APPLICATION OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

Docket No. 21-035-42

PUBLIC HEARING

November 30, 2021

ADVANCED REPORTING SOLUTIONS

801-746-5080 | office@advancedrep.com | advancedrep.com

SALT LAKE | 159 West Broadway, Broadway Lofts, Suite 100 | Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

PROVO | 3507 North University Avenue, Suite 350-D | Provo, Utah 84604

ST. GEORGE | 20 North Main Street, Suite 301 | St. George, Utah 84770



Public Hearing November 30, 2021

1	
2	PUBLIC HEARING DOCKET NO. 21-035-42
3	APPLICATION OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER FOR ALTERNATIVE COST
4	RECOVERY FOR MAJOR PLANT ADDITIONS OF THE PRYOR MOUNTAIN
5	AND TB FLATS wind PROJECTS
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	Hearing dated November 30, 2021
12	From 9:01 a.m. to 1:23 p.m.
13	
14	Public Service Commission of Utah Heber Wells Building
15	160 East 300 South Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
16	Bare lake city, otali offic
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Reported by: Deirdre Rand, RPR, CSR, CCR

1	APPEARANCES
2	
3	Public Service Commission:
4	CHAIR THAD LEVAR COMMISSIONER DAVID R. CLARK
5	COMMISSIONER DAVID R. CLARR COMMISSIONER RON ALLEN MELISSA PASCHAL
6	MEDISSA FASCIAL
7	Rocky Mountain Power: EMILY L. WEGENER
8 9	Division of Public Utilities: JUSTIN JETTER
10	Office of Consumer Services: ROBERT MOORE
11 12	Utah Association of Energy Users: PHILLIP RUSSELL
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	-00000-
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX	
2	WITNESS	PAGE
3	JOELLE STEWARD Direct Examination by Ms. Wegener Cross-Examination by Mr. Moore	
5	Cross-Examination by Mr. Russell Examination by the Commission (Chair LeVar)	21
6	NIKKI KOBLIHA Direct Examination by Ms. Wegener	28
7	TIMOTHY HEMSTREET Direct Examination by Ms. Wegener	31
9	ROBERT VAN ENGELENHOVEN Direct Examination by Ms. Wegener	35
10	STEVEN MCDOUGAL Direct Examination by Ms. Wegener	
12	Cross-Examination by Mr. Jetter	46
13	ROBERT MEREDITH Direct Examination by Ms. Wegener Cross-Examination by Mr. Russell	
15 16	MICHELE BECK Direct Examination by Mr. Moore Examination by the Commission (Chair LeVar)	
17 18	DR. JONI ZENGER Direct Examination by Mr. Jetter	97
19	TREVOR JONES Direct Examination by Mr. Jetter	104
20 21	GARY SMITH Direct Examination by Mr. Jetter	107
22	Cross-Examination by Ms. Wegener DR. WILLIAM ARTIE POWELL	111
23	Direct Examination by Mr. Jetter	
24 25	Examination by the Commission (Chair LeVar)	122
27		

1	I N D E X (continued)	
2	WITNESS	PAGE
3		
4	JUSTIN BIEBER Direct Examination by Mr. Russell	107
5	Cross-Examination by Ms. Wegener	
6	KEVIN HIGGINS Direct Examination by Mr. Russell	134
7	Examination by the Commission (Chair LeVar)	
8		
9	-00000-	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22 23		
23 24		
25		

1		EXHIBITS	
2	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
3	OCS CROSS	Selected portion of Rebuttal	19
4	EXHIBIT 1	Testimony of Joelle R. Steward	10
5			
6		-00000-	
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR LEVAR: We'll be on the record.

And good morning, we're here for a Public Service Commission hearing in Docket 21-035-42, Rocky Mountain Power's Application for an Alternative Cost Recovery for Major Plant Additions of the Pryor Mountain and TB Flats Wind Projects.

Participating for the Commission today is myself, Thad LeVar, Commissioner David Clark, and Commissioner Ron Allen. And we will go to appearances next, and we'll start with Rocky Mountain Power.

MS. WEGENER: Good morning. This is Emily
Wegener appearing on behalf of Rocky Mountain Power.
With me in the room I have Company witnesses Joelle
Steward, Steve McDougal, Robert Van Engelenhoven, Robert
Meredith, and with me joining remotely, is Nikki Kobliha
and Tim Hemstreet.

Thank you.

CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you.

For the Division of Public Facilities?

MR. JETTER: And good morning. My name is

Justin Jetter, and I'm an attorney with the Utah

Attorney General's Office. I'm here today representing

25 | the Utah Division of Public Utilities. And the Division

1 intends to present four witnesses today, Joni Zenger, 2 Trevor Jones, Gary Smith, and Dr. William Powell. 3 all of them are present in the hearing this morning, 4 I believe. 5 CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Jetter. Mr. Moore? 6 Robert Moore, I'm with the 7 MR. MOORE: Attorney General's Office representing the Office of 8 Consumer Services. The Office's witness today will be 9 10 Director Michele Beck. 11 CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moore. 12 Mr. Russell? 13 MR. RUSSELL: Thank you. Phil Russell on 14 behalf of the Utah Association of Energy Users. 15 will be presenting two witnesses today, Justin Bieber 16 and Kevin Higgins. Neither of whom are currently here, 17 but will be here when necessary. 18 CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Russell. 19 Rocky Mountain Power filed a motion requesting 20 permission to have two of its witnesses participate 21 remotely. They indicated in their motion that no party 22 objected, so I'll just confirm that. If anyone has any 23 objection to the motion, indicate it now. 24 And I'm not seeing any, so that motion is 25 granted.

Hopefully the video will work, but if it 1 2 doesn't, we can always fall back to audio. 3 Any other matters before we go to the first 4 witness? 5 Okay. Ms. Wegener? 6 MS. WEGENER: The Company calls Joelle 7 Steward. CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Ms. Steward. 8 9 Do you swear to tell the truth? 10 MS. STEWARD: I do. 11 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. 12 MS. STEWARD: Do you have a preference if 13 leave the mask on or off? 14 CHAIR LEVAR: No preference. I'm leaving mine 15 on. 16 JOELLE STEWARD 17 DIRECT EXAMINATION 18 BY MS. WEGENER: Good morning, Ms. Steward. Can you please 19 0. 20 state and spell your name for the record? 21 My name is Joelle Steward. It's J-o-e-l-l-e, Α. 22 S-t-e-w-a-r-d. 23 What's your position with Rocky Mountain 24 Power? 25 I'm the senior vice president of regulation Α.

1 for PacifiCorp. 2 And did you submit direct and rebuttal 0. 3 testimony in this matter? 4 Α. I did. Do you have any corrections to that testimony? 5 0. 6 I do not. Α. If I asked you the questions in that testimony 7 0. today, would your answers be the same? 8 9 Α. Yes. 10 MS. WEGENER: Move to admit the direct and 11 rebuttal testimony of Joelle Steward. 12 Thank you. If anyone objects to CHAIR LEVAR: 13 that motion, please indicate your objection. 14 I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted. 15 BY MS. WEGENER: 16 Ms. Steward, can you please provide a summary 17 of your testimony? 18 Yes, I can. 19 Thank you. Good morning, Chairman LeVar, 20 Commissioner Clark, and Commissioner Allen. My testimony provides an overview of Rocky Mountain 21 22 Power's application for alternative cost recovery for 23 the remaining cost of the Pryor Mountain and TB Flats 24 wind projects that are not currently in rates following 25 the 2020 general rate case.

Before I provide more detail on the Company's request, I will first provide some background on the two projects included in this case.

TB Flats was approved by the Commission in Docket 17-035-40 as part of the Company's Energy Vision 2020 project. And Pryor Mountain was found to be prudent in the 2020 general rate case.

When the Company submitted its 2020 general rate case application in May of 2020, both projects had planned in-service dates near the end of 2020. By the time the Company submitted its rebuttal testimony in October of 2020, the in-service for the full commercial operation of the projects had been pushed to 2021 as a result of delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

My rebuttal testimony in the 2020 rate case proposed a two-step rate change to recover the full revenue requirement of the portion of TB Flats and Pryor Mountain that were projected to be in service in 2021.

Ultimately, the Commission determined that
Utah law governing test periods in general rate cases
precluded their ability to approve the adjustment for
the delayed portion of the projects and based the
revenue requirement upon an average of test period for
calendar year 2021.

With that background, with this -- in this

application, Utah Code, specifically Section 54-7-13.4, which I'll refer to as the major plant addition statute, authorizes the Commission to approve alternative cost recovery for these major plant additions that have been found to be prudent.

The Company is requesting the 6.7 million in annual revenue requirement for the investment in these plants to be included in rates. This amount is not for incremental additions to Pryor Mountain and TB Flats, rather it reflects the capital cost of the projects not currently in rates. Since customers will receive the full benefits of the projects through the energy balancing account, the Company is seeking recovery of the capital cost of the projects to match costs and benefits.

Additionally, the application reflects an update to base EBA to reflect the projects' savings on a consistent timeline as the costs. The costs and benefits together result in a net rate decrease of \$4.2 million, or 0.2 percent, effective January 1, 2022.

The Division of Public Utilities, the Office of Consumer Services, and the Utah Association of Energy Users have argued in their testimony, and through a motion for summary judgment, that Utah Code does not apply in this case, and that the Company is

circumventing the normal results of rate making.
Clearly, the Company disagrees.

This statute defines a major plant addition as any single capital project -- any single capital investment project of an electrical corporation that in total exceeds one percent of the electrical corporation's rate base.

The cost the Company is seeking recovery of in this case are for the single capital investments of TB Flats and Pryor Mountain, and the cost of each exceed that threshold. The statute allows the Company to file for cost recovery of major plant addition if the Commission has entered a final order in a general rate case within 18 months of the in-service date of the major plant.

Again, both TB Flats and Pryor Mountain projects qualify since the in-service dates and the filing in this case were made within 18 months of the final order in the 2020 rate case.

Dr. Powell argues that only additional costs should be considered when defining any major plant additions, since this case could create a precedent where any incremental addition to the large project would meet the threshold.

However in this case, the Company is not

seeking recovery of an incremental addition, but it is instead seeking recovery of full costs necessary to support the resource decisions that were already found to be prudent by the Commission.

In other words, the Company has not added any additional portion to the projects, as they were defined and approved in a prior proceeding. Instead, the Company is seeking recovery of a material amount of the investment for these projects that is not currently in rates.

UAE witness Mr. Higgins argues that these projects are entirely included in the rate base because they were included in the average of period test year in the 2020 rate case, and we are therefore trying to circumvent normal rate making.

Similarly, OCS witness Ms. Beck states that the Company's request subverts the test year policy. However, the MPA statute and the test year rules in general rate cases are not in conflict with each other. On the contrary, the Company's major plant addition request is an example of applying the statute as it was intended to provide timely recovery of investment without the need for back-to-back general rate cases.

The 18-month qualification in the MPA statute

1 helps to balance rate case timing with in-service dates 2 for major capital investments. 3 Furthermore, average of period rate making 4 treatment in the -- used in the general rate case should not be conflated with the actual capital cost of the 5 investments that are incurred to produce the benefits 6 that will flow to the customers in the EBA. 7 The fact of the matter is that rates do not 8 9 reflect the full capital cost. The Company is seeking 10 nothing more than a fair outcome of obtaining full cost 11 recovery for the TB Flats and Pryor Mountain wind 12 projects, as customers are receiving the full net power 13 costs and production tax benefits. 14 And that concludes my summary. 15 Q. Thank you. 16 Thank you. I have nothing MS. WEGENER: further for this witness, and she's available for 17 18 cross-examination and questions from the Commission. 19 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Ms. Wegener. 20 Mr. Jetter, do you have any questions for 2.1 Ms. Steward? 22 MR. JETTER: I have no questions. Thank you. 23 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Jetter. 24 Mr. Moore? 25 MR. MOORE: Just a few questions.

1	CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. MOORE:
3	Q. Good morning, Ms. Steward. Can I direct your
4	attention to the question and answer on line 19 through
5	33 of your rebuttal testimony, and ask you to read that
6	portion of your testimony to yourself?
7	A. I'm sorry, could you repeat the cite?
8	Q. Yes. Your rebuttal testimony.
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Line 19 through 33.
11	A. And you want me to read?
12	Q. Just read that to yourself.
13	A. Oh, okay.
14	(Witness reviews testimony.) Okay.
15	Q. In this testimony, you provide your
16	understanding of the major plant addition statute, Utah
17	Code Section 54-7-13.4. Isn't that correct?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Do you agree with me that in reading this
20	statute, a reader should assume that the legislature
21	uses each word of the statute advisedly?
22	A. I believe so.
23	Q. Regarding your reading of the major plant
24	addition statute, how does your construction give
25	meaning to the word "addition" in Section

1 54-7-13.4(1)(c)? I believe that's the definition of 2 major plant addition. 3 I didn't guite catch the beginning of your 4 question. 5 How does your construction give meaning to the term "addition?" 6 The word "addition?" Well, a major plant is 7 Α. 8 an addition to our rate base. It's a new resource. 9 And that resource is it worth -- is it more 10 than one percent -- in your application, the resources 11 are worth more than one percent -- the additional 12 resources are worth more than one percent of your rate 13 base; isn't that correct? 14 The total project is more than one percent of Α. 15 our rate base. 16 But the addition is not? 0. 17 We were considering the entire project to be That was how the cost and benefits of the 18 the addition. 19 entire project were evaluated for prudence. 20 Do you agree with me that the term "major 0. 21 plant addition statute" should be used consistently 22 throughout the statute? 23 Α. I believe so. 24 0. I'm going to direct your attention to another

part of your rebuttal testimony, lines 50 to 52.

25

1 Will you please --

A. Okay.

- Q. Could you please read the sentence containing those lines, starting with the words "moreover," and ending with the words "proceeding into the record?"
- A. "Moreover, the concern that the Company could merely rely on these project costs to seek recovery of any incremental addition in the future is a red herring, as that is not a circumstance before the Commission in this proceeding."
- Q. Now, Ms. Steward, could I direct your attention to the lines 150 to 152 of your rebuttal testimony? Could you please read the sentence starting with the word "parties'," and ending with the word "proceeding?"
 - A. I'm sorry, the line 150?
 - Q. To 152, yes.
- A. Oh. "Parties' speculation about the result of allowing recovery here are not based on circumstances before the Commission in this proceeding."
- Q. In the sentence you just read, you take the position that the Commission's order granting -- that a Commission order granting your application would not set a precedent for future cases; isn't that correct?
 - A. I imagine any order sets some sort of

1 precedent for future cases. But the context of how 2 that's applied is probably what is important there. 3 0. What material facts are unique to the incident 4 case that will not be repeated in future cases dealing with incremental costs being added to an investment 5 already included in rates? 6 I'm not sure, given what future cases 7 may look like. But the circumstances of this case are 8 9 merely costs associated with a project that was 10 approved, that is a significant project providing 11 benefits to customers. 12 Do you agree with me under those factual 0. 13 circumstances the -- this -- the Commission order 14 granting your application would result in a precedent 15 regarding that situation where you have costs already 16 included in rates, adding incremental cost to the ... 17 Α. Potentially, yes. It would also govern, you 18 know, treatment going forward. 19 In Rocky Mountain Power's 220 [verbatim] rate 0. 20 case you testified that if the public -- I'm going to a different position now. In Rocky Mountain --21 22 Could you possibly move your microphone a 23 little bit closer. I'm having...

> 0. How is this?

24

25

Α. That is much better. Thank you.

1	Q. In Rocky Mountain Power's 220 [verbatim]
2	general rate case you testified that if the Commission
3	did not accept the proposal with a two-step rate
4	increase, the Commission could consider an alternative
5	recommendation proposed by Rocky Mountain Power; isn't
6	that correct?
7	A. I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?
8	I don't think I followed it.
9	Q. In your testimony in the recent general rate
10	case
11	A. Yes.
12	Q you testified that if the Commission did
13	not accept your proposal for a two-step rate increase in
14	connection with the Rocky Mountain Flats and the Pryor
15	Mountain Wind Project the Commission should consider an
16	alternative recommendation proposed by Rocky Mountain
17	Power; isn't that correct?
18	A. I mean, we proposed the two-step rate change.
19	That was our proposal in the case. And I stated in that
20	testimony that if it wasn't approved, we would seek
21	major plant addition filing for those costs.
22	Q. Ms. Steward, I'm going to hand you a document
23	marked as OCS Cross Exhibit 1 and represent to you that
24	it is a portion of your rebuttal testimony from the last
25	general rate case.

1	May I approach?
2	CHAIR LEVAR: Yes.
3	BY MR. MOORE:
4	Q. Now, may I direct your attention to lines 231
5	and 233 of the exhibit?
6	A. Oh, yes.
7	Q. I believe you testified, "If the Company's
8	proposed two-step rate change is not accepted, the
9	Company should be able to make adjustments to the EBA
10	and retain the portion of benefits associated with
11	capital not in rates." [As read.] Did I read that
12	correctly?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Isn't it correct that the Public Service
15	Commission did not accept your proposal of the two-step
16	rate increase, nor did the Public Service Commission
17	approve the Company's alternative prorationing of
18	benefits approach?
19	A. I don't believe the Commission made any
20	determination in the rate case order on that
21	alternative.
22	Q. They didn't grant it.
23	A. They didn't grant it. We also haven't filed
24	the EBA that would be applicable.
25	Q. But they didn't grant it in the general rate

1 case? 2 They did not address it in the rate case 3 order. 4 And Rocky Mountain Power didn't appeal the 0. Commission's decision on prorationing, nor did it even 5 file a petition to reconsider on that issue; isn't that 6 7 correct? We did not. 8 Α. I have no further questions. 9 MR. MOORE: 10 Thank you. 11 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Moore. 12 Mr. Russell? 13 MR. RUSSELL: I have a couple. 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. RUSSELL: 16 Ms. Steward, in your summary you indicated 0. 17 that the Company in this docket is seeking an increase to -- I think it was total plant -- annual total plant 18 19 revenue requirement of \$6.7 million; is that right? 20 Α. Yes. 21 And that's made up of two separate components, 22 the way I see it. One, is there's an adjustment or a 23 change to the manner in which -- for the measurement 24 period for the average rate base for each project,

25

correct?

1 It's an annualized revenue requirement, so Α. 2 it's for 12 months from the date of in-service. 3 0. Right. And that -- and that's different from 4 the way that those -- the capital costs of those 5 projects were measured in the rate case, right? 6 Correct. Α. 7 Q. Okay. And then in this docket, you've also updated 8 9 the projected cost of each project with TB -- well, I'll 10 just -- you've updated the projected cost for these 11 projects, right? 12 Α. Correct. 13 And the result of that update is that the 0. 14 projected cost for -- I think it's TB Flats, is slightly higher and the projected cost for Pryor Mountain is 15 16 slightly lower than was in the projections in the 17 general rate case, right? 18 I will say subject to check. I know our other 19 witnesses, Mr. McDougal, Mr. Hemstreet, Mr. Van 20 Engelenhoven, are more familiar with the specific cost 21 changes, yes. 22 Sure. Okay. 0. 23 And I want to focus on that last -- on that 24 second bit of the change that we're talking about, which

is the update to projected costs.

25

1 You've submitted some testimony regarding the 2 Company's view of how the major plant addition statute 3 works. 4 Is it the Company's view that for a project that is in a rate case fully in service prior to the 5 test period, but that there are increased costs, or the 6 projected costs of that project increase after the rate 7 case order, that the Company can file a -- for cost 8 9 recovery under the statute for those increased -- for 10 the increase in the projected costs? 11 Δ I don't know that we would. T think it. 12 would -- we would have to take into account the specific 13 circumstances here. Because a material portion of the costs were not included in rates, we sought a major 14 15 plant addition filing. 16 Yeah, the response you gave is slightly 0. 17 different than my question. The question -- the 18 response was -- your response was whether you would, and 19 my question was really whether you think you could. 20 I think yes. Α. 21 Thank you. Q. 22 I would like you to turn in your rebuttal 23 testimony to line 117.

24

25

Α.

Q.

Okay.

You beat me to it.

1 Starting on line 117 -- or at line 117, you 2 offer some testimony related to your position about 3 changing the EBA, the base EBA, in this docket, right? 4 Α. Yes. And I'll -- we can read this into the record 5 0. 6 if necessary, it's already in. But your -- generally speaking, your position is that the Commission ought to 7 change the base EBA. Assuming it approves the -- your 8 request for cost recovery, the Commission ought to 9 10 change the base EBA in this docket to match benefits and 11 costs, correct? 12 Α. Correct. 13 Okay. And that matching would occur on a Utah 0. 14 jurisdictional basis, right? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Utah's share of the system base is all I'm 0. 17 trying to get at. 18 Yes, all of our costs are on the Utah basis --19 or rates, yes. 20 0. Sure. 21 Now, that doesn't necessarily result in a 22 matching for each of the rate classes, though, right? 23 That would depend on the manner in which cost and 24 benefits are allocated to those rate classes, right? 25 Α. I mean, I think it should. I'm not sure

that -- what you're looking for there.

- Q. Well, I'm going to have a conversation with Mr. Meredith later, hopefully this morning, related to a -- the manner in which the Company is proposing to allocate costs and benefits versus spread the rates.

 And I guess my question to you is, does changing the base EBA -- does it create a uniform allocation if you're changing the manner in which rates are spread from the rate case to this docket?
- A. I mean, I believe it should. Mr. Meredith can probably go into more detail or even Mr. McDougal on the allocations of the cost.
- Q. And perhaps -- and perhaps I'll just talk to Mr. Meredith about this, but if you've got a -- your stated concern here is that the actual benefits of these projects would flow through the EBA otherwise, right?

 If the base EBA isn't changed, right?
 - A. Correct. Absent any other adjustment, yes.
 - O. Sure.

And they would be allocated however they get allocated in the EBA, but it would be based on the rates that are currently charged to customers, right? The costs that are allocated among the rate class would be based on the current rates, right?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And to the extent that you are changing the 0. rates for each rate class, it will -- and bringing forward the benefits, it will change the way that those benefits are allocated to the various rate classes, right? Just as a general proposition? Generally, it could. I don't know that it Α. would be any material amount. Fair enough. Okay. Thank you. 0. MR. RUSSELL: That's all I have. CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Russell. Ms. Wegener, any redirect? MS. WEGENER: No redirect. Thank you. CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Allen, do you have any questions for Ms. Steward? COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank you. CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Clark? COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have no questions. Thank you. I have maybe one. CHAIR LEVAR: DIRECT EXAMINATION BY THE COMMISSION BY CHAIR LEVAR: If you'll indulge a hypothetical. Q. Α. Okay. So my hypothetical is, Rocky Mountain Power Q.

completes a wind generation project that qualifies for 1 2 PTCs and comes in service 20 months following the most 3 recent general rate case order, and Rocky Mountain Power 4 does not file a general rate case for the next couple years after that in-service date. 5 How should those PTCs be treated in the EBA? 6 I'd have to look back at our EBA testimony --7 or our rate case testimony, but I believe the way we 8 9 phrased it in our case, that the PTC should flow back 10 and consistent with the costs that are included in the 11 case -- in rates. 12 0. Thank you. 13 That answers my question. I don't have anything further. Thank you for your testimony this 14 15 morning. 16 MS. STEWARD: Okay. Thanks. 17 CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener? 18 The Company calls Nikki Kobliha. MS. WEGENER: 19 MS. KOBLIHA: Okav. Hopefully you can both 20 hear me and see me. 21 CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Kobliha, we can see you. 22 At this point, the volume in this room is pretty low. 23 Is there a way we can try to increase that? 24 MS. KOBLIHA: If I talk louder, does that 25 help? Or is it somehow pulling from my computer and not

1	the headset?
2	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. We're adjusting the
3	microphone, and I think we have it solved. We might get
4	feedback.
5	MS. KOBLIHA: Okay.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Can you hear us clearly?
7	MS. KOBLIHA: Yes, I can.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Ms. Kobliha, do you swear
9	to tell the truth?
10	MS. KOBLIHA: I do.
11	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Go ahead.
12	NIKKI KOBLIHA
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MS. WEGENER:
15	Q. Good morning, Ms. Kobliha. Could you please
16	state and spell your name for the record?
17	A. Nikki Kobliha. N-i-k-k-i, K-o-b-l-i-h-a.
18	Q. What's your position with the Company?
19	A. I'm the chief financial officer and treasurer
20	of PacifiCorp.
21	THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, treasurer of the
22	what?
23	CHAIR LEVAR: I think the microphone turned
24	off.
25	If you could just start over your answer to

1	that question?
2	MS. KOBLIHA: Chief financial officer and
3	treasurer of PacifiCorp.
4	BY MS. WEGENER:
5	Q. Thank you.
6	Did you submit direct testimony and exhibits
7	in this proceeding?
8	A. Yes, I did.
9	Q. Do you have any corrections to that testimony?
10	A. No, I do not.
11	Q. If I asked you the same questions in your
12	testimony today, would your answers be the same?
13	A. Yes, they would.
14	MS. WEGENER: I move to admit the testimony
15	and exhibits submitted by Nikki Kobliha.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
17	If anyone objects to that motion, indicate
18	your objection.
19	I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted.
20	BY MS. WEGENER:
21	Q. Ms. Kobliha, could you please provide a
22	summary of your testimony?
23	A. Yes, I can.
24	Good morning, Commissioners. Thank you for
25	

1 this case. 2 My testimony discusses how the Company 3 financed the construction of Pryor Mountain and TB Flats 4 facilities through a blend of capital, including operating cash flows, and the issue of new long-term and 5 6 short-term debt. In addition, my testimony indicates 7 the capital investment plan for these facilities was noted in rating agency presentations, and disclosed in 8 9 the Company's December 31, 2020 Form 10-K. 10 concludes my summary. 11 Thank you. Q. 12 I have nothing further for this MS. WEGENER: witness and she's available for cross-examination and 13 14 questions from the Commission. 15 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Ms. Wegener. 16 Mr. Jetter, do you have any questions for Ms. Kobliha? 17 18 I do not have any questions. MR. JETTER: 19 Thank you. 20 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. 2.1 Mr. Moore? 22 MR. MOORE: No questions from the Office. 23 Thank you. 24 CHAIR LEVAR: Thanks. 25 Mr. Russell?

MR. RUSSELL: No questions. Thank you.
CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen?
COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions.
CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
Commissioner Clark?
COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank you.
CHAIR LEVAR: I don't have any either, so
thank you for your testimony this morning, Ms. Kobliha.
MS. KOBLIHA: Thank you.
CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
MS. WEGENER: The Company calls Timothy
Hemstreet.
CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Hemstreet, we can see you.
Can you hear us?
MR. HEMSTREET: Yes, I can.
CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Do you swear to tell the
truth?
MR. HEMSTREET: Yes, I do.
CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
TIMOTHY HEMSTREET
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MS. WEGENER:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Hemstreet. Can you please
state and spell your name for the record?
A. Timothy Hemstreet. T-i-m-o-t-h-y, Hemstreet,

1	H-e-m as in Mary, s-t-r-e-e-t.
2	Q. What's your position with the Company?
3	A. Managing director of renewable energy
4	development.
5	Q. Did you submit direct and rebuttal testimony
6	in this matter?
7	A. Yes, I did.
8	Q. Do you have any corrections to that testimony?
9	A. No, I do not.
10	Q. If I asked you the questions in that testimony
11	today, would your answers be the same?
12	A. Yes, they would.
13	MS. WEGENER: I move to admit the direct and
14	rebuttal testimony of Timothy Hemstreet.
15	CHAIR LEVAR: If anyone objects to that
16	motion, indicate your objection.
17	I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted.
18	BY MS. WEGENER:
19	Q. Mr. Hemstreet, can you please provide a
20	summary of your testimony?
21	A. Yes.
22	Good morning. My testimony demonstrates that
23	the Company has prudently managed the construction of
24	the TB Flats wind energy project, and that all costs
25	accrued by the Company for the project are reasonable.

TB Flats is a 500 megawatt wind generation facility and associated infrastructure located in Carbon and Albany counties, Wyoming.

The Public Service Commission of Utah preapproved TB Flats in Docket 17-035-40 as part of the Company's new wind projects included in its overall Energy Vision 2020 project.

