

June 3, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Utah Public Service Commission
Heber M. Wells Building, 4th Floor
160 East 300 South
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

Attention: Gary Widerburg
Commission Administrator

RE: **Docket No. 21-999-01**
Miscellaneous Correspondence and Reports Regarding Electric Utility Services; 2021
Comments Regarding CAISO Technical Conference Cancellation

In accordance with the Notice that Confidential Technical Conference is Canceled and Opportunity to Respond to Objections (“Notice”) issued by the Public Service Commission of Utah (“Commission”) on May 19, 2021, in this docket PacifiCorp (the “Company”) respectfully submits these comments concerning the objections to the closed technical conference.

Background of the Technical Conference

On May 4, 2021, the Commission issued a Notice of Requested Technical Conference to discuss “any potential economic or reliability implications to its Utah customers as a result of the rule changes approved by the Board of Directors of the California Independent System Operator on April 21, 2021.” As a result of this request, the Company arranged for Mr. Mike Wilding, its Vice President of Energy Supply Management, to prepare a presentation. Mr. Wilding indicated that the change will not have a direct impact on PacifiCorp because we do not export from CAISO and/or wheel across CAISO, but may affect PacifiCorp as the policies affect the broader market. Because the discussion relates to market trading activity, the Company requested that the technical conference be confidential. Accordingly, on May 11, 2021, the Commission issued a notice of technical conference closed to the public to be held on May 26, 2021. Based on objections to the closed nature of the technical conference, on May 19, 2021, the Commission canceled the technical conference and provided the Company with an opportunity to respond to the objections.

Objections of Western Resource Advocates and Utah Association of Energy Users

Representatives of Western Resource Advocates (“WRA”) and Utah Association of Energy Users (“UAE”) reached out to the Company upon reviewing the notice of the technical conference and requested to participate. The Company prepared a non-disclosure agreement, which both parties signed. Both parties also filed with the Commission stating that they intended to participate. UAE noted that they had signed the Company’s non-disclosure agreement and did not object to a closed technical conference so long as they could participate. WRA also requested to participate, also noting that they would sign the Company’s confidentiality agreement prior to attending the technical conference. PacifiCorp has discussed these comments with WRA and

June 3, 2021

Page 2

UAE who agree that participation with a non-disclosure resolves the concerns they raised with the Commission.

Objection of Stan Holmes

A member of the public, Mr. Stan Holmes, also filed an objection to the technical conference, asking the Commission to make the technical conference open to the public for portions that do not contain proprietary information “so that the public can have knowledge of what CAISO did on April 21, 2021, that might affect Utah.” The Company understands the importance of transparency and of providing relevant information to its Utah customers. However, as described below, it is difficult to divide the presentation under the circumstances of this technical conference. While the Company is willing to allow Mr. Holmes to participate if he signs the Company’s standard non-disclosure agreement, it otherwise requests that the Commission deny his objection.

Confidential Information

In its Notice, the Commission directed the Company to “describe the types of confidential information it intends to present at the technical conference and address whether any portion of the technical conference could be kept open to the public without risk of disclosure of confidential information.” The Commission’s request for information about the effect of the new CAISO rule on the market appears to require some discussion of the Company’s position heading into the summer peak and the performance of our resources, which is highly confidential. Divulging this type of information could significantly impact our ability to transact in the best interest of our customers. While the Company could present information at a high level without divulging confidential information, such a discussion is not likely to provide meaningful new information to the Commission about the effect of the new rule. Therefore, in order to make the technical conference as meaningful as possible, the Company requests that the technical conference remain confidential, but the Company will allow interested parties who sign a non-disclosure agreement to participate. The Company has discussed proceeding this way with WRA and UAE, who have represented that they agree with the Company.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, the Company respectfully requests that the Commission renounce the technical conference as confidential and allow parties who execute the Company’s non-disclosure agreement to participate.

Sincerely,



Joelle Steward
Vice President, Regulation

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Docket No. 21-999-01

I hereby certify that on June 3, 2021, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served by electronic mail to the following:

Stanley Holmes Stholmes3@xmission.com

Utah Office of Consumer Services

Michele Beck mbeck@utah.gov

ocs@utah.gov

Division of Public Utilities

dpudatarequest@utah.gov

Assistant Attorney General

Patricia Schmid pschmid@agutah.gov

Justin Jetter jjetter@agutah.gov

Robert Moore rmoore@agutah.gov

Victor Copeland vcopeland@agutah.gov

Rocky Mountain Power

Data Request Response datarequest@pacificorp.com
Center

Jana Saba jana.saba@pacificorp.com
utahdockets@pacificorp.com

Emily Wegener Emily.wegener@pacificorp.com



Mary Penfield
Adviser Regulatory Operations