Lauren R. Barros (Bar No. 6478)
Lauren Barros Law
Attorneys for Utah Clean Energy
370 E. South Temple, Suite 200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Telephone: (801) 746-0670
Facsimile: (385) 242-7917
Email: LRB@LaurenBarrosLaw.com
Attorney for Utah Clean Energy

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

In the Matter of the Application of Rocky Mountain Power for Approval of Amendments to the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program and Tariff Revisions	DOCKET NO. 20-035-34

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF KELBE GOUPIL, MPP/MPH.

ON BEHALF OF

UTAH CLEAN ENERGY

OCTOBER 2, 2025

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Kelbe Goupil. My business address is 215 S. 400 E. Salt Lake City, Utah 84111.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am a Senior Associate at Utah Clean Energy ("UCE"), a nonprofit public interest organization, whose mission is to lead and accelerate the clean energy transformation with vision and expertise. We support the objectives of an affordable, reliable, and clean energy system. In my role as Senior Associate, I lead UCE's transportation electrification team, which is focused on expanding access to electric vehicle ("EV") charging and accelerating the adoption of zero emission medium- and heavy-duty vehicles, as well as advocating for programs and policies that enable an equitable transition to a decarbonized transportation system.

Q. On whose behalf are you testifying?

A. UCE.

Q. Have you ever testified before the Utah Public Service Commission (hereinafter "the Commission")?

A. No.

Q. Please explain UCE's interest in testifying.

A. UCE is working to help Utah transition to a zero-emission transportation system, which necessarily involves increased EV adoption. As an intervener in Docket No 20-035-34 during the development of the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program ("EVIP"), UCE has supported the EVIP and observed how the program has benefited communities and EV drivers. UCE advocates for an EVIP structure that continues to meet statutory requirements by expanding EV adoption across the state and enabling competition, innovation, and customer choice.

Q. Please summarize your recommendations for the Commission.

A. UCE respectfully requests that the Commission deny the request by Rocky Mountain Power (hereinafter "the Company") to focus primarily on Company-owned charging stations and eliminate customer incentives. We support the Company's proposal to eliminate the make-ready program. We request that the EVIP continue to support incentives for Level 2 and DC fast charging (direct current fast charging, hereinafter "DCFC") with an emphasis on multifamily housing.

XVII. BACKGROUND

Q. Please provide an overview of the Company's EVIP.

A. On August 27, 2020, the Company filed a Notice of Intent to File a Proposed Charging Infrastructure Program with the Commission. One of the primary goals of the EVIP is to enable "the significant deployment of infrastructure in a manner reasonably expected to increase electric vehicle adoption" and to enable "competition, innovation, and customer choice in electric vehicle battery charging services, while promoting low-cost services for electric vehicle battery charging customers."[1]

---

[1] Utah Code Section 54-4-41, as amended, effective July 1, 2021 (hereinafter "EV Infrastructure/Charging Service law"), authorized the EVIP. The statute allows the Company to invest up to $50 million in utility-owned vehicle charging infrastructure, in incentives for utility vehicle charging service, and in innovative EV charging programs and partnership. Pursuant to statute, the Commission may only approve the program if the transportation plan promotes "the deployment of utility owned vehicle charging infrastructure in the public interest and the availability of utility vehicle charging service." Utah Code Section 54-4-41((2)(c). "The Commission shall find the charging infrastructure program to be in the public interest only if the Commission finds that the program a) increases the availability of electric vehicle battery charging service in the state; b) enables the significant deployment of infrastructure in a manner reasonably expected to increase electric vehicle adoption; ... and (d) enables competition, innovation, and customer choice in electric vehicle battery charging services, while promoting

After holding stakeholder meetings, the Company filed an application setting forth its proposed EVIP. On November 17, 2021, the Company filed a Settlement Stipulation (hereinafter the "Stipulation"), resolving all issues in the docket by the settling parties. After holding a hearing, the Commission issued an Order Approving Settlement Stipulation (hereinafter "the Order") on December 20, 2021, finding that the Stipulation satisfied the requirements of the EV Infrastructure/Charging Service law and thereby advanced the public interest.