The Company originally planned to complete the project in November 2020. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, 28 of 132 wind turbines were unable to be delivered during the construction season in time to allow for their erection in 2020, prior to the onset of winter weather conditions. Delivery of the remaining turbines was completed in May 2021, and the project was fully placed in service on July 26, 2021.

During the Company's 2020 general rate case in Docket No. 20-035-04, the Commission approved total projected -- total costs for TB Flats although only a portion of this was included in rates. The slight increase in project costs is due to construction and other delays caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

In his rebuttal testimony, Mr. Jones initially raised concerns regarding the increase in costs.

Specifically, he was concerned about the portion of the increase that was due to the contractor markup.

1	However, the Company explained that the markup is
2	included in the contract as an allowance for the
3	contractor's administrative and general costs associated
4	with change orders, which in this case, were wholly
5	related to the pandemic.
6	Following the Company's explanation, Mr. Jones
7	stated in surrebuttal that his concerns had been
8	addressed, and he now recommends that the costs for
9	TB Flats be approved.
10	The Company has prudently managed the
11	implementation of the project in the face of the
12	challenging conditions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.
13	I respectfully request that the Commission allow the
14	Company to recover its costs associated with the
15	TB Flats wind project. Thank you.
16	Q. Thank you.
17	MS. WEGENER: I have nothing further for this
18	witness, and he's available for cross-examination and
19	questions from the Commission.
20	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Ms. Wegener.
21	Mr. Jetter?
22	MR. JETTER: No questions. Thank you.
23	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Moore?
24	MR. MOORE: No questions. Thank you.
25	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Russell?

1	MR. RUSSELL: No questions. Thank you.
2	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Clark?
3	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank you.
4	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
5	Commissioner Allen?
6	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank you.
7	CHAIR LEVAR: I don't have any either, so
8	thank you for participating in our hearing this morning
9	Mr. Hemstreet.
10	MR. HEMSTREET: Thank you.
11	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
12	MS. WEGENER: The Company calls Robert Van
13	Engelenhoven.
14	CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Mr. Van
15	Engelenhoven. Do you swear to tell the truth?
16	MR. VAN ENGELENHOVEN: I do.
17	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
18	ROBERT VAN ENGELENHOVEN
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MS. WEGENER:
21	Q. Good morning, Mr. Van Engelenhoven. Can you
22	please state and spell your name for the record?
23	A. My name is Robert Van Engelenhoven,
24	R-o-b-e-r-t, space, capital V-a-n, space, capital
25	E-n-g-e-l-e-n-h-o-v-e-n.

1	CHAIR LEVAR: And I'm not sure the microphone
2	is picking you up, which only matters for the streaming,
3	but we want to make sure that you're audible there.
4	MR. VAN ENGELENHOVEN: Is that better?
5	CHAIR LEVAR: I think so, yes.
6	MR. VAN ENGELENHOVEN: Okay.
7	BY MS. WEGENER:
8	Q. What is your position with Rocky Mountain
9	Power?
10	A. I'm the resource development director for
11	Rocky Mountain Power.
12	Q. Did you submit direct and rebuttal testimony
13	in this matter?
14	A. I did.
15	Q. Aside from the correction noted in your
16	rebuttal testimony, do you have any corrections to that
17	testimony?
18	A. I do not.
19	Q. If I asked you the questions in your testimony
20	today, would your answers be the same?
21	A. They would.
22	MS. WEGENER: Move to admit the direct and
23	rebuttal testimony of Robert Van Engelenhoven.
24	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
25	If anyone objects to that motion, please

indicate your objection.

I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted.

BY MS. WEGENER:

Q. Mr. Engelenhoven, can you please provide a summary of your testimony?

A. Yes.

Good morning, Commissioners and parties. The purpose of my testimony is to provide information regarding the Company's Pryor Mountain Wind project. Specifically, I discuss the details of the project, the costs associated with the project, and the current status of the project.

The Pryor Mountain wind project is located approximately 60 miles south of Billings, Montana in Carbon County. It consists of 114 wind turbines with a main plate capacity of 240 megawatts.

Site activities for the project, such as construction of some of the access roads and material lay-down area, began in 2019 before winter weather halted construction. In March of 2020, construction began again.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Company received numerous force majeure and excusable event notices from contractors, and construction was not completed until December of 2020.

1 Ten wind turbines were placed in service on 2 December 31, 2020, and all remaining turbines were 3 placed in service by March 31, 2021. The completed 4 project was placed in commercial operation on April 1, 2021. 5 I'd also like to note that DPU witness 6 Dr. Joni Zenger initially raised some concerns regarding 7 affiliate transactions covering the equipment used at 8 9 Pryor Mountain. However, in her surrebuttal testimony 10 she indicated that the Company had resolved her concerns 11 with the answers provided in data responses in my 12 rebuttal testimony. 13 It is my understanding that the Division has 14 no further questions regarding any affiliate 15 transactions associated with Pryor Mountain. 16 In this major plant addition case, the Company 17 is seeking recovery of the total forecasted project costs, which is lower than was forecasted and approved 18 19 in the Company's 2020 general rate case. 20 That concludes my testimony -- my summary, 21 sorry. 22 Thank you, Mr. Van Engelenhoven. 0. 23 MS. WEGENER: I have nothing further for this 24 witness, and he is available for cross-examination and

questions from the Commission.

1	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
2	Mr. Jetter, do you have any questions?
3	MR. JETTER: No questions. Thank you.
4	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
5	Mr. Moore?
6	MR. MOORE: No questions from the Office.
7	Thank you.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Russell?
9	MR. RUSSELL: No questions. Thank you.
10	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen?
11	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank
12	you.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Clark?
14	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank
15	you.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: I don't either, so thank you for
17	your testimony this morning, Mr. Van Engelenhoven.
18	MR. VAN ENGELENHOVEN: Thank you.
19	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
20	MS. WEGENER: The Company calls Steve
21	McDougal.
22	CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Mr. McDougal.
23	Do you swear to tell the truth?
24	MR. MCDOUGAL: I do.
25	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.

1	STEVEN MCDOUGAL
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MS. WEGENER:
4	Q. Good morning, Mr. McDougal. Can you please
5	state and spell your name?
6	A. Yes. My name is Steven McDougal.
7	S-t-e-v-e-n, M-c-D-o-u-g-a-l.
8	Q. What's your position with Rocky Mountain
9	Power?
10	A. I am the managing director of revenue
11	requirements.
12	Q. Did you submit testimony direct, rebuttal, and
13	surrebuttal, as well as exhibits in this matter?
14	A. Yes, I did.
15	Q. Do you have any corrections to that testimony?
16	A. No, I do not.
17	Q. If I asked you the questions in your testimony
18	today, would your answers be the same?
19	A. Yes, they would.
20	MS. WEGENER: I move to admit the direct,
21	rebuttal, and surrebuttal testimony and associated
22	exhibits of Mr. Steve McDougal.
23	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
24	If anyone objects to that motion, please
25	indicate your objection.

Q. Mr. McDougal, can you please provide a summary of your testimony?

A. Yes.

As mentioned, I provided direct, rebuttal, and surrebuttal testimony. My direct testimony supports the Company's application to recover the remaining costs for the Pryor Mountain and TB Flats Wind projects that are not included in customer rates for the Company's 2020 general rate case, Docket No. 20-035-04, which I refer to as the 2020 GRC or general rate case.

As described in the testimony of Ms. Steward, the Company requested approval for the full annualized revenue requirement related to the Pryor Mountain and TB Flats wind projects in the 2020 GRC through a two-step increase.

The Commission denied the Company's two-step approach and instead included the Pryor Mountain and TB Flats wind projects using a 13-month average. This treatment does not allow for the full capital cost to be included in customer rates.

The Company is now requesting in this docket a rate change associated with the unrecovered portions of the Pryor Mountain and TB Flats. In order to fairly

match cost recovery with the pass back of benefits, the Company is requesting a net reduction of \$4.2 million in customer rates.

Table 1 on page 4 of my testimony summarizes the requested incremental revenue requirement. There are three components to the requested price change. First, an increase of approximately \$6.7 million for the total plant revenue requirement. Second, savings of approximately 6.8 million related to production tax credits, or PTCs. And third, savings related to net power costs of approximately 4.2 million.

Although the 2020 GRC appropriately matches the cost and benefits of these wind projects in calendar year 2021, it fails to appropriately match the cost and benefits starting in 2022. That is because the partial prorated capital and depreciation costs of the Pryor Mountain and TB Flats wind projects will remain embedded in customer rates until the next general rate case, while the net power cost and PTC benefits are tracked and trued up through the EBA, and absent any changes will be included at a full, annualized level.

My rebuttal testimony recaps and explains the Company's request in this case compared to the revenue requirement approved in the 2020 GRC. I describe how because of the use of the 13-month average rate base,

customers are not paying the full capital cost of the project. I also describe the impact of the requested change to net power cost and reaffirm the prudence of the Company's request.

Lastly, I describe how an adjustment could be made to the EBA to match benefits and costs, as first discussed in the Company's 2020 GRC rebuttal testimony.

Using Table 2 in my rebuttal testimony, the Company would include approximately 86 percent of the Pryor Mountain PTCs and net power cost benefits in the EBA, and approximately 83.4 percent of the TB Flats benefits.

My surrebuttal testimony more fully describes a potential option of changing the PTC and net power costs in the EBA to match the percent of TB Flats and Pryor Mountain capital included in rate base. This is similar to other adjustments that are already made in the EBA.

In conclusion, the revenue reduction of 4.2 million proposed by the Company is fair, just, and reasonable, and should be approved by this Commission. Thank you.

Q. Thank you, Mr. McDougal.

MS. WEGENER: I have nothing further for this witness, and he is available for cross-examination and

1 questions from the Commission. 2 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. 3 Mr. Jetter, do you have any questions for 4 Mr. McDougal? MR. JETTER: Just a few brief questions. 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. JETTER: 7 Good morning, Mr. McDougal. 8 0. 9 Good morning. Α. 10 You mentioned in your opening statement -- and 0. 11 I think this is also -- sorry, I'm bumping into my chair -- consistent with the testimony you've prefiled, that 12 13 in the general rate case the Commission takes a forward 14 test year and then they set rates based on that forward test year, and in a typical sense, without a change, 15 16 those rates would remain throughout whatever rate 17 effective period there is until the next general rate 18 Is that correct? 19 As a general rule, absent a major plant Α. 20 addition or other filing like this. 21 That's right. And so one of the ways to 0. 22 adjust that in the interim period would be a major plant 23 addition; isn't that correct? 24 Α. That's correct. 25 And otherwise, such a change is typically Q.

November 30, 2021 prohibited by this concept of single issue rate making; 1 2 would you agree with me on that? 3 Α. Typically. There's always changes that are 4 made, for instance, a tax law, and other changes where 5 things are changed that are material. Okay. And you mentioned the materiality --6 the materiality threshold exists so that only certain --7 certain categories or sizes of changes that are material 8 9 are allowed to be made, and would you agree with me 10 that the one percent threshold in the major plant 11 addition statute is that type of a materiality 12 threshold? 13 Α. It is a threshold that's mentioned by statute, 14 yes. And I think you would agree with me 15 0. Okay. 16 that the incremental addition from this major plant 17 addition case for each of the two different projects is less than one percent of the Company's rate base? 18 19 I consider the incremental the cost of the Α. 20 project, and the cost of each project was over that 21 threshold.

But you're not asking in this -- you -- and by 0. you, I mean Rocky Mountain Power in this application is not requesting an increase to the rate base that will make an adjustment to customer rates of the full project

22

23

24

1 cost, is it? 2 No, as outlined in my direct testimony, I show 3 that here is the total project revenue requirement, 4 here's what's already included in rates, so here's the difference that we're currently seeking. 5 6 And the difference you're currently seeking is less than one percent; is that correct? 7 It's -- yes, it's less than one percent. 8 Α. 9 It's the part that is not in rates of that original 10 project cost. Thank you. 11 Q. 12 MR. JETTER: Those are all my questions. 13 Thank you. 14 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Jetter. 15 Mr. Moore? 16 MR. MOORE: Just a few questions. 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 BY MR. MOORE: 19 Mr. McDougal, may I direct your attention to 20 your November 18th surrebuttal testimony and ask you to 21 read line 7 through 11 to yourself? 22 (Witness reviews testimony.) Okay. Α. 23 In those lines, you stated the purpose of your Q. 24 surrebuttal is to respond to the OCS's treatment of

production tax credits and net power cost benefits;

1	isn't that correct?
2	A. Okay. I actually was reading the wrong piece
3	of testimony. I'm sorry, let me
4	Q. That's line 7 through 11.
5	A. Yeah. I was looking at the rebuttal instead
6	of the surrebuttal.
7	Q. All right. Well, let's get straightened out.
8	A. Yeah. (Witness reviews testimony.) Okay.
9	Yes.
10	Q. On lines 28 and 30 of your surrebuttal
11	testimony, you stated, quote, "If the Commission rejects
12	the Company's proposal, the cost and benefits of the
13	projects should be matched, which would require an
14	adjustment to the EBA."
15	Did I read that correctly?
16	A. Correct. "After 2021," I would just point
17	that qualifier.
18	Q. Thank you.
19	Isn't it true that the calculation of adjusted
20	benefits of net power costs or the prorationing of net
21	power costs benefits, would be significantly more
22	complex than simply prorating production tax credits?
23	A. Not really.
24	Q. How would you propose to calculate and model

the adjustment in net power cost benefits?

Public Hearing November 30, 2021 Well, currently, in the EBA we already model 1 Α. 2 net power cost benefits associated with Subscriber 3 Solar, and we do adjustments associated with some 4 special contracts and other items. So in doing those, we look at the market 5 prices every hour and the output. So this would be no 6 different. You would just take a percentage of the 7 output in those hours and you would apply a market 8 9 price, just like what we do in Subscriber Solar. 10 I don't think it's overly complex. 11 Isn't it true that you haven't provided 0. 12 calculations or even a model in this docket to determine 13 how to calculate the net power cost benefits? 14 We have not provided a model. I state in my rebuttal testimony -- I have the table that shows the 15 16 percentage of each plant that we would use, which was a 17

percentage that was already in service.

And then for the calculations, that was not our primary recommendation, so no, we have not provided the model. But like I said, I would think it would be identical to the way we do the Subscriber Solar program here in Utah.

> MR. MOORE: I have no further questions.

CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moore.

Mr. Russell?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	MR. RUSSELL: I do excuse me, I do have two
2	questions.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. RUSSELL:
5	Q. Mr. McDougal, in your summary, you indicated a
6	percentage of the costs of each project, which are
7	already included in the rates. That percentage that you
8	gave comes from table 2 on page 4 of your rebuttal
9	testimony, does it not?
10	A. That is correct.
11	Q. And just to just to make clear, the
12	percentages are not considered to be confidential,
13	right?
14	A. Correct.
15	Q. Okay. So you've indicated that the percentage
16	of the costs of Pryor Mountain that the Company
17	considers to be in rates to be 86 percent, and the
18	percentage of the costs of TB Flats that the Company
19	considers to be in rates is 83.4 percent, right?
20	A. That is correct.
21	Q. Okay. And tell me how you measured those
22	percentages.
23	A. If you look at the table, what we did is we
24	calculated the prorated amount that is currently in
25	rates. The 20 well, the prorate amount we're

proposing, that's really the amount that the total project is.

Then we looked at the 2021 GRC project costs. So that's the second column. Then we took the difference, and then did a simple percentage of that difference divided by the project costs.

Q. And when you -- okay. Thank you for that.

And to address -- so there's -- as

I mentioned -- or as I discussed with Ms. Steward
earlier today, there's really two components to the
addition to total plant revenue requirement, right?
There's the change in the manner in which rate base is
measured for these projects, and there's also a change
in the projected cost of the projects, right?

- A. Right. As mentioned earlier by both
 Mr. Hemstreet and Mr. Van Engelenhoven, there are slight
 changes in the project costs. But also, there are
 changes in the way we calculate because we are now
 looking at the total project costs, not the 13-month
 average for 2021, where the projects were not in service
 at the beginning of the year.
- Q. And do you calculate a -- when you calculate an annualized 13-month average that includes what you consider to be the full amount of the costs, what year do you use?

1 We used a year from -- we actually used Α. 2 calendar year 2022, if you look at the sheets. 3 0. Sure. At this point --4 Α. The reason was if we don't look -- we've got 5 to appropriately match the accumulated depreciation. So... 6 Right. And your -- the request here is to --7 0. for a change in rates beginning January 1 of 2022 as 8 9 well, right? 10 Α. Correct. 11 And I'd like you to turn at this point in 0. 12 your -- to the exhibit attached to your direct 13 testimony. It's Exhibit SRM-1. And in that exhibit you 14 have a series of pages that are kind of associated with your calculations for TB Flats, and a separate series of 15 16 pages that are associated with your calculations for 17 Pryor Mountain. What I'd like to do is to have you walk me 18 19 through how we're intended to read these so we can understand your calculations. And I'd like to start 20 21 at -- it's page 6 of 15, of this exhibit. 22 MS. WEGENER: Excuse me, are we going to be 23 discussing confidential numbers on this? 24 MR. RUSSELL: I don't intend to ask about the

If it makes the conversation easier, I'm happy

25

numbers.

to -- to go into confidential session. That may be up to your witness.

MR. MCDOUGAL: I think we can describe what you just asked without going into confidential session.

What we have here, is -- you will notice, we have the net rate base for 2021. And on the first page that you're talking about, page 6, on the top part, January through June of 2021, the amount in rates. Then from January 2022 to June of 2022, we have the actual in-service amounts. The next page does the next months, so it does July through December of 2021 and 2022.

BY MR. RUSSELL:

Q. Right.

Just to back up for a moment, the numbers -looking at that line 1, for capital investment under
plant revenue requirement, there's a number that appears
for January through May of 2021. Can you tell me what
that number corresponds to?

- A. That amount on line 1 is the amount that is in the general rate case in the calculation of the 13-month average.
- Q. And there's a different number that appears from June through December of 2021. Can you tell me what that number is and why it's different from the numbers that we just looked at?

1	A. It is different because in the general rate
2	case we had a second capital addition, a second phase
3	coming in, in June.
4	Q. Okay. Thank you.
5	And then by June of 2021 in that average of
6	2021 test period that was used in the rate case, do we
7	have a hundred percent of the costs that were projected
8	in the rate case in as of that month of June?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Okay.
11	And then we have a different number on line 7
12	for each between if you compare the number of
13	June of 2021 to the number for each month in 2022, can
14	you tell me what the difference between those two
15	numbers is? Or why they're different?
16	A. The January of 2022 through June of 2022
17	reflects the actual in-service amount. So that's the
18	amount that was actually placed in service.
19	Q. And that uses the updated projected cost of
20	this project, right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Okay.
23	And while we're while we're here, lines 13
24	through 16 contain a similar comparison of the PTCs that

were projected for the portions of the projects and the

1 actuals that you're projecting now, right? 2 Α. That is correct. 3 0. Okay. So just to -- just to follow that 4 thread, line 13 is -- well, why don't you just tell me 5 what line 13 represents. Line 13, as it's labeled, is the megawatt 6 Α. hours in the general rate case. 7 And how did you derive that number? 8 0. 9 We went to the net power cost group and asked Α. 10 them what the output of, in this case, TB Flats was 11 within the grid model runs that were used in the general 12 rate case. 13 Okay. And do you have an understanding as to 14 how they calculated that number? I know they calculated it within their model, 15 Α. 16 but how their model exactly calculates it, I do not

O. Okay.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know.

- What I'm trying to understand is the difference -- how you -- how the Company calculated the difference between the number that shows up there in line 13 versus the number that shows up in line 15.
- A. In line 15 we went back to the exact same net power cost group and asked them, based upon the megawatt capability of the project as in service in January of

1 2022, what is their projection of the output for those 2 plants. 3 0. Okay. Thank you. 4 So you understand the numbers in each of those lines to be based off of the megawatt capability that 5 was in service at the time, right? 6 Yes. 7 Α. Okay. So the number there for January of 8 2021, line 13, is what the net power cost group tells 9 10 you is the capability of that project based on the 11 number of megawatts of that project that were in service in January of 2021, just to put a finer point on it? 12 13 Α. Yes. 14 Okav. And we see when we turn to the next 0. page that the numbers in line 13 and 15 are all the 15 16 same, right? 17 Right, because the project is fully in service 18 in both of the grid runs, both of the -- both scenarios. 19 Okay. And I'm going to ask you to turn back 20 one page, because I've got a question about that. 21 We talked about how in June of 2021 the 22 assumption was that all of the megawatts were in place, 23 but it appears that there's a difference between the 24 megawatt hour output in that month in line 13 than there

is in line 15. Do you know why that is different?

A. Yes. Basically, when we were talking about plant in service, we're doing a 13-month average. You start with the beginning number, which is December of 2020, and then you use the end of each month.

So when you're talking plant in service, your

June number means that the total plant was in service by the end of June. So that's the way the 13-month average is calculated, is looking at the end of December through the beginning and end of each month.

So the total was in service by the end of June, not the beginning of June, and hence the numbers are different.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. I wasn't sure whether the months that ran across the top corresponded with the beginning or the end of the month.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. So that does make sense to me.
 - A. Okay.

Q. Thank you.

Can you tell me -- well, before I leave that, so the production tax credit benefits have some seasonality to them, right?

A. Yes, they match the megawatt hour output of the unit, and the megawatt hour output varies based upon the wind in each month.

- right?
 - Q. Sure. So if the benefits of these projects are greater in the first six months than they are in the second six months, then, you know, the benefits that are associated with taking out portions of the projects in either of those periods would be greater or lesser, right?
 - A. That is correct.
 - Q. Okay. And in these circumstances we had a portion of the projects that were not placed in service until -- during the first six months of the year, right?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Okay. So the benefits that are associated with these projects in this docket are associated with PTCs -- are more closely correlated with PTCs that are generated in the first six months and not the second six months, right?
 - A. I'm not sure I quite follow that.
 - Q. That's because it was a terribly asked question and I'll try it again.
 - Sure, the PTC benefits that you're calculating in this docket are associated with PTCs that are generated in the first six months and not the second six months, right?
 - A. That is correct. In the second six months, as we noted, they are the same.

1	Q. And that's I could do this same exercise
2	with Pryor Mountain. That's the same with Pryor
3	Mountain, right?
4	A. I believe so.
5	Q. Okay. I believe so, too.
6	Can you tell me how the net power cost
7	benefits were calculated, just sort of on a high level,
8	and we'll see how much we need to drill down?
9	A. Basically, we talked to the net power cost
10	group. They looked at two different grid runs, two
11	different power cost outputs, with and without these new
12	winds, and they gave us what the change was that they
13	were estimating for the additional wind, once the
14	projects were complete.
15	Q. And was that exercise from the net power cost
16	group similar to what we just talked about for the PTCs,
17	where portions of the projects were assumed to be not in
18	service for the first roughly six months of the year,
19	and fully in service for the second six months of the
20	year?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Okay. So there is some seasonality to the NPC
23	benefits as well?
24	A. Yes. And the seasonality to the NPC benefits
2.5	is actually at times greater, because you have both the

1 change in output by month and you also have changes in 2 market prices by month, where with the PTCs, you have a 3 set dollar amount value by month, so it's only one of 4 the two variables, but the net power cost varies by 5 both. 6 Sure. And do you know whether -- when the net 0. power cost group ran their calculations, whether they 7 were using assumptions based on 2022 market prices? 8 9 I do not recall that. Α. 10 But in any event, it was based on an 0. Okay. 11 assumption that the projects -- at least one of the runs 12 would be based on an assumption that the projects would 13 be fully in service for each month as they were in 2022, 14 right? 15 Α. Correct. 16 0. Okay. 17 Bear with me for just a moment. I think that's all I have. 18 MR. RUSSELL: 19 Thank you. 20 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Russell. 21 Ms. Wegener, any redirect? 22 MS. WEGENER: No redirect. Thank you. 23 CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you. 24 Commissioner Clark, do you have any questions 25 for Mr. McDougal?

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank you.
2	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen?
3	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank you.
4	CHAIR LEVAR: And I don't have any either, so
5	thank you for your testimony, Mr. McDougal.
6	MR. MCDOUGAL: Thank you.
7	CHAIR LEVAR: Why don't we take a 15-minute
8	break and we'll come back at 10:20 on that clock.
9	(Whereupon a short break was taken.)
10	CHAIR LEVAR: We'll go back on the record.
11	I'll just note that the Division of Public Utilities
12	distributed a witness and testimony list during the
13	break.
14	And with that, I'll go back to Ms. Wegener.
15	MS. WEGENER: The Company calls Robert
16	Meredith.
17	CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Mr. Meredith.
18	Do you swear to tell the truth?
19	MR. MEREDITH: Good morning. I do.
20	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
21	ROBERT MEREDITH
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION
23	BY MS. WEGENER:
24	Q. Good morning, Mr. Meredith. Can you please
25	state and spell your name?

1	A. Yes. Robert Meredith. R-o-b-e-r-t,
2	M-e-r-e-d-i-t-h.
3	Q. What's your position with the Company?
4	A. I'm the director of pricing and costs of
5	service for PacifiCorp.
6	Q. Did you submit direct and rebuttal testimony
7	in this matter?
8	A. I did.
9	Q. Do you have any corrections to that?
10	A. No, I do not.
11	Q. If I asked you the same questions in your
12	testimony today, would your answers be the same?
13	A. Yes, they would.
14	MS. WEGENER: I move to admit the direct and
15	rebuttal testimony of Robert Meredith.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. If anyone objects to
17	that motion, please indicate your objection.
18	I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted.
19	BY MS. WEGENER:
20	Q. Can you please provide a summary of your
21	testimony?
22	A. Yes.
23	Good morning, Chair LeVar, Commissioner Clark,
24	and Commissioner Allen. In this major plant addition
25	proceeding, the Company has proposed a rate spread and

rate design that has been largely uncontroversial with the one exception of proposed pricing for Schedule 32, service from renewable energy facilities.

The Utah Association of Energy Users disagrees with the Company's proposed Schedule 32 pricing because the Company did not include renewable procurement costs in the revenue requirement percentage exchange.

In this summary, I will first describe why the Company has proposed this particular rate spread per Schedule 32 in the major plant addition, and then I will address UAE's specific criticisms for it.

In the Company's last general rate case,
Docket No. 20-035-04, prices for Schedule 32 were set
such that the combination of delivery facilities charges
and daily power charges recover the same level of costs
as facilities and power charges for full requirements
customers. A modest adjustment was then made to bring
the overall percentage increase for all Schedule 32
revenue, including revenue associated with renewable
procurement costs, to the same percentage increase as
for Schedule 9 customers.

The inclusion of renewable procurement costs in this rate spread decision became a contested issue for reconsideration.

Moving on to the major plant addition before

us today, the Company requested a rate spread where the same percentage price change as Schedule 9 was applied to Schedule 32.

The Company proposed only applying the price change to Schedule 32 revenue, excluding revenue for renewable procurement costs, the rationale being that since only recovery of two wind projects was being considered in this proceeding, it made sense for any price change to only apply to the portion of Schedule 32's revenue that was for service from Company resources.

The logic of applying the change to only revenue associated with service from Company resources is reasonable and sound, whether the rate change is an increase or a decrease.

Should the Company happen to have another major plant addition between now and its next general rate case, I would recommend this same logic, regardless if the sign of the price change be a decrease or an increase.

UAE has disputed this rate spread logic for Schedule 32 because it believes that it is unreasonable and inconsistent with the 2020 rate case order.

UAE first recommends that daily power charges be set such that in combination with the delivery

facility charges they would recover the same level of costs as facilities and power charges that are applicable to full requirements customers.

Effectively, this would be a resetting of the overall demand-based cost recovery for Schedule 32, a task which would be more appropriate to accomplish in a general rate case proceeding than in this more limited venue that we have today.

Per Mr. Bieber's direct testimony, this would result in summer daily power charge decreasing from 71 cents to 68 cents and the winter power charge decreasing from 61 cents to 59 cents, which for summer and winter daily power charges would be a 4.2 percent and a 3.3 percent decrease to the prices, respectively. This compares to the overall 0.2 percent decrease being requested by the Company.

