

17204

RECEIVED

JUN 13 8 54 AM '99

UTAH PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH**

\* \* \*

In the matter of the Application of	)	
PacifiCorp and ScottishPower plc	)	Docket No. 98-2035-04
for an Order Approving the Issuance	)	
of PacifiCorp Common Stock	)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF  
JOHN NIELSEN

ON BEHALF OF

THE LAND AND WATER FUND OF THE ROCKIES  
THE SOUTHERN UTAH WILDERNESS ALLIANCE  
THE WASATCH CLEAN AIR COALITION  
THE GRAND CANYON TRUST

June 18, 1999

1 I. INTRODUCTION

2

3 Q. Please state your name and address.

4 A. My name is John Nielsen. I work at 2260 Baseline Road, Suite 200, Boulder, Colorado,  
5 80302.

6

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

8 A. I am employed by the Land and Water Fund of the Rockies (LAW Fund) as a Senior Policy  
9 Advisor.

10

11 Q. Please describe the LAW Fund.

12 A. The LAW Fund is a regional law and policy center founded in 1990 to provide legal and  
13 policy assistance to community groups throughout the Rocky Mountain and Desert  
14 Southwest region. The LAW Fund's Energy Project was established in 1991 to advocate  
15 for environmentally responsible energy policy and practices in a variety of state and  
16 regional forums. Today the Energy Project operates in six western states: Arizona,  
17 Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah and Wyoming.

18

19 Q. Is the LAW Fund active in Utah?

20 A. Yes, the LAW Fund has an office in Utah, Utah members, a Utah steering committee, and  
21 a Board member who lives in Utah. The LAW Fund has been involved in proceedings  
22 before the Utah Public Service Commission for over five years, primarily on energy  
23 efficiency, financial incentive, and integrated resource planning issues.

24

25 Q. Do other environmental groups active in Utah support your testimony?

26 A. Yes. The Grand Canyon Trust, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance and the Wasatch  
27 Clean Air Coalition support the testimony. Together these groups have over 9,000  
28 members in Utah, many of whom are PacifiCorp customers. A brief description of each  
29 group is attached as exhibit JN-1.

30

31 Q. Please describe your educational and professional experience.

1 A. I have a Bachelor of Arts degree in economics and mathematics from the University of  
2 Colorado and a Master of Philosophy degree in economics from Yale University, where my  
3 major fields of study were Industrial Organization and Public Economics. I joined the LAW  
4 Fund after completing my graduate training and have been employed there for the past four  
5 years as an economist and policy advisor. My responsibilities at the LAW Fund involve  
6 reviewing and developing policies and practices to reduce the adverse environmental  
7 impacts of electricity generation. My work at the LAW Fund has focused on renewable  
8 energy, energy conservation and regional air quality.

9  
10 I have testified as an expert witness before the Colorado Public Utilities Commission in  
11 proceedings related to integrated resource planning, green pricing, and net metering. In  
12 Utah, I have participated in the RAMPP public advisory process and the DSM  
13 collaborative, and I am currently participating in the Utah Public Service Commission's  
14 Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Task. For the past year and half, as part of the  
15 Western Regional Air Partnership, I have been working with stakeholders from across the  
16 region — including representatives of the Utah Division of Air Quality, the Utah Office of  
17 Energy and Resource Planning, and PacifiCorp — to develop a plan for addressing regional  
18 haze in the West.

19  
20 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

21 A. I will review the impacts of the merger on PacifiCorp's environmental performance.

22  
23 Q. Why are environmental issues relevant to a merger case?

24 A. The issue for the Commission's decision in this proceeding is whether the proposed merger  
25 is in the public interest.<sup>1</sup> The impacts of the merger on the Utah's land, air and water  
26 quality are an important component of the public interest. Moreover, because complying  
27 with environmental regulations is an increasingly large component of utility expenses,  
28 sound environmental stewardship has economic implications as well. Thus, for both

---

<sup>1</sup>Utah Code Section 54-4-28. Merger, consolidation, or combination. No public utility shall combine, merge nor consolidate with another public utility engaged in the same general line of business in this state, without the consent and approval of the Public Utilities Commission, which shall be granted only after investigation and hearing and finding that such proposed merger, consolidation or combination is in the public interest.

1 environmental and economic reasons the merger's effects on the company's environmental  
2 performance has a bearing on the public interest.

3  
4 Q. What topics do you review in your testimony?

