

D. Matthew Moscon (#6947)
Richard R. Hall (#9856)
Stoel Rives LLP
201 South Main Street, Suite 1100
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131

R. Jeff Richards (#7294)
Heidi K. Gordon (#11655)
Rocky Mountain Power
1407 W North Temple Street Suite 320
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116
Telephone: (801) 220-4734

Attorneys for Petitioner
Rocky Mountain Power

BEFORE THE UTILITY FACILITY REVIEW BOARD

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER,

Petitioner,

vs.

WASATCH COUNTY,

Respondent.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
Chad B. Ambrose**

Background of Witness

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

Q: Please state your name, business address, and present position.

A: Chad Ambrose, 7657 Holden Street, Midvale, Utah, 84047, Regional Business Manager

Q: Please describe your education and business experience.

A: I hold a Bachelor of Science in Economics from the University of Utah and a Master of Business Administration from Utah State University. My pertinent business experience includes finance, marketing and 10 years managing large industrial customers and managing communities served by the Company.

Q: As a regional business manager, what are your primary responsibilities?

A: I am responsible for the overall satisfaction of large managed energy users and communities I am assigned to serve. I manage the Company's relationships in Summit County and all municipalities designated there in. Some of my responsibilities related to community management include securing franchise agreements and the necessary permits for the Company's assets in efforts to provide safe, reliable, and efficient and adequate service to our customers.

Q: What is your responsibility specifically related to the Project?

A: I am responsible for community outreach for Summit County including community interface regarding reconstruction of the 67 mile transmission line from 46 kV to 138 kV. This line runs from the Railroad substation north of Evanston, Wyoming, to the Silver Creek substation located near Park City, Utah. This line and substations interconnected to

1 this line are referred to hereafter as the “Project.” I also work with large commercial
2 customers and large property owners and Summit County, and took part in most of the
3 open houses that were held in Summit County for this Project.

4
5 **Q: What were the outreach steps taken in Summit County on the segment between**
6 **Brown’s Canyon Tap to Silver Creek substation?**

7 A: In May 2008, the first of five newsletters were sent to Summit County property owners
8 within a minimum distance of 1,500 feet of the transmission line. In addition, customers
9 and property owners were contacted by our property agents and in the case of large
10 customers or large property owners, I, along with a small team of Company employees
11 directly contacted these customers to discuss the Project. In addition, the Company
12 sponsored a new initiative called the Summit Wasatch Electrical Plan.

13
14 **Q: What is the Summit Wasatch Electrical Plan?**

15 A: The Summit Wasatch Electrical Plan was a yearlong collaborative effort, published in
16 2010, between the Company and local governmental entities, including Wasatch and
17 Summit Counties and local businesses, to integrate local governments’ long-term land-use
18 development plans with future electrical network requirements. The primary goal of this
19 process was to develop a clear and documented plan to help guide future infrastructure
20 siting discussions and decisions, and ensure the energy capacity for local communities to
21 achieve their goals. Please refer the current Summit Wasatch Electrical Plan attached as
22 Exhibit CBA-1.

23

1 **Q: Did anyone from Wasatch County participate in the Summit Wasatch Electrical Plan**
2 **efforts?**

3 A: The Company invited three Wasatch County representatives to participate in the Summit
4 Wasatch Electrical Plan efforts. Mr. Val Draper, who was then on the Wasatch County
5 Council, attended two meetings; Mr. Paul Kennard, who was then the Wasatch County
6 Director of Economic Development, attended four meetings; Mr. Mike Kohler who is on
7 the Wasatch County Council was initially invited but did not attend the meetings and was
8 later removed from the list of invitees. Bob Martino from the town of Hideout, located in
9 Wasatch County attended the concluding meeting.

10

11 **Q: Was the Project contemplated in the Summit Wasatch Electrical Plan?**

12 A: Yes. The need for the Project was identified in the Summit Wasatch Electrical Plan.
13 Specifically, the existing 46kV source from Brown's Canyon Tap to Silver Creek
14 substation was identified as requiring an upgrade to a double circuit 138/46 kV source.

