



1407 W North Temple, Suite 330
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116

June 11, 2019

Dale W. Cottam
Ronald J. Lopez
Bailey | Stock | Harmon | Cottam | Lopez LLP
80 East 1st Ave. | P.O. Box 850
Afton, WY 83110
dale@performance-law.com (C)
ronnie@performance-law.com (C)(W)
Attorneys for REC

RE: Wyoming Docket 20000-545-ET-18
REC 6th Set Data Request (1-17)

Please find enclosed Rocky Mountain Power's Responses to REC 6th Set Data Requests 6.1-6.17. Also provided are Attachments REC 6.1, 6.4, and 6.6.

If you have any questions, please call me at (307) 632-2677.

Sincerely,

_____/s/_____
Stacy Splittstoesser,
Manager, Regulation

Enclosures

C.c.: Michelle Brandt King/WIEC-VK-TR mbking@hollandhart.com (C)(W)
Abigail Briggerman/WIEC-VK-TR acbriggerman@hollandhart.com (C)
Gina Gargano-Amari/WIEC-VK-TR glgargano-amari@hollandhart.com (W)
Hannah Oakes/WIEC-VK-TR HMOakes@hollandhart.com (W)
Phillip J. Russell/RMCRE prussell@hjdllaw.com (C)
Dale W. Cottam/RMCRE dale@performance-law.com (C)
Ronald J. Lopez/RMCRE ronnie@performance-law.com (W)(C)
Crystal J. McDonough/NLRA crystal@mcdonoughlawllc.com (C)
Christopher Leger/OCA christopher.leger@wyo.gov (C)
Irion Sanger/REC irion@sanger-law.com (C)
Marie Barlow/REC marie@sanger-law.com (C)(W)
John Lowe/REC jravenesanmarcos@yahoo.com

REC Data Request 6.1

Please provide an updated response to RMCRE Data Request 2.19 providing:

- (a) The date of contract execution.
- (b) The resource type.
- (c) The name of the QF.
- (d) The state the QF is located in.

Response to REC Data Request 6.1

To provide context – RMCRE Data Request 2.19 requested a table that contains, by state, for Oregon, Idaho, Utah and Wyoming: for any qualifying facility (QF) that has been classified as being in the queue, beginning in 2010, the date the QF was classified as being in the queue, the kilowatt (kW) capacity of the QF, the expected annual megawatt-hour (MWh) production of the QF; and as applicable, the date of contract execution, the date that energy deliveries to PacifiCorp commenced, the actual kW produced by year, and actual MWh produced. Based on the foregoing context, the Company responds as follows:

Please refer to Attachment REC 6.1, which provides an updated version of the Company's 3rd Revised response to RMCRE Data Request 2.19 for the additional information requested in this REC Data Request 6.1. For those power purchase agreements (PPA) that are shown as yearly renewals, the date of execution is during Q4 of year before the next PPA renewal year. Note: for subpart (a), the date where applicable was provided in column E of Attachment RMCRE 2.19 3rd Revised.

Respondent: Bruce Griswold

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.2

REC Data Request 6.2

For each state that RMP operates in, please provide all evidence regarding whether that state has a policy regarding the time in which a QF can request a COD from contract execution.

Response to REC Data Request 6.2

In each of the states other than Wyoming in which Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) operates, the requested information is provided below:

Idaho – Please refer to Idaho Schedule 38, section I.B.11.a), which states: “The scheduled commercial operation date must not be greater than thirty (30) months after the execution date of the power purchase agreement;”

Utah – Please refer to Utah Schedule 38, section I.B.11.a), which states: “The scheduled commercial operation date must not be greater than thirty (30) months after the execution date of the power purchase agreement;”

Rates and regulation information, include rate schedules for Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) is publicly available and can be accessed by utilizing the following website link:

<https://www.rockymountainpower.net/about/rar.html>

Respondent: Kyle Moore

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.3

REC Data Request 6.3

For each state that RMP operates in, please identify RMP's internal policy regarding its policy regarding the time in which a QF can request a COD from contract execution, and provide all internal documents regarding this policy.

