2,9	25 106:23	proven 17:10	17,21,24 94:1,	25 28:4,5 29:6,
projected	107:1,2,11	•	22 95:24	9
106:13 110:11	108:23 119:20	proves 49:25	96:13,14	quantifiable
	proposals	provide 9:14	prudent 78:22	36:16
projects 6:8	113:2 119:24	12:1 16:5,20	·	
8:22 9:1,6,8,	110.2 110.2	17:3,22 33:7	public 4:3,17	quantified
19,22 10:4			34:7,11 52:18	73:24
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
			200 220 1110	

question 5:15	115:23	rationale 30:14	32:9,16 33:6	Recognizing
13:5 21:18,21		48:7	34:16 38:6	18:3 24:1
22:21,25 24:1	quite 121:8		39:23 50:8	_
38:25 40:22		re-call 93:12	52:25 53:10	recommend
41:4 46:1 47:8	R	re-conductor	61:14 65:8,13,	70:7 75:24
48:1,24 50:11		23:5	20 66:3 69:20	82:18 99:4
58:2 59:19		20.0	72:15,21	105:8 109:9
60:14,25 61:1,	R&d 80:25	re-	73:12,16 74:19	110:13,20
22 88:21	81:3,4,10,12	conductoring	75:15 79:25	recommendati
91:19,24 92:24	82:12 91:1,11	23:7 40:7	83:20,25 85:2,	
93:2 94:4	121:7,19	120:20	19 103:19	on 37:2 57:8,
104:7 115:14	45.44			24,25 58:23
	raise 45:11	re-cross 45:22	107:12 123:15	59:20,21 65:23
117:7 124:19	raised 34:17	46:21 47:1	126:11,23	74:20 101:12
125:8,19	73:14 94:7	re-litigate	rebuttals	105:6 107:6
questions 7:25	126:12	93:19	100:25	109:6 123:18
8:2 12:13,16,				recommendati
19,22,25 13:2,	raises 84:11	reach 34:24	rebutting	ons 65:21
12,16,20,22	107:13	42:1	103:9,11	69:23 70:1
20:13,14,17	***** 100.7		recall 61:3	73:21 98:15
21:8,11,15	ramp 123:7	reactive 16:11	recail 01.3	
26:9 29:22	range 18:7	readily 115:15	receive 56:16	101:5,6,16
	43:21		58:12 85:3	102:16,18
30:1,4,7,9,21		reading 8:9	99:8 102:1	105:5 106:8
39:12,13,19	rapidly 23:9	ready 52:6	110:15 113:3	110:18 123:20
42:6 44:22	rate 8:18 36:7			recommended
47:5 48:17	57:12 81:13	real 31:25	received	55:10 58:9,25
49:18 51:7,22	82:9 84:14	104:6	112:12	65:10 69:17
53:5 59:3,4,9	87:17 90:14	roolity 04:40	receives 112:7	74:11,15,23
60:18,23 61:12	95:24 99:9	reality 94:19	10001100 112.7	87:15
63:6 64:12	100:14	95:8	receiving	07.10
66:19,20 67:3,	100.14	really 25:12	109:15	recommends
5,7,8,10 70:23	ratepayers	43:19 48:14	rocontly	37:6 38:4 54:4,
71:1,2,4,6,9,	81:8,12 85:17	87:18 92:8	recently	21 55:2 56:8
10,13 76:15,	99:1 101:11,13	95:25 116:11,	106:24	57:13 76:9
19,21,23 77:2,	102:22 103:7	20 120:10	recess 51:16,	109:18
18 86:5,8,9,13,	105:2,21	122:21 125:23	19 126:20	***
16 88:15 89:24	108:13 110:10			reconvene
95:21 96:18		reason 30:12	recipient's	51:18
101:4 111:8,	rates 11:13	48:7 69:16	106:16	record 5:19
10,14,17	20:7 46:16	95:23	recipients	6:17 7:7,12
117:23,25	57:12 59:23	recentle.	98:24 99:11	14:10 26:25
118:4 124:1,4,	60:2 106:4	reasonable	100:9 101:22	31:10 51:21
5,8,10,12,15	rather 50:0	36:16 75:15		52:16 53:10
126:4,11	rather 52:2	119:25	102:6,8 109:14	63:19 64:19
•	74:3 75:9	reasons 75:23	112:11,14,18	72:1 79:11
quick 31:25	99:23 101:19		recipients'	97:7 118:20
quickly 45:5	125:23	rebuttal 21:22	99:17	31.1 110.20