5 A. My testimony addresses the impacts that the merger is likely to have on the following areas  
6 relating to the environment: renewable resources, environmental process, energy  
7 efficiency and several other issues including distributed generation, regional haze and  
8 climate change.

9  
10 Q. Please summarize your conclusions.

11 A. I believe that in the areas of renewable energy and environmental process the merger will  
12 improve PacifiCorp's environmental performance. In the areas of energy efficiency,  
13 distributed generation, regional haze and climate change, environmental performance will  
14 at least be maintained and may improve. Taken as a whole, I think the merger will  
15 improve PacifiCorp's environmental performance and, with respect to the environment, is  
16 in the public interest.

17  
18  
19 **II. RENEWABLE RESOURCES**

20  
21 Q. Why should the Commission care about renewable resources and the impacts the merger  
22 may have on their development?

23 A. Compared to fossil-fuel generation, renewable resources have much lower environmental  
24 impacts. In Utah, for example, fossil fuel-fired electric power plants are responsible for  
25 roughly 30% of SO<sub>2</sub> emissions and 40% of NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, pollutants that contribute to  
26 visibility degradation and public health problems. Similarly, fossil fuel-fired power plants  
27 are responsible for over half the state's CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the principal pollutant associated  
28 with the risk of global climate change. Renewable resources can help reduce emissions of  
29 these pollutants at a reasonable cost, particularly in light of prior, and expected future,  
30 price declines.

1 Renewable resources also help reduce risk. Renewables have no fuel costs and thus  
2 reduce the economic risks associated with rising fossil fuel prices. In addition, because  
3 they reduce environmental impacts, they also protect against the risk of higher electric rates  
4 resulting from more stringent future environmental regulations. Finally, because of their  
5 modular nature, power suppliers can develop renewable capacity when they need it, thus  
6 reducing the risks of overbuilding if demand forecasts are inaccurate.

7  
8 Q. What is PacifiCorp currently doing with respect to renewable energy?

9 A. With respect to projects serving Utah customers, PacifiCorp's most significant renewable  
10 energy activity is its participation in the Wyoming Wind Energy Project. The Wyoming  
11 wind energy site is located at Foote Creek Rim, between Laramie and Rawlins. Under  
12 current plans the site will be home to 69 wind turbines capable of generating 41 MW of  
13 electricity. Of this 41 MW, PacifiCorp will own 80%, or approximately 33 MW. A  
14 portion of this 33 MW will be designated to serve Utah customers.

15 In addition to its wind power activities, PacifiCorp owns the 24-megawatt Blundell  
16 geothermal plant in Utah and is a participant in the Solar Two Project that has successfully  
17 demonstrated the feasibility of molten salt storage in conjunction with central receiver solar  
18 generation. PacifiCorp also has smaller solar photovoltaic energy projects in Oregon,  
19 Wyoming and Utah.

20  
21 Q. What new commitments toward renewable resources will ScottishPower make?

22 A. According to Alan Richardson's direct testimony, within five years of the approval of the  
23 merger, ScottishPower would commit PacifiCorp to develop an additional 50 MW of  
24 renewable resources (wind, solar, geothermal).

25 In addition, ScottishPower would commit PacifiCorp to file an application for a  
26 "green resource tariff." This tariff would give those customers who wish to consume more  
27 renewable energy than is in the company's base resource mix the opportunity to purchase  
28 additional amounts of renewable energy, at a small premium. ScottishPower has also

1 committed PacifiCorp to evaluate the possibility of expanding its Blundell geothermal  
2 plant.<sup>2</sup>

3  
4 Q. How do you view ScottishPower's commitment to develop an additional 50 MW of  
5 renewable resources?

6 A. I think it is a very positive step. While it is true that, even with this commitment, non-  
7 hydro renewable resources will still make up only about 1% of PacifiCorp's capacity base,  
8 integrating an additional 50 MW of clean renewable energy into the PacifiCorp system will  
9 allow the company to continue gaining experience with these technologies. Moreover, the  
10 additional renewable resources will help reduce the environmental impacts of PacifiCorp's  
11 operations. When one considers that renewable resources remain somewhat more  
12 expensive than conventional resources, and that additional renewable resources are likely to  
13 be developed through the proposed green pricing tariff, it seems that the size and the timing  
14 of the commitment — i.e. 50 MW over five years — are reasonable.