I disagree with this recommendation because the major plant addition is not an appropriate proceeding to reset demand-based charges.

UAE's second alternative recommendation, which yields the same Schedule 32 prices for transmission voltage daily power charges as its first recommendation, would apply the percentage price change to all revenue for Schedule 32, including the revenue associated with renewable procurement costs.

I disagree with this proposal because this major plant addition is limited to the recovery of two wind plants. It is therefore reasonable to limit this change to Schedule 32's revenue that is related to service from Company resources.

In the general rate case, \$34,000 out of the total \$350,000 overall increase for Schedule 32, was related to adjusting Schedule 32's increase in revenue, including revenue associated with renewable procurement to the overall Schedule 9 percentage increase.

My point here is not that it was small from a customer impact perspective, but rather that in the rate case, the rate spread logic itself was of secondary importance relative to the larger portion of the increase being related to the increases in demand-based costs.

Before the Commission right now is a more limited major plant addition filing with a 0.2 percent decrease. Applying this decrease to Schedule 32's revenue, excluding revenue associated with renewable procurement costs, is reasonable and not inconsistent with the general rate case order.

I recommend the Commission approve the Company's proposed rate spread and rate design for the major plant addition.

1	Thank you for your consideration. This
2	concludes my summary.
3	MS. WEGENER: Thank you. I have nothing
4	further for this witness, and he's available for
5	cross-examination and questions from the Commission.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Ms. Wegener.
7	Mr. Jetter, do you have any questions for
8	Mr. Meredith?
9	MR. JETTER: I have no questions. Thank you.
10	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Moore?
11	MR. MOORE: No questions. Thank you.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. Mr. Russell?
13	MR. RUSSELL: I do have some questions. Thank
14	you.
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. RUSSELL:
17	Q. Mr. Meredith, before we start, let's maybe
18	make sure we're all talking about the same thing.
19	In your summary and in your testimony, and in
20	Mr. Bieber's testimony, there was a fair bit of
21	discussion about the renewal procurement costs or
22	revenues. Let's just make sure that everybody
23	understands what that is, if you would.
24	A. Sure. What that is, is there's revenue that
25	effectively a Schedule 32 customer pays the Company, and

1 then the Company then uses that revenue to purchase, for 2 example, a PPA, a purchase power agreement for that 3 particular renewable resource and the output of it. 4 And that's what I mean by those renewable procurement 5 costs. So it attains those dollars from the 6 Schedule 32 customer and turns around and gives them to 7 the developer, right? 8 9 In that sense, it -- yeah. Α. 10 0. Okay. 11 Let's take a look at where that appears. 12 I think maybe the best place to start would be 13 Exhibit RMM-3 in your direct testimony. Pages 18 and 19 14 is where the Schedule 32 revenues show up. 15 Α. RMM-3, I think, is my --16 Oh, I'm sorry, RMM-2, I apologize. Pages 18 0. 17 and 19 of that. 18 Okay, I'm there. Α. 19 And can you just tell us what this exhibit Ο. 20 reflects, just generally? This is the exhibit that shows the 21 Α. Yes. 22 billing determinants and the proposed prices for the 23 major plant addition. 24 0. Sure. Okay. And so on page -- let's turn to

25

page 19.

1 Α. Okay. 2 The top column there is actually a 0. 3 continuation of the billing determinants and pricing for 4 Schedule 32 customers, right? 5 Α. Yes. 6 In -- what we're looking at here shows the 0. supplemental portion of that bill, but also shows the 7 total aggregate, which is what I want to talk about. 8 9 And the present revenue dollars shows an amount of 10 \$13,353,130, right? 11 Yes, it does. Α. 12 Okay. And so that 13.4 million is the present 0. 13 revenue dollars for all of Schedule 32, right? 14 Α. Correct. Okay. And if we turn back over to page 18, 15 0. 16 we'll see one line up from the bottom there is the 17 renewable energy PPA dollars, right? 18 Yes, I see that. Α. 19 And that amount is approximately --Okay. 0. 20 well, it's 9,885,000 and change, right? 21 Α. That's correct. 22 So of that 13.4 million, approximately Okav. **Q.** 23 9.9 million approximately comes from that renewable 24 energy PPA, right? 25 Α. That is correct.

Q. Okay. And that's not an amount that changes
when the Company's revenue requirement changes, right?
A. It does not.
Q. Okay. And the Company considers that
approximately \$9.9 million to be Company revenue; does
it not?
A. Yes. It is part of technically speaking,
it's part of the Company's revenue for this customer
since it collects that from the customer, and per the
way that we account for it, it's considered revenue for
the Company.
Q. And you considered it revenue to the Company
in the general rate case, yes?
A. Yes, we did.
Q. Okay. And you included it in the chart in the
general rate case so it looks just like this one?
A. Right. It's yeah, very similar billing
determinants. It's all the same billing determinants,
different prices and different present revenue.
Q. Sure. Right.
And let's then turn to let's take a look at
how that the rate spread that you're proposing here
plays out. I think I'd have you turn to RMM-1.
A. Okay.
O. Page 3.

And the Schedule 32 is on line number 17 1 2 there, right? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Okay. And maybe you could just tell us **Q.** 5 generally what page 3 here shows. 6 Yes. Page 3 is showing the difference between the present revenues and the proposed revenues, the 7 particular allocation factors that were being used for 8 9 the major plant addition. And then it shows the 10 difference between that and expresses that in both 11 dollars and in percentage terms. 12 Okay. And so for Schedule 32, as you said in 0. 13 your testimony, you propose to apply the same percentage 14 change as Schedule 9 for all Schedule 32 revenue except 15 that portion of the revenue that is that renewable 16 energy PPA, right? 17 Α. Correct. Okay. And so it's easier to see in your work 18 19 papers, but for purposes of generating the change here 20 on line 17, you start with that approximately 13 point 21 -- well, 13,353 number there, under present revenues, 22 right? 23 Α. Yes. 24 0. Then you subtract out that approximately \$9.9 million, right? 25

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And then you multiply that by the percentage
3	change for general service high voltage Schedule 9
4	customers, right?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. And that yields this going back to line 17,
7	this change of \$11,000 for Schedule 32 customers, right?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Okay. And if you did not exclude that
10	approximately 19 excuse me, \$9.9 million, then
11	that the number that shows up there where the 11,000
12	is would be higher, just generally speaking, right?
13	A. That's correct.
14	Q. Okay.
15	A. It would be well, it would be lower it
16	would be a higher negative value.
17	Q. Yeah. Thanks. You beat me to it.
18	So we'll come back to target revenues in a
19	moment, but let's talk pricing.
20	There's been some discussion in your testimony
21	about the fact that this method yields well, I guess
22	I'll start over.
23	You have proposed even price changes across
24	various billing components, right?
25	A. Yes. Even price changes across billing

components for particular rate schedules.

- Q. Sure. If you look at your direct testimony, line 60 to 62, you state that "The Company proposes to change all back-up power, daily power, excess power, base power and energy charges for each schedule in each" -- "in equal proportions to achieve each class's revenue allocation." Right?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. Okay. And so when you spread that negative \$11,000 target revenue out equally among those billing components that apply to Schedule 32, you end up reducing them, at least some of them, by fractions of a cent, right?
- A. Right. I think when we're talking about Schedule 32, there's two components with it. There is the actual charges that are on Schedule 32, and then there's the supplemental service that has charges that rely upon Schedule 9. And so those -- both of those components change. The component that is supplemental is directly tied to Schedule 9 rates themselves.
- Q. Right. In fact, the Schedule 32 tariff talks about the supplemental charges and it just says go look at the full rate requirement schedule for that, right?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Okay. And so when you spread this \$11,000

target revenue reduction out equally among the billing 1 2 components that you mentioned, those billing components 3 that are specific to Schedule 32 that are not based on 4 the full requirements schedule, those don't actually result in any sort of price change here, do they? 5 6 They do not, because the price change is so small that it doesn't round to the nearest penny. 7 that component that is on Schedule 32 itself, part of 8 that is since the daily power charges are expressed in 9 10 cents per kilowatt per day, it just ends up -- the math 11 of it ends up rounding to the same penny amount. 12 0. Okay. 13 Now I'm going to ask you to turn back to 14 RMM-2. 15 Α. Okay. 16 And we can see the -- so if we wanted to 0. 17 calculate the sort of target price change for the daily power charges for Schedule 32, where would we look? 18 19 I'm looking at the bottom of page 18 of RMM-2. 20 Can you ask that question again? Α. 21 So you've proposed spreading this 0. Yeah. 22 \$11,000 reduction in revenue requirement across various 23 billing components. I'm just trying to see what you're 24 targeting for that reduction for the daily power charges 25 for Schedule 32.

A. Sure. And so what we're doing here -- the price change itself is not going to all billing components, as Mr. Russell said here, it's going to, specifically, energy and power charges. It's not going to facilities charges and customer service charges, since what we're looking at is specifically the recovery of cost from Company resources, not delivery-related costs.

For this particular customer, the spread is happening -- or the math is intended to happen on the daily power charges, which are the only component that is a power or energy charge for Schedule 32. As you can note, there is no actual change in those prices for the Schedule 32 prices themselves, just because the rounding of it ends up being to the same penny.

- Q. Great. So if we're looking at the bottom of page 18, the lines immediately above Renewable Energy PPA where we see the On-Peak Transmission Voltage charges, all the way off to the right, there is -- if you compared that number for Proposed Revenue Dollars to the numbers in the column under Present Revenue Dollars, there is a change reflected there. But because the prices aren't going to change, that change in Proposed Revenue Dollars will not change, correct?
 - A. That is true. It won't change, again because

- this spreadsheet -- what's happening here is the
 spreadsheet carries it out, and so it does end up
 showing a change in the dollars. But really for that
 component that's not supplemental service, there
 wouldn't be a change in dollars because of the rounding
 here.
 - Q. Okay. So a portion of the \$11,000 target revenue reduction for Schedule 32, the pricing that you propose is not going to capture that, right?
 - A. Yes. It won't be \$11,000, it looks like.
 Yeah.

- Q. And I will tell you, I calculated the amount that is attributable to the sort of proposed incremental change to these daily power charges to be approximately \$6,000. Does that -- subject to check, does that sound in the ballpark?
 - A. I wouldn't be able to confirm or deny that.
- Q. I mean, all you'd have to do is just see the difference between the numbers in the revenue dollars proposed versus the numbers in the revenue dollars present, right?
- A. I think if I'd look at the supplemental component there, just looking on page 19, again, there may be some rounding here as well that might be affecting that total dollar amount. I believe in the

1 Excel spreadsheet itself these prices go out some 2 decimal places that are cut off, I think is what's 3 happening here. 4 So I think it's harder to say exactly with this right before us, but I think it could be \$6,000. 5 I think that sounds right to me. 6 Okay. And you got there by also looking at 7 0. the -- turning to page 19, the portion of the 8 9 Schedule 32 customer's rate that goes through the full 10 rate requirement schedule, right? 11 Α. Yes. 12 Okay. And this is a part where the prices 0. actually will change? 13 14 Α. Yes. Okay. And so is it the Company's position 15 0. 16 that this reduction in revenue actually will happen? 17 Α. Yes. They will be different. You can see on 18 page 19 at the top in the supplemental revenues that 19 there are different prices for power charges, as well as 20 energy charges, that are based upon Schedule 9, the full 21 requirements tariff. 22 But for a little bit more than half of 0. Right. 23 the target revenue requirement reduction for 24 Schedule 32, you are actually not going to achieve that,

25

right?

- A. That is correct.
 - Q. Okay.

Would it be appropriate for the Commission to make a modest change to ensure that we do achieve a reduction in target revenues like this one?

A. You know, I was actually thinking about that. I think there could be something of a modest change to this. I was thinking about this as I was going over my testimony. You know, one option would be that you could round down the amounts when you do that calculation. That might be one way to get something closer. It's difficult when you're dealing with a very small price change, and then also dealing with a component like this that's expressed in daily power charges. So it's difficult to get that same precision level.

One alternative that I thought of is that you could, instead of, for example, having a round function, you could do a round down function that would, you know, bring it down by a cent. For example, on the daily power charges, I think it would produce something more than \$11,000. But that could be a reasonable alternative.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

Let's talk -- I think that's all the questions

I have about pricing, but let's go talk about the rate

spread itself, which we started with.

You have indicated that you think it's reasonable in this docket to exclude those Company revenues associated with the renewable PPA, because all we are dealing with here are Company resources, right?

I don't mean to put words in your mouth. You can say it however you need to.

- A. I think that's a fair summarization.
- Q. Right. And I will point you to -- it's your rebuttal testimony, lines 26 to 32. The last sentence of that question and answer says, "Therefore, it is reasonable for the price change from these two projects to be limited to the proportion of Schedule 32's revenue that is related to service supplied from Company resources."
 - A. Yes, that's what I said.
- Q. Yeah. I guess I'm curious why -- if it's Company revenue, as the Company has indicated that it is, why it's not associated or related to service supplied by Company resources?
- A. I think what we're looking at here -- I think there's a couple of things that's happening. First of all, what we're looking at here is not looking back at the general rate case and all the different costs associated with service, including delivery costs.

I think when we look at the general rate case,
there was something of a significant shift in cost per
Schedule 32 to bring that demand-based recovery to be in
alignment with Schedule 9, which was also having some
changes, particularly looking at the demand-based and
energy-based relationship for Schedule 9. That was a
fairly significant shift.

There was also a modest adjustment to just have a uniform rate spread for Schedule 9.

When we think about the major plant addition itself, we're looking at a very limited cost, and I think that it makes sense to not think about kind of a larger reshuffling of demand-related costs, but think about what are we particularly examining here, which is cost recovery for these wind projects.

So I think that it makes sense just in the same way that we're limiting the recovery for power charges and energy charges, not customer service charge, not for the facilities charge, it makes sense for Schedule 32 to limit this particular price change to the revenue that is not related to the renewable procurement costs.

And I think that -- you know, just thinking about it, I think that it's reasonable and fair, and I think that if we were in a different circumstance and

- this were, you know, an increase instead of a decrease,

 I think that it might be a very different conversation

 with UAE. And so I think that this is what I believe to

 be the principal way to allocate these costs.
 - Q. There was a lot there, and I'm going to follow up on a fair bit of it.

You referenced the general rate case and how there were a number of costs associated with that we just don't have here, right?

A. Sure.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. But we do have -- we did have some costs in the general rate case that we do have here, or at least we have projects that were associated with the revenue requirement request in the general rate case that we're also talking about here, right?

Parts of the revenue requirement associated with the projects at issue here were included in the rate case, yes?

- A. A portion of the wind projects were in the general rate case, yes.
- Q. Right. So by proposing to change the manner in which rates associated with revenue requirement from the general rate case to here, proposing to change that rate spread changes the allocation of costs and benefits for these projects, right? Even if it's a small change,

	November 30, 2021 Page
1	it will change, won't it?
2	A. Could you restate that question?
3	Q. Sure.
4	There was one rate spread that was used in the
5	general rate case, and that rate spread allocated costs
6	and benefits of everything that was in the rate case,
7	including these two projects, right?
8	A. Right, there was, although I would note again
9	with Schedule 32 that if we look at that \$350,000
10	increase, it was a smaller component of that that was
11	related to adjusting to the Schedule 9 overall revenue
12	increase.
13	A larger portion of it was a setting those
14	demand-related costs to be at the same level as
15	Schedule 9.
16	Q. And we're going to get to the tying together
17	of the demand costs here in a moment, but just as a
18	general matter, one rate spread was used in the rate
19	case, which included the revenues associated with these
20	two projects, right?
21	A. Yes.

22

23

24

- And we had two projects that are at Okay. Q. issue in this docket that were also at issue in the general rate case, yes?
 - A. Yes.

- 1 And you're proposing to use a different 0. Okay. rate spread here than was used in the general rate case, 2 3 right? I am, because of the purpose of the docket. 4 Α. 5 0. Understood. But what we then have is, you've got rate spread for whatever portion of the revenue 6 requirement increase in the general rate case that is 7 associated with these two projects being handled one 8 9 way, and rate spread in this case being handled a 10 different way, right? 11 Α. It is being handled a little bit differently 12 for Schedule 32, but they are different proceedings. And again, I think one of the reasons why this is 13 14 reasonable from the Company's perspective is because the larger component of that increase for Schedule 32 was 15 16 not related to that rate spread adjustment itself, but 17 rather to that adjustment to the demand-related cost for 18 Schedule 9. 19 Q. We're going to get to that Schedule 9 in just 20 a moment. But I believe you were in the hearing room 21 when I had my conversation with Mr. McDougal about the
 - A. Yes.

these projects, right?

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. And Mr. McDougal testified that PTCs

seasonality of some of the benefits associated with

The benefits

are not generated evenly every month of the year, and 1 2 the same goes with net power costs. 3 associated with the portions of the projects that we're 4 talking about in this docket are all front-loading, meaning they're all in the first six months. 5

recall that?

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- I do recall that. Α.
- So if the benefits in the first six Q. months are not equal to the benefits generated in the second six months, aren't we distributing benefits associated with these projects differently by changing the rate spread from the general rate case to this docket?
- I don't know that we are, just because in the general rate case, again that particular proceeding was not limited just to those few wind projects. It was looking at a lot of different costs and looking at really the totality of the Company's costs and applying those to Schedule 32. So I think that it's hard to say that they have to be an identical rate spread, since we're looking at two very different things.
- Well, but you acknowledge that the costs ο. associated with these two projects and the benefits associated with these two projects were distributed in one way in the rate case, and you're proposing to

distribute them differently here, and if the benefits are seasonal, that may affect whether the -- you know, the Schedule 32 customers get the same deal that all the other customers get, right?

- A. I don't know that I would totally agree with that, because again, looking at the rate case, it is the totality of the costs that are being considered. And while that totality does include these two wind projects, I think there's a lot more going on in the rate case than what's happening here in this major plant addition filing where we're specifically honing in on two wind projects and looking at what is the appropriate cost recovery for this particular major plant addition.
- Q. Okay. I promised that we were going to talk about the demand-based recovery alignment between Schedule 39 -- Schedule 32 and Schedule 9. So let's talk about that.

In the general rate case, the Company and UAE and others were all in alignment that we -- in agreement that we should try to align the demand-based costs, the combination of the facilities charges and the daily power charges and monthly power charges for those rate schedules, right?

A. I think there was some agreement on -- there was a particular part in the general rate case where

1 there was a formula that looked at, yes, the alignment 2 of full requirements, demand-related charges, and the Schedule 32 demand-related charges. And there was some 3 4 agreement that that calculation itself should occur in 5 that wav. However, there was quite a bit of disagreement in terms of how much should be the delivery 6 facilities' charges versus the daily power charges. 7 But yes, that formula itself, there was 8 agreement between UAE, University of Utah, and the 9 10 Company on that particular formula. 11 Agreed. Q. 12 The rate spread proposal that the Company has 13 made in this case would reduce the monthly power charges

for Schedule 9, right?

Α. Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- But there is the reduction to the daily 0. Okay. power charges for Schedule 32, right? In part because you've decided to exclude the renewable PPA revenues from the rate spread calculation, yes?
- Α. Yes, in part because of that, and then just then that rounding then ends up to go down and not go to that next cent -- or go up and not to go down to that next cent down, that next step.
- 0. Okay. So the Company's rate spread proposal in this docket no longer tries to keep that demand-based

recovery in alignment between those two -- those two rate classes, right?

A. It does not, and I think it's because the Company's position here is that the rate case was the time to set those demand-related costs and to look at an alignment with Schedule 9. And it wasn't completely aligned, because there was that -- that adjustment that was of secondary importance to the larger change to bring it to the overall price change for Schedule 9.

So there were two components there. So it -really effectively, if we do apply this same percentage
price change to all the costs, it effectively actually
gets us back to something very close to what would have
been UAE's recommendation had they, you know, won in
reconsideration. And so it effectively negates that
sort of adjustment that happened in the general rate
case.

Q. I want to go back to this concept that you've included in your testimony and we've talked a little bit about here, about your sort of justification for why you think the renewable PPA revenues ought to be excluded from the rate spread calculation. And you stated that it's because it's -- you want to limit the rate spread to what is related to service supply from Company resources.

I'm trying to understand what -- where that might take us outside of this docket. How else would we apply that in other circumstances in which you offer rate spread testimony in various circumstances?

A. You know, I think one analogy maybe perhaps is if we look at this major plant addition, we did not propose an equal change across all charging components. As I mentioned earlier, customer service charge, facilities charge, those are charges that typically tend to be more related to the delivery of power, to distribution costs, for example.

I think that this is an example where because we had a limited scope in this major plant addition, we're not looking at changing all charging components, but really just the energy charge and the demand charge components themselves.

- Q. But what you were just talking about is how you impose on the pricing the change that you're proposing for each rate class, but what we're talking about here is how you measure the amount of change that will be attributed to the class before you ever get to changing the pricing, right?
 - A. The rate spread.
 - Q. Yeah. Sure.
 - A. Yeah.

- Q. So how do you decide what Company revenues should be included or excluded based on whether you think it's related to service supplied by the Company or not? I guess I'm trying to figure out where that takes us.
- A. I think that what we have before us is a major plant addition, and it's looking at the recovery of two wind projects. And so I think it's reasonable just to look at that proportion of revenue that's not paying for that renewable procurement cost.
- Q. In a rate case, would it be appropriate to exclude these PPA revenues from rate spread calculation that deals with Company generation resources, for instance?
- A. That isn't what ended up being the Commission's ordered rate spread. I think that was reasonable. Again, though, I think it was a minor adjustment that was made. When I say minor, I don't mean minor from a customer impact perspective. I mean it was a modest change relative to the much larger change that was happening for the demand-based sort of reshuffling that happened to get that at the same level as Schedule 9 for requirements demand charges.
- Q. You say you cite what happened in the 2020 rate case where you have to grapple with rate spread for

Schedule 32 customers at some point in the future at another general rate case.

Would it be appropriate to exclude the renewable energy, renewable PPA revenues, from a rate spread calculation that you can cordon off, I guess, the portion of Company revenue requirements associated with generation resources, for instance?

A. You know, looking at the general rate case, I actually don't have that strong of an opinion about whether those renewable PPA prices were excluded or not in that rate spread adjustment that happened. I know the Company argued for that in the reconsideration. I think our concern there was just the timeliness of it mostly.

And when that happened, I think you could make pretty good arguments either way for that. I think -fortunately in the next general rate case, I think -well, we will have 12 months of data so we can do a
cost of service study on Schedule 32 customers, which
I think is far more appropriate than looking at, for
example, Schedule 9 as a proxy in setting a rate spread
on that.

I think that will -- I think then largely this will not be an issue that we'll be having to contend with because we can look at those particular cost of

1 service results and make some sort of a rate spread 2 decision based upon that. Well, and we may or may not have enough 3 4 Schedule 32 customers next time we get to a rate case to do a meaningful cost of service study though, right? 5 Well, we do already have cost of service 6 classes for some special customers where there's a 7 single customer on a class. I don't know, it's possible 8 9 that in the next rate case we'll only have one, but 10 I think it's probably likely we'll have more than one, 11 based upon the interest and some of the activity that 12 I think is happening around Schedule 32. 13 MR. RUSSELL: Thank you. I have no further 14 questions. 15 Ms. Wegener, any redirect? CHAIR LEVAR: 16 MS. WEGENER: No redirect. Thank you. 17 CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Clark, any 18 questions? No questions. 19 COMMISSIONER CLARK: Thank you. 20 CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen? 2.1 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank you. 22 CHAIR LEVAR: I don't have any. Thank you for 23 your testimony this morning, Mr. Meredith. 24 MR. MEREDITH: Thank you. 25 CHAIR LEVAR: Anything else, Ms. Wegener?

1	MS. WEGENER: I have nothing further from the
2	Company at this time.
3	CHAIR LEVAR: I think I will go to the Office
4	of Consumer Services next. Mr. Moore?
5	MR. MOORE: Unfortunately, Director Beck is
6	not in the courtroom right now. Maybe if you give me
7	two minutes I can get her up here.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Yeah, I think rather than trying
9	to shuffle things in the afternoon, I think it would be
10	more efficient to do that. But if it takes if it's
11	more than a minute or two, maybe we can just go on to
12	the Division.
13	MR. MOORE: I doubt that it will be more than
14	a minute or two.
15	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Well, why don't we just
16	take five and we can reconvene at 11:05. And if it
17	takes longer, we'll just move on with the Division's
18	witnesses.
19	(Whereupon a short break was taken.)
20	CHAIR LEVAR: Back on the record. Mr. Moore?
21	MR. MOORE: Yes, the Office calls Michele Beck
22	to the stand and ask that she be sworn.
23	CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Ms. Beck. Do you
24	swear to tell the truth?
25	MS. BECK: Yes.

1	MICHELE BECK
2	DIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. MOORE:
4	Q. Will you please state your name, occupation,
5	and business address for the record?
6	A. Yes, my name is Michele, M-i-c-h-e-l-e, Beck,
7	B-e-c-k, and I am the director of the Office of Consumer
8	Services.
9	Q. In your capacity as director of the Office of
0 .	Consumer Services, have you viewed the application,
1	testimony, and filing in this docket?
_2	A. Yes, I have.
_3	Q. Did you prepare and cause to be filed direct
_4	testimony on October 6, 2021 and surrebuttal testimony
_5	November 18, 2021?
L 6	A. Yes. And also rebuttal testimony.
L7	Q. Do you have any changes you'd like to make to
_8	this testimony at this time?
_9	A. No, I do not.
20	Q. If I asked of you the same questions that are
21	contained in your written testimony, would your answers
22	be the same?
23	A. Yes, they would.
24	MR. MOORE: We move to admit the testimony of
25	Michele Beck.

1 If anyone objects to that CHAIR LEVAR: 2 motion, please indicate your objection. 3 I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted. 4 BY MR. MOORE: Have you prepared a summary of the Office's 5 0. position? 6 Yes, I have. 7 Α. 8 Please proceed. 0. In my opinion, Rocky Mountain Power's request 9 Α. 10 does not meet the statutory requirements for a major plant addition. Our view is clear in this testimony 11 12 that this request is for the incremental revenue 13 requirement associated with two plants which are not 14 additions because the majority of the associated revenue 15 requirement is already in rates. 16 Further, the incremental request is well below 17 the one percent statutory threshold. The joint motion 18 for summary judgment of the OCS, DPU, and UAE details 19 the legal arguments supporting this position. 20 In addition to the legal arguments, my testimony, as 21 well as testimony presented by the DPU and UAE 22 demonstrate that RMP's request should be denied for 23 policy reasons. 24 Rocky Mountain Power has many regulatory processes available to it and made its own decision of 25

how to request cost recovery for Pryor Mountain and TB Flats, presumably considering all potential benefits and risks.

In particular, these two projects could have been removed from the rate case and filed as NPAs at a later time. If the PSC now approves this request, it would set a bad precedent that would surely result in multiple similar cases and undermine the concept of test periods.

I also recommend that if the PSC denies Rocky Mountain Power's petition for cost recovery, it should also reject any prorationing of the NPC benefits of Pryor Mountain and TB Flats. Rejecting prorationing would be consistent with the order in the last GRC Docket 20-035-04 in which the PSC denied Rocky Mountain Power's request for a two-part rate increase and also declined to implement any prorationing of benefits.

Rocky Mountain Power did not appeal that order, nor did it provide any new support for the prorationing of benefits of explanation of how it be accomplished in this case. In fact, Rocky Mountain Power simply supported a statement from the DPU's direct testimony that may have been misunderstood and has since been clarified by the DPU to not represent their position.