quickly 40.0		30:16 31:19,23		
	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	

Index: recovery..result

				JOVELY I CBUIC
recovery 74:3	107:21	remain 51:24	representing	reserving
87:16	regarding	remains	4:11,16 5:7	110:9
recross 89:21	42:15 59:20	106:18	118:22	resource 5:7
	73:14,19,22		request 11:18	6:22,23 98:18
red 84:11	88:24 105:4	remove 55:14	12:3 37:1	118:22
redirect 45:2	108:3	115:1	51:15 56:13	
60:19,20		removed 57:12	126:10	resources 9:13
88:16,18	regeneration			21:24 25:16
114:11	25:9	renewable	requested 29:8 36:9	55:23 56:1
maduaa 10.1	regularly 84:6	16:24 18:4,14	36.9	84:13
reduce 16:1	rogulation	56:24	requesting	respect 13:5
22:15 23:16 85:24 107:17	regulation 19:14 34:10	repackaged	8:11 15:15	52:20 57:23
108:11 115:5	122:18 125:13	113:20	27:20 34:9	61:2,4,14
117:3	122.10 125.15	ropockaging	requests 16:23	73:13 74:6
	regulatory	repackaging 113:6,13	54:1 70:16	93:7 114:20
reduced 9:13	33:17 34:2	,	76:1,6	respectfully
125:5 126:1	42:23 54:8	rephrase 58:1	·	38:3
reduces 86:1	70:4,6	replace 123:4,	require 25:4	
108:19	reimburse 76:1	5	36:6 74:15	respectively
			75:24 76:10	119:3
reducing 8:17	rejection 16:12	replacement	85:11	respond 83:19
16:8	related 33:16,	28:17,21 29:7	required 17:14,	102:15 103:15,
reduction 8:22,	21 36:20 47:16	36:17 37:19	23 35:1 54:22	18
23 9:25 10:3,	69:23 70:1,19	48:4 62:21	69:18 84:17	roopended
13 54:18,19	73:8 92:4,11,	74:9,14,21	requirement	responded 106:1
73:8	12 120:18	75:1,8,16 76:5 94:23 95:1,12	31:16,18 76:10	100.1
reductions 9:9	relating 57:3	94.23 93.1,12		response 34:9
10:13,16		replicate 111:2	requirements	73:11 75:14
·	relation 45:25	report 54:22	24:3 55:4	78:6 80:1
refer 30:17	62:21		57:16 65:11	88:20 101:7,9
80:20	relationship	reporter 79:14	73:15,19 75:3	103:17 104:4
reference	47:10 91:9	126:15	requiring 40:7	105:17 106:7
62:20 69:17	ualativ-al	reporting	research 6:8	107:10,20
rofino 25:24	relatively 19:17 48:21	34:15 36:24	8:13 9:16,20	responses
refine 25:21	19.17 48.21	37:25 38:1	10:22 11:6,15	78:6
reflect 66:5	release 24:24	55:4 57:16	80:25 81:1	responsible
reflecting	released 26:1	61:13,15 65:7,		102:8
37:23		9,10,12 70:13,	researched	
	releasing 52:1	15,19 73:15,	8:17	rest 51:24
refresh 62:19,	relevant 6:2	17,19,20 75:2	resembles	restrictions
22	64:1 76:7	reports 54:24	48:12	47:20
regard 40:13		-		
41:8 98:16	reliability	representative	reserve 74:1	result 9:4,8
101:10 106:21	11:24 18:1	41:5	77:9	47:22 56:3 110:6
	50:25			110.0
	l	I	I	l

resulting 37:19	Road 118:24	116:25 121:13	19,24,25	24:7 43:5
results 35:5	roads 121:11	Salt 28:2,6	90:17,18,22,23 106:4 107:2	sensible
50:10,17,18,20	Robert 52:8,23	68:3 72:5	115:18 116:16	125:24
retail-type	53:11	97:10	scheduled	separate 32:25
90:14	robust 89:13	same 19:22	29:5 105:11	90:18
retain 46:4		45:15 49:19,21		sequestration
56:20	Rocky 4:4,11 6:6,21 10:21	53:5,7 56:16 64:12,14 85:4	schedules 54:10 65:5,19	8:23