The Commission in their Order approved the Stipulation. In particular, page 11, fn. 30 of the Order notes that the Commission could only approve the Stipulation pursuant to the EV Infrastructure/Charging Service law if they made findings that the EVIP program: "(a) increases the availability of EV battery charging service in Utah; (b) enables significant deployment of infrastructure that supports EV battery charging service and utility-owned vehicle charging infrastructure in a manner **reasonably expected to increase EV adoption**; …and (d) **enables competition, innovation, and customer choice** in EV battery charging services, while promoting low-cost services for EV battery charging customers…"

The Order notes that Mr. James Campbell of the Company testified that, during the periodic program review, there would be an opportunity to "adjust the allocation of expenditures" among the other issues brought before the PSC.

---

low-cost services for electric vehicle battery charging customers; ..." Utah Code Section 54-4-41(4). The Commission may approve an amendment to the charging infrastructure program if the utility demonstrates that the amendment is prudent, will provide net benefits to customers, and is otherwise consistent with furthering the deployment of utility-owned vehicle charging infrastructure in the public interest and the availability of utility vehicle charging service. *See* Utah Code Section 54-4-41(5). The Company's investment is prudent if the utility demonstrates "that the investment can be reasonably anticipated to ... reduce transportation sector emissions over a reasonable time period as determined by the Commission, and facilitate any other measures that the Commission determines create deployment of utility owned vehicle charging infrastructure and utility vehicle charge service or create significant benefits in the long-term for customers of the utility." Utah Code Section 54-4-41(7).

Q. Did the Commission find that the EVIP met the required elements of the "EV Infrastructure/Charging Service law?"

A. Yes, the Commission found that the evidence supported a finding that the EVIP included the required elements of such a program and that the Company provided supporting evidence for each of the required public interest criteria.

Q. Did UCE support the EVIP, as approved by the Commission?

A. Yes. UCE supported the 10-year EVIP program because of its balanced structure that includes Company-owned DCFC stations, make-ready infrastructure investments, and incentives (administered through Schedule 120).

Q. Given your review of the first three years of the program, do you believe that some changes might be prudent?

A. We support some but not all of the proposed changes. We support the Company's proposal to include an idling fee for Schedule 60 and reduce the rate for Schedule 198 to collect $4.2 million annually instead of $5 million. We also understand the challenges associated with the make-ready program and are supportive of eliminating make-ready incentives.

Q. Do you support the Company's proposal to eliminate all incentives in the EVIP?

A. No. We understand that there are limited funds available in the EVIP. However, we strongly oppose the proposal to eliminate all customer incentives.

Q. What are your recommendations for the EVIP customer incentives?

A. We recommend that the Commission deny the Company's request to eliminate all Schedule 120 incentives. Of the $14,841,713 left in the 10-year EVIP budget, we propose $6 million be dedicated to rebates for Level 2 and DCFC through Schedule 120, with a focus on multifamily charging projects. Remaining funds could be used for Company-owned charging stations and activities related to innovation and partnerships.

Q. Please explain why you recommend keeping incentives for multifamily housing and workplace charging.

A. EVIP incentives for multifamily housing and workplace charging expand access to charging and EV adoption, are cost-effective, and align with Utah law and the Order. Company-owned DCFC cannot replace the need for multifamily and workplace charging. Not only is public DCFC more expensive than charging at home or work, but EV drivers also benefit from the convenience of being able to charge at home or at work. For those living in multifamily housing especially, relying solely on shared public DCFC can be inconvenient and create uncertainty. Public DCFC is well suited for longer-distance travel or supplemental fueling, but does not meet daily charging needs. An effective EV charging market includes investments in both DCFC, as well as Level 2 workplace and multifamily housing charging infrastructure. UCE's request to prioritize rebates for Level 2 charging in multifamily housing and workplaces is based on the current EV market and EV charging marketplace, review of the data provided by the Company showing demand for these incentives, and the testimony provided by the Company regarding the challenges associated with the make-ready program.