1	At this point in the proceeding, RMP is the
2	only party supporting the concept of prorationing, and
3	it should be rejected by the Commission.
4	That concludes my summary.
5	MR. MOORE: Director Beck is available for
6	cross and questions from the Commission.
7	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Moore.
8	Mr. Jetter, do you have any questions for
9	Director Beck?
10	MR. JETTER: No, thank you.
11	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Russell?
12	MR. RUSSELL: No, thank you.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
14	MS. WEGENER: I also have no questions.
15	Thank you.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen?
17	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank you.
18	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Clark.
19	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I also have no questions.
20	Thank you.
21	CHAIR LEVAR: I have one.
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY THE COMMISSION
23	BY CHAIR LEVAR:
24	Q. It's a hypothetical, and I presented it
25	earlier to Ms. Steward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So presume that Rocky Mountain Power completed a wind project that qualified for PTCs 20 months following the most recent GRC order, and then they did not file a future GRC for the next couple of years, how should the PTCs from that hypothetical wind project be treated in the EBA? Presume there is PTC revenue. So If I understand your hypothetical, the plant is not in rate base at all? Because it was -- yeah --0. Because it was not in a rate case and it was Α. not in a subsequent MPA case. 0. Yes. To me, I don't think that those PTCs need to Α. flow through the EBA at all. 0. Okay. Thank you. CHAIR LEVAR: No more questions. So thank you for your testimony this morning. Thank you for accommodating me. MS. BECK: Anything else, Mr. Moore? CHAIR LEVAR: MR. MOORE: The OCS has nothing further. However, I neglected to move to admit OCS Cross Exhibit 1. May I move to admit that now? That was just the testimony of Joelle Steward from the general rate case. CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Any objections to

1 entering this OCS Cross Exhibit 1? 2 I'm not seeing any objection, so the motion is 3 granted. 4 MR. MOORE: The Office has nothing more. Thank you. 5 6 CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Thank you. 7 Mr. Jetter? Thank you. The Division would 8 MR. JETTER: 9 like to call and have sworn its first witness, Joni 10 Zenger. 11 CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Dr. Zenger. 12 Do you swear to tell the truth? 13 DR. ZENGER: Yes, I do. 14 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. 15 JONI ZENGER 16 DIRECT EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. JETTER: 18 Good morning. Would you please state your 19 name and occupation for the record? 20 Α. Yes. Dr. Joni, J-o-n-i, S. Zenger, 21 Z-e-n-q-e-r, technical consultant for the Division of 22 Public Utilities. 23 Thank you. And in the course of your 24 employment with the Division, did you create and cause 25 to be filed prefiled direct testimonies -- and they're

labeled direct and surrebuttal -- along with 1 2 confidential and redacted exhibits that were attached to 3 those prefiled testimonies? 4 Α. Yes, I did. If you were asked the same questions in your 5 0. prefiled written testimony today, would your answers 6 remain the same? 7 I do have a couple of corrections. 8 Α. 9 Please go ahead. Okay. 0. 10 I just have two minor corrections to my Α. 11 surrebuttal that I would like to request. 12 And for state of confusion, on the cover page 13 of my surrebuttal testimony, it says it's surrebuttal in 14 the middle of the page, but in the caption it says 15 direct. This should be changed to surrebuttal. 16 There's one other small correction on page 5 of my surrebuttal on lines 106 and 107, it says, "These 17 18 activities include site view, mobilization, and 19 restoration." And then where it -- the next three 20 words, "permit closeout activities," those should be 2.1 deleted. They were repeated later in the paragraph. 22 Thank you for letting me read those. 23 Q. Thank you. 24 And Dr. Zenger, have you prepared a brief summary of your testimony? 25

1 A. Yes, I have.

Q. Please go ahead.

A. Good morning, Commissioners. Nice to see you all in person. As the Division's first witness, I will summarize the Division's findings and recommendations to the Commission in these proceedings.

I'll also introduce the Division's other witnesses, each of whom have provided analysis and testimony in this case.

In summary, the Division's primary position throughout this proceeding has remained uncharged. The Commission should deny the Company's request because the investments in Pryor Mountain and TB Flats do not satisfy the statutory requirements for alternative cost recovery under Utah Code Section 54-7-13.4.

Since that application does not satisfy the one percent threshold rate base requirement, the Commission should deny the Company's application in whole.

The Division also notes, and this has been brought up by other witnesses this morning, that other intervening parties to this case, each with different missions and purposes, independently arrived at the same overall conclusion in their respective direct testimonies.

Should the Commission determine that the one 1 2 percent threshold is satisfied and incremental additions 3 may be added to rates, the individual Division witnesses 4 address the following issues in their own respective testimonies. 5 6 My testimony focuses on the analysis of the COVID-19 related delayed project costs for delayed plant 7 for the Pryor Mountain wind project. 8 Division witness Mr. Trevor Jones will testify 9 10 about costs for delayed plant for TB Flats project. 11 Division witness Mr. Gary Smith will provide a 12 review of the Company's proposed request to modify the 13 base net power costs and base production tax credit in 14 the energy bill account. 15 And Division witness Dr. William Artie Powell 16 will testify that the projects separately or together do 17 not satisfy the one percent capital addition threshold 18 required by Utah Code Section 54-7-13.4. 19 Dr. Powell also addresses the treatment of 20 production tax credits and other net power cost benefits if the Commission rejects the application. 21 22 As I previously stated, the focus of my 23 analysis investigation in this proceeding has been on 24 delayed plant for the Pryor Mountain wind project. 25 Pryor Mountain was placed in commercial operation on

April 1, 2021, but was anticipated to be in service in December of 2020.

I verified that the cause for the in-service delays were due to the COVID-19 pandemic, in particular, the delayed delivery of major equipment like wind turbine generators and other large components.

As part of my review of delayed plant for Pryor Mountain, I looked at force majeure claims, change orders, wind turbine supply agreements, vendor notices, and contingency costs that I obtained through discovery.

I also investigated the purchase, substitution, and affiliate transactions related to Pryor Mountain wind turbine components.

My concern about potential cost increases due to the substitution and purchase of wind turbine components has been resolved. I found that no additional project costs were ascribed at Pryor Mountain because of the Company's supply changes to various wind turbine components. I concluded that the Company's decisions with respect to the wind turbine components were prudent and had no adverse impact on delayed plant for Pryor Mountain.

If the Commission does approve the application, I recommend that the total project costs for Pryor Mountain be approved at the amount contained

1 in the confidential rebuttal testimony of Mr. Robert Van 2 Engelenhoven, page 2, on lines 30 to 31. The Division 3 has determined the project costs in this amount were 4 prudently incurred. A small portion of the final costs remain for 5 the settlement of contractural delay claims with 6 contractors and for final completion activities, which 7 can typically take about 9 to 12 months after 8 9 commissioning to complete. 10 If the total project costs exceed the identified amounts when final project costs are known, 11 12 the Company may request additional recovery in a future 13 rate case proceeding. 14 This completes the summary of my testimony and the Division's positions and recommendations to the 15 16 Commission. Thank you. 17 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Dr. Zenger. 18 MR. JETTER: Thank you. I have no further 19 questions, and Dr. Zenger is available for 20 cross-examination and questions from the Commission. 21 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. I'm not sure we have 22 admitted her testimony, though. 23 MR. JETTER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 24 allow me, I would like to make a motion to admit the

prefiled testimony, along with the prefiled exhibits

1	that were attached to Dr. Zenger's testimonies. Thank
2	you.
3	CHAIR LEVAR: If anyone objects to that
4	motion, please indicate it.
5	Not seeing any, the motion is granted.
6	MR. JETTER: Thank you. And I will re-tender
7	Dr. Zenger for cross and questions from the Commission.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
9	Mr. Moore?
10	MR. MOORE: No questions. Thank you.
11	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Russell?
12	MR. RUSSELL: No questions. Thank you.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
14	MS. WEGENER: No questions. Thank you.
15	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Clark?
16	COMMISSIONER CLARK: I have no questions.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen?
19	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: Also no questions. Thank
20	you.
21	CHAIR LEVAR: I don't either. So thank you
22	for your testimony this morning, Dr. Zenger.
23	DR. ZENGER: Okay. Thank you.
24	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Jetter?
25	MR. JETTER: The Division would the

Division would like next to call and have sworn in 1 2 Division witness Trevor Jones. 3 CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Mr. Jones. Do you swear to tell the truth? 4 5 MR. JONES: T do. 6 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. 7 TREVOR JONES 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. JETTER: 10 Good morning, Mr. Jones. Would you please 0. 11 state your name and occupation for the record. 12 Α. Trevor Jones. T-r-e-v-o-r, J-o-n-e-s. 13 Utilities analyst for the Division. 14 0. Thank you. And in the course of your employment with the Division of Public Utilities, did 15 16 you create and cause to be filed with the Commission in this docket direct and surrebuttal testimonies along 17 18 with a few exhibits attached to those? 19 Α. Yes. 20 And do you have any corrections or changes 0. 21 you'd like to make to either of those prefiled 22 testimonies? 23 Α. No. 24 0. If you were asked the same questions contained 25 in those prefiled testimonies today, would your answers

be the same? 1 2 Α. Yes. 3 MR. JETTER: I'd like to move at this point to 4 enter into the record the prefiled direct and surrebuttal testimony along with the attached exhibits 5 6 of Division witness Trevor Jones. Thank you. 7 CHAIR LEVAR: 8 If anyone objects, please indicate your 9 objection. 10 I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted. MR. JETTER: 11 Thank you. 12 BY MR. JETTER: 13 Mr. Jones, have you prepared a brief summary 0. 14 of your testimony? 15 Α. Yes. 16 Please go ahead. 0. 17 To summarize my testimony, I analyzed the 18 increased costs related to TB Flats, which occurred 19 because of the COVID-19 pandemic. The values are 20 confidential and can be found in my testimony. There is 21 one small adjustment to the values that now differs from 22 the application because of a negotiated contract. 23 If the application is accepted, I recommend 24 the increased cost for TB Flats be approved. 25 Thank you.

1	Q. Thank you.
2	MR. JETTER: And I have no further questions
3	for Mr. Jones. He's available for cross-examination and
4	questions from the Commission.
5	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
6	Mr. Moore?
7	MR. MOORE: No questions. Thank you.
8	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Russell?
9	MR. RUSSELL: No questions. Thank you.
10	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
11	MS. WEGENER: No questions. Thank you.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen?
13	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank you.
14	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Clark?
15	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank you.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: I don't have any either, so
17	thank you for your testimony this morning, Mr. Jones.
18	MR. JONES: Thank you.
19	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Jetter?
20	MR. JETTER: The Division would next like to
21	call its third witness, Gary Smith.
22	CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Mr. Smith.
23	Do you swear to tell the truth?
24	MR. SMITH: I do.
25	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.

1 GARY SMITH 2 DIRECT EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. JETTER: 4 0. Mr. Smith, would you please state your name and occupation for the record? 5 6 My name is Gary Smith. I'm the technical consultant for the Division of Public Utilities and have 7 participated in this docket on behalf of the Division. 8 9 Thank you. 0. 10 And in the course of your participation in 11 this docket, did you create and cause to be filed with 12 the Commission direct and surrebuttal testimony? 13 Α. Yes. And do you have any corrections or changes 14 0. 15 you'd like to make to either of those? 16 I do not. Α. 17 If you were asked the same questions contained in each of those two identified prefiled direct and 18 19 surrebuttal testimonies, would your answers be the same? 20 Yes, they would. Α. MR. JETTER: 21 I'd like to move at this point to 22 enter into the record the direct and surrebuttal 23 prefiled testimonies of DPU witness Gary Smith along 24 with the attached exhibits to each of those. 25 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.

1	Please indicate if there's any objection.
2	I'm not seeing any, so the motion is granted.
3	MR. JETTER: Thank you.
4	BY MR. JETTER:
5	Q. Mr. Smith, have you prepared a brief summary
6	of your testimony?
7	A. I have.
8	Q. Please go ahead.
9	A. Thank you.
0	Good morning, Commissioners. Thank you for
1	the opportunity to address the Company's request to
_2	adjust the base energy balancing account in this filing.
_3	The Commission's ongoing duty to order rates
_4	that are just and reasonable must be considered even if
_5	a single item adjustment is generally permitted.
L 6	Power costs, actual results thus far in 2021,
. 7	suggest the Commission needs to be suggests the
_8	Commission needs more evidence before determining that a
_9	single item adjustment would be in the public interest.
20	These actual results show that the current
21	base EBA set in the 2020 general rate case deviates
22	significantly from the actual results experienced so far
23	in 2021.
24	The Division found that the net power cost was
25	much higher, wind generation and the resulting

production tax credits were much lower, creating an actual loss of over \$3 million in production tax credits for the months of January through August.

Adjusting the base EBA, as the Company has requested, would create an even wider deviation from actual results creating a larger loss in PTCs that will eventually be trued up to the Company resulting in a future rate increase to customers.

The Company has not provided meaningful support -- supporting evidence indicating that the current trends creating a large EBA deferral in 2021 will not continue into the near future and beyond. There is insufficient evidence to conclude that the Company's proposed adjustment to the base EBA rate results in a just and reasonable rate.

That electric Schedule 94 may contemplate the possibility of adjusting base EBA side of a general rate case is not sufficient alarm without the evaluation of the entirety of the rate to be changed. Changes to base EBA have historically occurred during a general rate case.

Adjusting base EBA to accommodate a single project in isolation without consideration of the actual results and the accuracy of the existing base EBA may be warranted in some circumstances but not when the

experience of the actual test year deviates so markedly 1 2 from what it is in rates, and the proposal would 3 exasperate that difference. 4 The mere fact that a periodic change may be made to an element of rates does not remove the duty to 5 6 consider the entirety of that rate, its effect, and its reasonableness. 7 Under the facts on record, adjusting the base 8 9 EBA in this case would result in a rate that is most 10 likely to be inaccurate and not just and reasonable. 11 The public interest will better served by 12 leaving the base EBA as set in the 2020 general rate 13 case until a fuller record presented in an appropriate 14 proceeding allows formulation of a better rate or 15 explains why 2021's costs are anomalous. 16 That concludes my summary. 17 Q. Thank you. I have no further questions. 18 MR. JETTER: 19 Mr. Smith is available for cross-examination and 20 Comission questions. 2.1 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. 22 Mr. Moore? 23 MR. MOORE: No questions. Thank you. 24 CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Russell? 25 MR. RUSSELL: No questions. Thank you.

1	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
2	MS. WEGENER: I just have a few.
3	CROSS-EXAMINATION
4	BY MS. WEGENER:
5	Q. Good morning, Mr. Smith.
6	A. Good morning.
7	Q. In the Company's 2020 general rate case, did
8	the Division argue that there should be higher base net
9	power costs?
10	A. Did the Division
11	Q. Did they did they want a higher base net
12	power cost number?
13	A. I don't recall. I'd have to, you know, check
14	that.
15	Q. Okay. Thank you.
16	If I had said that there wasn't a significant
17	dispute about that number for base net power costs,
18	would you say that at the time the Company's forecast
19	there was no reason to believe that the Company's
20	forecast in the 2020 GRC was going to be inaccurate?
21	A. At the time I don't think that we thought that
22	it would not be accurate.
23	Q. Okay. And so your position now is that the
24	base EBA should not be changed because that forecast
25	turned out to be wrong so far in 2021?

Yeah, I mean, if you look and see what 1 Α. 2 happened in 2021, and the deviation is significant to 3 warrant, you know, thinking about that as you address 4 changes to the base now. But you'd agree with me that absent this 5 proceeding, there wouldn't be an opportunity to change 6 that base EBA based on changes to the actual and net 7 power cost numbers, correct? 8 So the question is can the Commission adjust 9 Α. 10 base EBA rates outside of this proceeding? 11 Or outside of a proceeding do they typically, Ο. 12 I quess is my --13 Do they typically? Generally, it's in a rate 14 case, although it doesn't exclude the opportunity for 15 the Commission to adjust as it sees is needed. 16 And you would agree with me that the net power 0. 17 cost benefits from TB and Pryor Mountain don't have a 18 significant effect on the deviation -- the difference 19 between the forecast and the actual for 2021; would you 20 agree with me? 21 Would I -- can you restate that, please? Α. 22 0. Yeah. 23 Would you agree with me that the TB Flats and 24 Pryor Mountain projects don't -- they aren't one of the

significant factors that is affecting the difference

25

between the forecast and the -- and the actuals?

- A. Yeah, generally speaking, all -- wind production generation is an issue. I mean, if you look at the overall Company's -- I address that in my surrebuttal. There is a significant deviation from actual to what was proposed in the general rate case.
- Q. If the Commission granted the Company's application but did not modify the base EBA, that would be an inaccurate reflection of those specific benefits to customers through the EBA, right?
- A. I -- like I said before and in all my testimony so far, you can't do it in isolation. The mere fact that you can do something doesn't mean you should do something. And if it -- it puts it into a situation where it places that base further away from what the actual results are, I think you need to reevaluate that and consider that.

Q. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MS. WEGENER: I have no further questions.

CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.

Any redirect, Mr. Jetter?

MR. JETTER: No redirect. Thank you.

CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.

Commissioner Clark, any questions?

COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank you.

1	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen?
2	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions.
3	CHAIR LEVAR: And I don't have any, so thank
4	you for your testimony this morning, Mr. Smith.
5	MR. SMITH: Thank you.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Jetter?
7	MR. JETTER: The Division would like to call
8	its final witness, Dr. William Powell.
9	CHAIR LEVAR: Good morning, Dr. Powell.
10	Do you swear to the tell truth?
11	DR. POWELL: Yes, I do.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
13	DR. WILLIAM ARTIE POWELL
14	DIRECT EXAMINATION
15	BY MR. JETTER:
16	Q. Dr. Powell, would you please state your name
17	and occupation for the record?
18	A. My name is Artie Powell, and I am the manager
19	of the in the Division of Public Utilities.
20	Q. Thank you.
21	And in the course of your employment with the
22	Division and participation in this case, did you create
23	and cause to be filed with the Commission direct and
24	surrebuttal testimonies?
25	A. Yes.

1	Q. And do you have any corrections or changes you
2	would like to make to those?
3	A. No.
4	Q. If you were asked the same questions that are
5	contained in those two prefiled testimonies today, would
6	your answers remain the same?
7	A. If the questions were asked in the same
8	sequence as in the testimony, yes, they would be.
9	Q. Thank you.
10	MR. JETTER: I'd like to move at this time to
11	enter into the record of this hearing the direct and
12	surrebuttal testimonies identified just previously,
13	along with I believe there's one exhibit that was
14	oh, I'm going to take that back, there were no attached
15	exhibits to those.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
17	Please indicate if you have any objection to
18	that motion.
19	I'm not seeing any objections, so the motion
20	is granted.
21	MR. JETTER: Thank you.
22	BY MR. JETTER:
23	Q. Have you prepared a brief summary of your
24	testimony?
25	A. Yes, I have.

Q. Please go ahead.

A. Good morning, Commissioners. And I am surprised it's still morning.

Thank you for the opportunity to present here today on behalf of the Division of Public Utilities.

I will keep my summary brief.

The Company is requesting to recover costs for two wind projects, TB Flats and Pryor Mountain, that are not currently in customer rates. I've referred to this -- these costs as additional costs in my testimony.

While the entire cost of the two plants were considered in setting customer rates in the last general rate case, the costs were treated on an average-of-period basis reflecting the fact that the plants were only on line for part of the test year.

The total additional costs, the costs not already in customer rates, that the Company seeks to recover in this case does not meet the statutory requirement of one percent of rate base, therefore the Division recommends that the application be denied.

The Division also recommends that the base net power costs not be adjusted in this case, and that the production tax credits and other net power cost benefits flow through the energy balancing account and be trued up in future filings of the EBA.

1	That concludes my summary statement.
2	Q. Thank you.
3	MR. JETTER: I have no further questions for
4	Dr. Powell, and he is available for cross-examination or
5	Commission and/or Commission questions.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
7	Mr. Moore?
8	MR. MOORE: No questions. Thank you.
9	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
10	Mr. Russell?
11	MR. RUSSELL: No questions. Thank you.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
13	MS. WEGENER: Yeah, just a few.
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION
15	BY MS. WEGENER:
16	Q. Good morning, Dr. Powell.
17	A. Morning.
18	Q. I just want to confirm, you would you
19	would agree with me that the Company's EBA tariff allows
20	changes to base EBA during this proceeding, right?
21	A. It does contemplate that that's allowable,
22	yes.
23	Q. Okay. But it's your position, and I think
24	that your testimony says and we don't need to go
25	there, but I'm looking at lines 237 and 238, that it

The

1 that base EBA should not be changed unless there are 2 clearly demonstrable ratepayer benefits; is that right? 3 I think outside of a rate case, that's --4 I think that was my point. And so you would include this 5 Okay. proceeding as -- as a time when the Company should have 6 to demonstrate clear ratepayer benefits? 7 8 Α. Right. And that's just your opinion about the policy; 9 0. 10 it's not found in a statute or a Commission order or 11 anything like that, right? 12 That's correct. I would agree with that. Α. 13 You would agree that a change to the base EBA 0. 14 affects only the timing of the recovery of the costs that the Company incurs and not the amount, right? 15 16 I think that's correct. Α. 17 Okay. And if the Company's application is 0. granted -- and I understand it's your position that it 18 19 should not be, but if it's granted and the cost of 20 TB Flats and Pryor Mountain are incorporated into rates, 21 then the timing of the recovery or the -- of the 22 benefits, giving the benefits to customers through the 23 EBA, would better match the costs if the base EBA were 24 changed to reflect the benefits?

I'm not sure what you mean by better.

25

Α.

timing would be different, but I'm not sure I would
characterize it as being better or worse.

Q. Well, if the timing changed along -- at the

- Q. Well, if the timing changed along -- at the same time as the increase for the cost recovery, the benefits of the project, then those benefits would flow through the EBA at the same time that customers are paying the cost of the project; isn't that right?
 - A. I would agree with that.

- Q. Okay. And doesn't matching the timing of cost recovery with the benefits, doesn't that benefit customers to have -- have those costs and benefits matched?
- A. It may. But I don't believe there's a matching issue here that needs to be addressed by the Commission in that regard.

I would also point out that the amount of the net benefit here to customers is fairly small, \$4.2 million, and that benefit could be -- could go away with variations in production from the wind plants themselves.

Q. Thank you.

I want to turn to your direct testimony, lines
267 through 273. And I want you to read them, but
there's a confidential number that you can skip because
the -- the confidential portion isn't important. But

I'd like to just read 267 to 273 to set a baseline for a couple of questions that I have.

- A. "Absent approval"?
- Q. Uh-huh. Yeah, right there.
- A. Is that the line you want to start? Okay.
- Q. Yeah, and then end on "plants" in line 273.
- A. Okay.

"Absent approval of the recovery of additional costs, 'the pro-rated capital and depreciation costs of the Pryor Mountain and TB Flats wind projects will remain embedded in customer rates until the next general rate case,' (Mr. McDougal, Direct Testimony, line 49). If the PTCs and other net power cost benefits associated with the additional costs are allowed to flow through the EBA, then ratepayers will receive through a future EBA filing an approximate" confidential benefit "without the offsetting commensurate additional costs from the two plants."

- Q. So you agree and acknowledge that if the Company's application is denied, and the benefits of Pryor Mountain and TB Flats flow through the EBA, the customers will receive the benefits of the projects without paying the full project costs, right?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. And your position is just that you're okay

with this mismatch if it goes in customers' favor? 1 2 No, I'm not. That's not our position, and 3 I don't remember talking about customers' favor or 4 disfavor anyplace in my testimony. Our position is, is that the EBA is designed 5 6 to compare actual net power costs to embedded net power 7 costs that's being embedded in customer rates. that's exactly the way the EBA is designed to operate. 8 9 But you acknowledge that only part of the 10 costs of TB Flats and Pryor Mountain are embedded in 11 customer rates absent the Commission granting the 12 Company's application here? 13 Α. Correct. 14 Thank you. 0. 15 MS. WEGENER: That's all the questions I have. 16 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Ms. Wegener. 17 Mr. Jetter, any redirect? 18 No redirect. MR. JETTER: Thank you. 19 CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. 20 Commissioner Allen? 21 COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank 22 you. 23 CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Clark? 24 COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank 25 you.

1 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY THE COMMISSION

BY CHAIR LEVAR:

Q. Okay. I'd like to ask your opinion of a hypothetical that I've asked a couple witnesses today, Dr. Powell.

So presume that the utility completed a wind facility that qualified for PTCs, and they completed it 20 months after the most recent general rate case, and then for the next two years, there -- two or so years, there wasn't a general rate case filed.

How should the PTCs -- and I think when
I asked before I just referred to PTCs, but I'm also
talking about, you know, net power cost benefits. How
should those be addressed in the EBA in that situation
where none of the plants is in a rate case?

A. It would be the Division's position that those PTCs and other benefits should flow through the EBA and be trued up as a part of actual net power costs compared to what they raise in rates in future EBA filings.

Let me go back a little bit in history on the EBA, and in particular production tax credits. The Company proposed and argued that the production tax credits should be included in the EBA.

The Division took the position that the production tax credits were not really a net power cost

and should not be included in the EBA or balancing account and the adjustments that take place there. The Commission, however, ordered that those PTCs be included in net power costs and in the EBA.

And so those net power -- that's why the Division says, consistent with past Commission orders, those PTCs should flow through the EBA despite the fact that those costs for those two -- that wind plant in your hypothetical is not in cost.

I would also add that several years ago, again in one of the EBA filings, the Comm- -- or the Company filed making some adjustments in the EBA, which the Division considered to be out-of-period adjustments. In prior years of the EBA the Company had included estimates of net power cost components. And after those EBA filings were closed, in other words those rates became final, the Company in a subsequent filing made adjustments to those prior period components in the net power costs and the EBA filing.

The Division took the position that since they were out-of-period adjustments, and that those costs are -- excuse me, those rates were already final, that those adjustments were improper.

The Commission again ruled against the Division and said that since those were actual net power

costs, the Company was entitled to recover those.

So I think that's what we're talking about here in your hypothetical is that these PTCs and other net power cost benefits are part of actual net power costs. And the statute and the tariff contemplate comparing those actual net power costs to what's embedded in the rates. And therefore, again, those PTCs should flow through the EBA and be trued up.

Q. Okay. Thank you.

Just one follow-up question to that then. On line 49 of your direct -- I don't think there's any confidential information in this -- you refer to "an average or prorated basis" for PTCs and NPC benefits.

Do you have a suggestion for a formula or methodology if we were -- if we were in this situation -- again, this depends on other decisions we might make in this docket, but how would you suggest we implement that average or prorated basis that you referred to in line 49 of your direct?

- A. So if -- let me make sure I'm understanding what you're asking. If you grant the -- if you deny the application, how should you adjust the PTCs if you were going to do that? Is that what you're asking?
- Q. That's a cleaner way of asking the question I asked.

A. Okay. Luckily I'm not an accountant, and so I'm not sure I have a direct answer. I know that the Company has proposed a method where you would look at a percentage of the costs that are embedded in rates versus that which is not being recovered and simply apply that to the PTCs and other benefits.

I'm not sure that's an appropriate method to use because the production tax credits are a result of the production or the energy that's generated from the wind plants. And that's going to vary. I think we heard testimony earlier today that there's seasonal components to that.

And so it seems to be that just simply applying a percentage to the total benefits that are coming from those wind plants would be inappropriate. You're not taking into account the production characteristics that took place over that deferral period.

So I know that's not a positive answer to your question, but it -- to me, it would be difficult to figure out and separate all those components and just simply attribute as a percentage to costs embedded in rates.

Q. But your testimony is that we should attempt to do so if we deny the primary application?

1	A. No. Our position is and this goes from my
2	direct testimony to my surrebuttal testimony. After
3	reviewing Commission orders, the tariff and the statute,
4	the Division's position is, is that there should be no
5	prorating of those PTCs in the EBA.
6	The total PTCs and other benefits should flow
7	through the energy balancing account and be trued up as
8	the EBA was designed to.
9	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. That's all the
10	questions I had. Thank you for your testimony,
11	Dr. Powell.
12	DR. POWELL: Thank you.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: I think it's probably
14	appropriate to go ahead and take a lunch break and
15	reconvene at one o'clock, unless there's any objection
16	from anyone to that.
17	Okay. We are in recess until 1:00 p.m.
18	(Whereupon a lunch break was taken.)
19	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Good afternoon,
20	everyone. We'll go back on the record.
21	And now go to Mr. Russell.
22	MR. RUSSELL: Thank you. UAE calls
23	Justin Bieber to the stand.
24	CHAIR LEVAR: Good afternoon, Mr. Bieber.
25	Do you swear to tell the truth?

