Mark C. Moench (2284) Daniel E. Solander (11467) ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER 201 South Main Street, Suite 2300 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Telephone: (801) 220-4014 Facsimile: (801) 220-3299 mark.moench@pacificorp.com daniel.solander@pacificorp.com

D. Matthew Moscon (6947) Mark E. Hindley (7222) STOEL RIVES LLP 201 South Main Street, Suite 1100 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Telephone: 801-328-3131 Facsimile: 801-578-6999 dmmoscon@stoel.com mehindley@stoel.com

Attorneys for Rocky Mountain Power

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of:

THE VOLUNTARY REQUEST OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER FOR APPROVAL OF RESOURCE DECISION TO CONSTRUCT SELECTIVE CATALYTIC REDUCTION SYSTEMS ON JIM BRIDGER UNITS 3 AND 4 Docket No. 12-035-92

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER'S PETITION FOR CLARIFICATION

REDACTED VERSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER'S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

Rocky Mountain Powerhereby submits its motion for clarification to the Public Service Commission of Utah ("Commission") requesting the Commission issue an order clarifying two portions of its Report and Order, issued May 10, 2013, approving Rocky Mountain Power's voluntary request for approval of a resource decision to construct selective catalytic reduction systems ("SCR") on Jim Bridger Units 3 and 4 (the "Order"). In support of its motion, Rocky Mountain Powerstates as follows:

1. On May 10, 2013, the Commission issued the Order, in which it approved the Company's voluntary request for approval of a resource decision to construct SCR on Jim Bridger Units 3 and 4. On page 33 of the Order, the Commission stated:

We approve as the reasonable projected cost of the resource decision to implement SCR systems designed to meet the proposed NOx limit of 0.07 lbs/MMBtu. We base this finding on the Company's testimony that achieving 0.05 lbs/MMBtu is expected to cost between and that this amount is contained within the estimated Project cost of the source of the SCR systems. Accordingly, we have removed to remove of the Project cost required to meet the 0.07 lbs/MMBtuNOx emission limit from the requested to reflect the Company's testimony.

2. Rocky Mountain Power seeks to clarify this portion of the Commission's Order regarding the removal of the **management** of the Project cost. As stated in Mr. Teply's direct testimony,¹ the Bridger generating facility is two-thirds owned by Rocky Mountain Power and one-third owned by Idaho Power. The **management** difference referenced in Rocky Mountain Power's testimony when achieving an emission limit of 0.07 lbs/MMBtuversus 0.05 lbs/MMBturepresents the increased costs for the entire project, not just the ownership share of the SCR installation costs that Rocky Mountain Power is requesting preapproval for in this proceeding.

3. Accordingly, Rocky Mountain Power requests that the Commission clarify that

the reduction was intended to apply to the entire project, and that the Company's ownership share would reduce the reduction amount by one-third to

¹Teply Direct Testimony page 10, lines 227-228.

for Rocky Mountain Power's share, allocating to Idaho Power, resulting in approval

as Rocky Mountain Power's share of the reasonable projected cost to of implement the SCR systems.

4. Additionally, Rocky Mountain Power requests that the Commission clarify that

the Commission's order grants the Company recovery on the total project cost incurred to implement the project, not just the engineering, procurement, and construction("EPC") contract cost, as the EPC contract represents only a portion of the included work and actual costs required

to fully execute the project. On page 33 of its Order, the Commission stated:

Approval of the projected cost is conditioned upon our future review of the final EPC contract(s) for the SCR systems. If the EPC contract(s) to achieve 0.07 lbs/MMBtuNOx emission limits total less than this amount, the EPC amount shall replace the as the approved projected costs of the resource decision required pursuant to UCA § 54-17-402(7)(a). Pursuant to UCA § 54-17-403, any increase from this projected cost is subject to Commission review as part of a rate hearing under UCA § 54-7-12, except to the extent the Commission issues an order under UCA § 54-17-404.

... If the EPC contract(s) to achieve 0.05 lbs/MMBtu emission limits total less than this amount, the EPC contracts(s) amount shall replace the as the approved projected cost of the resource decision required pursuant to UCA § 54-17-402(7)(a).

As reported in Confidential Exhibit RMP_(CAT-1)(d), on pages 6 through 8, the total estimated direct project cost includes the EPC contract cost plus additional non-EPC contract direct cost line items. Confidential Exhibit RMP_(CAT-1.2) "Initial Capital Cost Estimates" provides a line item summary of the application's estimated EPC contract cost plus additional non-EPC contract direct costs on page 2 for Unit 3 and on page 4 for Unit 4. On page 1 of Confidential Exhibit RMP (CAT-1.2), a Unit 3 summary of direct cost plus capital surcharge plus escalation plus allowance for funds used during construction ("AFUDC") is presented at both the 100 percent and the Company's two-thirds share levels. On page 3 of Confidential Exhibit RMP_(CAT-1.2), a Unit 4 summary of direct plus capital surcharge plus escalation plus AFUDC is presented at both the 100 percent and the Company's two-thirds share level.

WHEREFORE, Rocky Mountain Power respectfully requests the following:

1. That the Commission grant Rocky Mountain Power's request for clarification.

2. That the Commission clarify the **example** reduction was intended to apply to the entire project and will be adjusted to reflect Rocky Mountain Power's ownership share; and that the Commission grants the Company recovery on the total project cost, not just the EPC contract cost.

DATED this 17thday of May 2013.

Respectfully submitted, ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

Mark C. Moench Daniel E. Solander D. Matthew Moscon

Attorneys for Rocky Mountain Power