Q. Why is access to charging in multifamily housing important?

A. People who live in multifamily housing often rely on shared parking and therefore do not have the ability to install their own EV charging equipment. Electric vehicles have numerous benefits including improved air quality, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, lower maintenance costs for vehicles, and significant fuel cost savings.[2] Since 80% of charging happens at home,[3] this creates a significant barrier to EV adoption for people who live in multifamily housing. Thus, residents of multifamily housing cannot reap the cost savings of EV ownership. Access to charging in all types of housing, especially multifamily, is crucial to reducing range anxiety and increasing EV adoption, therefore ensuring that Utahns can access the benefits of electric vehicles.

Q. How do current state policies affect this issue?

A. Utah charges a 12.5% tax on the retail sale of electricity at public EV charging stations,[4] contributing to the higher cost of charging in public compared to charging at home or work. Those who are only able to charge in public end up paying significantly more overall to fuel their electric vehicle,[5] underscoring the importance of investing in expanding access charging in additional settings, particularly in multifamily housing.

Additionally, several Utah municipalities have adopted "EV readiness" policies, indicating continued interest in expanding access to EV charging. "EV readiness" refers to policies and programs that prepare buildings for the increased adoption of EVs by ensuring the necessary electrical infrastructure is in place to support EV charging. These ordinances support the future installation of EV charging, particularly in multifamily housing, and have been adopted in Salt Lake City, Park City, Summit County, and Moab. Other

[2] U.S. Dep't of Energy, *Electric Vehicle Benefits and Considerations*, Alternative Fuels Data Center (last updated 2025), https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/electricity-benefits

[3] U.S. Dep't of Energy, *National EV Charging Network* (last updated Nov. 8, 2024), https://www.energy.gov/topics/national-ev-charging-network#/analyze?country=US&fuel=ELEC&status=E&status=T&show_map=true&show_corridor_stations=false

[4] Utah Code § 59-30-P1, *Part 1: Electric Vehicle Charging Tax* (Title 59, Chapter 30) (2023), https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title59/Chapter30/59-30-P1.html?v=C59-30-P1_2023050320240101

[5] Constance Crozier, *At Home or in Forecourts: The Challenges of Public vs Private Charging Infrastructure*, IEEE Smart Grid Bulletin (June 2023), https://smartgrid.ieee.org/bulletins/june-2023/at-home-or-in-forecourts-the-challenges-of-public-vs-private-charging-infrastructure

communities in Utah are also considering adoption of this type of ordinance. Continued incentives for the purchase of these charging stations in multifamily settings help multifamily property owners upgrade their properties to make EV charging available to residents.

Q. Have Schedule 120 incentives been effective? If so, why?

A. Yes. The Schedule 120 incentive program has shown to be popular, particularly for AC Level 2 rebates for multifamily and workplace applicants. According to the Company's 2024 Annual Report,[6] AC Level 2 rebates were particularly popular with multifamily and workplace applicants, with 288 AC Level 2 projects awarded for multifamily dwellings and 122 for workplaces in 2024. While multifamily and workplace awards have been the most popular project types in the Schedule 120 incentive program, the need for charging in these types of locations has not been met. A big shift toward high-density housing, which includes multifamily housing, is taking place in Utah to address Utah's housing shortage. Affordable housing challenges and forecasts show that local demand for multifamily construction remains higher than the 10-year historical average.[7,8] Incentives will help to ensure that new and existing buildings provide access to EV charging that residents need in order to adopt electric vehicles.

Q. Does the ratepayer investment for incentives result in more EV chargers than the same ratepayer investment in Company-owned chargers?

---

[6] Rocky Mountain Power Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program Annual Report, 2024.

[7] Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute, University of Utah, State of the State's Housing Market (Latest Edition), 2025. https://d36oiwf74r1rap.cloudfront net/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/State-Of-State-Housing-Jul2025.pdf

[8] MMG Real Estate Advisors, Market Snapshot 2025 Salt Lake City Forecast, https://mmgrea.com/2025-salt-lake-city-forecast/

A. Yes. Between 2022 and 2024, EVIP incentives provided to third-party companies installing DCFCs in the Company's service area facilitated the installation of DCFC ports at an average cost to ratepayers of $20,809 per port. By contrast, Company-owned DCFC stations cost ratepayers about [redacted] per port. Schedule 120 Level 2 chargers are even more cost-effective, with the ratepayer investment averaging about $832 per port for Level 2 chargers during the review period.[9,10,11] Table 1 below summarizes the cost per port comparison. EVIP incentives cover only a portion of the total cost of EV charging infrastructure by leveraging private sector investment, which helps to extend the reach of ratepayer funds. Given that the investment per port for Schedule 120 DCFC and Level 2 chargers is so much lower than the cost for Company-owned stations, we believe that continuing to offer an incentive program through Schedule 120 to support the installation of third-party chargers is a good use of ratepayer funds and meets the intent of the statute and the Order.