retained 56:9	13:24 14:14	87:9,20 94:8,	·	serve 20:8 95:9
	17:16 26:14	25 95:1 109:13	scheduling	
return 13:23	27:3 30:24	122:25	73:10	serves 81:25
revenue 31:16,	31:14 51:11,21	Sarah 5:4	schools	service 4:3
17	81:24 83:19	96:22,24 97:8	112:19	20:8 37:16
review 55:1,8	92:25 93:4 98:5 119:20	satisfy 25:10	SCR 10:3	65:18 81:6 99:22
63:24 65:3	126:9	61:14 62:3	11:13 54:19	
66:14 72:8			screen 116:2	services 4:22
79:20 88:23 89:1 101:7	room 5:23 13:10 93:2	savings 56:9	second 11:2	14:16,18 68:5 72:4 79:16,19
105:11 109:7,		say 24:19 40:6	33:20 35:23	,
23	rough 115:19	41:13 43:1 46:10 89:4	102:4 107:18	Services' 57:1
reviewed 53:20	roughly 29:9	94:12 95:2	122:17,20	serving 34:25
66:13	49:2	103:5 114:25	secondary	session 126:13
reviews 113:2	RPS 62:3 92:4,	116:15 120:22	115:4	
	10,11	121:21 125:20	section 80:22	set 99:24 105:5 110:14 112:21
revised 55:9,	rule 47:21	saying 39:6		125:13
11,13 66:8	117:11	44:3 60:3 88:2	seek 74:3	setting 105:8
revising 54:9,	rules 49:20	94:21 95:15	seeks 74:17	111:23
10		96:13 114:20 117:17 122:23	76:11	
revisions	run 48:10		seem 104:19	seven 9:19 31:24 122:19
57:17 80:4	running 83:11	says 84:3	seems 48:20	
Rex 4:21	123:4	scalable 23:8,	104:14	several 5:15
RFP 12:3,7		19	sees 81:15	53:25 88:8
•	S	scale 9:12 10:1	82:11 105:18	shaping 98:21
rings 120:22	_	11:4	select 36:3	share 8:5
ripple 23:14	S-t-e-v-e-n	scenarios	38:21 113:20	15:10 27:15
risk 28:24	31:12	24:21,25		32:17 86:1
50:25 81:2,4	S.B. 66:13	schedule 4:8	selected 9:6	123:19
risks 17:6	said 20:23	36:7 54:11	Selective 10:2	sheet 36:21
81:10	25:16 40:12	55:11 65:16,	Senate 27:19	55:13 57:17
RMP 32:8,9	48:11 62:18	19,23 66:2,5,6	sense 21:1	65:19
1XIVIF 32.0,9	78:6 96:11	69:2,4,14,18,	301130 Z1.1	sheets 31:21

37:22 55:10	significant	situs-type 39:9	32:6,14,23	121:1
65:5 66:8	23:9 25:4 99:1	air 100:0	33:4 36:25	a a law/b attawy
69:12	a i a un ifi a a un i lu c	six 120:9	39:11 45:4,20	solar/battery
ah altana 00.40	significantly	sizable 70:5	51:10,11	80:21,24 81:9,
shelters 99:12	82:3 126:1		59:15,16,18	11,18 82:4,5,
108:25 112:23	similar 10:25	size 22:14	60:17 67:5	14,25 83:1
shift 26:5	11:13 17:1	90:21	71:8,9 77:1,2	84:9,25 85:23
1.64 1.45 40	33:18 35:16	Sky 15:21	86:18,20 88:14	89:10
shifted 45:13	40:18,20 41:2,	16:23 35:23,24	89:21,22 93:11	solely 62:2,3
shifting 122:11	8 99:4 101:24	36:1 37:13	103:8 111:19,	95:13
1	111:25 112:17	56:14,15,22,23	21 114:7,9,10	
short 12:6	113:5 119:23	83:7,8,12	124:11,12	solid 119:21
22:16 23:11,18		98:19,21,23,25	126:9,18,21,22	solution 17:8,
25:17 126:16	similarities	99:2,3,7,11	Calamalania	9,13 82:2,16,
short-term	61:25	101:4,19	Solander's	20,23 84:21
23:8	simple 103:1	102:8,14	88:21	88:11 119:22
	116:5	105:12,19,20	solar 14:1	120:8
should 35:14,		106:6,10	15:2,22,23	
25 36:2 37:20	simplest	107:7,22,24	16:18,25 17:3	solutions
38:23 39:6,10	106:11	108:13,16,24	18:7 24:18	16:21 35:2