15  
16 Q. Is the commitment to an additional 50 MW of resources economically responsible?

17 A. Yes. PacifiCorp relies heavily on fossil fuel-fired resources. Diversifying its resource mix  
18 by investing in additional renewable resources will help reduce the potential risks to  
19 PacifiCorp and its customers of rising fuel prices or stricter environmental regulations. In  
20 addition, the renewable resources selected for acquisition will be evaluated in the integrated  
21 resource planning process. This process will help ensure that the resources ultimately  
22 selected provide the most value to PacifiCorp's customers and its electric system. Finally,  
23 the five-year phased-in approach for acquiring these resources across the entire system will  
24 reduce the total net present value expense for Utah customers and also give the company  
25 time to adjust its plans in response to possible changes in the relative costs and benefits of  
26 various types of renewable energy resources.

27  

---

<sup>2</sup>For an outline of ScottishPower's renewable energy commitments see Direct Testimony of Alan V. Richardson,  
Docket No. 98-2035-04, p.14, lines 9-20.

1 Q. You mentioned that if the merger is approved ScottishPower would commit PacifiCorp to  
2 file a "green resource tariff" within 60 days. Could you briefly describe how a green  
3 resource tariff would work?

4 A. A green resource tariff would provide customers with the choice of purchasing a clean,  
5 renewable energy product. The idea is that those customers interested in consuming more  
6 renewable energy than is provided in the base resource mix would pay a small premium in  
7 their electric bills to account for the incremental costs of renewable resources above  
8 conventional resources. As customers choose to purchase the renewable energy product,  
9 the company would acquire renewable resources to meet the demand.

10  
11 Q. How do you view ScottishPower's commitment to offer a green resource tariff?

12 A. Again, I think this is a positive proposal. According to Alan Richardson's testimony the  
13 renewable resources acquired through the green pricing tariff would be in addition to the 50  
14 MW commitment described above. Thus the green resource tariff will lead to increased  
15 renewable energy development by the company. Based on the LAW Fund's experience  
16 with green tariffs in Colorado, the amount of renewable resources developed through such  
17 programs can be significant. For example, in Colorado a number of utilities are developing  
18 wind energy projects using green tariffs. The wind power sells at a premium of roughly  
19 2.5 cents more per kWh. In the two years that the programs have been in operation, over  
20 10,000 residential customers, 120 businesses and more than a dozen governmental entities  
21 have subscribed to the program, leading to the development of roughly 20 MW of wind  
22 capacity.

23

24

25 **III. ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS**

26

27 Q. One of the areas you identified as being an issue associated with the merger was  
28 environmental process. What do mean by that term?

29 A. By environmental process I mean the process by which PacifiCorp communicates with  
30 citizens and organizations interested in promoting increased environmental quality.

31

- 1 Q. How would you characterize PacifiCorp's past communication with the environmental  
2 community?
- 3 A. For the most part, I think the communication has been good. For example, in the RAMMP  
4 process PacifiCorp convenes a public advisory group to gather outside input on resource  
5 planning issues. The LAW Fund and other environmental groups have participated in these  
6 advisory groups, and PacifiCorp has generally been responsive to the concerns raised by  
7 the environmental community. The company used a similar process - referred to as the  
8 DSM collaborative - to take input on the design and implementation of its energy efficiency  
9 programs.
- 10
- 11 Q. What process does ScottishPower propose to communicate with the environmental  
12 community?
- 13 A. ScottishPower commits in its testimonies to develop a process to gather outside input on  
14 environmental matters, such as the establishment of an Environmental Forum.<sup>3</sup>  
15 ScottishPower uses this type of system in the UK. In the UK, the Environmental Forum  
16 consists of key ScottishPower decision makers and leading members of the environmental  
17 community and serves as an advisory body that ensures that the company's approach to  
18 environmental issues is relevant to a wide stakeholder base.
- 19
- 20 Q. Would the establishment of an Environmental Forum improve the current situation?
- 21 A. Yes, I think the establishment of an Environmental Forum would be a valuable addition to  
22 the way PacifiCorp communicates with and responds to the environmental community.  
23 Although the RAMPP public advisory group and DSM Collaborative are useful in raising  
24 and addressing environmental issues, at times it is our sense that these forums have been  
25 somewhat removed from the strategic business decisions being made by upper  
26 management. For the environmental community, developing relationships and channels to  
27 communicate ideas at the level in the company where strategic business decisions are made  
28 is important. An Environmental Forum, similar to that used in the UK, seems well suited  
29 to developing these types of relationships and elevating environmental issues to high levels  
30 within the company.