1	MR. BIEBER: Yes.
2	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
3	JUSTIN BIEBER
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. RUSSELL:
6	Q. Can you state and spell your name for the
7	record, please?
8	A. Yes. My name is Justin Bieber, J-u-s-t-i-n,
9	B-i-e-b-e-r.
10	Q. And can you tell us who you work for and on
11	whose behalf you offer testimony?
12	A. Yes. I work for Energy Strategies, and I'm
13	offering testimony on behalf of the Utah Association of
14	Energy Users.
15	Q. And you are you have prefiled or have
16	you prefiled direct and surrebuttal testimony in this
17	proceeding?
18	A. Yes, that's correct.
19	Q. And specifically you prefiled direct testimony
20	that's been labeled as UAE Exhibit 2.0 along with
21	associated Exhibits 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, and surrebuttal
22	testimony that's been labeled as UAE Exhibit 4.0 and the
23	associated exhibit, UAE Exhibit 4.1?
24	A. Yes, I have.
25	Q. Okay. With respect to your prefiled

1	testimony, do you have any corrections to make?
2	A. No, I do not.
3	Q. And you if were asked the same questions today
4	that were posed in your prefiled testimony, would you
5	provide the same answers?
6	A. Yes, I would.
7	MR. RUSSELL: At this point, I'll move for the
8	admission of Mr. Bieber's prefiled testimony.
9	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
10	If anyone objects to that motion, please
11	indicate.
12	I'm not seeing any objection, so the motion is
13	granted.
14	BY MR. RUSSELL:
15	Q. Have you prepared a summary of your testimony
16	for us today?
17	A. Yes, I have.
18	Q. Please proceed with that.
19	A. Good afternoon. I recommend that the
20	Commission should reject the Company's proposal to
21	adjust base rates in this proceeding as described in
22	detail by my colleague Kevin Higgins.
23	However, to the extent that the Commission
24	does determine that it is appropriate to revise base
25	rates in this proceeding, I recommend that the

Schedule 32 daily power charges should be set at a level that, in combination with the delivery facilities' charges, would recover the same level of cost as the facilities and power charges that are applicable to full requirements customers.

The Company proposed to calculate Schedule 32 rates in this manner in the Company's 2020 general rate case, Docket No. 20-035-04. Both UAE and the University of Utah agreed with the Company's proposed method.

If the Commission determines it is appropriate to revise base rates in this proceeding but does not approve my recommendation to calculate the Schedule 32 daily power charges rates as I have described, then I recommend that the Schedule 32 daily power charges be calculated in the same manner ordered and approved by the Commission in the Company's 2020 rate case.

In the 2020 rate case, the Commission ordered that the Schedule 32 rates for transmission voltage customers should be calculated to result in a rate increase that was equal to a rate -- that was equal to the rate increase for Schedule 9 inclusive of the portion of Schedule 32 revenue that is related to the renewable procurement contract.

Since the revenue related to the renewable procurement contract makes up the majority of

Schedule 32 revenue, this resulted in an increase that was substantially larger than the increase that would have been calculated if renewable procurement revenues were excluded from the calculation, all else being equal.

2.1

The Company's proposal in this case is to calculate Schedule 32 rates that would result -- that would result in a base rate decrease that is equal to the Schedule 9 base rate decrease excluding the portion of revenue related to the renewable procurement contract.

All else being equal, this results in a base rate decrease that is substantially less than the base rate decrease that would be calculated if the same method ordered by the Commission in the 2020 rate case were utilized to set Schedule 32 base rates in this proceeding. In fact, due to rounding, it results in a zero base rate decrease for Schedule 32 as calculated by the Company.

The cost increase allocated to Schedule 32 in the 2020 rate case included the revenue requirement for the two wind projects at issue in this proceeding.

While I do not necessarily agree that revenues associated with the Schedule 32 customers' power purchase agreement should be considered the Company's --

1	as the Company's retail revenue for the purpose of
2	determining rate spread, given the Commission's order to
3	include the revenue related to the renewable procurement
4	to determine the Schedule 32 rate spread in the 2020
5	rate case, it would not be consistent or reasonable to
6	exclude those revenues in determining the Schedule 32
7	rate spread for the requirement associated with those
8	same wind plants in this proceeding.
9	This concludes my summary.
10	Q. Thank you.
11	MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Bieber is available for
12	cross-examination and Commission questions.
13	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Russell.
14	I'll go to Mr. Moore first. Do you have any
15	questions for Mr. Bieber?
16	MR. MOORE: No questions. Thank you.
17	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
18	Mr. Jetter?
19	MR. JETTER: I have no questions. Thank you.
20	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
21	MS. WEGENER: Just just a short line.
22	CROSS-EXAMINATION
23	BY MS. WEGENER:
24	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Bieber.
25	A. Good afternoon.

Do you -- have you reviewed the other 1 0. 2 testimony filed in this -- in this proceeding? 3 Α. Yes, I have. 4 And do you understand that the DPU's position **Q.** is that the base EBA should not be modified as part of 5 the Company's application? 6 That's my understanding. 7 Α. And if that happens then the -- and the 8 0. Commission grants the Company's application, that 9 10 results in a rate increase, right? 11 Yes, that's also my understanding. Α. 12 Does that change your position at all about 0. 13 the way that the Schedule 32 rate spread should be 14 implemented? 15 It might. You know, my concern -- so my Α. 16 primary recommendation is that the rate design should be 17 designed so that the delivery -- the facilities and 18 power charges for Schedule 32 are set to recover the 19 same level of revenue as the delivery and facility 20 charges for Schedule 9. So that does not change. 21 However, if you are contemplating a result 22 where the revenue requirement for the wind facilities 23 is -- you know, if you're only increasing the result --24 I'm sorry, if you're only increasing the revenue 25 requirement for the wind facilities, then you would

1	still have an inconsistency with the Company's proposed
2	method and the Commission's proposed method.
3	So it does not change my primary
4	recommendation. And it does not mitigate the
5	inconsistency that I have described between the two
6	methods.
7	Q. Okay. Thank you.
8	MS. WEGENER: That's all the questions I have.
9	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Ms. Wegener.
10	Any redirect, Mr. Russell?
11	MR. RUSSELL: No. Thank you.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
13	Commissioner Clark?
14	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank you.
15	CHAIR LEVAR: Commissioner Allen?
16	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions.
17	CHAIR LEVAR: I don't have any either.
18	Thank you for your testimony this afternoon,
19	Mr. Bieber.
20	MR. BIEBER: Thank you.
21	MR. RUSSELL: UAE next calls Kevin Higgins to
22	the stand.
23	CHAIR LEVAR: Good afternoon, Mr. Higgins.
24	MR. HIGGINS: Good afternoon.
25	CHAIR LEVAR: Do you swear to tell the truth?

1	MR. HIGGINS: I do.
2	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
3	KEVIN HIGGINS
4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. RUSSELL:
6	Q. Could you state and spell your name for the
7	record, please?
8	A. Kevin C. Higgins. K-e-v-i-n, middle
9	initial C, H-i-g-g-i-n-s.
10	Q. And can you tell us who you work for and on
11	whose behalf you offer testimony in this proceeding?
12	A. Yes. I'm a principal in the firm Energy
13	Strategies, and I'm here on behalf of the Utah
14	Association of Energy Users.
15	Q. And have you submitted prefiled direct and
16	surrebuttal testimony in this proceeding?
17	A. Yes, I have.
18	Q. Specifically, did you prepare and cause to be
19	filed direct testimony labeled UAE Exhibit 1.0 with
20	associated exhibits UAE Exhibits 1.1 and 1.2, and
21	surrebuttal testimony that was labeled UAE Exhibit 3.0?
22	A. Yes, I have.
23	Q. And with respect to your prefiled testimony in
24	this proceedings, do you have any corrections to make?
25	A. I have a typo to correct on in my

1 surrebuttal testimony. On line 109, the word there 2 should be "prefiled," not "prefled." 3 I have no other corrections. 4 0. Okay. And if you are asked the same questions today that were posed in your prefiled testimony, would 5 you provide the same answers, except spell that word 6 correctly? 7 8 Α. Yes. 9 0. Okay. 10 MR. RUSSELL: And at this point, I'll move for 11 the admission of Mr. Higgins' testimony. 12 CHAIR LEVAR: Please indicate if anyone 13 objects to that. 14 I don't see any, so the motion is granted. 15 BY MR. RUSSELL: 16 Have you prepared a summary of your testimony 17 for us today? 18 Yes, I have. 19 Please proceed. 0. 20 Good afternoon, Commissioners. I recommend Α. 21 that Rocky Mountain Power's request for approval of the 22 base revenue change for the TB Flats and Pryor Mountain 23 wind projects be rejected because the Company's 24 application does not reasonably meet the criteria for 25

approval of a major plant addition.

The application fails at two levels. First, as a threshold matter, UAE opposes any designation of the TB Flats and Pryor Mountain wind projects as plant additions under the major plant addition statute as both of these facilities are already included in rate base in their entirety.

Specifically, the entire amount of the TB Flats plant services, as projected by the Company in that case -- in the rate case, was included in a rate base starting in June 2021. And the entire amount of the Pryor Mountain plant in-service as projected by the Company in the rate case was included in a rate base starting in July of 2021.

I acknowledge that the measurement of plant in-service differs depending on whether it is measured on an average of 2021 basis, as was done in the general rate case, or an average of 2022 basis, as proposed in the Company's major plant additions filing, and that the measurement is somewhat greater using an average of 2022 basis.

But the fact remains that the rate making treatment in the general rate case took account of the full amount of plant brought into service. There is no addition to plant in the major plant addition filing that was not already in rate base in the general

rate case. And, logically, UAE maintains that the major plant addition designation should be applicable only to plant that is not already included in rate base.

Secondly, the application should also be rejected even if these plants are construed to be additions. To be considered a major plant addition under the statute, the investment must exceed one percent of the Company's rate base allocated to Utah as determined in the Company's most recent rate case.

In a rate-making context, they could logically only be considered to be additions on an incremental basis; that is, one would have to examine whether the incremental change in the measurement of plant in-service for each plant exceeds one percent of Utah rate base.

And as I demonstrated in my confidential testimony, using Rocky Mountain Power's numbers, the incremental measurement of plant in-service for the TB Flats and Pryor Mountain projects relative to what is already included in rate base fails to meet the one percent threshold.

Rocky Mountain Power presents the application as a reduction in Utah base revenue of \$4.1 million.

And while this is technically correct, the base revenue reduction is caused by including incremental production

1	tax credit and incremental net power cost benefits in
2	base rates. However, 100 percent of these incremental
3	benefits would flow to customers anyway through the
4	energy balancing account if the Company's application
5	was not made, or if it was rejected by the Commission.
6	Thus, if the major plant addition were to be
7	approved, the actual net impact to customers would be an
8	increase to plant revenue requirement of \$6.7 million
9	per year; that is, this MPA filing represents a net rate
10	increase to Utah customers of around \$6.7 million, not a
11	net reduction of \$4.1 million.
12	That concludes my summary.
13	Q. Thank you.
14	MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Higgins is available for
15	cross-examination and Commission questions.
16	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you, Mr. Russell.
17	Mr. Moore, do you have any questions for
18	Mr. Higgins?
19	MR. MOORE: No questions. Thank you.
20	CHAIR LEVAR: Mr. Jetter?
21	MR. JETTER: I have no questions. Thank you.
22	CHAIR LEVAR: Ms. Wegener?
23	MS. WEGENER: I also have no questions. Thank
24	you.
25	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Commissioner Clark?

1	COMMISSIONER CLARK: No questions. Thank you.
2	CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you.
3	Commissioner Allen?
4	COMMISSIONER ALLEN: No questions. Thank you.
5	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY THE COMMISSION
6	BY CHAIR LEVAR:
7	Q. Okay. My children tell me I repeat myself too
8	much, but I'm going to ask the same question I've asked
9	three other times because I'm just curious of your
10	opinion.
11	This is a hypothetical. Consider that if the
12	utility built a wind facility that qualified for PTCs,
13	and it came in service 20 months after the most recent
14	GRC, so it's not in rate base. A year or two go by
15	without another GRC being filed. What should be the
16	treatment of the PTCs and other net power cost benefits
17	in the EBA for a plant that is entirely out of rate
18	base?
19	A. First, let me say I appreciate you repeating
20	yourself. I appreciate the opportunity to address the
21	question.
22	Let me first mention that I believe there's
23	precedent for the situation you described, at least with
24	respect to net power costs. Because if we look at the
25	Company's EB 2020 investments, with the exception of

TB Flats, which came in after -- came in full after

January 1, 2021, and if we look the Company's repowering
investments that they made that came into service prior
to January 1, 2021, the net power cost benefits from
those investments did flow through the EBA, to the best
of my knowledge. And so -- and yet those plants were
not yet recognized in base rates.

Now, the PTC treatment was different because at the time those plants came into service, the production tax credits were treated in rate-making context as a base revenue requirement item. And so until the rate effective period of the last rate case, that is until, you know, January 1, 2021, the Company held the benefit -- received the benefits of the production tax credits from those investments, but they were reflected in rates going forward.

Now, with production tax credits also flowing through the EBA, that would be a new situation. And my answer to your question about what should happen would be as follows. Unless the plant were declared to be a merchant facility and not intended to serve Utah customers, then I believe that the net power cost benefits and the production tax credit benefits should be recognized as benefits to Utah customers, but deferred because the question would remain whether the

plant, under this hypothetical, would ultimately be included or accepted as a prudent investment by the Commission.

At such time that the investment were determined to be a prudent investment, then I believe it would be appropriate for the deferral to be recognized.

But my answer is generally, you know, similar to what Dr. Powell said. I believe that we -- you know, the Commission has adopted a number of mechanisms, generally at the Company's request, whether it be the EBA or whether it be the inclusion of production tax credits in the EBA, and I believe it is hazardous to begin to try to cherry-pick or color code the net power cost benefits or the production tax credit benefits depending on the prior rate making treatment of the -- of the plant that's generating these.

We have an integrated system. The plants are operated. And if one were to just all of a sudden say, "Well, we're not going to recognize the -- you know, the net power cost benefits to -- you know, to customers or the production tax credit benefits to customers from these facilities," then you're really running sort of a counter-factual analysis, I think, on what the -- what occurs in the MPA case.

So I think the right balance to strike is to

1 recognize that these mechanisms are in place, largely 2 requested by the Company, and I think in the interest of mitigating shareholder risk, I think the Company has to 3 4 take, you know, the pros and the cons. When they -when they do that, I think the benefit should flow to 5 6 customers irrespective of whether the plants are in -recognizing the revenue requirement in base rates, but 7 I think it would be appropriate to defer those benefits 8 9 subject to the ultimate disposition of the plant and the 10 general rate case.

Q. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Higgins.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Let me just clarify, your suggestion for a deferral is only for the hypothetical where it has not been a prudent determination, is that --

A. Exactly. Very limited situation where there has not been a prudent determination, and there has not been a prior approval sought by the Company. Simply this hypothetical where they built the plant, it's operating, but the Company hasn't sought any type of revenue recognition, which makes it a novel hypothetical in my experience, but still it could happen.

But nevertheless, I do think, yes, they would be that limited circumstance of where I think a deferral would be appropriate.

CHAIR LEVAR: Thank you. I don't have any

1	other questions. Thank you for your testimony this
2	afternoon.
3	MR. HIGGINS: Thank you.
4	CHAIR LEVAR: Anything else, Mr. Russell?
5	MR. RUSSELL: UAE has no additional witnesses.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Anything else from
7	anyone?
8	MR. RUSSELL: Unless the Commission wants to
9	hear argument on the motion for summary judgment that
10	has been filed? I'm happy to provide it, but that's
11	subject to the Commission's desire to hear it.
12	CHAIR LEVAR: We didn't come to the hearing
13	prepared with questions we wanted to ask on that issue.
14	We're not opposed, but we're not I don't think we're
15	in a position where we're requesting that.
16	MR. RUSSELL: What I'll say here is that my
17	my
18	CHAIR LEVAR: And if I'm speaking differently
19	from how either of my colleagues feel, please jump in.
20	But we weren't planning I don't think we
21	were planning to request it, but we're not opposed to it
22	if the parties want to, if I'm saying that correctly.
23	MR. RUSSELL: Yeah, it's my position that if
24	you're if you're wanting to hear it, I'm happy to
25	give it. I don't I don't require that you sit here

1	and watch me talk at you.
2	My view is an oral argument is for the benefit
3	of the decision-maker here. And if you think you've
4	got if the Commission believes it has everything it
5	needs in the filed paperwork, then I'm satisfied.
6	CHAIR LEVAR: Okay. Well, I'll repeat myself
7	again I guess just to say we're not requesting it. If
8	any party wants to request it, please do so right now.
9	Not seeing any. I'm looking left and right to
10	see if we're in a good place. Okay.
11	Okay. Anything else from anyone?
12	Okay. We are aware of the statutory deadline
13	for issuing an order in this matter.
14	And with that, we're adjourned.
15	(Hearing adjourned at 1:23 p.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
2	STATE OF UTAH)
3	COUNTY OF UTAH)
4	
5	I, DEIRDRE RAND, a Certified Court Reporter and
6	Registered Professional Reporter, hereby certify:
7	THAT the foregoing proceedings were taken before
8	me at the time and place therein set forth, at which
9	time the witnesses were placed under oath to tell the
10	truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; that
11	the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and
12	thereafter my notes were transcribed through
13	computer-aided transcription; and the foregoing
14	transcript constitutes a full, true, and accurate record
15	of such testimony adduced and oral proceedings had, and
16	of the whole thereof.
17	I further certify that I am not a relative or
18	employee of any attorney of the parties, nor do I have a
19	financial interest in the action.
20	I have subscribed my name on this 14th day of
21	December, 2021.
22	
23	The land
24	DEIRDRE RAND, RPR, CSR, CCR
25	

Index: \$11,000..28

	117 23:23 24:1	20 27:2 49:25 96:2 122:8
\$	11:05 91:16	20-035-04 33:17 41:11
\$11,000 71:7 72:10,25	12 22:2 89:18 102:8	62:13 94:15 129:8
73:22 75:7,10 77:21	13 53:23 54:4,5,6,22	2019 37:19
\$13,353,130 68:10	55:9,15,24 70:20	2020 9:25 10:6,7,8,9,10,
\$3 109:2	13,353 70:21	12,15 12:19 13:14 30:9 33:7,9,12,16 37:20,25
\$34,000 65:6	13-month 41:20 42:25	38:2,19 41:10,12,16
\$350,000 65:7 81:9	50:19,23 52:20 56:2,7	42:12,24 43:7 56:4 63:23
\$4.1 137:23 138:11	13.4 68:12,22	88:24 101:2 108:21 110:12 111:7,20 129:7,
\$4.2 11:20 42:2 119:18	132 33:10	16,17 130:15,21 131:4
\$6,000 75:15 76:5	15 51:21 54:22,23 55:15, 25	2021 10:13,18,24 33:14,
\$6.7 21:19 42:7 138:8,10	15-minute 60:7	15 38:3,5 42:14 47:16 50:3,20 52:6,8,11,17,23
\$9.9 69:5 70:25 71:10	150 17:12,16	53:5,6,13 55:9,12,21
	152 17:12,17	92:14,15 101:1 108:16, 23 109:11 111:25 112:2,
0	16 53:24	19 136:10,13,16
0.2 11:20 64:15 65:18	17 70:1,20 71:6	2021's 110:15
1	17-035-40 10:5 33:5	2022 11:20 42:15 51:2,8
<u> </u>	18 12:14,18 67:13,16	52:9,11 53:13,16 55:1 59:8,13 136:17,19
1 11:20 19:23 38:4 42:4 51:8 52:15,19 96:22 97:1	68:15 73:19 74:17 92:15	21-035-42 6:5
101:1	18-month 13:25	220 18:19 19:1
1.1 134:20	18th 46:20	231 20:4
1.2 134:20	19 15:4,10 67:13,17,25 71:10 75:23 76:8,18	233 20:5
10-K 30:9	1:00 126:17	237 117:25
100 138:2		238 117:25
106 98:17	2	240 37:16
107 98:17	2 43:8 49:8 102:2	26 33:15 78:10
109 135:1	2.0 127:20	267 119:23 120:1
10:20 60:8	2.1 127:21	273 119:23 120:1,6
11 46:21 47:4	2.2 127:21	28 33:10 47:10
11,000 71:11	2.3 127:21	
114 37:15		

	500 33:1	9.9 68:23
3	52 16:25	94 109:16
3 69:25 70:5,6	54-7-13.4 11:1 15:17 99:15 100:18	A
3.0 134:21		
3.3 64:13	54-7-13.4(1)(c) 16:1	ability 10:21
30 47:10 102:2	59 64:12	absent 25:18 42:20
31 30:9 38:2,3 102:2	6	44:19 112:5 120:3,8 121:11
32 62:2,5,10,13,18 63:3, 5,22 64:5,21,24 65:7	6 51:21 52:7 92:14	accept 19:3,13 20:15
66:25 67:7,14 68:4,13	6.7 11:6	accepted 20:8 105:23
70:1,12,14 71:7 72:11, 15,16,21 73:3,8,18,25	6.8 42:9	access 37:18
74:12,14 75:8 76:9,24	60 37:14 72:3	accommodate 109:22
78:10 79:3,20 81:9 82:12,15 83:19 84:3,16	61 64:12	accommodating 96:18
85:3,17 89:1,19 90:4,12	62 72:3	accomplish 64:6
129:1,6,12,14,18,22	68 64:11	accomplished 94:21
130:1,7,16,18,20,24 131:4,6 132:13,18 32's 63:10 65:4,8,19	7	account 11:13 23:12 69:10 100:14 108:12 116:24 123:2 125:16
78:13	7 46:21 47:4 53:11	126:7 136:22 138:4
33 15:5,10	71 64:10	accountant 125:1
39 84:16		accrued 32:25
	8	accumulated 51:5
	83.4 43:11 49:19	accuracy 109:24
4 42:4 49:8	86 43:9 49:17	accurate 111:22
4.0 127:22		achieve 72:6 76:24 77:4
4.1 127:23	9	acknowledge 83:22
4.2 42:11 43:20 64:13	9 62:21 63:2 65:10 70:14	120:19 121:9 136:14
49 120:12 124:11,18	71:3 72:18,20 76:20 79:4,6,9 81:11,15 82:18,	activities 37:17 98:18,20 102:7
5	19 84:16 85:14 86:6,9	activity 90:11
5 98:16	88:23 89:21 102:8 129:21 130:9 132:20	actual 14:5 25:15 52:9 53:17 72:16 74:13
50 16:25	9,885,000 68:20	108:16,20,22 109:2,6,23 110:1 112:7,19 113:6,16

Index:	actuals.	.analysis
--------	----------	-----------

121:6 122:18 123:25 Albany 33:2 25 62:17 79:8 82:16,17 124:4,6 138:7 86:7,16 88:18 89:11 align 84:20 105:21 108:15,19 109:14 actuals 54:1 113:1 aligned 86:7 adjustments 20:9 43:17 add 123:10 alignment 79:4 84:15,19 48:3 123:2,12,13,18,21, added 13:5 18:5 100:3 85:1 86:1,6 23 adding 18:16 **Allen** 6:11 9:20 26:14,16 administrative 34:3 31:2,3 35:5,6 39:10,11 addition 11:2 12:3,12,23 admission 128:8 135:11 60:2,3 61:24 90:20,21 13:1,21 15:16,24,25 admit 9:10 29:14 32:13 95:16,17 103:18,19 16:2,6,7,8,16,18,21 17:8 36:22 40:20 61:14 92:24 106:12,13 114:1,2 19:21 23:2,15 30:6 38:16 96:21,22 102:24 121:20,21 133:15,16 44:20,23 45:11,16,17 50:11 53:2 61:24 62:10, admitted 102:22 allocate 25:5 80:4 25 63:17 64:18 65:2,18, adverse 101:21 allocated 24:24 25:20. 25 67:23 70:9 79:10 21.23 26:4 81:5 130:20 advisedly 15:21 84:11,13 87:6,13 88:7 137:8 93:11,20 100:17 135:25 affect 84:2 allocation 25:7 70:8 72:7 136:4,24 137:2,6 138:6 affecting 75:25 112:25 80:24 additional 12:20 13:6 affects 118:14 allocations 25:12 16:11 58:13 101:17 102:12 116:10,16 120:8, **affiliate** 38:8,14 101:12 allowable 117:21 14,17 afternoon 91:9 126:19, allowance 34:2 **Additionally** 11:16 24 128:19 131:24,25 allowed 45:9 120:14 133:18,23,24 135:20 **additions** 6:7 11:4,9 allowing 17:19 12:22 93:14 100:2 136:4, agency 30:8 18 137:6,11 **alternative** 6:6 9:22 11:3 aggregate 68:8 19:4,16 20:17,21 64:20 address 21:2 50:8 62:11 agree 15:19 16:20 18:12 77:16,22 99:14 92:5 100:4 108:11 112:3 45:2,9,15 84:5 112:5,16, 113:4 amount 11:8 13:8 26:7 20,23 117:19 118:12,13 49:24,25 50:1,24 52:8,19 addressed 34:8 119:14 119:8 120:19 130:23 53:17,18 59:3 68:9,19 122:14 agreed 85:11 129:9 69:1 73:11 75:12,25 addresses 100:19 87:20 101:25 102:3 agreement 67:2 84:19,24 118:15 119:16 136:7,10, adjust 44:22 108:12 85:4,9 130:25 23 112:9.15 124:22 128:21 agreements 101:9 **amounts** 52:10 77:10 adjusted 47:19 116:22 ahead 28:11 98:9 99:2 102:11 adjusting 28:2 65:8 105:16 108:8 116:1 analogy 87:5 81:11 109:4,17,22 110:8 126:14 **analysis** 99:8 100:6,23 adjustment 10:21 21:22 alarm 109:18 25:18 43:5 45:25 47:14,

analyst 104:13 analyzed 105:17 and/or 117:5 annual 11:7 21:18 annualized 22:1 41:14 42:21 50:23 anomalous 110:15 answers 9:8 27:13 29:12 32:11 36:20 38:11 40:18 61:12 92:21 98:6 104:25 107:19 115:6 128:5 135:6 anticipated 101:1 anyplace 121:4 apologize 67:16 appeal 21:4 94:18 appearances 6:11 appearing 6:14 67:11 **applicable** 20:24 64:3

appears 52:16,22 55:23 129:4 137:2 application 6:6 9:22 10:9

11:1,16 16:10 17:23 18:14 41:8 45:23 92:10 99:16,18 100:21 101:24 105:22,23 113:8 116:20 118:17 120:20 121:12 124:22 125:25 132:6,9 135:24 136:1 137:4,22 138:4

applied 18:2 63:2

apply 11:25 48:8 63:9 64:23 70:13 72:11 86:11 87:3 125:6

applying 13:21 63:4,12

65:19 83:18 125:14

approach 20:1,18 41:19 appropriately 42:12,14 51:5

approval 41:14 120:3,8 135:21,25

approve 10:21 11:3 20:17 65:23 101:23 129:12

approved 10:4 13:7 18:10 19:20 33:17 34:9 38:18 42:24 43:21 101:25 105:24 129:15 138:7

approves 24:8 94:6 approximate 120:16 approximately 37:14 42:7,9,11 43:9,11 68:19, 22,23 69:5 70:20,24 71:10 75:14 **April** 38:4 101:1

area 37:19 **argue** 111:8 argued 11:23 89:12 122:22

argues 12:20 13:11

arguments 89:16 93:19, 20

arrived 99:23

Artie 100:15 114:13,18

ascribed 101:17

Association 7:14 11:22 62:4 127:13 134:14

assume 15:20 assumed 58:17 **Assuming** 24:8

assumption 55:22 59:11, 12

assumptions 59:8

attached 51:12 98:2 103:1 104:18 105:5 107:24 115:14

attains 67:6

attempt 125:24

attention 15:4 16:24 17:12 20:4 46:19

attorney 6:23,24 7:8

attributable 75:13

attribute 125:22

attributed 87:21

audible 36:3

audio 8:2

August 109:3

authorizes 11:3

average 10:23 13:13 14:3 21:24 41:20 42:25 50:20,23 52:21 53:5 56:2,7 124:13,17 136:16, 17,19

average-of-period 116:14

В

B-E-C-K 92:7

B-I-E-B-E-R 127:9

back 8:2 27:7,9 42:1 52:14 54:23 55:19 60:8, 10,14 68:15 71:6,18 73:13 78:23 86:13,18 91:20 115:14 122:20