40:13,14 47:17	simply 90:23	109:2,5,9,11,	25:7,14,23	42:16,17
56:16 57:5,8,	94:10	14,24 110:13,	26:2 34:20	120:4,5,7,16
11 58:12 60:8		15 112:9	35:14,17,18,21	121:1,15
69:18 74:1	simultaneously	113:8,10 114:5	36:2,20 37:8,	solve 25:5 40:2
75:25 84:16,21	103:2	116:23 117:3,	11,13,17,18	45:8 85:20
85:4,11,12	since 6:1 17:16	10,17,20	38:13,20 39:1,	88:4 120:16
89:7 91:6,9,13	28:13 29:8		23 46:15	122:4,8,24
99:3 105:13	73:9 90:21	sleep 116:3	54:10,15	
109:13,21,25	98:22	slipstream	55:12,18,20	solving 81:21
110:3,12 113:3	00.22	11:7	56:6,15 57:18	somehow 91:7
117:8,17	sincere		60:11 61:24	
121:22	103:17,18	small 24:22	62:6,12 69:2,3	someone
shoulder 89:11	sincerely	25:13 113:22	80:19 81:4	116:18
	102:17	smaller 44:12,	83:4,9,10 85:5	something
shouldn't 95:8	102.17	13	87:9 90:4 98:6,	44:1 49:10
116:15	sit 125:21,22		17,18 99:5,8,9,	62:1 90:16
show 85:12	site 33:10	software 10:21	15,25 100:2,3,	92:3 103:25
104:1	113:15	Solandar 67:4	11,14 101:10,	115:1
	113.13		24 102:3,13	
showed 116:6	sited 115:8	Solander 4:10,	106:25 107:1,	sometimes
shown 122:21	situs 46:5	11 5:13,14 6:5,	7,15 108:1,6,	125:14,16
3110WII 122.21	47:17 84:15	6,13 7:4,11,16	17,21 109:12,	somewhere
side 19:21		13:13,23,24	20,22 110:17	62:19
20:2,4 48:15	85:22 87:2	14:6,25 15:7	112:1,5	02.13
58:5 69:4	situs-allocated	20:12 26:13,	113:15,17,19,	soon 17:19
81:19 87:13	41:3	14,21 29:15,21	22 115:10,12	500nor 22:7
120:21,24		30:24 31:6	116:14 120:13	sooner 23:7
L				

Index: Sophie..summaries

Sophie 5:2	stand 93:15	44:12,13	77:19 93:2	suboptimal
115:25	96:22	45:14,19 47:18	115:12 116:25	19:8 35:12
50.0		81:24 82:17	119:6 120:2	41:19 44:4,8,
sorry 52:6	standalone	84:1 85:2 91:8,	126:25	17 50:10,16,17
114:18 116:9	11:12	19 120:7		87:2
117:4	standard 62:7	123:11	stop 121:18	
sound 121:8	Standard 02.7		storage 15:3,	Subscriber
30unu 121.0	standards	station 90:8	23 16:18 17:2	99:5,9,16,25
sounds 48:4	14:15,18 16:11	ototionom		100:2,14
96:1	18:21,22 35:1	stationary	18:4,7 34:20	101:25 102:13
0.00		15:16 55:18	35:14,22 36:20	106:25 108:1,
source 8:20	start 4:8 25:20	statute 47:11	37:8,11,14,18	17,21 109:20
South 68:3	119:25 122:25		38:14 39:2	112:1,5 113:16
72:5 79:17	started 32:18	stay 105:3	54:16 55:18	115:10,12
72.0 70.17	Startou 02.10	steady 122:19	56:7 57:18	116:14
specific 8:25	starting 47:18		60:12 61:24	
41:25 48:2	49:6	steel 16:24	62:12 80:20	Subsequent
68:24 73:17	ctoto 6:16 14:0	otooring	87:9 98:6	10:14
77:25 89:1	state 6:16 14:9 19:10,11 26:24	steering 112:21	108:7 113:19	substation
90:19 92:12	,	112:21	120:1,13 121:1	15:19 16:4,9
95:25	31:9 39:10	STEP 8:10,12	122:2,8 125:12	17:18 22:9,10
,,	45:7 47:22,23	11:14 15:14,16	store 24:23	120:20 121:2
specifically	48:12 52:15	27:21 32:20		120.20 121.2
61:4 62:6	62:2,4 63:18	34:15,21 36:23	122:12 123:6	successful
70:13 74:13	67:25 71:25	38:1 53:21	125:15	10:24 81:2
77:21,24 99:14	79:10 82:13	54:3,7 55:1,9,	stored 24:6	