---

<sup>3</sup>See Direct Testimony of Alan V. Richardson, Docket No. 98-2035-04, p.14, lines 4-5.

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  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

Q. Are there benefits for customers and shareholders due to this type of improved communication?

A. Yes. Environmental costs are a significant impact for most utilities. They can be particularly problematic if they arise suddenly without an opportunity for planning. By identifying potential environmental problems early, improved communications with the environmental community can reduce the risk of these unforeseen costs. Moreover, improved communication can shift decision making away from adversarial approaches and toward a more collaborative decision making process which can lead to more innovative and cost-effective solutions.

**IV. ENERGY EFFICIENCY**

Q. Energy Efficiency, often referred to as Demand Side Resources (DSR), is another topic you wanted to address. Why should the Commission care about the impacts the merger will have on energy efficiency?

A. PacifiCorp's experience with DSR in Utah has shown that energy efficiency investments can meet growing electricity demands at lower cost than conventional supply-side resources, with virtually no adverse environmental impacts. In addition, like renewable resources, energy efficiency reduces the reliance on fossil fuels and thus has the added benefit of reducing the risk that rising fossil fuel prices or stricter environmental regulations will raise electricity costs.

Q. What is PacifiCorp currently doing with respect to energy efficiency?

A. PacifiCorp currently acquires cost-effective DSR identified through its RAMPP process. As a result of the RAMPP-5 analysis, the company committed to acquiring 5-7 MWa of DSR in Utah in 1998 and an additional 5-7 MWa in 1999.<sup>4</sup>

Q. What does ScottishPower propose with respect to DSR?

---

<sup>4</sup> See RAMPP-5 Report, December 1997, pp. 146-147.

1 A. In response to the LAW Fund's discovery request LWF1-3(b)(4), ScottishPower has said  
2 that they plan to maintain PacifiCorp's policy of acquiring cost-effective DSR identified in  
3 the RAMPP process. This discovery response is attached as exhibit JN-2.  
4

5 Q. How does the LAW Fund feel about ScottishPower maintaining the status quo?

6 A. In general, maintaining the status quo on energy efficiency is acceptable. We feel that the  
7 RAMPP process — where the costs and benefits of DSR can be evaluated against those of  
8 other resource types — is a proper forum for identifying the appropriate level of DSR to  
9 acquire.

10  
11  
12 **V. OTHER ISSUES: DISTRIBUTED GENERATION, REGIONAL HAZE AND**  
13 **CLIMATE CHANGE**

14  
15 Q. Do you have other issues you would like to address?

16 A. Yes. I'd like to briefly discuss some issues surrounding distributed generation, regional  
17 haze and global climate change.  
18

19 **A. Distributed Generation**

20  
21 Q. Can you please give a definition of distributed generation?

22 A. Yes. By distributed generation I mean small, modular generation sited near distribution  
23 facilities or customer load centers that benefit the electric system, specific customers, or  
24 both.  
25

26 Q. Why is distributed generation relevant in this case?

27 A. One of the major benefits ScottishPower claims will result from the merger is increased  
28 electric system performance and reliability. Indeed, as part of the merger, ScottishPower  
29 has committed to meeting a number of network performance standards, and has estimated  
30 that roughly \$30 million in capital investment for new infrastructure, primarily investments

1 in the distribution network, will be necessary to meet the standards.<sup>5</sup> Distributed  
2 generation may be a cost-effective means of improving system performance and thus is  
3 relevant to the merger.  
4

5 Q. Is distributed generation also relevant from an environmental perspective?

6 A. Yes. Many distributed generation technologies such as natural gas-fired micro-turbines,  
7 fuel cells and renewable resources have fewer environmental impacts than conventional  
8 fossil fuel-fired resources. Incorporating cleaner distributed generation into the electric  
9 system may reduce the need for conventional generation and thus yield environmental  
10 benefits. In addition, distributed generation can reduce the need for traditional distribution  
11 system investments, such as new lines, which have their own environmental impacts.  
12

13 Q. Has ScottishPower determined that distributed generation will be part of its plan to increase  
14 system reliability?