Response to REC Data Request 6.3

In each of the states other than Wyoming in which Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) operates, RMP's policy is the policy as adopted by the Public Service Commission of Utah (UPSC) and the Idaho Public Utilities Commission (Idaho), which states: "The scheduled commercial operation date must not be greater than thirty (30) months after the execution date of the power purchase agreement;"

Respondent: Kyle Moore

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.4

REC Data Request 6.4

Please identify the contract length in all of RMP's non-QF PPAs.

Response to REC Data Request 6.4

Contract lengths are 20 years or 25 years for purchases from non-qualifying facility (QF) resources with the exception of three vintage wholesale agreements with other utilities. Please refer to Attachment REC 6.4.

Respondent: Bruce Griswold

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.5

REC Data Request 6.5

Please identify the date of PPA execution and the date of scheduled COD in all of RMP's non-QF PPAs.

Response to REC Data Request 6.5

Please refer to the Company's response to REC Data Request 6.4.

Respondent: Bruce Griswold

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.6

REC Data Request 6.6

Please refer to the Rebuttal Testimony of Daniel MacNeil at page 55: “Contract negotiation typically is longer than this, even for small projects which do not take choose to negotiate changes to the standard contract terms”. Please identify the contract negotiation length for Schedule 37 and 38 for all of RMP’s QF PPAs since 2000. If Mr. MacNeil’s statement is based on QF PPAs prior to 2000, please provide the same information for those QFs prior to 2000 as well.

Response to REC Data Request 6.6

Please refer to Attachment REC 6.6.

Respondent: Bruce Griswold

Witness: Dan MacNeil

REC Data Request 6.7

Please refer to the Rebuttal Testimony of Mark Tourangeau at pages 11-12, and 18-19. Please identify all PacifiCorp requests for approval that were approved or acknowledged by a state utility commission, and whether the RFP resulted in no resource acquisition, a utility owned resource acquisition and/or a PPA.

Response to REC Data Request 6.7

The Company objects to this data request on the grounds that it is overly broad and unduly burdensome, additionally the question refers to “requests for approval” and it is not clear to the Company what that term means. Assuming “requests for approval” is intended to mean “request for proposals” the question is not time bounded and would require the Company to produce information throughout its long history. Notwithstanding the foregoing objections, the Company responds as follows:

Please refer to the table below which lists commission approved request for proposals (RFP) since 2000, together with the results of the RFP:

Request for Proposals (RFP)	Results
2003-A RFP	Utility Owned Resource
2003B RFP	Power Purchase Agreement (PPA)
2003B RFP Amended	Utility Owned Resource
RFP 2012 (Issued 2006)	No Resource Acquired
2008R RFP	PPA
2008R-1 RFP	PPA
2009 All Source RFP	Utility Owned Resource
2009R RFP	Utility Owned Resource
2017R RFP	Utility Owned Resource and PPA

Respondent: Bruce Griswold

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.8

REC Data Request 6.8

For each non-QF PPA (other than front office transactions) that RMP has entered into since 2000, please identify the contract term.

Response to REC Data Request 6.8

Please refer to the Company's response to REC Data Request 6.4.

Respondent: Bruce Griswold

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.9

REC Data Request 6.9

Referring to MacNeil Rebuttal Testimony/Page 6, lines 17-23, would the QF on Schedule 37 in excess of 100 kW have the option on pricing to wait until the Commission orders new pricing for Schedule 37 in response to RMP's filing updated Schedule 37 prices?

Response to REC Data Request 6.9

Yes. Qualifying facilities (QF) always have the option not to enter a power purchase agreement (PPA).

Respondent: Dan MacNeil

Witness: Dan MacNeil

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.10

REC Data Request 6.10

Referring to MacNeil Rebuttal Testimony/Page 37, lines 7-18, is it RMP's contention that the 75 percent figure of QFs with executed contracts but not commercial operation dates are comprised solely of the RMP identified 7 QF contracts? Please explain.