---

[9] Rocky Mountain Power, *2022 Annual Report: Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program* (filed Apr. 3, 2023) (on file with Public Service Commission of Utah, Docket No. 23-035-18), https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/23docs/2303518/3274842022AnlRprt4-3-2023.pdf

[10] Rocky Mountain Power, *2023 Annual Report: Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program* (filed Apr. 1, 2024) (on file with Public Service Commission of Utah, Docket No. 24-035-17), https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/24docs/2403517/3331172023AnlRprt4-1-2024.pdf

[11] Rocky Mountain Power, *2024 Annual Report: Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program* (filed Apr. 1, 2025) (on file with Public Service Commission of Utah, Docket No. 25-035-23), https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/25docs/2503523/3390462024AnlRprt4-1-2025.pdf

Table 1. Cost per EV Charging Port for Level 2 and DCFC[12]

Year	Sch 120 AC Level 2	Sch 120 DCFC	Company-owned DCFC[13]
	Cost per Port	Cost per Port	Cost per Port
2022	$ 700	$ 19,360	-
2023	$ 878	$ 22,335	-
2024	$ 917	$ 20,732	[redacted]
Average	**$ 832**	**$ 20,809**	[redacted]

Q. What are your concerns with the Company's spending on Company-owned charging stations?

A. While UCE thinks that it is reasonable for a portion of the EVIP funds to continue to be invested in Company-owned charging stations, data from the Company demonstrates that Schedule 120 incentives also bring value to ratepayers in alignment with the EV Infrastructure/Charging Service law and the Order. In fact, between 2022 and 2024, Schedule 120 incentives have resulted in the installation of **38 times more EV charging ports** as compared to the number of Company-owned ports. The Company installed a total of 22 Company-owned DCFC ports, while third parties receiving EVIP incentives installed 755 Level 2 charging ports and 81 DCFC ports (see Table 2 below). Clearly, increasing the number of EV charging ports available to ratepayers enables "significant deployment of infrastructure that supports EV battery charging service."[14] The widespread availability of Schedule 120-funded EV charging infrastructure provides convenient and affordable access to fuel and is a good use of ratepayer funds.

[12] See Notes 9, 10, and 11 for cost per port data for Schedule 120 AC Level 2 and Schedule 120 DCFC information.

[13] Confidential Ex. RMP JAC-2 (Rocky Mountain Power, itemized charger expenditures) (filed July 25, 2025), Docket No. 20-035-34, Utah Public Service Commission.

[14] Utah Code § 54-4-41(4)(a).

Table 2. Number of EV Charging Port for Level 2 and DCFC[15]			
Year	Sch 120 AC Level 2	Sch 120 DCFC	Company-owned DCFC[16]
	Number of Ports	Number of Ports	Number of Ports
2022	133	18	-
2023	265	54	-
2024	357	9	22
Total	**755**	**81**	**22**

Q. How do customer incentives further align with Utah law?

A. The EV Infrastructure/Charging Service law[17] requires not only that the EVIP increase charging availability, and support deployment that increases EV adoption, but also that it enables competition, innovation, and customer choice while keeping costs low. Incentives meet these requirements by expanding availability of charging, encouraging EV adoption in a difficult to serve market (i.e. multifamily housing), and promoting competition and customer choice.

XVIII. RESPONDING TO COMPANY CLAIMS

Q. The Company argues that the statute emphasizes utility-owned charging and "does not mention incentives, suggesting they should not be the largest funded component of the EVIP." Do you agree?

A. No. The statute and implementing Order[18] emphasize Company-owned charging as one component of the EVIP, but also requires competition, customer choice, and low costs, all of which are supported by incentives.

---

[15] *See* Notes 9, 10, and 11 for cost per port data for Schedule 120 AC Level 2 and Schedule 120 DCFC information.