15 A. No. ScottishPower has yet to conduct a detailed assessment of PacifiCorp's operational  
16 activities and, as a result, has not developed a specific portfolio of reliability-enhancing  
17 investments for the PacifiCorp system. In response to discovery, however, ScottishPower  
18 has indicated that they will explore any commercially efficient means to improve system  
19 performance, and that this may include distributed generation.  
20

21 Q. In its UK operations, has ScottishPower invested in distributed generation as a means of  
22 improving system reliability and power quality?

23 A. No. According to discovery responses from ScottishPower, small-scale distributed  
24 resource technologies have not been a source of investment in the UK for improving system  
25 reliability and power quality.  
26

27 Q. For its UK operations, has ScottishPower conducted any studies or analyses to determine  
28 the benefits of distributed generation to its electric system and its customers?

---

<sup>5</sup>For a description of the performance standards related to reliability and improved network performance see Direct Testimony of Bob Moir, Docket No. 98-2035-04, pp. 5-9. For the estimate of expenditures necessary to meet the network performance standards see Mr. Moir's direct testimony, p. 15, lines 9-22.

1 A. No. According to discovery responses from ScottishPower, no such studies or analyses  
2 have been conducted.

3  
4 Q. What is PacifiCorp currently doing with respect to distributed generation?

5 A. Like ScottishPower, PacifiCorp has made few, if any, investments in small-scale  
6 distributed resource technologies for the purposes of increased system reliability.  
7 However, PacifiCorp has conducted several preliminary studies analyzing the benefits  
8 distributed generation has to its customers and its electric system and has identified  
9 distributed generation as a priority technology area for potential investments and strategic  
10 initiatives. PacifiCorp is also involved in marketing the deployment and management of  
11 distributed generation resources in concert with power quality related products and services  
12 through a subsidiary. In addition, as part of the on-going Public Service Commission  
13 Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Task Force, the company has expressed a  
14 willingness to explore the development of a distributed generation pilot program whose  
15 purpose would be to further identify and begin to quantify the benefits of distributed  
16 generation to the company's electric system.

17  
18 Q. With respect to distributed generation, what should the Commission keep in mind when  
19 reviewing the merger?

20 A. As outlined above, neither PacifiCorp or ScottishPower seem to have much experience with  
21 actual investments in distributed resource technologies. However, it appears that  
22 PacifiCorp is somewhat ahead of ScottishPower when it comes to, at least, assessing the  
23 potential benefits of distributed generation for its customers and electric system. If the  
24 merger is approved we believe the Commission should encourage the company to build  
25 upon the analysis that PacifiCorp has already done and ensure that distributed generation is  
26 fully considered in ScottishPower's reliability enhancement plans. In addition, we would  
27 expect the merged company to continue to work with other stakeholder groups on  
28 distributed resource issues in appropriate Commission-sponsored forums, such as the on-  
29 going Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Task Force.

30  
31

1 **B. Regional Haze**

2

3 Q. Do you think the merger will have a positive impact on PacifiCorp's actions to help solve  
4 the problem of regional haze in the Western United States?

5 A. I think it will. Over the past two years, PacifiCorp has been a leader in the Western  
6 Regional Air Partnership's (WRAP) attempt to develop a consensus-based plan for solving  
7 the regional haze problem in the West.<sup>6</sup> In the WRAP process, the company has worked  
8 closely and in good faith with the environmental community. However, in the several  
9 months prior to the merger announcement the company appeared to be less focused. I  
10 think this was because management turnover and problems with its overseas ventures had  
11 forced the company to pull back and reevaluate its activities, including the resources it was  
12 devoting to addressing regional haze. Since the merger was announced, however, the  
13 company is again fully engaged. Management for ScottishPower has been briefed on the  
14 issue and PacifiCorp's has resumed its leadership role in working with the environmental  
15 community to solve this problem. I think this is a positive development for the  
16 environment.

17

18 **C. Climate Change**

19

20 Q. Can you describe PacifiCorp's previous activities to address the risk of climate change?

21 A. Yes. As part of the RAMPP process, they have attempted to assess the financial risks to  
22 the company of future regulations designed to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. In addition, as part  
23 of the company's Climate Challenge agreement with the U.S. Department of Energy they  
24 have agreed to fund at least \$1 million in small-scale carbon offset projects through the  
25 year 2000.<sup>7</sup>

26

27 Q. How might the merger affect PacifiCorp's climate change activities?

---

<sup>6</sup>The WRAP is a collaborative effort of tribal governments, state governments, various federal agencies, and a full range of stakeholder groups that was set up to promote the implementation of Grand Canyon Visibility Transport Commission (GCVTC) recommendations for addressing regional haze on the Colorado Plateau.