Inday.	back-to-back.	canita
muex.	Dack-IO-Dack.	.Capila

capital 11:10,14 12:4,9

14:2,5,9 20:11 22:4 30:4,

		November 30, 2021	Index: back-to-backcapi
	126:20	96:18	bottom 68:16 73:19
	back-to-back 13:23	began 37:19,21	74:16
	back-up 72:4	beginning 16:3 50:21 51:8 56:3,9,11,15	break 60:8,9,13 91:19 126:14,18
	background 10:2,25 bad 94:7	behalf 6:14 7:14 107:8 116:5 127:11,13 134:11,	bring 62:17 77:19 79:3 86:9
	balance 14:1	13	bringing 26:2
	balancing 11:13 108:12	believes 63:22	brought 99:21 136:23
	116:24 123:1 126:7 138:4	benefit 119:10,17,18	bumping 44:11
	ballpark 75:16	120:16 benefits 11:12,15,19	business 92:5
	base 11:17 12:7 13:12	14:6,13 16:18 18:11	С
	16:8,13,15 21:24 24:3,8, 10,16 25:7,17 42:25 43:16 45:18,24 50:12 52:6 72:5 96:8 99:17 100:13 108:12,21 109:4, 14,17,19,22,24 110:8,12 111:8,11,17,24 112:4,7, 10 113:8,15 116:19,21 117:20 118:1,13,23 128:21,24 129:11 130:8,	20:10,18 24:10,24 25:5, 15 26:3,4 42:1,13,15,19 43:6,10,12 46:25 47:12, 20,21,25 48:2,13 56:21 57:1,3,12,20 58:7,23,24 80:24 81:6 82:22 83:2,8, 9,10,23 84:1 94:2,12,17, 20 100:20 112:17 113:9	calculate 47:24 48:13 50:18,22 73:17 129:6,12 130:7
			calculated 49:24 54:14, 15,20 56:8 58:7 75:12 129:15,19 130:3,14,18
		116:23 118:2,7,22,24	calculates 54:16
	9,12,13,16,18 132:5	119:5,10,11 120:13,20, 22 122:13,17 124:4,13	calculating 57:20
135:22 136:5,1	135:22 136:5,10,12,25 137:3,8,15,20,23,24 138:2	125:6,14 126:6 138:1,3 Bieber 7:15 126:23,24 127:1,3,8 131:11,15,24	calculation 47:19 52:20 77:10 85:4,19 86:22 88:12 89:5 130:4
	based 10:22 17:19 25:21, 24 44:14 54:24 55:5,10	133:19,20	calculations 48:12,18 51:15,16,20 59:7
56:24 59:8,10,12 73:	56:24 59:8,10,12 73:3 76:20 88:2 90:2,11 112:7	Bieber's 64:9 66:20 128:8	calendar 10:24 42:13
	baseline 120:1	bill 68:7 100:14	51:2
	Basically 56:1 58:9 billing 67:22 68:3 69:17,	billing 67:22 68:3 69:17, 18 71:24,25 72:10 73:1,	call 97:9 104:1 106:21 114:7
	basis 24:14,18 116:14	2,23 74:2	calls 8:6 27:18 31:11
	124:13,18 136:16,17,20 137:12	Billings 37:14	35:12 39:20 60:15 91:21 126:22 133:21
	Bear 59:17	bit 18:23 22:24 66:20	capability 54:25 55:5,10
	beat 23:25 71:17	76:22 80:6 82:11 85:5 86:19 122:20	capacity 37:16 92:9

blend 30:4

Beck 7:10 13:16 91:5,21,

23,25 92:1,6,25 95:5,9

7 35:24 41:21 42:16 43:1,16 52:15 53:2 100:17 120:9

caption 98:14

capture 75:9

Carbon 33:2 37:15

carries 75:2

case 9:25 10:3,7,9,15 11:25 12:9,14,18,19,22, 25 13:14 14:1,4 18:4,8, 20 19:2,10,19,25 20:20 21:1,2 22:5,17 23:5,8 25:9 27:3,4,8,9,11 30:1 33:16 34:4 38:16,19 41:11,12 42:18,23 44:13, 18 45:17 52:20 53:2,6,8 54:7,10,12 62:12 63:18, 23 64:7 65:6,13,22 69:13,16 78:24 79:1 80:7,12,14,18,20,23 81:5,6,19,24 82:2,7,9 83:12,15,25 84:6,10,18, 25 85:13 86:4,17 88:11, 25 89:2,8,17 90:4,9 94:5, 21 96:10,11,24 99:9,22 102:13 108:21 109:18,21 110:9,13 111:7 112:14 113:6 114:22 116:13,18, 22 118:3 122:8,10,15 129:8,16,17 130:6,15,21 131:5 136:9,12,17,22 137:1,9

case, 120:12

cases 10:20 13:19,24 17:24 18:1,4,7 94:8

cash 30:5

catch 16:3

categories 45:8

caused 10:14 33:21

34:12 137:25

cent 72:13 77:19 85:22, 23

cents 64:11,12 73:10

chair 6:3,20 7:5,11,18 8:8,11,14 9:12 14:19,23 20:2 21:11 26:10,13,17, 20,22 27:17,21 28:2,6,8, 11,23 29:16 30:15,20,24 31:2,4,7,10,13,16,19 32:15 34:20,23,25 35:2, 4,7,11,14,17 36:1,5,24 39:1,4,8,10,13,16,19,22, 25 40:23 44:2,11 46:14 48:24 59:20,23 60:2,4,7, 10,17,20 61:16,23 66:6, 10,12 90:15,17,20,22,25 91:3,8,15,20,23 93:1 95:7,11,13,16,18,21,23 96:16,19,25 97:6,11,14 102:17,21 103:3,8,11,13, 15,18,21,24 104:3,6 105:7 106:5,8,10,12,14, 16,19,22,25 107:25 110:21,24 111:1 113:20, 23 114:1,3,6,9,12 115:16 117:6,9,12 121:16,19,23 122:2 126:9,13,19,24 127:2 128:9 131:13,17, 20 133:9,12,15,17,23,25 134:2 135:12 138:16,20, 22,25

Chairman 9:19 102:23

challenging 34:12

change 10:16 19:18 20:8 21:23 22:24 24:8,10 26:3 34:4 41:24 42:6 43:3 44:15,25 50:12,13 51:8 58:12 59:1 63:2,5,9,12, 14,19 64:23 65:4 68:20 70:14,19 71:3,7 72:4,19

73:5,6,17 74:2,13,22,23, 24,25 75:3,5,14 76:13 77:4,7,13 78:12 79:20 80:21,23,25 81:1 86:8,9, 12 87:7,18,20 88:20,21 101:8 110:4 112:6 118:13 132:12,20 133:3 135:22 137:13

changed 25:17 45:5 98:15 109:19 111:24 118:1,24 119:3

changing 24:3 25:6,8 26:1 43:14 83:11 87:14, 22

characteristics 125:17

characterize 119:2

charge 64:10,11 74:12 79:18,19 87:8,9,15

charged 25:22

charges 62:14,15,16 63:24 64:1,2,13,19,22 72:5,16,17,22 73:9,18,24 74:4,5,11,19 75:14 76:19,20 77:14,20 79:18 84:21,22 85:2,3,7,13,17 87:9 88:23 129:1,3,4,13, 14 132:18,20

charging 87:7,14

chart 69:15

check 22:18 75:15 111:13

chief 28:19 29:2

circumstance 17:9 79:25

circumstances 17:19 18:8,13 23:13 57:8 87:3, 4 109:25

circumvent 13:15

			4 .		
cır	cum	IVAI	ntın	a 1	ワ・1
•••	ou			9	-

cite 15:7 88:24

claims 101:8 102:6

clarified 94:24

Clark 6:10 9:20 26:17,18 31:5,6 35:2,3 39:13,14 59:24 60:1 61:23 90:17, 19 95:18,19 103:15,16 106:14,15 113:24,25 121:23,24 133:13,14 138:25

class 25:23 26:2 87:19, 21 90:8

class's 72:6

classes 24:22,24 26:4 86:2 90:7

cleaner 124:24

clear 49:11 93:11 118:7

clock 60:8

close 86:13

closed 123:16

closely 57:14

closeout 98:20

closer 18:23 77:11

Code 11:1,24 15:17 99:15 100:18

colleague 128:22

collects 69:9

column 50:4 68:2 74:21

combination 62:14 63:25

84:21 129:2

Comission 110:20

Comm- 123:11

commensurate 120:17

commercial 10:12 38:4 100:25

Commission 6:5,9 10:4. 19 11:3 12:13 13:4 14:18 17:9,20,23 18:13 19:2,4, 12,15 20:15,16,19 24:7,9 26:21 30:14 33:4,17 34:13,19 38:25 41:18 43:21 44:1,13 47:11 65:17,23 66:5 77:3 95:3, 6,22 99:6,12,18 100:1,21 101:23 102:16,20 103:7 104:16 106:4 107:12 108:17,18 112:9,15 113:7 114:23 117:5 118:10 119:15 121:11 122:1 123:3,6,24 126:3 128:20,23 129:10,16,17 130:15 131:12 132:9 138:5,15

Commission's 17:22 21:5 88:16 108:13 131:2 133:2

Commissioner 6:10,11 9:20 26:14,16,17,18 31:2,3,5,6 35:2,3,5,6 39:10,11,13,14 59:24 60:1,2,3 61:23,24 90:17, 19,20,21 95:16,17,18,19 103:15,16,18,19 106:12, 13,14,15 113:24,25 114:1,2 121:20,21,23,24 133:13,14,15,16 138:25

Commissioners 29:24 37:7 99:3 108:10 116:2 135:20

commissioning 102:9

Company 6:15 8:6 10:8, 11 11:6,13,25 12:2,8,11, 25 13:5,8 14:9 17:6 20:9 21:17 23:8 25:4 27:18

28:18 30:2 31:11 32:2, 23,25 33:8 34:1,10,14 35:12 37:22 38:10,16 39:20 41:14,23 42:2 43:9,20 49:16,18 54:20 60:15 61:3,25 62:6,9 63:1,4,10,13,16 64:16 65:5 66:25 67:1 69:4,5, 11,12 72:3 74:7 78:3,5, 14,18,20 84:18 85:10,12 86:24 88:1,3,13 89:6,12 91:2 102:12 109:4,7,9 116:7,17 118:6,15 122:22 123:11,14,17 124:1 125:3 129:6 130:19 136:8,12

Company's 10:1,5 13:17, 20 20:7,17 23:2,4 30:9 33:6,16 34:6 37:9 38:19 41:8,10,18 42:23 43:4,7 45:18 47:12 62:5,12 65:24 69:2,8 76:15 82:14 83:18 85:24 86:4 99:12, 18 100:12 101:18,19 108:11 109:14 111:7,18, 19 113:4,7 117:19 118:17 120:20 121:12 128:20 129:7,9,16 130:6, 25 131:1 132:6,9 133:1 135:23 136:18 137:8,9 138:4

compare 53:12 121:6

compared 42:23 74:20 122:18

compares 64:15

comparing 124:6

comparison 53:24

complete 33:8 58:14 102:9

completed 33:14 37:25 38:3 96:1 122:6,7

Index:	com	nletelv	/ cost
IIIUEA.	COIII	pictci	/

completely 86:6
completes 27:1 102:14
completion 102:7
complex 47:22 48:10
component 72:19 73:8 74:11 75:4,23 77:13 81:10 82:15
components 21:21 42:6 50:10 71:24 72:1,11,15, 19 73:2,23 74:3 86:10 87:7,14,16 101:6,13,16, 19,20 123:15,18 125:12, 21
computer 27:25
concept 45:1 86:18 94:8 95:2
concern 17:6 25:15 89:13 101:14 132:15
concerned 33:24
concerns 33:23 34:7 38:7,10
conclude 109:13
concluded 101:19
concludes 14:14 30:10 38:20 66:2 95:4 110:16 117:1 131:9 138:12
conclusion 43:19 99:24
conditions 33:13 34:12
confidential 49:12 51:23 52:1,4 98:2 102:1 105:20 119:24,25 120:16 124:12 137:16
confirm 7:22 75:17 117:18

conflated 14:5

conflict 13:19

November 30, 2021
confusion 98:12
connection 19:14
consideration 66:1 109:23
considered 12:21 49:12 63:8 69:10,12 84:7 108:14 116:12 123:13 130:25 137:6,11
considers 49:17,19 69:4
consistent 11:18 27:10 44:12 94:14 123:6 131:5
consistently 16:21
consists 37:15
construction 15:24 16:5 30:3 32:23 33:11,20 37:18,20,24
construed 137:5
consultant 97:21 107:7
Consumer 7:9 11:22 91:4 92:7,10
contained 92:21 101:25 104:24 107:17 115:5
contemplate 109:16 117:21 124:5
contemplating 132:21
contend 89:24
contested 62:23
context 18:1 137:10
contingency 101:10
continuation 68:3
continue 109:12
contract 34:2 105:22 129:23,25 130:11
contractor 33:25

```
contractor's 34:3
contractors 37:24 102:7
contracts 48:4
contractural 102:6
contrary 13:20
conversation 25:2 51:25
 80:2 82:21
cordon 89:5
corporation 12:5
corporation's 12:7
correct 15:17 16:13
 17:24 19:6.17 20:14
 21:7,25 22:6,12 24:11,12
 25:18 44:18,23,24 46:7
 47:1,16 49:10,14,20
 51:10 54:2 57:7,11,24
 59:15 68:14,21,25 70:17
 71:13 72:8,24 74:24 77:1
 112:8 118:12,16 120:24
 121:13 127:18 134:25
 137:24
correction 36:15 98:16
corrections 9:5 29:9
 32:8 36:16 40:15 61:9
 98:8,10 104:20 107:14
 115:1 128:1 134:24
 135:3
correctly 20:12 47:15
 135:7
correlated 57:14
corresponded 56:14
corresponds 52:18
cost 6:6 9:22,23 11:3,10,
 14 12:8,10,12 14:5,9,10
 16:18 18:16 22:9,10,14,
 15,20 23:8 24:9,23 25:12
 41:21 42:1,13,14,19
```

Index: costs..declined

43:1,3,10 45:19,20 46:1, 10,25 47:12,25 48:2,13 50:14 53:19 54:9,24 55:9 58:6,9,11,15 59:4,7 64:5 74:7 79:2,11,15 82:17 84:13 88:10 89:19,25 90:5,6 94:1,11 99:14 100:20 101:14 105:24 108:24 111:12 112:8,17 116:11,23 118:19 119:4, 7,9 120:13 122:13,25 123:9,15 124:4 129:3 130:20 138:1

costs 11:14,18 12:20 13:2 14:13 17:7 18:5,9, 15 19:21 22:4,25 23:6,7, 10,14 24:11,18 25:5,23 27:10 32:24 33:18,20,23 34:3,8,14 37:11 38:18 41:8 42:11,16 43:6,15 47:20,21 49:6,16,18 50:3,6,17,19,24 53:7 61:4 62:6,15,20,22 63:6 64:2,25 65:16,21 66:21 67:5 74:8 78:24,25 79:13,22 80:4,8,11,24 81:5,14,17 83:2,17,18,22 84:7,20 86:5,12 87:11 100:7,10,13 101:10,17, 24 102:3,5,10,11 105:18 108:16 110:15 111:9,17 116:7,10,13,16,22 118:14,23 119:11 120:9, 14,17,23 121:6,7,10 122:18 123:4,8,19,21 124:1,5,6 125:4,22

counties 33:3

County 37:15

couple 21:13 27:4 78:22 96:4 98:8 120:2 122:4

courtroom 91:6

cover 98:12

covering 38:8

COVID-19 10:14 33:9,21 34:12 37:22 100:7 101:4 105:19

create 12:22 25:7 97:24 104:16 107:11 109:5 114:22

creating 109:1,6,11

credit 56:21 100:13 138:1

credits 42:10 46:25 47:22 100:20 109:1,2 116:23 122:21,23,25 125:8

criteria 135:24

criticisms 62:11

cross 19:23 95:6 96:21 97:1 103:7

cross-examination

14:18 15:1 21:14 30:13 34:18 38:24 43:25 44:6 46:17 49:3 66:5,15 102:20 106:3 110:19 111:3 117:4,14 131:12, 22 138:15

curious 78:17

current 25:24 37:11 108:20 109:11

customer 41:10,22 42:3, 18 45:25 65:12 66:25 67:7 69:8,9 74:5,9 79:18 87:8 88:19 90:8 116:9, 12,17 120:11 121:7,11

customer's 76:9

customers 11:11 14:7,12 18:11 25:22 43:1 62:17, 21 64:3 68:4 71:4,7 84:3,

4 89:1,19 90:4,7 109:8 113:10 118:22 119:6,11, 17 120:22 129:5,19 138:3,7,10

customers' 121:1,3 130:24

cut 76:2

D

daily 62:15 63:24 64:10, 13,22 72:4 73:9,17,24 74:11 75:14 77:14,19 84:21 85:7,16 129:1,13, 14

data 38:11 89:18

date 12:14 22:2 27:5

dates 10:10 12:17 14:1

David 6:10

day 73:10

deal 84:3

dealing 18:4 77:12,13 78:5

deals 88:13

debt 30:6

December 30:9 37:25 38:2 52:11,23 56:3,8 101:2

decide 88:1

decided 85:18

decimal 76:2

decision 21:5 62:23 90:2 93:25

decisions 13:3 101:20 124:16

declined 94:17

Public Hearing November 30, 2021

Index: decrease..dispute

decrease 11:19 63:15,19 64:14,15 65:19 80:1	deny 75:17 99:12,18 124:21 125:25	53:14 54:20,21 55:23 70:6,10 75:19 110:3	
130:8,9,13,14,18	depend 24:23	112:18,25	
decreasing 64:10,11	depending 136:15	differently 82:11 83:11 84:1	
deferral 109:11 125:17	depends 124:16	differs 105:21 136:15	
defined 13:6	depreciation 42:16 51:5		
defines 12:3	120:9	difficult 77:12,15 125:20	
defining 12:21	derive 54:8	direct 8:17 9:2,10 15:3 16:24 17:11 20:4 26:21	
definition 16:1	describe 42:24 43:2,5	28:13 29:6 31:21 32:5,13	
delay 102:6	52:3 62:8	35:19 36:12,22 40:2,12,	
delayed 10:22 100:7,10,	describes 43:13	20 41:6,7 46:2,19 51:12 60:22 61:6,14 64:9 67:13	
24 101:5,7,21	design 62:1 65:24 132:16	72:2 92:2,13 94:22 95:22	
delays 10:14 33:21 101:4		97:16,25 98:1,15 99:24	
deleted 98:21	designation 136:2 137:2	104:8,17 105:4 107:2,12, 18,22 114:14,23 115:11	
delivered 33:11	designed 121:5,8 126:8 132:17	119:22 120:12 122:1	
delivery 33:13 62:14 63:25 78:25 85:6 87:10	detail 10:1 25:11 128:22	124:11,19 125:2 126:2 127:4,16,19 134:4,15,19	
101:5 129:2 132:17,19	details 37:10 93:18	directly 72:20	
delivery-related 74:7	determinants 67:22 68:3	director 7:10 32:3 36:10	
demand 81:17 87:15	69:18	40:10 61:4 91:5 92:7,9	
88:23	determination 20:20	95:5,9	
demand-based 64:5,19	determine 48:12 100:1 128:24 131:4	disagree 64:17 65:1	
65:15 79:3,5 84:15,20 85:25 88:21		disagreement 85:6	
demand-related 79:13	determined 10:19 102:3 137:9	disagrees 12:2 62:4	
81:14 82:17 85:2,3 86:5	determines 129:10	disclosed 30:8	
demonstrable 118:2		discovery 101:10	
demonstrate 93:22	determining 108:18 131:2,6	discuss 37:10	
118:7	developer 67:8	discussed 43:7 50:9	
demonstrated 137:16	development 32:4 36:10	discusses 30:2	
demonstrates 32:22	deviates 108:21 110:1	discussing 51:23	
denied 41:18 93:22	deviation 109:5 112:2,18	discussion 66:21 71:20	
94:15 116:20 120:20	113:5	disfavor 121:4	
denies 94:10	difference 46:5,6 50:5,6	dispute 111:17	

Index: disputed..estimating end 10:10 56:4,7,8,9,10, 15 72:11 75:2 120:6 **ended** 88:15 ending 17:5,14 **ends** 73:10,11 74:15 85:21 energy 7:14 10:5 11:12, 22 32:3,24 33:7 62:3,4 68:17,24 70:16 72:5 74:4,12,17 76:20 79:18 87:15 89:4 100:14 108:12 116:24 125:9 126:7 127:12,14 134:12, 14 138:4 energy-based 79:6 Engelenhoven 6:16 22:20 35:13,15,16,18,21, 23 36:4,6,23 37:4 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:2 ensure 77:4 enter 105:4 107:22 115:11 entered 12:13 entering 97:1 entire 16:17,19 116:11 136:7,10 entirety 109:19 110:6 136:6 entitled 124:1 equal 72:6 83:9 87:7 129:20 130:5,8,12 equally 72:10 73:1

disputed 63:21

distribute 84:1

distributed 60:12 83:24

distributing 83:10

distribution 87:11

divided 50:6

Division 6:21,25 11:21 38:13 60:11 91:12 97:8, 21,24 99:20 100:3,9,11, 15 102:2 103:25 104:1,2, 13,15 105:6 106:20 107:7,8 108:24 111:8,10 114:7,19,22 116:5,20,21 122:24 123:6,13,20,25

Division's 91:17 99:4,5, 7,10 102:15 122:16 126:4

docket 6:5 10:5 21:17 22:8 24:3,10 25:9 33:5, 17 41:11,23 48:12 57:13, 21 62:13 78:3 81:23 82:4 83:4,13 85:25 87:2 92:11 94:15 104:17 107:8,11 124:16 129:8

document 19:22

dollar 59:3 75:25

dollars 67:6 68:9,13,17 70:11 74:20,21,24 75:3, 5,19,20

doubt 91:13

down 58:8 77:10,18,19 85:21,22,23

DPU 38:6 93:18,21 94:24 107:23

DPU's 94:22 132:4

drill 58:8

due 33:9,20,25 37:22 101:4,14 130:17

duty 108:13 110:5

Ε

E-N-G-E-L-E-N-H-O-V-E-N 35:25

earlier 50:10,15 87:8 95:25 125:11

easier 51:25 70:18

EBA 11:17 14:7 20:9,24 24:3,8,10 25:7,16,17,21 27:6,7 42:20 43:6,11,15, 18 47:14 48:1 96:6,14 108:21 109:4,11,14,17, 20,22,24 110:9,12 111:24 112:7,10 113:8, 10 116:25 117:19,20 118:1,13,23 119:6 120:15,16,21 121:5,8 122:14,17,19,21,23 123:1,4,7,11,12,14,16,19 124:8 126:5,8 132:5

effect 110:6 112:18

effective 11:20 44:17

effectively 64:4 66:25 86:11,12,15

efficient 91:10

electric 109:16

electrical 12:5,6

element 110:5

embedded 42:17 120:11 121:6,7,10 124:7 125:4, 22

Emily 6:13

employment 97:24 104:15 114:21

equipment 38:8 101:5

erection 33:12

estimates 123:15

estimating 58:13

evaluated 16:19 evaluation 109:18 evenly 83:1 event 37:23 59:10 eventually 109:7 evidence 108:18 109:10, 13 **exact** 54:23 **EXAMINATION** 8:17 26:21 28:13 31:21 35:19 40:2 60:22 92:2 95:22 97:16 104:8 107:2 114:14 122:1 127:4 134:4 **examine** 137:12 examining 79:14 exasperate 110:3 **exceed** 12:10 102:10 137:7 **exceeds** 12:6 137:14 **Excel** 76:1 exception 62:2 excess 72:4 exchange 62:7 **exclude** 71:9 78:3 85:18 88:12 89:3 112:14 131:6 **excluded** 86:21 88:2 89:10 130:4 **excluding** 63:5 65:20 130:9 excusable 37:23 excuse 49:1 51:22 71:10 123:22

exercise 58:1,15

exhibit 19:23 20:5 51:12. 13,21 67:13,19,21 96:22 97:1 115:13 127:20,22, 23 134:19,21 **exhibits** 29:6,15 40:13, 22 98:2 102:25 104:18 105:5 107:24 115:15 127:21 134:20 existing 109:24 exists 45:7 experience 110:1 experienced 108:22 explained 34:1 **explains** 42:22 110:15 **explanation** 34:6 94:20 **expressed** 73:9 77:14 expresses 70:10 extent 26:1 128:23 F

face 34:11

facilities 6:21 30:4,7
62:3,14,16 64:2 74:5
79:19 84:21 87:9 129:4
132:17,22,25 136:5

facilities' 85:7 129:2

facility 33:1 64:1 122:7
132:19

fact 14:8 71:21 72:21
94:21 110:4 113:13
116:14 123:7 130:17
136:21

factors 70:8 112:25 facts 18:3 110:8 factual 18:12

Index: evaluated..Flats fails 42:14 136:1 137:20 fair 14:10 26:8 43:20 66:20 78:8 79:24 80:6 fairly 41:25 79:7 119:17 **fall** 8:2 familiar 22:20 favor 121:1,3 feedback 28:4 figure 88:4 125:21 file 12:11 21:6 23:8 27:4 96:4 filed 7:19 20:23 92:13 94:5 97:25 104:16 107:11 114:23 122:10 123:12 132:2 134:19 filing 12:18 19:21 23:15 44:20 65:18 84:11 92:11 108:12 120:16 123:17,19 136:18,25 138:9 filings 116:25 122:19 123:11.16 **final** 12:13,19 102:5,7,11

filings 116:25 122:19 123:11,16 final 12:13,19 102:5,7,1 114:8 123:17,22 financed 30:3 financial 28:19 29:2 findings 99:5 finer 55:12 firm 134:12

Flats 6:8 9:23 10:4,17 11:9 12:10,16 14:11 19:14 22:14 30:3 32:24 33:1,5,18 34:9,15 41:9, 16,20,25 42:17 43:11,15 49:18 51:15 54:10 94:2, 13 99:13 100:10 105:18, 24 112:23 116:8 118:20 120:10,21 121:10 135:22 136:3,8 137:19

flow 14:7 25:16 27:9 96:14 116:24 119:5 120:14,21 122:17 123:7 124:8 126:6 138:3

flows 30:5

focus 22:23 100:22

focuses 100:6

follow 54:3 57:17 80:5

follow-up 124:10

force 37:23 101:8

forecast 111:18,20,24 112:19 113:1

forecasted 38:17,18

Form 30:9

formula 85:1,8,10 124:14

formulation 110:14

fortunately 89:17

forward 18:18 26:3 44:13.14

found 10:6 11:5 13:3 101:16 105:20 108:24 118:10

fractions 72:12

front-loading 83:4

full 10:12,16 11:12 13:2 14:9,10,12 41:14,21 42:21 43:1 45:25 50:24 62:16 64:3 72:23 73:4 76:9,20 85:2 120:23 129:4 136:23

fuller 110:13

fully 23:5 33:15 43:13 55:17 58:19 59:13

function 77:17,18

future 17:8,24 18:1,4,7 89:1 96:4 102:12 109:8, 12 116:25 120:15 122:19

G

Gary 7:2 100:11 106:21 107:1,6,23

gave 23:16 49:8 58:12

general 9:25 10:7,8,20 12:13 13:19.23 14:4 19:2,9,25 20:25 22:17 26:5 27:3,4 33:16 34:3 38:19 41:11,12 42:18 44:13,17,19 52:20 53:1 54:7,11 62:12 63:17 64:7 65:6,22 69:13,16 71:3 78:24 79:1 80:7,12,14, 20,23 81:5,18,24 82:2,7 83:12,15 84:18,25 86:16 89:2,8,17 96:23 108:21 109:17,20 110:12 111:7 113:6 116:12 120:11 122:8,10 129:7 136:16, 22,25