specificity	84:3,12 85:25	20 56:6 57:3,6,	124:24	such 25:3
43:13	89:9 92:5 97:6	9,10,11 59:20,		35:17 81:17
	118:19	21,25 61:6	strictly 120:17	85:10 89:9
specify 70:18	state's 62:3	65:4,9 66:10	122:4	91:16,20 99:12
speculative	86:1	69:20,25 72:8	structured	108:25
114:3	00.1	73:17,25 74:1,	101:25	sufficient
114.3	state-assigned	, , ,	101.25	29:11 78:12
spell 6:16	82:15	4,5,17 76:1,11 79:21 80:23	study 17:16	85:6
14:10 26:24			18:12 98:11	00.0
31:9 79:13	state-driven	82:6 105:9	otumbling	sufficiently
	47:11	121:5	stumbling	25:8 74:8
spend 20:2,3	state-specific	steps 119:25	111:3	75:10
spoke 88:21	47:17	•	sub-optimally	
•		Steve 4:12	45:8	suggested
spread 49:10	stated 70:9	32:8 107:12		90:20
56:2	statement	Steven 30:25	subject 55:3	suggesting
spreadsheet	20:23 53:17	31:2,11 32:9	57:16 94:8	88:23
96:9	58:25 64:25	65:8 69:21	submit 85:11,	
90.9	83:13 100:16	83:19	14	suggestions
stakeholders	03.13 100.10	00.19	'7	104:5
53:25 54:25	states 20:8	still 19:21	submitted 9:22	summaries
	40:19 41:8,20	58:22 76:9	68:8	70:16
	_			70.10
	I	1	1	1

summarize	suppose 104:6	system-	tariffs 69:1	territories 20:8
46:13 65:3 119:17	surcharge	allocated 42:3	70:2	test 11:9
summarizes	33:23 69:20,25	systems 18:2, 15 19:5,9 39:9	technical 7:19, 21,23 10:4	tested 11:18
12:8	surrebuttal	·	14:15,18 48:21	testified 6:11
	73:10 83:16,24	systemwide	54:1,24 55:6	14:4 26:19
summary 8:4 15:9 27:14	86:3 99:19	56:5	63:22 94:15,18	31:4 52:10,21
29:13 32:15	104:1,15,21 111:5		110:14,21	57:21 63:14
33:7 38:8,19	111.5	Т	119:19	67:22 71:22
44:2 46:8	Sustainable		technically	79:7 97:1
66:17 69:6,9	4:6 80:23	T-h-o-m-s-o-n	119:21	118:16
70:12,21 73:3,	sworn 6:10	63:20	113.21	testifying 87:6
12 76:13	14:3 26:18		technological	119:23
80:14,17 83:13	31:3 52:7,9	tabbed 32:25	17:7 49:24	119.25
98:3 100:22	63:10,13 67:21	table 4:12,18,	technologies	testimonies
111:4 123:13,	71:19,21 79:6	22	9:3,10,11,18	53:6
23	96:23,25		11:5,8,11,17,	testimony 5:21
04.40	118:15	tackling 62:8	20 16:20 18:7	6:1,25 7:5,17
summer 24:12		take 19:9,17	25:5 98:10	8:5 12:10
supplement	system 9:24	22:20 24:23	120:9 121:20	14:19,23 15:1,
32:8	10:3,9,12,19	25:24 96:9	tooknology	10 21:22 27:7,
cupplemental	11:14 15:17 18:14,23 19:3,	106:19 124:20	technology 8:14,16 9:2	11,15 29:16
supplemental 31:19 32:16	6 22:5,18	taken 29:6	10:23 11:21,25	30:16 31:19,23
33:5,8 37:23	23:13 24:4,5	51:19 126:20	12:1,5,7 13:6	32:3,8,9,16,19
33.3,0 37.23	25:8 26:3 36:7	31.19 120.20	15:24 18:10,13	33:6,8 34:4,16,
support 6:8	39:2 40:2,9	taking 81:4	22:20 23:8,17	17,19 35:19
14:1 16:12	41:21,22 42:18	96:16	24:25 25:19	37:4,6,23 38:6,
21:20 22:1	43:20 44:3,9	talk 47:16	54:18 61:5	7,20 39:23
38:10 57:5	45:7,15 48:10,		80:20 81:15	41:11 42:14
66:9 88:2,5	15 49:3,17	talking 48:9	82:7,25 91:15	44:2 46:8 48:5
98:10 101:5	50:10,23	50:21 90:6	92:14 120:1,2,	50:9 52:24,25
106:9 114:2	55:18,23 56:4,	114:21 115:16	11 124:20	53:10 55:7