[16] Confidential Ex. RMP JAC-2 (Rocky Mountain Power, itemized charger expenditures) (filed July 25, 2025), Docket No. 20-035-34, Utah Public Service Commission.

[17] Utah Code § 54-4-41(4)(a)–(b), (d).

[18] Utah Code § 54-4-41.

Q. Do you agree with the Company's argument that other incentive programs for EV charging in Utah are sufficiently able to meet the demand for EV charging incentives?

A. No. The Company has not provided analysis supporting the claim that programs from the Utah Department of Transportation and Department of Environmental Quality will "provide enough incentives for the market to support competition" and that "EVIP funded incentives are no longer needed."[19] Mr. Campbell specifically mentions the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program, which is only focused on public DCFC along highway and interstate corridors. Further, the specific incentive types, eligibility, and amounts that will be available from the Department of Environmental Quality's Beehive Emissions Reduction Plan are also unknown. Therefore, it cannot be determined that these programs negate the need for EVIP incentives.

Q. The Company argues that incentives do not provide significant direct benefits.[20] Do you agree?

A. No. Both make-ready and Schedule 120 incentives provide direct, measurable benefits to customers. While there are benefits to the make-ready program, we concur with the Company that it is difficult to administer and, given the limited resources for the EVIP program, we support removing the make-ready incentives from the EVIP. However, customers benefit directly from access to more charging, especially workplace and residential charging. In 2024 alone, a total of 604 new AC Level 2 charging ports were

[19] James A. Campbell, *Redacted Direct Testimony of James A. Campbell*, Docket No. 20-035-34, Line 515-526 (Utah Pub. Serv. Comm'n July 25, 2025), https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/20docs/2003534/340800RdctdDirTstmnyJamesACampbellRMP7-25-2025.pdf

[20] James A. Campbell, *Redacted Direct Testimony of James A. Campbell*, Docket No. 20-035-34, Line 406-408 (Utah Pub. Serv. Comm'n July 25, 2025), https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/20docs/2003534/340800RdctdDirTstmnyJamesACampbellRMP7-25-2025.pdf.

funded through the EVIP, the majority of which were located in multifamily dwellings and workplaces.[21]

Q. How does the revenue from Company-owned stations compare to the broader benefits of keeping incentives?

A. The Company estimates that, if they build all 20 Company-owned stations, the annual revenue from these Company-owned stations will be approximately $1.5 million.[22] If the Commission accepts the Company's proposal to direct 50% of this revenue to the Energy Balancing Account ("EBA"), that means the Company will distribute about $750,000 dollars across the Company's roughly 1 million residential, commercial, and industrial customers in Utah.[23] The benefits of reducing barriers to EV adoption and transforming the market, by allowing for competition in the EV charging space, far outweigh the $750,000 in potential customer credits via the EBA.

Q. Do you agree that focusing EVIP primarily on Company-owned charging aligns with the Order and statute?

A. No. Both Company-owned and third-party charging infrastructure are important aspects of the EVIP. Both respond to important needs within the EV charging market and can provide complementary pathways to expanding access to EV charging infrastructure both quickly and cost-effectively. While revenue from Company-owned charging stations benefits the

---

[21] Rocky Mountain Power, *2024 Annual Report of Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program*, Docket No. 25-035-23, Table 5 (Utah Pub. Serv. Comm'n Apr. 1, 2025), https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/25docs/2503523/3390462024AnlRprt4-1-2025.pdf.

[22] James A. Campbell, *Redacted Direct Testimony of James A. Campbell*, Docket No. 20-035-34, Line 427, (Utah Pub. Serv. Comm'n July 25, 2025), https://pscdocs.utah.gov/electric/20docs/2003534/340800RdctdDirTstmnyJamesACampbellRMP7-25-2025.pdf.

[23] Rocky Mountain Power, *2023 Utah Energy Efficiency and Peak Reduction Annual Report* (issued July 22, 2024, revised), https://www.pacificorp.com/content/dam/pcorp/documents/en/pacificorp/environment/dsm/utah/UT_Energy_Efficiency_and_Peak_Reduction_Report_2023.pdf.

