

EXHIBIT C

Mike Cutbirth

From: Fishback, Thomas [Thomas.Fishback@PacifiCorp.com]
Sent: Friday, March 01, 2013 12:30 PM
To: Mike Cutbirth
Cc: Stephen S. Miller (Stephen.Miller@cai-engr.com)
Subject: PacifiCorp's Response to the Q0426 Point of Interconnection

Hi Mike,

After considerable evaluation, PacifiCorp is unable to agree to Q0426 Blue Mountain Power Partner's, LLC request to construct a point of interconnection substation at the requested location for the following reasons.

Good Utility Practice

PacifiCorp does not believe adding two substations this close together is Good Utility Practice or offers better system or operational reliability as nearly twice the equipment would be required to construct and operate two substations vs. one. PacifiCorp is confident that the Interconnection Agreements and detailed project engineering for the two projects will define the required equipment for each interconnection and keep the projects from being physically and logically intermingled.

Maintenance and Operational Cost

There is a cost for the operation and continued maintenance of any substation on PacifiCorp's electric system and there are many factors which PacifiCorp considers when evaluating the location of a substation including operational need.

PacifiCorp does not see an operational need to put two point of interconnection substations in this area so close together. Furthermore, PacifiCorp cannot justify passing the operational and maintenance costs of two substations to the ratepayers.

Precedence

PacifiCorp is dedicated to treating all customers fairly. Many customers who have been in PacifiCorp's interconnection queue have requested points of interconnection which were unacceptable to PacifiCorp for the same or similar reasons as the Q0426 project. PacifiCorp normally addresses these concerns during the scoping meeting and the customer follows up with any required changes per the provisions of Section 41.1 of the Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT). PacifiCorp has required other customers to change their points of interconnection when they were in close proximity.

In Blue Mountain Power's case, Ben Kerl declined PacifiCorp's request for a Q0426 scoping meeting on July 6, 2012, stating that the previously hosted scoping meeting for Q0418 was adequate for the Q0426 project. Had an initial scoping meeting been held for Q0426, PacifiCorp would have had an opportunity to discuss changes in the interconnection environment as a result of the Q0420 Project application, which had been submitted during the period between the original Q0418 meeting, and the revised Q0426 application. PacifiCorp would have notified Q0426 that the requested point of interconnection was unacceptable and needed to be changed to the proposed Q0420 location.

PacifiCorp appreciates Blue Mountain Power's situation, and commits to working collaboratively with Q0420 and Q0426 throughout the interconnection process. However, PacifiCorp must treat Q0426 the same way it has treated other similarly situated customers.

I'm going to make my best effort to call you as soon as I can about this – there are a couple things I absolutely have to do today before calling you though.

Thanks Mike,
Tom Fishback
503.813.6102