<sup>7</sup> See RAMPP-5 Report, December 1997, p.158.

1 A. I can't say for certain, but ScottishPower's experience with climate change issues in the UK  
2 — in particular the company's commitment to work toward meeting the Kyoto protocol's  
3 greenhouse gas emission reduction targets in a way that sensibly balances economic  
4 concerns — suggests that PacifiCorp's activities with respect to climate change will  
5 continue and, perhaps, be improved.  
6

7 **VI. CONCLUSIONS**  
8

9 Q. Can you please summarize your conclusions regarding the environmental implications of  
10 the merger?  
11

12 A. Yes. I believe that in several important areas the merger will have positive implications for  
13 the company's environmental performance. First, ScottishPower's commitment to 50 MW  
14 of new renewable resources and its plan to file a green resource tariff will improve  
15 PacifiCorp's environmental performance in the area of renewable resource development.  
16 Second, ScottishPower's proposal to develop an Environmental Forum will facilitate  
17 communication between senior managers in the company and key environmental leaders  
18 and help identify pending environmental problems before they pose significant risks to the  
19 company and its customers. Third, by resolving uncertainty concerning the company's  
20 priorities and management, the merger should allow PacifiCorp to continue to play a  
21 leadership role in addressing the problem of regional haze in the West. Fourth, given the  
22 position ScottishPower has taken on the risks of global climate change in the UK,  
23 PacifiCorp is likely to at least maintain its climate change activities and may well do more  
24 to address this issue.

25 Although the merger is unlikely to lead to an increased acquisition of energy  
26 efficiency resources, the merged company will continue its policy of investing in cost-  
27 effective demand side resources. Finally, although an initial assessment suggests that  
28 PacifiCorp may be further along than ScottishPower when it comes to evaluating the  
29 benefits of distributed generation to its electric system, if ScottishPower builds upon  
30 PacifiCorp's prior work in this area, and is willing to fully evaluate distributed generation  
31 as part of the company's overall portfolio of system performance-enhancing investments,

1 the merger could lead to the increased deployment of environmentally friendly distributed  
2 generation technologies.

3 All told, I believe that, with respect to environmental performance, the merger is in  
4 the public interest.

5

6 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

7 A. Yes.

## **Description of the Environmental Organizations**

The **Grand Canyon Trust** is dedicated to the conservation of the natural and cultural resources on the Colorado Plateau. The Trust advocates an ecologically responsible and sustainable balance between resource use and preservation, along with the protection of areas of beauty and solitude. Headquartered in Flagstaff, Arizona, the Trust has two Utah offices, one in St. George and one in Moab. The Trust has approximately 4,500 members nationwide and approximately 325 members in Utah.

The **Land and Water Fund of the Rockies (LAW Fund)** is a regional non-profit environmental law center serving the Rocky Mountain states. The LAW Fund's Energy Project promotes energy efficiency, renewable resources and other environmentally sound energy options in the Rocky Mountain and Desert Southwest regions through selective interventions in regulatory and administrative proceedings.

The **Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA)** is a non-profit organization under 501(c)(3) of the Federal Tax Code. The mission of SUWA is the preservation of the outstanding wildlands at the heart of the Colorado Plateau, and the management of these lands in their natural state for the benefit of all Americans. SUWA has approximately 18,000 members, 9,000 of whom live in Utah.

The **Wasatch Clean Air Coalition** is valley-wide organization devoted to reducing regional air pollution through education and selective regulatory interventions.

## PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH

Docket No. 98-2035-04

## First Discovery Request of The Land and Water Fund to ScottishPower

LWF1-3. On page 13, lines 24-25 of Alan Richardson's Direct Testimony, he commits to "support and maintain PacifiCorp's current and committed focus on environmental programs". In regard to PacifiCorp's existing environmental programs, please respond to our requests in the following areas:

a. Resource Planning: PacifiCorp currently is engaged in an extensive integrated resource planning (IRP) process that results in the filing of detailed plans with the Utah PSC. In regard to this resource planning process, please respond to the following questions:

- (1) Do PacifiCorp and Scottish Power intend to maintain the IRP process in its current form?
- (2) If not, what changes are being contemplated?
- (3) Will the merged company commit to maintaining the IRP process in some reasonably similar form until retail competition is implemented in Utah? If not, why not?
- (4) Will PacifiCorp's planning process remain independent or will various resource planning functions be transferred to Scotland?
- (5) If so, what functions would be transferred?

b. DSM: PacifiCorp is supporting energy efficiency programs in both Utah and Wyoming that, in our view, are highly cost-effective means of reducing energy demands, avoiding the need for new power plants, lowering pollutant emissions, and improving the competitiveness of businesses. In regard to PacifiCorp's DSM efforts, please respond to the following questions:

- (1) Do PacifiCorp and Scottish Power intend to continue investing in the cost-effective energy efficiency programs identified in the IRP process?
- (2) Will the merged company rely on the existing program designs or are changes being contemplated?
- (3) If so, what changes are being contemplated?
- (4) Will the merged company commit to maintaining its investments in the cost-effective energy efficiency efforts identified by the IRP process until retail competition is implemented in Utah? If not, why not?

c. **Renewable Resources:** PacifiCorp has recently completed the installation of a wind farm in Arlington Wyoming. In regard to this wind farm, please answer the following questions:

- (1) Is this wind farm in PacifiCorp's Utah rate base (or in their revenue requirement calculation)?
- (2) If not, how are the costs associated with the wind farm treated?
- (3) If the wind farm is in the revenue requirement, is the merged company willing to leave the cost recovery treatment as it is?
- (4) To the extent PacifiCorp sells wind energy to other utilities (like Public Service Company of Colorado) or to retail customers in a competitive environment, would PacifiCorp agree to ensure that new turbines are built (to serve this new demand) and leave the existing turbines in the Utah revenue requirement?

d. **Regional Haze:** Over the past two years, PacifiCorp has played a leadership role in developing a consensual regional approach for resolving regional haze issues. Does the merged company foresee any changes in PacifiCorp's approach to the regional haze problem? If so, what changes are contemplated?

**Response:**

- (a)
1. Yes. Standards and Guidelines for IRP were set by Utah Commission order in Docket 90-2035-01. Future IRPs will adhere to these guidelines unless and until they are revised. The public advisory group to the IRP process will be examining during 1999 the current structure of the IRP and its relevance in light of changes in the utility industry. It is premature to determine whether this examination will result in suggestions for changes to the IRP. Any proposed changes to the IRP standards and guidelines would be filed with the Utah Commission for approval prior to implementation.
  2. Please see ScottishPower's response to Utah LWF Data Request 1.3(a)(1).
  3. Please see ScottishPower's response to Utah LWF Data Request 1.3(a)(1).
  4. The planning process will remain within PacifiCorp.
  5. Please see ScottishPower's response to Utah LWF Data Request 1.3(a)(4).

(b)

1. Yes.
2. DSM programs are continually evaluated and monitored to assure their effectiveness. Any changes to existing programs or introduction of new programs would be filed with the Commission for approval prior to implementation.
3. Please see ScottishPower's response to Utah LWF Data Request 1.3(b)(2).
4. The IRP Standards and Guidelines require that the IRP consider both demand side and supply side alternatives on a consistent and comparable basis. The Company will continue to develop the IRP in accordance with these guidelines and will achieve the level of DSM identified in the process until such time as the Standards and Guidelines are modified by the Utah Commission.

(c)

1. The Wyoming wind farm was placed in service in 1998. Current rates in Utah are based on a 1997 test period. Therefore, current Utah prices do not include recovery of the cost of the wind farm. When rates are reset on a 1998 or later test period, the wind farm will be included in Utah rate base and reflected in revenue requirement calculations.
2. Please see ScottishPower's response to Utah LWF Data Request 1.3 (c) (1).
3. Please see ScottishPower's response to Utah LWF Data Request 1.3 (c) (1).
4. ScottishPower reiterates that it has made a commitment to both new renewables (50 MW) and additional new renewables to meet the demand of a Green tariff. These commitments signal ScottishPower's interest in developing new renewable generation.

(d) ScottishPower has not studied this issue in detail but supports PacifiCorp's general approach to the regional haze issue.



## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the original and fifteen (15) copies of the DIRECT TESTIMONY OF JOHN NIELSEN ON BEHALF OF THE LAND AND WATER FUND OF THE ROCKIES, THE SOUTHERN UTAH WILDERNESS ALLIANCE, THE WASATCH CLEAN AIR COALITION & THE GRAND CANYON TRUST were sent via Federal Express to Stephen F. Mecham, Chairman, Public Service Commission of Utah, 160 East 300 South, Salt Lake City, Utah 84145, on this 17th day of June, 1999, and a true and correct copy was sent by U.S. mail, first-class and postage prepaid, to the following persons:

Anne E. Eakin  
Vice President, Regulation  
PacifiCorp  
825 NE Multnomah St.  
Portland OR 97332

Robert Green  
Scottish Power  
121 SW Morrison #1800  
Portland OR 97204

Curtis Broadbent  
Controller  
Nucor Steel  
PO Box 100  
Plymouth UT 84330

Matthew F. McNulty III  
Van Cott, Bagley, Cornwall & McCarthy  
50 S. Main St. #1600  
PO Box 45340  
Salt Lake City UT 84145

Brian W. Burnett  
Callister Nebeker & McCullough  
10 East South Temple #800  
Salt Lake City UT 84133

Paul T. Morris  
3600 Constitution Blvd.  
West Valley City UT 84119

Daniel Moquin  
Asst. Attorney General  
1594 West North Temple #300  
Salt Lake City UT 84116

Lawrence H. Reichman  
Perkins Cole LLP  
1211 SW 5th Ave. #1500  
Portland OR 97204-3715

Dave Blackwell  
Emery County Attorney  
PO Box 249  
Castle Dale UT 84513

F. Robert Reeder  
William J. Evans  
Parsons Behle & Latimer  
201 S. Main St. #1800  
PO Box 45898  
Salt Lake City UT 84145-0898

Doug Larson  
Director, Regulatory Policy  
PacifiCorp  
One Utah Center #2200  
201 S. Main  
Salt Lake City UT 84140-2000

Douglas O. Hunter  
General Manager  
UAMPS  
2825 E. Cottonwood Pkwy #200  
Salt Lake City UT 84121

Lee R. Brown  
V.P. Contracts, Human Resources  
Public & Government Affairs  
238 North 2200 West  
Salt Lake City UT 84116

Brian L. Farr  
Asst. Attorney General  
160 East 300 South  
PO Box 140857  
Salt Lake City UT 84114-0857

Gary A. Dodge  
Parr Waddoups Brown Gee & Loveless  
185 S. State St. #1300  
Salt Lake City UT 84111-1536

Steven Allred  
Salt Lake City Corp. Law Dept.  
451 S. State St. #505  
Salt Lake City UT 84111

Michael Ginsberg  
Asst. Attorney General  
Utah Division of Public Utilities  
160 East 300 South, 5th Floor  
Salt Lake City UT 84111

Jim Matheson  
Dr. Robert Malko  
The Matheson Group  
466 East 500 South #200  
Salt Lake City UT 84111

Dr. Charles E. Johnson  
The Three Parties  
1338 Foothill Blvd. #134  
Salt Lake City UT 84108

E. A. Prawitt  
Utah Association of Counties  
5397 S. Vine St.  
Salt Lake City UT 84107

Rick Anderson  
Energy Strategies, Inc.  
39 Market St. #200  
Salt Lake City UT 84101

Peter J. Mattheis  
Dean S. Brockbank  
Brickfield, Burchette & Ritts, P.C.  
1025 Thomas Jefferson St. NW  
800 West Tower  
Washington DC 20007

Stephen R. Randle  
Thomas M. Zarr  
Randle, Deamer, Zarr, Romrell & Lee, P.C.  
139 East South Temple #330  
Salt Lake City UT 84111-1004

Glen E. Davies  
Bill Thomas Peters  
Parsons, Davies, Kinghorn & Peters  
185 S. State St. #700  
Salt Lake City UT 84111

Edward A. Hunter  
Stoel Rives  
201 S. Main St. #1100  
Salt Lake City UT 84111

Doug Tingey  
Asst. Attorney General  
Committee of Consumer Services  
160 East 300 South, 5th Floor  
Salt Lake City UT 84111

David F. Crabtree  
Deseret Generation & Transmission Co.  
5295 South 300 West #500  
Murray UT 84107

Roger O. Tew  
60 South 600 East #200  
Salt Lake City UT 84102

Betsy Wolf  
Salt Lake Community Action Program  
764 South 200 West  
Salt Lake City UT 84101

  
Rick Anderson