Company and customers, the EV charging market will more effectively achieve its goals if there are investments in both Company-owned DCFC and third-party owned DCFC, Level 2 public, workplace, and multifamily charging. An effective EV charging market comes from healthy competition among providers of EV chargers, rewarding those who provide economical and well performing charging services.

Q. What are your additional concerns with the Company's proposal to shift away from incentives?

A. Company-only deployment is costly and is limited by the Company's internal pace. An incentive program supplements the impact of Company-owned charging stations by allowing additional stakeholders, such as property owners, businesses, and residents, to install chargers more quickly and affordably. EVIP dollars will stretch further if a portion of the funding continues to be invested in Level 2 residential and commercial charging. Maintaining the incentive program supports EV charging that is competitive and serves the greatest number of customers, including multifamily customers, at the lowest cost. We find that EVIP is most beneficial when it is structured to be a combination of investments, which will enable competition and balance deployment across the EV charging marketplace.

XIX. UCE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Q. How would you propose the Company structure the EVIP budget moving forward?

A. The Company is proposing to commit remaining unallocated and forfeited funds to new Company-owned chargers. The Company estimates that it needs $10,781,495 to complete all 20 Company-owned sites that it has planned. Of the original $50 million authorized for the program, there is $14,841,713 remaining. We propose that the Company commit $6 million of the remaining funds for a Schedule 120 rebate program targeting Level 2 and DCFC. We suggest that the program consider securing a significant portion of the funds for multifamily charging projects in affordable housing.

XX. CONCLUSION

Q. Can you summarize your testimony?

A. Between 2022 and 2024, the Company has made valuable strides toward meeting the intent of the EVIP as authorized by statute and the Commission's Order. We believe that incentives offered through the EVIP support expanded access to charging and EV adoption, are cost-effective, and align with Utah law. Company-owned public DCFC plays an important role in the EV charging space, but it cannot replace the need for multifamily and workplace charging. We recommend that the EVIP continue to fund rebates for Level 2 and DCFC charging.

Q. Does that conclude your testimony?

A. Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
Docket No. 20-035-34

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by email this 2nd day of October 2025, on the following:

Data Request Response Center (datareq@pacificorp.com, utahdockets@pacificorp.com)
PacifiCorp

Max Backlund (max.backlund@pacificorp.com)
Joe Dallas (joe.dallas@pacificorp.com)
Rocky Mountain Power

Sophie Hayes (sophie.hayes@westernresources.org)
Deborah Kapiloff (deborah.kapiloff@westernresources.org)
Aaron Kressig (aaron.kressig@westernresources.org)
Western Resource Advocates

Kelbe Goupil (kelbe@utahcleanenergy.org)
Logan Mitchell (logan@utahcleanenergy.org)
Sarah Wright (sarah@utahcleanenergy.org)
Utah Clean Energy

Scott Dunbar (sdunbar@keyesfox.com)
Partner, Keyes & Fox LLP
Matthew Deal (matthew.deal@chargepoint.com)
ChargePoint, Inc.

Phillip J. Russell (prussell@jdrslaw.com)
JAMES DODGE RUSSELL & STEPHENSPC
Kevin C. Higgins (khiggins@energystrat.com)
Energy Strategies LLC
Utah Association of EnergyUsers

Victoria R. Mandell, Esq. (vmandell@comcast.net)
Lindsey Stegall (lindsey.stegall@evgo.com)
EVgo Services, LLC

Linda M. Bullen (linda@bullenlaw.com)
Erick Karlen (ekarlen@greenlots.com)
Thomas Ashley (tom@greenlots.com)
Greenlots

Patricia Schmid (pschmid@agutah.gov)
Patrick Grecu (pgrecu@agutah.gov)
Robert Moore (rmoore@agutah.gov)
Assistant Utah Attorneys General

Madison Galt (mgalt@utah.gov)
Division of Public Utilities

Alyson Anderson (akanderson@utah.gov)
Cameron Irmas (cirmas@utah.gov)
Jennifer Ntiamoah (jntiamoah@utah.gov)
Bela Vastag (bvastag@utah.gov)
Alex Ware (aware@utah.gov) (ocs@utah.gov)
Office of ConsumerServices

/s/ *Lauren R. Barros*
Attorney for Utah Clean Energy