Response to REC Data Request 6.10

No. The specific list of qualifying facilities (QF) with executed power purchase agreements (PPA) that have not reached commercial operation will necessarily vary over time. The Company contends that the specific circumstance of each QF with an executed PPA that has not reached commercial operation produces a more accurate avoided cost than the proposal made by Dr. Hellman / Dr. Kaufman, representing the Renewable Energy Coalition (REC). In support of this position, the Company identified that seven referenced QF PPAs used to justify the position of Dr. Hellman / Dr. Kaufman are already excluded from the determination of avoided costs.

Respondent: Dan MacNeil

Witness: Dan MacNeil

REC Data Request 6.11

Referring to MacNeil Rebuttal Testimony/Page 38, beginning at line 1, why would the company be required to add resources? Please explain. How many MW would PacifiCorp believe it would be required to add with RMP assumptions consistent with this docket including the 75 percent factor?

Response to REC Data Request 6.11

The Company's avoided cost modeling already includes zero megawatts (MW) from the seven referenced signed qualifying facility (QF) power purchase agreements (PPA) that have not reached commercial operation based on the specific circumstances of those resources. If a blanket assumption that 75 percent of these resources should be assumed to reach commercial operation, a portion of these resources would need to be added to the avoided cost modeling. The seven resources total 556 MW nameplate capacity, and those PPAs that have not yet been terminated total 396 MW. 75 percent of 396 MW is approximately 297 MW of resources that are not present in the current avoided cost modeling.

Respondent: Dan MacNeil

Witness: Dan MacNeil

REC Data Request 6.12

Referring to Tourangeau Rebuttal Testimony/Page7, beginning at line 9, is RMP saying that they have no option to revise its pricing to QFs so as to include a fixed, per kW payment, along with a near zero per kWh payment equal to the variable cost of operating a wind or solar resource such that dispatch is made on an economic resource variable cost basis? From an economic dispatch total resource cost standpoint, meaning looking at the economic resource cost of the resource itself, why should a thermal unit costing \$18/MWh operate when a wind resource is able to operate with lower variable costs?

Response to REC Data Request 6.12

No. The Company and qualifying facilities (QF) have the option to negotiate mutually agreeable contract terms.

In the referenced example, if a thermal unit is dispatched down to accommodate QF generation, that resource loses the opportunity to economically dispatch down in response to energy imbalance market (EIM) signals. In either case, the thermal resource would have been dispatched down. The distinction is that the QF avoided cost can be overstated to the extent it reflects the variable cost of the thermal resource, and does not account for the lower cost energy available as a result of EIM redispatch of that thermal resource.

Respondent: Dan MacNeil

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.13

REC Data Request 6.13

Referring to Tourangeau Rebuttal Testimony/Page13, beginning at line 7, for projects coming on-line in the years 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022, provide the Production Tax Credit that was or projected to be available to RMP. Are the Production Tax Credits available based on on-line date or beginning construction date? Please explain.

Response to REC Data Request 6.13

The project referred to in the Rebuttal Testimony of Company witness, Mark P. Tourangeau, page 13, line 7, Cedar Springs III, is selling the output from the wind project to Rocky Mountain Power (RMP) under a power purchase agreement (PPA). The owners of Cedar Springs III retain the production tax credits (PTC) for their own use and are not made available to RMP. PTCs become available based on the commercial operation of the wind turbine at the on-line date in accordance with Internal Revenue Service (IRS) requirements.

Respondent: Bruce Griswold

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.14

REC Data Request 6.14

Referring to Tourangeau Rebuttal Testimony/Page13 beginning at line 15, please provide the work papers for the calculation of the \$38 to \$84 million net present value benefit. Identify to what extent the benefit arises out of the Production Tax Credit?