General's 6:24 7:8

generally 24:6 26:6 67:20 70:5 71:12 108:15 112:13 113:2

generated 57:15,22 83:1, 9 125:9

generating 70:19

generation 27:1 33:1 88:13 89:7 108:25 113:3

generators 101:6

give 15:24 16:5 91:6

giving 118:22

good 6:4,13,22 8:8,19 9:19 15:3 28:15 29:24 31:23 32:22 35:14,21 37:7 39:22 40:4 44:8,9 60:17,19,24 61:23 89:16 91:23 97:11,18 99:3 104:3,10 106:22 108:10 111:5,6 114:9 116:2 117:16 126:19,24 128:19 131:24,25 133:23,24 135:20

govern 18:17

governing 10:20

grant 20:22,23,25 124:21

granted 7:25 9:14 29:19 32:17 37:2 41:1 61:18 93:3 97:3 103:5 105:10 108:2 113:7 115:20 118:18,19 128:13 135:14

granting 17:22,23 18:14 121:11

grants 132:9

grapple 88:25

GRC 41:12,16 42:12,24 43:7 50:3 94:14 96:3,4 111:20

Great 74:16

greater 57:2,5 58:25 136:19

grid 54:11 55:18 58:10

group 54:9,24 55:9 58:10,16 59:7

guess 25:6 71:21 78:17 88:4 89:5 112:12

Н

H-E-M 32:1

H-I-G-G-I-N-S 134:9 **honing** 84:11 included 10:3 11:8 13:12,13 18:6,16 23:14 half 76:22 hour 48:6 55:24 56:23,24 27:10 33:6,19 34:2 hours 48:8 54:7 **halted** 37:20 41:10,19,22 42:21 43:16 46:4 49:7 69:15 80:17 hand 19:22 hundred 53:7 81:19 86:19 88:2 122:23 handled 82:8,9,11 hypothetical 26:23,25 123:1,3,14 130:21 136:5, 95:24 96:5,7 122:4 123:9 9,12 137:3,20 **happen** 63:16 74:10 124:3 76:16 includes 50:23 happened 86:16 88:22, including 30:4 62:19 I 24 89:11,15 112:2 64:24 65:9 78:25 81:7 137:25 happening 74:10 75:1 identical 48:21 83:20 76:3 78:22 84:10 88:21 inclusion 62:22 identified 102:11 107:18 90:12 115:12 inclusive 129:21 **happy** 51:25 imagine 17:25 inconsistency 133:1,5 **hard** 83:19 immediately 74:17 inconsistent 63:23 65:21 harder 76:4 impact 43:2 65:12 88:19 incorporated 118:20 headset 28:1 101:21 138:7 increase 19:4,13 20:16 hear 27:20 28:6 31:14 implement 94:17 124:17 21:17 23:7,10 27:23 33:20,23,25 41:17 42:7 heard 125:11 implementation 34:11 45:24 62:18,20 63:15,20 hearing 6:5 7:3 35:8 implemented 132:14 65:7,8,10,15 80:1 81:10, 82:20 115:11 **importance** 65:14 86:8 12 82:7,15 94:16 109:8 **helps** 14:1 119:4 129:20,21 130:1,2, **important** 18:2 119:25 20 132:10 138:8,10 Hemstreet 6:18 22:19 **impose** 87:18 31:12,13,15,18,20,23,25 increased 23:6,9 105:18, 32:14,19 35:9,10 50:16 improper 123:23 24 **in-service** 10:10,12 herring 17:8 increases 65:15 101:14 12:14,17 14:1 22:2 27:5 **Higgins** 7:16 13:11 **increasing** 132:23,24 52:10 53:17 101:3 128:22 133:21,23,24 136:11,15 137:14,18 **incremental** 11:9 12:23 134:1,3,8 138:14,18 13:1 17:8 18:5,16 42:5 inaccurate 110:10 Higgins' 135:11 45:16,19 75:13 93:12,16 111:20 113:9 100:2 137:11,13,18,25 high 58:7 71:3 inappropriate 125:15 138:1,2

higher 22:15 71:12,16

108:25 111:8,11

historically 109:20

history 122:20

indicating 109:10		127:3,8
individual 100:3	J	
indulge 26:23	J-O-E-L-L-E 8:21	K
information 37:8 124:12	J-O-N-E-S 104:12	K-E-V-I-N 134:8
infrastructure 33:2	J-O-N-I 97:20	K-O-B-L-I-H-A 28:17
initial 134:9	J-U-S-T-I-N 127:8	Kevin 7:16 128:22
initially 33:22 38:7	January 11:20 51:8 52:8,	133:21 134:3,8
instance 45:4 88:14 89:7	9,17 53:16 54:25 55:8,12 109:3	kilowatt 73:10
insufficient 109:13		kind 51:14 79:12
intend 51:24	Jetter 6:22,23 7:5 14:20, 22,23 30:16,18 34:21,22	Kobliha 6:17 27:18,19, 21,24 28:5,7,8,10,12,15, 17 29:2,15,21 30:17 31:8,9
intended 13:22 51:19 74:10	39:2,3 44:3,5,7 46:12,14 66:7,9 95:8,10 97:7,8,17	
intends 7:1	102:18,23 103:6,24,25 104:9 105:3,11,12 106:2,	
interest 90:11 108:19 110:11	19,20 107:3,21 108:3,4 110:18 113:21,22 114:6,	L
interim 44:22	7,15 115:10,21,22 117:3	I.0 134:19
intervening 99:22	121:17,18 131:18,19 138:20,21	labeled 54:6 98:1 127:20, 22 134:19,21
introduce 99:7	Joelle 6:15 8:6,16,21	large 12:23 101:6 109:11
investigated 101:11	9:11 96:23	largely 62:1 89:23
investigation 100:23	joining 6:17	larger 65:14 79:13 81:13
investment 11:7 12:5	joint 93:17	82:15 86:8 88:20 109:6
13:9,23 18:5 30:7 52:15 137:7	Jones 7:2 33:22 34:6	130:2
investments 12:9 14:2,6	100:9 104:2,3,5,7,10,12 105:6,13 106:3,17,18	Lastly 43:5
99:13	Joni 7:1 38:7 97:9,15,20	law 10:20 45:4
isolation 109:23 113:12	judgment 11:24 93:18	lay-down 37:19
issue 21:6 30:5 45:1	July 33:15 52:11 136:13	leave 8:13 56:20
62:23 80:17 81:23 89:24 113:3 119:14 130:22	June 52:8,9,23 53:3,5,8,	leaving 8:14 110:12
issues 100:4	13,16 55:21 56:6,7,11	legal 93:19,20
	136:10	legislature 15:20
item 108:15,19	jurisdictional 24:14	lesser 57:5
items 48:4	justification 86:20	letting 98:22
	Justin 6:23 7:15 126:23	Levar 6:3,10,20 7:5,11,

18 8:8,11,14 9:12,19 14:19,23 20:2 21:11 26:10,13,17,20,22 27:17, 21 28:2,6,8,11,23 29:16 30:15,20,24 31:2,4,7,10, 13,16,19 32:15 34:20,23, 25 35:2,4,7,11,14,17 36:1,5,24 39:1,4,8,10,13, 16,19,22,25 40:23 44:2 46:14 48:24 59:20,23 60:2,4,7,10,17,20 61:16, 23 66:6,10,12 90:15,17, 20,22,25 91:3,8,15,20,23 93:1 95:7,11,13,16,18, 21,23 96:16,19,25 97:6, 11,14 102:17,21 103:3,8, 11,13,15,18,21,24 104:3, 6 105:7 106:5,8,10,12, 14,16,19,22,25 107:25 110:21,24 111:1 113:20, 23 114:1,3,6,9,12 115:16 117:6,9,12 121:16,19,23 122:2 126:9,13,19,24 127:2 128:9 131:13,17, 20 133:9,12,15,17,23,25 134:2 135:12 138:16,20, 22,25

level 42:21 58:7 62:15 64:1 77:15 81:14 88:22 129:1,3 132:19

levels 136:1

limit 65:3 79:20 86:23

limited 64:7 65:2,18 78:13 79:11 83:16 87:13

limiting 79:17

lines 16:25 17:4,12 20:4 46:23 47:10 53:23 55:5 74:17 78:10 98:17 102:2 117:25 119:22

list 60:12

located 33:2 37:13

logic 63:12,18,21 65:13

logically 137:1,10

long-term 30:5

longer 85:25 91:17

looked 50:3 52:25 58:10

85:1 101:8

loss 109:2,6

lot 80:5 83:17 84:9

louder 27:24

low 27:22

lower 22:16 38:18 71:15

109:1

Luckily 125:1

lunch 126:14,18

M

M-C-D-O-U-G-A-L 40:7

M-E-R-E-D-I-T-H 61:2

M-I-C-H-E-L-E 92:6

made 12:18 20:19 21:21 43:6,17 45:4,9 62:17 63:8 85:13 88:18 93:25 110:5 123:17 138:5

main 37:16

maintains 137:1

majeure 37:23 101:8

major 6:7 11:2,4 12:3,12, 15,21 13:20 14:2 15:16, 23 16:2,7,20 19:21 23:2, 14 38:16 44:19,22 45:10, 16 61:24 62:10,25 63:17 64:18 65:2,18,25 67:23 70:9 79:10 84:10,13 87:6,13 88:6 93:10 101:5

135:25 136:4,18,24 137:1,6 138:6

majority 93:14 129:25

make 20:9 36:3 45:25 49:11 56:17 66:18,22 77:4 89:15 90:1 92:17 102:24 104:21 107:15 115:2 124:16,20 128:1 134:24

makes 51:25 79:12,16,19 129:25

making 12:1 13:15 14:3 45:1 123:12 136:21

managed 32:23 34:10

manager 114:18

managing 32:3 40:10

manner 21:23 24:23 25:4,8 50:12 80:21 129:7,15

March 37:20 38:3

marked 19:23

markedly 110:1

market 48:5,8 59:2,8

markup 33:25 34:1

Mary 32:1

mask 8:13

match 11:14 24:10 42:1, 14 43:6,15 51:5 56:23 118:23

matched 47:13 119:12

matches 42:12

matching 24:13,22 119:9,14

material 13:8 18:3 23:13 26:7 37:18 45:5,8

materiality 45:6,7,11

math 73:10 74:10

matter 9:3 14:8 32:6 36:13 40:13 61:7 81:18 136:2

matters 8:3 36:2

Mcdougal 6:16 22:19 25:11 39:21,22,24 40:1, 4,6,22 41:3 43:23 44:4,8 46:19 49:5 52:3 59:25 60:5,6 82:21,25 120:12

meaning 15:25 16:5 83:5

meaningful 90:5 109:9

means 56:6

measure 87:20

measured 22:5 49:21 50:13 136:15

measurement 21:23 136:14,19 137:13,18

meet 12:24 93:10 116:18 135:24 137:20

megawatt 33:1 54:6,24 55:5,24 56:23,24

megawatts 37:16 55:11, 22

mentioned 41:6 44:10 45:6,13 50:9,15 73:2 87:8

mere 110:4 113:13

Meredith 6:17 25:3,10,14 60:16,17,19,21,24 61:1, 15 66:8,17 90:23,24

method 71:21 125:3,7 129:9 130:15 133:2

methodology 124:14

methods 133:6

Michele 7:10 91:21 92:1, 6,25

microphone 18:22 28:3, 23 36:1

middle 98:14 134:8

miles 37:14

million 11:6,20 21:19 42:2,7,9,11 43:20 68:12, 22,23 69:5 70:25 71:10 109:2 119:18 137:23 138:8,10,11

mine 8:14

minor 88:17,18,19 98:10

minute 91:11,14

minutes 91:7

mismatch 121:1

missions 99:23

misunderstood 94:23

mitigate 133:4

mobilization 98:18

model 47:24 48:1,12,14, 20 54:11,15,16

modest 62:17 77:4,7 79:8 88:20

modified 132:5

modify 100:12 113:8

moment 52:14 59:17 71:19 81:17 82:20

Montana 37:14

month 53:8,13 55:24 56:4,9,15,25 59:1,2,3,13 83:1

monthly 84:22 85:13

months 12:14,18 22:2 27:2 52:10 56:14 57:2,3,

10,15,16,22,23,24 58:18, 19 83:5,9,10 89:18 96:2 102:8 109:3 122:8

Moore 7:6,7,11 14:24,25 15:2 20:3 21:9,11 30:21, 22 34:23,24 39:5,6 46:15,16,18 48:23,24 66:10,11 91:4,5,13,20,21 92:3,24 93:4 95:5,7 96:19,20 97:4 103:9,10 106:6,7 110:22,23 117:7, 8 131:14,16 138:17,19

morning 6:4,13,22 7:3
8:8,19 9:19 15:3 25:3
27:15 28:15 29:24 31:8,
23 32:22 35:8,14,21 37:7
39:17,22 40:4 44:8,9
60:17,19,24 61:23 90:23
91:23 96:17 97:11,18
99:3,21 103:22 104:3,10
106:17,22 108:10 111:5,
6 114:4,9 116:2,3
117:16,17

motion 7:19,21,23,24 9:13,14 11:24 29:17,19 32:16,17 36:25 37:2 40:24 41:1 61:17,18 93:2,3,17 97:2 102:24 103:4,5 105:10 108:2 115:18,19 128:10,12 135:14

Mountain 6:6,7,12,14
7:19 8:23 9:21,23 10:6,
18 11:9 12:10,16 14:11
18:19,21 19:1,5,14,15,16
21:4 22:15 26:25 27:3
30:3 36:8,11 37:9,13
38:9,15 40:8 41:9,15,19,
25 42:17 43:10,16 45:23
49:16 51:17 58:2,3 93:9,
24 94:1,11,13,15,18,21
96:1 99:13 100:8,24,25

101:8,13,17,22,25 112:17,24 116:8 118:20 120:10,21 121:10 135:21,22 136:3,11 137:17,19,22

mouth 78:6

move 9:10 18:22 29:14 32:13 36:22 40:20 61:14 91:17 92:24 96:21,22 105:3 107:21 115:10 128:7 135:10

Moving 62:25

MPA 13:18,25 96:11 138:9

multiple 94:8 multiply 71:2

Ν

N-I-K-K-I 28:17

nearest 73:7

necessarily 24:21 130:23

needed 112:15

negates 86:15

negative 71:16 72:9

neglected 96:21

negotiated 105:22

net 11:19 14:12 42:2,10, 19 43:3,10,14 46:25 47:20,25 48:2,13 52:6 54:9,23 55:9 58:6,9,15 59:4,6 83:2 100:13,20 108:24 111:8,11,17 112:7,16 116:21,23 119:17 120:13 121:6 122:13,18,25 123:4,5,15, 18,25 124:4,6 138:1,7,9,

11

Nice 99:3

Nikki 6:17 27:18 28:12, 17 29:15

normal 12:1 13:15

note 38:6 60:11 74:13 81:8

noted 30:8 36:15 57:25

notes 99:20

notice 52:5

notices 37:24 101:9

November 33:9 46:20 92:15

NPAS 94:5

NPC 58:22,24 94:12 124:13

number 52:16,18,22,24 53:11,12,13 54:8,14,21, 22 55:8,11 56:3,6 70:1, 21 71:11 74:20 80:8 111:12.17 119:24

numbers 51:23,25 52:14, 25 53:15 55:4,15 56:11 74:21 75:19,20 112:8 137:17

numerous 37:23

0

objected 7:22

objection 7:23 9:13 29:18 32:16 37:1 40:25 61:17 93:2 97:2 105:9 108:1 115:17 126:15 128:12

objections 96:25 115:19

objects 9:12 29:17 32:15 36:25 40:24 61:16 93:1 103:3 105:8 128:10 135:13

obtained 101:10

obtaining 14:10

occupation 92:4 97:19 104:11 107:5 114:17

occur 24:13 85:4

occurred 105:18 109:20

OCS 13:16 19:23 93:18 96:20,21 97:1

OCS's 46:24

October 10:12 92:14

offer 24:2 87:3 127:11 134:11

offering 127:13

Office 6:24 7:8 11:21 30:22 39:6 91:3,21 92:7, 9 97:4

Office's 7:9 93:5

officer 28:19 29:2

offsetting 120:17

On-peak 74:18

ongoing 108:13

onset 33:12

opening 44:10

operate 121:8

operating 30:5

operation 10:13 38:4 100:25

opinion 89:9 93:9 118:9 122:3

opportunity 29:25

Index: opposes..plants

52:7 69:7.8 73:8 76:12 periodic 110:4 108:11 112:6,14 116:4 84:25 85:17,20 101:7 **opposes** 136:2 periods 10:20 57:5 94:9 116:15 121:9 122:18 **option** 43:14 77:9 permission 7:20 124:4 132:5 order 12:13,19 17:22,23, **permit** 98:20 partial 42:15 25 18:13 20:20 21:3 23:8 permitted 108:15 participate 7:20 27:3 41:25 63:23 65:22 person 99:4 94:14,19 96:3 108:13 participated 107:8 118:10 131:2 **perspective** 65:12 82:14 participating 6:9 35:8 88:19 ordered 88:16 123:3 participation 107:10 129:15,17 130:15 petition 21:6 94:11 114:22 orders 34:4 101:9 123:6 **phase** 53:2 parties 37:7 99:22 126:3 **Phil** 7:13 parties' 17:14,18 original 46:9 phrased 27:9 **Parts** 80:16 originally 33:8 picking 36:2 party 7:21 95:2 out-of-period 123:13,21 **piece** 47:2 pass 42:1 outcome 14:10 **place** 55:22 67:12 123:2 past 123:6 outlined 46:2 125:17 paying 43:1 88:9 119:7 output 48:6,8 54:10 55:1, **places** 76:2 113:15 120:23 24 56:23,24 59:1 67:3 **plan** 30:7 **pays** 66:25 outputs 58:11 planned 10:10 33:8 penny 73:7,11 74:15 **overly** 48:10 **plant** 6:7 11:2,4 12:3,12, percent 11:20 12:6 overview 9:21 15,21 13:20 15:16,23 16:10,11,12,14 43:9,11, 16:2,7,21 19:21 21:18 15 45:10,18 46:7,8 Ρ 23:2,15 38:16 42:8 49:17,19 53:7 64:13,14, 44:19,22 45:10,16 48:16 15 65:18 93:17 99:17 50:11 52:16 56:2,5,6 **p.m.** 126:17 100:2,17 116:19 137:8, 61:24 62:10,25 63:17 14,21 138:2 **Pacificorp** 9:1 28:20 29:3 64:18 65:2,18,25 67:23 61:5 percentage 48:7,16,17 70:9 79:10 84:10,13 49:6,7,15,18 50:5 62:7, pages 51:14,16 67:13,16 87:6,13 88:7 93:11 96:8 18,20 63:2 64:23 65:10 100:7,10,24 101:7,21 pandemic 10:14 33:10, 70:11.13 71:2 86:11 123:8 135:25 136:3,4,8, 21 34:5.12 37:22 101:4 125:4,14,22 11,14,18,23,24 137:2,3, 105:19 6,13,14,18 138:6,8 percentages 49:12,22 **papers** 70:19 plants 11:8 55:2 65:3 **period** 10:23 13:13 14:3 paragraph 98:21 21:24 23:6 44:17,22 53:6 93:13 116:11,15 119:19 123:18 125:18 120:6,18 122:15 125:10,

part 10:5 16:25 33:5 46:9

Index: plate..proceeding

15 131:8 137:5

plate 37:16

plays 69:23

point 27:22 47:16 51:3,
11 55:12 65:11 70:20
78:9 89:1 95:1 105:3
107:21 118:4 119:16

128:7 135:10

policy 13:17 93:23 118:9 portion 10:17,22 13:6 15:6 19:24 20:10 23:13 33:19,24 57:9 63:9 65:14 68:7 70:15 75:7 76:8 80:19 81:13 82:6 89:6 102:5 119:25 129:22

portions 41:24 53:25 57:4 58:17 83:3

posed 128:4 135:5

130:9

position 8:23 17:22 18:21 24:2,7 28:18 32:2 36:8 40:8 61:3 76:15 86:4 93:6,19 94:25 99:10 111:23 117:23 118:18 120:25 121:2,5 122:16, 24 123:20 126:1,4 132:4, 12

positions 102:15

positive 125:19

possibility 109:17

possibly 18:22

potential 43:14 94:2 101:14

Potentially 18:17

Powell 7:2 12:20 100:15, 19 114:8,9,11,13,16,18 117:4,16 122:5 126:11, 12

power 6:12,14 7:19 8:24 14:12 19:5,17 21:4 26:25 27:3 36:9,11 40:9 42:11, 19 43:3,10,14 45:23 46:25 47:20,21,25 48:2, 13 54:9,24 55:9 58:6,9, 11,15 59:4,7 62:15,16 63:24 64:2,10,11,13,22 67:2 72:4,5 73:9,18,24 74:4,11,12 75:14 76:19 77:14,20 79:17 83:2 84:22 85:7,13,17 87:10 93:24 94:18,22 96:1 100:13,20 108:16,24 111:9,12,17 112:8,16 116:22,23 120:13 121:6 122:13,18,25 123:4,5,15, 19,25 124:4,6 129:1,4, 13,14 130:24 132:18 137:22 138:1

Power's 6:6 9:22 18:19 19:1 93:9 94:11,16 135:21 137:17

PPA 67:2 68:17,24 70:16 74:18 78:4 85:18 86:21 88:12 89:4,10

preapproved 33:5

precedent 12:22 17:24 18:1,14 94:7

precision 77:15

precluded 10:21

preference 8:12,14

prefiled 44:12 97:25 98:3,6 102:25 104:21,25 105:4 107:18,23 115:5 127:15,16,19,25 128:4,8 134:15,23 135:2,5

prefled 135:2

prepare 92:13 134:18

prepared 93:5 98:24 105:13 108:5 115:23 128:15 135:16

present 7:1,3 68:9,12 69:19 70:7,21 74:21 75:21 116:4

presentations 30:8

presented 93:21 95:24 110:13

presenting 7:15

presents 137:22

president 8:25

presume 96:1,6 122:6

pretty 27:22 89:16

previously 100:22 115:12

price 42:6 48:9 63:2,4,9, 19 64:23 71:23,25 73:5, 6,17 74:2 77:12 78:12 79:20 86:9,12

prices 48:6 59:2,8 62:13 64:14,21 67:22 69:19 74:13,14,23 76:1,12,19 89:10

pricing 61:4 62:2,5 68:3 71:19 75:8 77:25 87:18, 22

primary 48:19 99:10 125:25 132:16 133:3

principal 80:4 134:12

prior 13:7 23:5 33:12 123:14,18

pro-rated 120:9

proceed 93:8 128:18 135:19

proceeding 13:7 17:5,10,

Index: proceedings..PTCS

15,20 29:7 61:25 63:8 64:7,19 83:15 95:1 99:11 100:23 102:13 110:14 112:6,10,11 117:20 118:6 127:17 128:21,25 129:11 130:17,22 131:8 132:2 134:11,16

proceedings 82:12 99:6 134:24

processes 93:25

procurement 62:6,20,22 63:6 64:25 65:9,21 66:21 67:4 79:21 88:10 129:23, 25 130:3,10 131:3

produce 14:6 77:20

production 14:13 42:9 46:25 47:22 56:21 100:13,20 109:1,2 113:3 116:23 119:19 122:21, 22,25 125:8,9,16 137:25

program 48:21

prohibited 45:1

project 10:6 12:4,5,23 16:14,17,19 17:7 18:9,10 19:15 21:24 22:9 23:4,7 27:1 32:24,25 33:7,9,14, 20 34:11,15 37:9,10,11, 12,13,17 38:4,17 43:2 45:20,25 46:3,10 49:6 50:2,3,6,17,19 53:20 54:25 55:10,11,17 96:2,5 100:7,8,10,24 101:17,24 102:3,10,11 109:23 119:5,7 120:23

projected 10:18 22:9,10, 14,15,25 23:7,10 33:18 50:14 53:7,19,25 136:8, 11

projecting 54:1

projection 55:1

projections 22:16

projects 6:8 9:24 10:3,9, 13,22 11:10,12,14 12:17 13:6,9,12 14:12 22:5,11 25:16 33:6 41:9,16,20 42:13,17 45:17 47:13 50:13,14,20 53:25 57:1, 4,9,13 58:14,17 59:11,12 63:7 78:12 79:15 80:13, 17,19,25 81:7,20,22 82:8,23 83:3,11,16,23,24 84:9,12 88:8 94:4 100:16 112:24 116:8 120:10,22 130:22 135:23 136:3 137:19

projects' 11:17 promised 84:14

proportion 78:13 88:9

proportions 72:6

proposal 19:3,13,19 20:15 47:12 65:1 85:12, 24 110:2 128:20 130:6

propose 47:24 70:13 75:9 87:7

proposed 10:16 19:5,16, 18 20:8 43:20 61:25 62:2,5,9 63:4 65:24 67:22 70:7 71:23 73:21 74:20,23 75:13,20 100:12 109:14 113:6 122:22 125:3 129:6,9 133:1,2 136:17

proposes 72:3

proposing 25:4 50:1 69:22 80:21,23 82:1 83:25 87:19

proposition 26:5

prorate 49:25

prorated 42:16 49:24 124:13,18

prorating 47:22 126:5

prorationing 20:17 21:5 47:20 94:12,13,17,20 95:2

provide 9:16 10:1,2 13:22 15:15 29:21,25 32:19 37:4,8 41:3 61:20 94:19 100:11 128:5 135:6

provided 38:11 41:6 48:11,14,19 99:8 109:9

providing 18:10

proxy 89:21

prudence 16:19 43:3

prudent 10:7 11:5 13:4 101:21

prudently 32:23 34:10 102:4

Pryor 6:7 9:23 10:6,17 11:9 12:10,16 14:11 19:14 22:15 30:3 37:9,13 38:9,15 41:9,15,19,25 42:16 43:10,16 49:16 51:17 58:2 94:1,13 99:13 100:8,24,25 101:8,13,17, 22,25 112:17,24 116:8 118:20 120:10,21 121:10 135:22 136:3,11 137:19

PSC 94:6,10,15

PTC 27:9 42:19 43:14 57:20 96:6

PTCS 27:2,5 42:10 43:10 53:24 57:14,21 58:16 59:2 82:25 96:2,5,13 109:6 120:13 122:7,11,

Index: public..reader

12,17 123:3,7 124:3,7, 13,22 125:6 126:5,6

public 6:4,21,25 11:21 18:20 20:14,16 33:4 60:11 97:22 104:15 107:7 108:19 110:11 114:19 116:5

pulling 27:25

purchase 67:1,2 101:11, 15 130:25

purpose 37:8 46:23 82:4 131:1

purposes 70:19 99:23

pushed 10:13

put 55:12 78:6

puts 113:14

Q

qualification 13:25

qualified 96:2 122:7

qualifier 47:17

qualifies 27:1

qualify 12:17

question 15:4 16:4 19:7 23:17,19 25:6 27:13 29:1 55:20 57:19 73:20 78:11 81:2 112:9 124:10,24 125:20

questions 9:7 14:18,20, 22,25 21:9 26:14,16,18 29:11 30:14,16,18,22 31:1,3,6 32:10 34:19,22, 24 35:1,3,6 36:19 38:14, 25 39:2,3,6,9,11,14 40:17 44:1,3,5 46:12,16 48:23 49:2 59:24 60:1,3 61:11 66:5,7,9,11,13