supported	17 58:5,17	talks 21:23	ton 51:10 60:0	64:1,14,17
37:3 65:11	81:19 85:13		ten 51:18 68:8 105:9 125:4	65:6,8,13,14, 20 67:15 68:6,
117:20	86:1 87:1	targeted 9:15	105.9 125.4	9,11,14,21,22
supporting	91:17 92:7	targeting 10:12	ten-year 33:14	69:7,10,21
74:16 123:10	94:24 98:12		70:5	72:12,15,18,21
	102:23 103:3,5	tariff 31:21 36:21 37:22	tend 104:19	73:7,11,12,16
supportive	104:25 108:4,	54:9 55:10,13		74:7,19 75:7,
56:13,25 98:5,	6,7,10,18	57:17 65:5	term 65:24	15 78:18,23
14	109:3 110:7,9,	69:11,15,16,	terms 47:7,13	79:25 80:1,6,
supports 57:7	10 116:6	19,20,25	51:22 115:16,	15,18 82:1
65:15,17 76:3	120:13,14 122:2,8,21,23,	117:11	21	83:20,25 85:2,
83:2	24 125:15			19 86:3 90:21
	27 120.10			
		l		1

93:1,6 96:1	third 26:16	tighter 25:22	87:16 115:19,	4:6 80:23
97:14,19,22	34:14 36:11	time 7:4 14:23	23,24	treat 41:2
98:3 100:15,23	96:9	17:12 22:17	totally 114:3	ticat 41.2
101:1 103:10,	Thomson 4:19	23:11,18,20,21	120:21	treatment
13,19 107:13	55:7 61:19	24:16,24 25:1,	120.21	35:16 37:10
111:5 115:24		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	toward 8:25	55:4,9 57:1,17,
119:1,6,10,17	63:11,12,17,20	3,18 27:12	4	19 58:9,15
120:5,6 121:25	64:5,18,24 66:19 67:12	29:17 32:4,10	tradeoffs 84:20	
122:5 123:13,	00:19 07:12	49:5 53:9 60:1,	trading 37:21	true 97:19
16,21	thought 96:6	21 64:17	95:17	119:6 120:22
1 1 100 1		66:14,23		truth 6:10 14:3
testing 120:1	thoughtful	68:11,14 69:17	traditional 9:5	26:18 31:3
tests 11:7	102:18	70:9 72:18,22	15:25 16:14	52:9 63:13
	thoughts 61:22	73:3 77:13	18:11	67:21 71:21
than 19:20	124:21	80:5,9 83:17	training 55:21	79:6 96:25
20:3 23:7	124.21	89:15 92:22	training 55.21	118:15
24:22 35:20	Thousands	93:21 94:2,14	transformer	
42:2,20 52:2	42:18	95:1 96:12	16:2,9 23:14	try 26:5 40:22
74:3 82:3 96:4	4h ree 40.00	105:5 107:8	120:19	41:18 49:12
99:23 101:19,	three 19:23	109:21 114:5,6		111:2
23 105:9	22:3 29:9	119:11,16	transmission	4
109:22 110:7	30:12 33:9	times 19:23	18:2 19:11,15,	trying 18:24
120:4 125:18,	39:22 48:6		21 23:14 34:25	78:2 99:18
21	69:1 77:8,13	20:3 24:10	35:3,9 40:2,6,	turn 85:25
41 1 70 40	78:14 93:10,22	116:12,19	19 41:1,14	
their 70:16	94:12,19 96:5,	title 69:15	42:17,19,25	turns 125:11
102:2,7 109:16	9,16 106:22		43:3,15 45:9	two 7:22 9:20
theme 100:21	115:17 126:11	titled 7:1 64:7	48:24 49:17	12:8 22:12
	through 5:20	today 4:14,17,	55:17 56:3	24:1,10 25:1
thereby 103:6	27:23 28:9,11	20 5:21 7:22	62:8,14 81:22,	38:19 43:5
therefore 34:7	35:15 37:12	9:21 15:11	23 82:2,15	67:13 68:22
38:22 81:9	38:23 43:12	31:1 32:17	84:4,7,18,20	70:20 91:10
82:11,18	46:9 49:13	53:7,17 57:22	85:21 88:3,4,8,	107:13 108:22
02.11,10	54:24 55:5,19	64:14 67:15	13 89:8 95:3	
thereto 32:3,10	1	72:9 79:22	98:7,12 100:19	114:24 118:13
thermal 0:40	56:5,11,22 58:1 75:12	82:5 83:18	108:8 110:22	122:10 124:19
thermal 8:18		87:21 100:21	113:24 120:18,	125:5