Response to REC Data Request 6.14

The Company objects to this data request on the grounds that the information requested includes commercially sensitive and trade-secret third-party proprietary information that is subject to contractual confidentiality requirements. Exposing pricing and other details of the Cedar Springs III PPA risks exposing competitively sensitive and trade secret data to other competing developers, some of whom make up REC's membership. Moreover, the Company could be exposed to legal liability for producing information to the level of detail requested by REC. Without waiving the foregoing objection the Company responds as follows:

Because the Company is only purchasing the output from this resource, under the terms of its power purchase agreement (PPA) the PTCs are retained by the project.

Respondent: Mark Tourangeau

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

20000-545-ET-18 / Rocky Mountain Power

June 11, 2019

REC Data Request 6.15

REC Data Request 6.15

Referring to Tourangeau Rebuttal Testimony/Page19 beginning at line 16, please identify which examples discuss projects built in Wyoming?

Response to REC Data Request 6.15

The Rebuttal Testimony of Company witness, Mark P. Tourangeau, specifically page 19, line 16 through the end of the page does not refer to any specific project built in Wyoming. However, comparing the avoided cost pricing for both the Sweetwater Solar and the Sage Solar I / Sage Solar II / Sage Solar III projects with the pricing results of the Company's 2017 Renewable Request for Proposals (2017R RFP) – under which no resource was acquired due to prices being too high – does demonstrate an avoided cost rate that is above competitive market pricing which has allowed for economic rent extraction by qualifying facilities (QF).

Respondent: Kyle Moore

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

REC Data Request 6.16

Referring to Tourangeau Rebuttal Testimony/Page27 beginning at line 18, what are the various reasons RMP is aware of why a QF with a executed agreement my not reach a COD?

Response to REC Data Request 6.16

There are multiple reasons a qualifying facility (QF) with an executed power purchase agreement (PPA) may not reach commercial operation including, but not limited to:

- Adverse ruling by government agency in securing permits;
- Site control not finalized;
- Financing arrangements not secured;
- Loss of project incentives (i.e., tax credits expiration or change of law, incentive program terminated, etc.);
- Unbudgeted project costs incurred (i.e., tariffs assessed on specific equipment, increased installation costs due to site conditions, etc.);
- Project schedule delays (i.e., permits, weather, equipment delay, site remediation issue, interconnection schedule revised, etc.);
- Miscellaneous (i.e., litigation, bankruptcy, etc.).

Respondent: Bruce Griswold

Witness: Mark Tourangeau

REC Data Request 6.17

Please refer to the Rebuttal Testimony of Mark Tourangeau at pages 26-27: “In my 10 plus years of experience in the utility scale renewables markets, it is extremely rare for a site to require more than two years to achieve COD from the time of PPA execution, unless there were specifically negotiated reasons for the longer time frame”. Please identify:

- (a) Each of the PPAs that Mr. Tourangeau is referring to,
- (b) The contract execution date,
- (c) The contracted COD,
- (d) Whether the PPA was a QF or non-QF PPA, and
- (e) The actual COD.

Response to REC Data Request 6.17

The Company objects to this data request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome, the Company further objects on the grounds that the information is not in the Company’s possession custody or control. Mr. Tourangeau has more than 10 years of experience working with utility scale renewable generation and this request is overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it would require Mr. Tourangeau to specifically identify the many renewable projects he has worked on for the past decade based on his general statement of experience. Mr. Tourangeau spent much of the past decade working for other companies, and to the extent this data request seeks information about projects relating to those companies the information is not in the Company’s possession, custody or control, and is likely proprietary to those other companies. Without waiving the foregoing objections the Company responds as follows:

Mr. Tourangeau was referring to his general experience with utility scale renewable development, much of it gained during his time working for NextEra Energy, and was not referring to specific projects. Most of the projects Mr. Tourangeau managed were completed within two years from power purchase agreement (PPA) execution.

Respondent: Counsel

Witness: Mark Tourangeau