77:24 90:14,18,19,21 92:20 95:6,8,14,17,19 96:16 98:5 102:19,20 103:7,10,12,14,16,19 104:24 106:2,4,7,9,11, 13,15 107:17 110:18,20, 23,25 113:19,24,25 114:2 115:4,7 117:3,5,8, 11 120:2 121:15,21,24 126:10 128:3 131:12,15, 16,19 133:8,14,16 135:4 138:15,17,19,21,23

quote 47:11

R

R-O-B-E-R-T 35:24 61:1

raise 122:19

raised 33:23 38:7

ran 56:14 59:7

rate 9:25 10:7,9,15,16,20 11:19 12:1,7,13,19 13:12,14,15,19,24 14:1, 3,4 16:8,12,15 18:19 19:2,3,9,13,18,25 20:8, 16,20,25 21:2,24 22:5,17 23:5,7 24:22,24 25:9,23 26:2,4 27:3,4,8 33:16 38:19 41:11,12,24 42:18, 25 43:16 44:13,16,17 45:1,18,24 50:12 52:6,20 53:1,6,8 54:7,12 61:25 62:1,9,12,23 63:1,14,18, 21,23 64:7 65:6,12,13, 22,24 69:13,16,22 72:1, 23 76:9,10 77:25 78:24 79:1,9 80:7,12,14,18,20, 23,24 81:4,5,6,18,24 82:2,6,7,9,16 83:12,15, 20,25 84:6,10,18,22,25 85:12,19,24 86:2,4,16,

22,23 87:4,19,23 88:11, 12,16,25 89:2,4,8,11,17, 21 90:1,4,9 94:5,16 96:8, 10,23 99:17 102:13 108:21 109:8,14,15,17, 19,20 110:6,9,12,14 111:7 112:13 113:6 116:13,19 118:3 120:12 122:8,10,15 129:7,16,17, 19,20,21 130:8,9,13,14, 15,18,21 131:2,4,5,7 132:10,13,16 136:5,9,12, 17,21,22,25 137:1,3,8,9, 15,20 138:9

rate-making 137:10 ratepayer 118:2,7 ratepayers 120:15

rates 9:24 11:8,11 13:10 14:8 18:6,16 20:11 23:14 24:19 25:5,8,21,24 26:2 27:11 33:19 41:10,22 42:3,18 44:14,16 45:25 46:4,9 49:7,17,19,25 51:8 52:8 72:20 80:22 93:15 100:3 108:13 110:2,5 112:10 116:9,12, 17 118:20 120:11 121:7, 11 122:19 123:16,22 124:7 125:4,23 128:21, 25 129:7,11,13,18 130:7, 16 138:2

rating 30:8

rationale 63:6

re-tender 103:6

read 15:5,11,12 17:3,13, 21 20:11 24:5 46:21 47:15 51:19 98:22 119:23 120:1

reader 15:20

reading 15:19,23 47:2 reconsider 21:6 124:18 reaffirm 43:3 reconsideration 62:24 reflect 11:17 14:9 118:24 86:15 89:12 reason 51:4 111:19 reflected 74:22 reconvene 91:16 126:15 reasonable 32:25 43:21 reflecting 116:14 63:14 65:3,21 77:21 record 6:3 8:20 17:5 24:5 reflection 113:9 78:3,12 79:24 82:14 28:16 31:24 35:22 60:10 reflects 11:10,16 53:17 88:8,17 108:14 109:15 91:20 92:5 97:19 104:11 67:20 110:10 131:5 105:4 107:5,22 110:8,13 114:17 115:11 126:20 regard 119:15 reasonableness 110:7 127:7 134:7 regulation 8:25 reasons 82:13 93:23 recover 10:16 34:14 41:8 regulatory 93:24 rebuttal 9:2,11 10:11,15 62:15 64:1 116:7,18 15:5,8 16:25 17:12 19:24 124:1 129:3 132:18 reject 94:12 128:20 23:22 32:5,14 33:22 recovered 125:5 rejected 95:3 135:23 36:12.16.23 38:12 40:12. 137:5 138:5 21 41:6 42:22 43:7,8 recovery 6:7 9:22 11:4, 47:5 48:15 49:8 61:6,15 13 12:8,12 13:1,2,8,22 Rejecting 94:13 78:10 92:16 102:1 14:11 17:7,19 23:9 24:9 rejects 47:11 100:21 38:17 42:1 63:7 64:5 recall 59:9 83:6,7 111:13 related 24:2 25:3 34:5 65:2 74:6 79:3,15,17 recaps 42:22 41:15 42:9,10 65:4,8,15 84:13,15 86:1 88:7 94:1, 78:14,19 79:21 81:11 11 99:15 102:12 118:14, receive 11:11 120:15,22 82:16 86:24 87:10 88:3 21 119:4,10 120:8 received 37:23 100:7 101:12 105:18 **red** 17:8 129:22,24 130:10 131:3 receiving 14:12 redacted 98:2 relationship 79:6 recent 19:9 27:3 96:3 redirect 26:11,12 59:21, 122:8 137:9 relative 65:14 88:20 22 90:15,16 113:21,22 137:19 recess 126:17 121:17,18 133:10 rely 17:7 72:18 recommend 63:18 65:23 **reduce** 85:13 94:10 101:24 105:23 remain 42:17 44:16 98:7 reducing 72:12 128:19,25 129:14 135:20 102:5 115:6 120:11 reduction 42:2 43:19 recommendation 19:5, remained 99:11 73:1,22,24 75:8 76:16,23 16 48:19 64:17,20,22 remaining 9:23 33:13 77:5 85:16 137:23,25 86:14 129:12 132:16 38:2 41:8 138:11 133:4 remains 136:21 reevaluate 113:17 recommendations 99:5 102:15 remember 121:3 refer 11:2 41:11 124:12 recommends 34:8 63:24 remotely 6:17 7:21 referenced 80:7 116:20,21 **remove** 110:5 referred 116:9 122:12

rem) N	ha	94:5
1611	10 4	Cu	3 T.U

renewable 32:3 62:3,6, 19,22 63:6 64:25 65:9,20 67:3,4 68:17,23 70:15 74:17 78:4 79:21 85:18 86:21 88:10 89:4,10 129:23,24 130:3,10 131:3

renewal 66:21

repeat 15:7 19:7

repeated 18:4 98:21

REPORTER 28:21

represent 19:23 94:24

representing 6:24 7:8

represents 54:5 138:9

request 10:2 13:17,21 24:9 34:13 42:23 43:4 51:7 80:14 93:9,12,16,22 94:1,6,16 98:11 99:12 100:12 102:12 108:11 135:21

requested 41:14 42:5,6 43:2 63:1 64:16 109:5

requesting 7:19 11:6 41:23 42:2 45:24 116:7

require 47:13

required 100:18

requirement 10:17,23 11:7 21:19 22:1 41:15 42:5,8,24 46:3 50:11 52:16 62:7 69:2 72:23 73:22 76:10,23 80:14,16, 22 82:7 93:13,15 99:17 116:19 130:21 131:7 132:22,25 138:8

requirements 40:11 62:16 64:3 73:4 76:21 85:2 88:23 89:6 93:10

99:14 129:5

reset 64:19

resetting 64:4

reshuffling 79:13 88:22

resolved 38:10 101:16

resource 13:3 16:8,9 36:10 67:3

resources 16:10,12 63:11,13 65:5 74:7 78:5, 15.20 86:25 88:13 89:7

respect 101:20 127:25 134:23

respectfully 34:13

respective 99:24 100:4

respond 46:24

response 23:16,18

responses 38:11

restate 81:2 112:21

restoration 98:19

result 10:14 11:19 17:18 18:14 22:13 24:21 64:10 73:5 94:7 110:9 125:8 129:19 130:7,8 132:21, 23

resulted 130:1

resulting 108:25 109:7

results 12:1 90:1 108:16, 20,22 109:6,15,24 113:16 130:12,17 132:10

retail 131:1

retain 20:10

revenue 10:17,23 11:7 21:19 22:1 40:10 41:15 42:5,8,23 43:19 46:3 50:11 52:16 62:7,19 63:5,10,13 64:23,24 65:4,8,9,20 66:24 67:1 68:9,13 69:2,5,8,10,12, 19 70:14,15 72:7,10 73:1,22 74:20,21,24 75:8,19,20 76:16,23 78:13,18 79:21 80:13,16, 22 81:11 82:6 88:9 89:6 93:12,14 96:6 129:22,24 130:1,10,21 131:1,3 132:19,22,24 135:22 137:23,24 138:8

revenues 66:22 67:14 70:7,21 71:18 76:18 77:5 78:4 81:19 85:18 86:21 88:1,12 89:4 130:3,23 131:6

review 100:12 101:7

reviewed 132:1

reviewing 126:3

reviews 15:14 46:22 47:8

revise 128:24 129:11

risks 94:3

RMM-1 69:23

RMM-2 67:16 73:14,19

RMM-3 67:13,15

RMP 95:1

RMP's 93:22

roads 37:18

Robert 6:16 7:7 35:12, 18,23 36:23 60:15,21 61:1,15 102:1

Rocky 6:5,12,14 7:19 8:23 9:21 18:19,21 19:1, 5,14,16 21:4 26:25 27:3 36:8,11 40:8 45:23 93:9, 24 94:10,15,18,21 96:1 135:21 137:17,22

Ron 6:11

room 6:15 27:22 82:20

roughly 58:18

round 73:7 77:10,17,18

rounding 73:11 74:14 75:5,24 85:21 130:17

rule 44:19

ruled 123:24

rules 13:18

runs 54:11 55:18 58:10

59:11

Russell 7:12.13.18 21:12,13,15 26:9,10 30:25 31:1 34:25 35:1 39:8,9 48:25 49:1,4 51:24 52:12 59:18,20 66:12,13,16 74:3 90:13 95:11,12 103:11,12 106:8,9 110:24,25 117:10,11 126:21,22 127:5 128:7,14 131:11, 13 133:10,11,21 134:5 135:10,15 138:14,16

S

S-T-E-V-E-N 40:7

S-T-E-W-A-R-D 8:22

s-t-r-e-e-t 32:1

satisfied 100:2

satisfy 99:14,16 100:17

savings 11:17 42:8,10

scenarios 55:18

schedule 62:2,5,10,13, 18,21 63:2,3,5,10,22 64:5,21,24 65:4,7,8,10, 19 66:25 67:7,14 68:4,13 70:1.12.14 71:3.7 72:5. 11,15,16,18,20,21,23 73:3,4,8,18,25 74:12,14 75:8 76:9,10,20,24 78:13 79:3,4,6,9,20 81:9,11,15 82:12,15,18,19 83:19 84:3,16 85:3,14,17 86:6, 9 88:23 89:1,19,21 90:4, 12 109:16 129:1,6,12,14, 18,21,22 130:1,7,9,16, 18,20,24 131:4,6 132:13, 18.20

schedules 72:1 84:23

scope 87:13

season 33:11

seasonal 84:2 125:11

seasonality 56:22 58:22, 24 82:22

secondary 65:13 86:8

Section 11:1 15:17,25 99:15 100:18

seek 17:7 19:20

seeking 11:13 12:8 13:1, 2,8 14:9 21:17 38:17 46:5,6

seeks 116:17

sees 112:15

senior 8:25

sense 44:15 56:17 63:8 67:9 79:12,16,19

sentence 17:3,13,21 78:10

separate 21:21 51:15 125:21

separately 100:16

sequence 115:8

series 51:14.15

served 110:11

service 6:5 10:18 20:14, 16 23:5 27:2 33:4,15 38:1,3 48:17 50:20 53:18 54:25 55:6,11,17 56:2,5, 6,10 57:9 58:18,19 59:13 61:5 62:3 63:10,13 65:5 71:3 72:17 74:5 75:4 78:14.19.25 79:18 86:24 87:8 88:3 89:19 90:1,5,6 101:1 136:23

services 7:9 11:22 91:4 92:8,10 136:8

session 52:1,4

set 17:23 44:14 59:3 62:13 63:25 86:5 94:7 108:21 110:12 120:1 129:1 130:16 132:18

sets 17:25

setting 81:13 89:21 116:12

settlement 102:6

share 24:16

sheets 51:2

shift 79:2,7

short 60:9 91:19 131:21

short-term 30:6

show 46:2 67:14 108:20

showing 70:6 75:3

shows 48:15 54:21.22 67:21 68:6,7,9 70:5,9 71:11

shuffle 91:9

side 109:17

sign 63:19

Index: significant..Subscriber

significant 18:10 79:2,7	south 37:14	104:11 107:4 114:16
111:16 112:2,18,25 113:5	space 35:24	127:6 134:6
significantly 47:21	speaking 24:7 69:7 71:12 113:2	stated 19:19 25:15 34:7 46:23 47:11 86:22 100:22
similar 43:17 53:24	special 48:4 90:7	statement 44:10 94:22
58:16 69:17 94:8	specific 22:20 23:12 62:11 73:3 113:9	117:1
Similarly 13:16		states 13:16
simple 50:5	specifically 11:1 33:24 37:10 74:4,6 84:11	status 37:12
simply 47:22 94:22	127:19 134:18 136:7	statute 11:2 12:3,11
125:5,13,22	speculation 17:18	13:18,21,25 15:16,20,21, 24 16:21,22 23:2,9
single 12:4,9 45:1 90:8 108:15,19 109:22	spell 8:20 28:16 31:24	45:11,13 118:10 124:5
site 37:17 98:18	35:22 40:5 60:25 127:6	126:3 136:4 137:7
	134:6 135:6	statutory 93:10,17 99:14
situation 18:15 113:15 122:14 124:15	spread 25:5,8 61:25 62:9,23 63:1,21 65:13,24	116:18
sizes 45:8	69:22 72:9,25 74:9 78:1	step 85:23
skip 119:24	79:9 80:24 81:4,5,18	Steve 6:16 39:20 40:22
slight 33:19 50:16	82:2,6,9,16 83:12,20 85:12,19,24 86:22,23	Steven 40:1,6
	87:4,23 88:12,16,25	Steward 6:16 8:7,8,10,
slightly 22:14,16 23:16	89:5,11,21 90:1 131:2,4, 7 132:13	12,16,19,21 9:11,16 14:21 15:3 17:11 19:22
small 65:11 73:7 77:12 80:25 98:16 102:5		21:16 26:15 27:16 41:13
105:21 119:17	spreading 73:21	50:9 95:25 96:23
smaller 81:10	spreadsheet 75:1,2 76:1	straightened 47:7
Smith 7:2 100:11 106:21,	SRM-1 51:13	Strategies 127:12 134:13
22,24 107:1,4,6,23 108:5 110:19 111:5 114:4,5	stand 91:22 126:23 133:22	streaming 36:2
·	start 6:12 28:25 51:20	strong 89:9
Solar 48:3,9,21	56:3 66:17 67:12 70:20	study 89:19 90:5
solved 28:3	71:22 120:5	subject 22:18 75:15
sort 17:25 58:7 73:5,17 75:13 86:16,20 88:21	started 78:1	submit 9:2 29:6 32:5
90:1	starting 17:4,13 24:1	36:12 40:12 61:6
sought 23:14	42:15 136:10,13	submitted 10:8,11 23:1 29:15 134:15
sound 63:14 75:15	state 8:20 28:16 31:24 35:22 40:5 48:14 60:25	29.15 134.15 Subscriber 48:2,9,21
sounds 76:6	72:3 92:4 97:18 98:12	Gub30(10€) 40.2,3,21

Index: subsequent..testimonies

subsequent 96:11 123:17 substantially 130:2,13 substitution 101:12,15 subtract 70:24 subverts 13:17 sufficient 109:18 suggest 108:17 124:17 suggestion 124:14 suggests 108:17 summarization 78:8 summarize 99:5 105:17 summarizes 42:4 **summary** 9:16 11:24 14:14 21:16 29:22,25 30:10 32:20 37:5 38:20 41:3 49:5 61:20 62:8 66:2.19 93:5.18 95:4 98:25 99:10 102:14 105:13 108:5 110:16 115:23 116:6 117:1 128:15 131:9 135:16 138:12

summer 64:10,12

supplemental 68:7 72:17,19,22 75:4,22 76:18

supplied 78:14,20 88:3 **supply** 86:24 101:9,18

support 13:3 94:19 109:10

supported 94:22

supporting 93:19 95:2 109:10

supports 41:7

surely 94:7

surprised 116:3

surrebuttal 34:7 38:9 40:13,21 41:7 43:13 46:20,24 47:6,10 92:14 98:1,11,13,15,17 104:17 105:5 107:12,19,22 113:5 114:24 115:12 126:2 127:16,21 134:16, 21 135:1

swear 8:9 28:8 31:16 35:15 39:23 60:18 91:24 97:12 104:4 106:23 114:10 126:25 133:25

sworn 91:22 97:9 104:1 **system** 24:16

Т

T-I-M-O-T-H-Y 31:25 T-R-E-V-O-R 104:12 table 42:4 43:8 48:15 49:8,23

takes 44:13 88:5 91:10,

taking 57:4 125:16

talk 25:13 27:24 68:8 71:19 77:24,25 84:14,17

talked 55:21 58:9,16 86:19

talking 22:24 52:7 56:1,5 66:18 72:14 80:15 83:4 87:17,19 121:3 122:13 124:2

talks 72:21

target 71:18 72:10 73:1, 17 75:7 76:23 77:5

targeting 73:24

tariff 72:21 76:21 117:19 124:5 126:3

task 64:6

tax 14:13 42:9 45:4 46:25 47:22 56:21 100:13,20 109:1,2 116:23 122:21, 22,25 125:8 138:1

TB 6:8 9:23 10:4,17 11:9 12:10,16 14:11 22:9,14 30:3 32:24 33:1,5,18 34:9,15 41:9,16,20,25 42:17 43:11,15 49:18 51:15 54:10 94:2,13 99:13 100:10 105:18,24 112:17,23 116:8 118:20 120:10,21 121:10 135:22 136:3,8 137:19

technical 97:21 107:6 technically 69:7 137:24

tells 55:9

Ten 38:1

tend 87:9

term 16:6,20

terms 70:11 85:6

terribly 57:18

test 10:20,23 13:13,17,18 23:6 44:14,15 53:6 94:8 110:1 116:15

testified 18:20 19:2,12 20:7 82:25

testify 100:9,16

testimonies 97:25 98:3 99:25 100:5 103:1 104:17,22,25 107:19,23 114:24 115:5,12

Index: testimony..typo

testimony 9:3,5,7,11,17, tied 72:20 treated 27:6 96:6 116:13 21 10:11,15 11:23 15:5, **Tim** 6:18 treatment 14:4 18:18 6,8,14,15 16:25 17:13 41:21 46:24 100:19 time 10:11 33:11 55:6 19:9,20,24 23:1,23 24:2 136:22 86:5 90:4 91:2 92:18 27:7,8,14 29:6,9,12,14, 94:6 111:18,21 115:10 trends 109:11 22,25 30:2,6 31:8 32:5,8, 118:6 119:4,6 10,14,20,22 33:22 36:12, **Trevor** 7:2 100:9 104:2,7, 16,17,19,23 37:5,8 38:9, timeline 11:18 12 105:6 12,20 39:17 40:12,15,17, true 47:19 48:11 74:25 timeliness 89:13 21 41:4,7,13 42:4,22 43:7,8,13 44:12 46:2,20, timely 13:22 trued 42:20 109:7 116:24 22 47:3,8,11 48:15 49:9 122:18 124:8 126:7 times 58:25 51:13 60:5,12 61:6,12, truth 8:9 28:9 31:17 timing 14:1 118:14,21 15,21 64:9 66:19,20 35:15 39:23 60:18 91:24 119:1,3,9 67:13 70:13 71:20 72:2 97:12 104:4 106:23 77:9 78:10 86:19 87:4 **Timothy** 31:11,20,25 114:10 126:25 133:25 90:23 92:11,14,16,18,21, 32:14 turbine 101:6,9,13,15,19, 24 93:11,20,21 94:23 today 6:9,24 7:1,9,15 9:8 20 96:17,23 98:6,13,25 99:9 29:12 32:11 36:20 40:18 100:6 102:1,14,22,25 turbines 33:10,14 37:15 50:10 61:12 63:1 64:8 103:22 105:5,14,17,20 38:1,2 98:6 104:25 115:5 116:5 106:17 107:12 108:6 122:4 125:11 128:3,16 turn 23:22 51:11 55:14, 113:12 114:4 115:8,24 19 67:24 68:15 69:21,23 135:5,17 116:10 117:24 119:22 73:13 119:22 120:12 121:4 125:11,24 top 52:7 56:14 68:2 126:2,10 127:11,13,16, 76:18 turned 28:23 111:25 19,22 128:1,4,8,15 132:2 total 12:6 16:14 21:18 turning 76:8 133:18 134:11,16,19,21, 33:17,18 38:17 42:8 46:3 turns 67:7 23 135:1,5,11,16 137:17 50:1,11,19 56:6,10 65:7 two-part 94:16 Thad 6:10 68:8 75:25 101:24 102:10 116:16 125:14 two-step 10:16 19:3,13, thing 66:18 126:6 18 20:8,15 41:17,18 things 45:5 78:22 83:21 totality 83:18 84:7,8 tying 81:16 91:9 totally 84:5 thinking 77:6,8 79:23 type 45:11 112:3 tracked 42:19 typical 44:15 thought 77:16 111:21 transactions 38:8,15 typically 44:25 45:3 87:9 101:12 102:8 112:11,13 thread 54:4 transmission 64:21 threshold 12:11,24 45:7, typo 134:25 74:18 129:18

treasurer 28:19,21 29:3

10,12,13,21 93:17 99:17 100:2,17 136:2 137:21

Index: UAE..William

	update 11:17 22:13,25	vice 8:25
U	updated 22:8,10 53:19	video 8:1
UAE 7:14 13:11 63:21,24	Users 7:14 11:23 62:4	view 23:2,4 93:11 98:18
80:3 84:18 85:9 93:18,21 126:22 127:20,22,23	127:14 134:14	viewed 92:10
129:8 133:21 134:19,20,	Utah 6:23,25 7:14 10:20 11:1,22,24 15:16 24:13,	Vision 10:5 33:7
21 136:2 137:1	18 33:4 48:22 62:4 85:9	voltage 64:22 71:3 74:18
UAE's 62:11 64:20 86:14	99:15 100:18 127:13	129:18
Uh-huh 120:4	129:9 134:13 137:8,14, 23 138:10	volume 27:22
Ultimately 10:19	Utah's 24:16	
unable 33:10	Utilities 6:25 11:21 60:11	
uncharged 99:11	97:22 104:13,15 107:7	walk 51:18
uncontroversial 62:1	114:19 116:5	wanted 73:16
undermine 94:8	utility 122:6	warrant 112:3
understand 51:20 54:19 55:4 87:1 96:7 118:18 132:4	utilized 130:16	warranted 109:25
		ways 44:21
		weather 33:13 37:19
I linderstanding 15:16		
understanding 15:16 38:13 54:13 124:20	V-A-N 35:24	Wegener 6:13,14 8:5,6,
_	V-A-N 35:24 values 105:19,21	18 9:10,15 14:16,19
38:13 54:13 124:20	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14,	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14,	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9 unique 18:3	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1 variables 59:4	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22 60:14,15,23 61:14,19 66:3,6 90:15,16,25 91:1
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9 unique 18:3 unit 56:24	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1 variables 59:4 variations 119:19	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22 60:14,15,23 61:14,19 66:3,6 90:15,16,25 91:1 95:13,14 103:13,14
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9 unique 18:3 unit 56:24 University 85:9 129:8	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1 variables 59:4 variations 119:19 varies 56:24 59:4	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22 60:14,15,23 61:14,19 66:3,6 90:15,16,25 91:1
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9 unique 18:3 unit 56:24 University 85:9 129:8 unreasonable 63:22 unrecovered 41:24 up 21:21 36:2 42:20 52:1,	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1 variables 59:4 variations 119:19 varies 56:24 59:4 vary 125:10	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22 60:14,15,23 61:14,19 66:3,6 90:15,16,25 91:1 95:13,14 103:13,14 106:10,11 111:1,2,4 113:19 117:12,13,15 121:15,16 131:20,21,23
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9 unique 18:3 unit 56:24 University 85:9 129:8 unreasonable 63:22 unrecovered 41:24 up 21:21 36:2 42:20 52:1, 14 54:21,22 67:14 68:16	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1 variables 59:4 variations 119:19 varies 56:24 59:4 vary 125:10 vendor 101:9	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22 60:14,15,23 61:14,19 66:3,6 90:15,16,25 91:1 95:13,14 103:13,14 106:10,11 111:1,2,4 113:19 117:12,13,15 121:15,16 131:20,21,23 133:8,9 138:22,23
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9 unique 18:3 unit 56:24 University 85:9 129:8 unreasonable 63:22 unrecovered 41:24 up 21:21 36:2 42:20 52:1, 14 54:21,22 67:14 68:16 71:11 72:11 73:10,11 74:15 75:2 80:6 85:21,22	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1 variables 59:4 variations 119:19 varies 56:24 59:4 vary 125:10 vendor 101:9 venue 64:8	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22 60:14,15,23 61:14,19 66:3,6 90:15,16,25 91:1 95:13,14 103:13,14 106:10,11 111:1,2,4 113:19 117:12,13,15 121:15,16 131:20,21,23 133:8,9 138:22,23 wholly 34:4
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9 unique 18:3 unit 56:24 University 85:9 129:8 unreasonable 63:22 unrecovered 41:24 up 21:21 36:2 42:20 52:1, 14 54:21,22 67:14 68:16 71:11 72:11 73:10,11 74:15 75:2 80:6 85:21,22 88:15 91:7 99:21 109:7	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1 variables 59:4 variations 119:19 varies 56:24 59:4 vary 125:10 vendor 101:9 venue 64:8 verbatim 18:19 19:1 verified 101:3 versus 25:5 54:22 75:20	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22 60:14,15,23 61:14,19 66:3,6 90:15,16,25 91:1 95:13,14 103:13,14 106:10,11 111:1,2,4 113:19 117:12,13,15 121:15,16 131:20,21,23 133:8,9 138:22,23 wholly 34:4 wider 109:5
38:13 54:13 124:20 132:7,11 understands 66:23 Understood 82:5 uniform 25:7 79:9 unique 18:3 unit 56:24 University 85:9 129:8 unreasonable 63:22 unrecovered 41:24 up 21:21 36:2 42:20 52:1, 14 54:21,22 67:14 68:16 71:11 72:11 73:10,11 74:15 75:2 80:6 85:21,22	values 105:19,21 Van 6:16 22:19 35:12,14, 16,18,21,23 36:4,6,23 38:22 39:17,18 50:16 102:1 variables 59:4 variations 119:19 varies 56:24 59:4 vary 125:10 vendor 101:9 venue 64:8 verbatim 18:19 19:1 verified 101:3	18 9:10,15 14:16,19 26:11,12 27:17,18 28:14 29:4,14,20 30:12,15 31:10,11,22 32:13,18 34:17,20 35:11,12,20 36:7,22 37:3 38:23 39:19,20 40:3,20 41:2 43:24 51:22 59:21,22 60:14,15,23 61:14,19 66:3,6 90:15,16,25 91:1 95:13,14 103:13,14 106:10,11 111:1,2,4 113:19 117:12,13,15 121:15,16 131:20,21,23 133:8,9 138:22,23 wholly 34:4

Public Hearing November 30, 2021

Index: wind..Zenger's

wind 6:8 9:24 14:11
19:15 27:1 32:24 33:1,6,
10 34:15 37:9,13,15 38:1
41:9,16,20 42:13,17
56:25 58:13 63:7 65:3
79:15 80:19 83:16 84:8,
12 88:8 96:2,5 100:8,24
101:5,9,13,15,18,20
108:25 113:2 116:8
119:19 120:10 122:6
123:8 125:10,15 130:22
131:8 132:22,25 135:23
136:3

winds 58:12

winter 33:13 37:19

64:11,12

witnesses 6:15 7:1,15,20

22:19 91:18 99:8,21 100:3 122:4

won 86:14

word 15:21,25 16:7

17:14 135:1,6

words 13:5 17:4,5 78:6

98:20 123:16

work 8:1 70:18 127:10,12

134:10

works 23:3

worse 119:2

worth 16:9,11,12

written 92:21 98:6

wrong 47:2 111:25

Wyoming 33:3

Υ

year 10:24 13:13,17,18 42:14 44:14,15 50:21,24 51:1,2 57:10 58:18,20

83:1 110:1 116:15 138:9

years 27:5 96:4 122:9 123:10,14

yields 64:21 71:6,21

Ζ

Z-E-N-G-E-R 97:21

Zenger 7:1 38:7 97:10, 11,13,15,20 98:24 102:17,19 103:7,22,23

Zenger's 103:1