34:3 54:9	82:8 83:5	120:2 122:5	24 121:3,16	type 92:2,10
thing 22:6	105:2 108:13		·	104:20 121:6,9
45:15 62:12	113:16 116:9	123:19 126:13	transmission-	,
104:20,21	throughout	today's 6:2	related 43:1	types 43:5
121:24	13:11 53:25		transmit	typical 119:21
	54:23	ton 103:24	124:23	120:4 123:10
things 47:22		topics 7:22		
57:21 93:19	throw 96:8	-	transparent	typically 24:13
thinking 32:19	tied 21:2	total 17:13	36:16	28:9 104:22
uniking 32.19	104 21.2	29:2 35:5	Transportation	
		41:12 84:5	Transportation	

	universe 43:10	117:11 120:9	17,19 56:7,10,	value 35:18
U	universities	121:5 122:8,	13,19 58:10	46:9,10,12,14,
		12,24 125:12,	68:3 69:2 72:6	16 56:11 58:15
UCE 38:12	9:2,17	21	79:15 81:8,12,	74:8 83:3
UCE 30.12	University		20 83:3,5,7	90:13 99:14,24
UCE'S 107:11	10:20	used 8:17	85:3,17 87:10,	100:3,10
		11:15,20 20:1	15 88:6,9	101:11 105:2
unacceptable	unknown 57:4	34:3 36:19	90:11 91:6,13,	106:15,18,24
28:24	60:1 91:12	38:18 48:14	17 96:21 97:9,	107:1,2 108:15
uncertainty	unless 82:19	49:2,5 56:14,	11,15 98:4,14	109:15,19
17:12	112:13	23 74:2 75:20,	101:11,13,16	115:20 116:12,
17.12	112.13	22,25 78:25	102:6,14 105:3	13,20
under 9:20	unlike 102:7	81:13,15 93:10	106:23 107:6	13,20
38:4 56:21		100:1,3 108:6		valued 83:10
57:14 72:9	unreasonable	109:10 112:3	108:12 109:18	
79:20,21 80:22	46:4	121:1 122:6	116:21 122:3,	values 116:19
90:22 102:6	unrecoverable	125:4,24	10	variety 121:20
126:25		·	Utah's 9:16,17	_
120.20	28:23	USEP 113:6	36:19	various 34:17
underlying	until 25:3 93:9	uses 8:19	30.13	37:22 84:10
11:25	105:8 107:5		Utah-allocated	V 4 400
		124:21	82:1,4	Vastag 4:23
understand	update 65:9	using 18:10	4.11	61:2 68:23
21:25 40:21	updated 65:22	28:16,18 37:21	utilities 4:17	70:15 79:4,5,
42:13 43:13	66:5	54:18 56:6,19	5:12 52:18	10,13 80:14
50:18 60:14	00.3	77:7 85:4	63:22 83:3	83:14 86:4,8,
77:20,25 85:7	upgrade 41:14	93:20 95:6	119:24,25	22 88:20 92:19
89:5 94:16	46:17	100:16 101:20	121:23 125:8	Vehicle 54:14
95:11 98:9		105:19 107:2		venicie 54.14
99:17 113:7	upgrades 40:8,		utility 4:9 9:12,	vehicles
115:14	19 56:4 98:7	110:5 122:25	25 11:3 52:17	125:10
l	108:8	USIP 54:11,12	68:4 72:4,7	
understanding	usage 99:23		78:12 79:15,18	Verde 28:20
55:25 77:5	_	usually 80:20	80:22 120:10,	30:13 77:9
understood	112:3	82:9	14 121:14	94:13 96:2
20:23 44:1	use 10:2 15:15	Utah 4:16 5:3	utilize 15:20	versus 43:15
20.20 77.1	23:8 34:9,12	9:1,2 10:20	16:20 95:24	49:16 62:7
unexpected	35:24 48:3	14:1 15:19	98:6,11,19	
23:6	50:9 62:20		30.0,11,13	84:7,20 89:8
	63:2 74:10,23,	21:24 27:25	utilized 90:7	117:8
unfair 46:2	25 75:4,5,8	32:20 33:10	99:16	via 101:12
Unfortunately	77:11 82:12	34:18 35:7,8,		
81:14	90:22 91:14	15,17,21 36:3		viable 12:1
		37:10 38:21,23	V	view 41:12
unit 9:24	93:8 94:14,21	40:18 41:6,7,		50:13 62:22
10:10,12,16,24	95:2,7 96:13	16,18 42:2	V-a-s-t-a-g	50.13 02.22
	99:3 106:20,24	45:12,17 46:2,	79:15	virtual 111:24