15

16 **Q: Did the Company contact Promontory Development, LLC (Promontory) about the**
17 **Project?**

18 A: Yes. The Company approached Promontory on the Project to discuss a new fixed width
19 easement in the existing 46 kV alignment on their property.

20 Promontory requested the Company consider an alternate siting for the relocation of less
21 than two (2) miles of the existing 46 kV transmission line currently located on their
22 property.

23

24 **Q: Who is Promontory and where are they located?**

1 A: To the best of my knowledge, Promontory Development LLC, also known as Promontory
2 Ranches is a large private landowner located east of Utah Highway 40 and just south of
3 Interstate 80. Their physical address is 8758 North, Promontory Ranch Road, Park City,
4 Utah 84098. Promontory Club is owned by Promontory Investments, LLC an Arizona
5 limited liability company. The development consists of two luxury golf courses, luxury
6 homes, club houses and a unique high-end amenities development for the benefit of its
7 members all spanning over 7,200 acres. Their master plan has been approved by Summit
8 County and will include a maximum of 1,624 resort residential homes (most 3,500 square
9 feet or larger) with lots of 1 acre or greater, 5 golf courses and 400 cabins. 60% of the
10 development is dedicated to open space and preservation of the Summit County mountain
11 character.

12

13 **Q: Where is the existing 46 kV transmission line located in relation to Promontory?**

14 A: The existing 46 kV transmission line enters Promontory's property on the south-eastern
15 side of their property north of Brown's Canyon road and then proceeds through the middle
16 of the property's southeastern side, crosses over the mountain and then heads southwest.
17 Please refer to Exhibit CBA-2.

18

19 **Q: Where is Promontory's proposed relocation of the 138 kV/46 kV transmission line**
20 **located?**

21 A: Promontory proposed to relocate the line generally following the southeastern and southern
22 boundary of their property. Please refer to Exhibit CBA-2.

23

24 **Q: Is the Company required to relocate its facilities upon third party request?**

1 A: The Company operates under its Utah tariff (Utah Rule 12 section 6) which provides that
2 the Company will relocate distribution-voltage facilities crossing a landowner's property,
3 provided performance of the request is feasible, the Applicant or Customer pays the costs
4 for such relocation, and the Applicant or Customer provides adequate rights-of-way.
5 Relocations for transmission-voltage facilities are at the discretion of the Company, but are
6 typically evaluated in the same manner as with distribution-voltage facilities. In addition
7 to the tariff cited above, the Company has a long history of working with landowners and
8 locating or relocating facilities in locations that respect the landowner's property rights and
9 property uses.

10

11 **Q: How does the Company determine if the request is feasible?**

12 A: The Company reviews the feasibility of the Applicant or Customer's request as outlined in
13 Mr. Ken Shortt's testimony. If the proposal is determined to be feasible and the requesting
14 party will provide or commit to provide appropriate easements and defray all associated
15 increases in costs, the Company will approve the relocation request. The Company also
16 considers the future development of property, any increase in cost, access to the facilities
17 in the as-built condition, vegetation management concerns, potential conflicting uses both
18 existing and long-term, geography, and other metrics that have a bearing on the ability to
19 efficiently construct, operate, and maintain the power line.

20

21 **Q: Was more than one option considered as a result of Promontory's relocation request?**

22 A: Yes. At Promontory's request five alternatives were evaluated. See Exhibit CBA-3. The
23 Company identified the feasible alternatives and provided cost estimates for each

1 alternative. Promontory requested that the line be placed on the eastern and southern area
2 of its property.

3

4 **Q: What is the status of Promontory's request for re-location?**

5 A: The Company found Promontory's proposed re-location acceptable after evaluation. The
6 re-location request met all technical requirements, the property owner provided appropriate
7 easements, and paid a deposit and committed to the balance of the funds required for the
8 relocation per the executed relocation agreement. See Exhibit CBA-4.

9 Promontory's relocation request was integrated into the Project.

10

11 **Q: After Wasatch County Planning Commission denied Company's application did the
12 Company engage Promontory to discuss opportunity for alternate alignments?**

13 A: Yes. Promontory did not identify any acceptable alternative routes.

14

15 **Q: How much of the Project has been permitted?**

16 A: Approximately 52 miles of the Project has been permitted.

17

18 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

19 A: Yes.