units 27:23	107:1,16	4,12,17 48:12	73.13	
28:9,11,13	108:15 114:23	54:10 55:12,	valuable 55:21	voltage 16:2,
	1	1	I	1

Index: want..years

				waiicycarb
10,13 18:9,18,	weigh 5:24	20 11:10,18,20	without 10:2	work 25:19
20,23,25 19:9,	103:22	15:25 16:5	23:9 40:13	63:21 72:1
12 21:20 22:1,		17:1,3,14,18,	41:8 63:21	78:20 79:18
4,10,13 23:12	weird 62:12	20,22 18:4,13,	74:13 84:9	88:1 91:12
34:24 40:2,7	went 43:12	23 23:2,3 25:2,	87:19 111:2	96:15 108:10
55:17 119:22		25 26:3 28:3	07.19 111.2	110:15 121:12
	116:2	29:4,7 33:12,	witness 4:18,	110.15 121.12
122:4,12,25	Western 5:7		20 5:4,8 6:7	workings 99:5
	118:22	14,17 34:1,8,	22:3 24:9	
l w		12,23,24	25:11 26:11,16	works 25:12
	whatever	35:15,17 37:10	30:15 31:1	49:9 50:5,6
	90:19 96:10	38:18 43:21	47:15 48:9	112:13 120:11
want 8:10 13:7	116:12	49:20,23 54:11	49:4 50:1,20	121:11
22:9 41:16	whereas 115:4	55:8,21,22	51:2,5 52:23	worry 125:24
44:1 50:18	whereas 115.4	60:12 61:19	53:11 61:7,16,	WOITY 125.24
77:9,11,12,16	whether 11:21	65:12 70:6,15	19 62:5,11,25	worth 81:4
90:2 93:12	42:22 43:14	73:11 81:5	64:5 67:14	41 00 04
112:15	62:23 63:3	91:12 96:22		worthy 98:24
wented 04:0	91:12 92:1	97:6 98:2,8	69:21 77:14,23	99:11
wanted 94:8	105:12,24	101:7 103:19	78:16 83:18,19	WRA 119:2
121:3	109:25 113:25	105:7,16	90:9,20 91:11	
wants 5:24	100.20 110.20	107:10,19	92:8 94:17	Wright 5:4
103:15	while 17:19	108:6,10	95:16 96:6	38:11 96:22,24
100.10	70:7 93:1 94:4	118:19 119:16	114:17,24	97:8 104:2,23
warranties	98:14 103:2	120:3,6 121:13	115:22 116:4	111:7,11
12:2	120:1 122:3	122:5 123:2,4	118:7,10 125:7	114:14 118:6
		122.3 123.2,4	126:11,23	
waste 9:3	White 13:1,3,	Wilson 5:8	witnessis	Wright's 93:1
wastefully	17 21:16,17	118:14,21,25	witness's	103:13
123:5	23:23 30:10,	119:16 123:25	118:11	written 81:25
	11,18 47:4,6,	126:4	witnesses 4:13	104:21 117:10
watts 116:4	25 48:16		6:3 13:10 37:5	104.21 117.10
way 5:23 21:2	60:24,25 61:9,	Wilson's	38:7 52:1,2	Wyoming
26:4 41:22	23 67:6,8	119:10	57:21 68:23	45:16,19 88:9
43:24 49:17	71:12,13 77:3,	winter 24:11	70:14	
58:21 85:16	4 90:1,2,15,24	25:8,11 27:24		
87:1 89:7	91:23 92:16	28:10,12 29:9	witnesses'	Υ
	95:22 96:17		5:21	
91:25 95:9	114:13,15,19	wire 23:3	wonder 92:23	year 11:19
101:22 102:21	115:13 117:6,	wired 120:4	WOITURE 92.23	22:17 23:12,18
103:1 106:11	22 124:14,15	wireu 120:4	wondering	24:10 29:10
109:13 116:23		wires 16:15	91:25	74:18 76:12
125:3,24	whole 52:3			96:14 106:13
ways 22:12	whom 6:20	withhold 103:4	woody 9:3	112:12 116:7
40:24	14:12 68:1	within 18:21	words 25:9	122:6,7 125:5
	17.12 00.1	19:22 47:19,22	50:13 80:24	122.0,1 120.0
week 122:20	will 4:13,23	92:6 109:24	95:25 125:4	years 23:2,4
wooks 20:40	5:3,8 7:15 8:25	120:3	30.20 120.4	28:11 59:23
weeks 29:10	9:1,12 10:15,	120.3		65:25 74:4
	•	•	•	

Index: yet..yet 75:23 105:10 109:22 120:3,9 121:19 yet 7:25

HEARING PROCEEDINGS, DOCKET NO. 16-035-36 - 11/30/2016