



KATHERINE MCDOWELL  
Direct (503) 595-3924  
katherine@mrg-law.com

September 16, 2020

**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

Attention: Filing Center  
Public Utility Commission of Oregon  
P.O. Box 1088  
Salem, Oregon 97308-1088

**Re: UE 374 – In the Matter of PACIFICORP d/b/a PACIFIC POWER’S Request for a General Rate Revision.**

Attention Filing Center:

Attached for filing in the above-referenced docket is PacifiCorp d/b/a Pacific Power’s Errata to the Direct Testimony of Mr. Chad A. Teply (PAC/800, Teply/27), filed February 14, 2020. This errata clarifies the wording on page 27, as shown in redline. The revised portion of Mr. Teply’s testimony was adopted by Mr. James Owen (PAC/2500, Owen/2), filed June 25, 2020.

For convenience, both a red-line and clean version of the corrected page of the errata are enclosed.

Please contact this office with any questions.

Sincerely,

Katherine McDowell

Attachment

**UE 374**

**CLEAN VERSION**

**ERRATA PAGE 27**

**Direct Testimony of Chad A. Teply  
(PAC/800)**

1 State Implementation Plan (SIP) required the installation of the SCR systems on Unit  
2 3 by the end of 2015, and on Unit 4 by the end of 2016.

3 **Q. Did EPA approve the state of Wyoming's Regional Haze SIP compliance**  
4 **requirements for Jim Bridger Units 3-4?**

5 A. Yes. EPA proposed approval of these requirements in its proposed Regional Haze  
6 Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for Wyoming published in the *Federal Register* on  
7 June 4, 2012. EPA subsequently finalized its approval of these requirements in its  
8 updated Regional Haze FIP for Wyoming published in the *Federal Register* on  
9 January 30, 2014. EPA's final approval made these emissions reduction compliance  
10 requirements at Jim Bridger Units 3-4 federally enforceable, in addition to being  
11 enforceable under state law.

12 **Q. How did the Company assess the benefits associated with the Jim Bridger SCR**  
13 **projects described?**

14 A. The Company began its detailed economic assessment of the projects in 2012 to  
15 support its Wyoming CPCN filing (Wyoming SCR CPCN) and its Utah Voluntary  
16 Resource Procurement Decision filings for the projects. The Company used the same  
17 analysis methodology and results to support its 2013 IRP filings and updates across  
18 its service territory states. The proceedings associated with these various filings  
19 provided stakeholders an opportunity for rigorous review of the projects prior to their  
20 implementation in the 2013 through 2016 timeframe, as facilitated by the statutes  
21 available and procedural schedules used by the public utility commissions in each  
22 state. The Company's economic analyses are detailed in the testimony of Mr. Link.

**UE 374**

**REDLINED VERSION**

**ERRATA PAGE 27**

**Direct Testimony of Chad A. Teply  
(PAC/800)**

1 State Implementation Plan (SIP) required the installation of the SCR systems on Unit  
2 3 by the end of 2015, and on Unit 4 by the end of 2016.

3 **Q. Did EPA approve the state of Wyoming's Regional Haze SIP compliance**  
4 **requirements for Jim Bridger Units 3-4?**

5 A. Yes. EPA ~~approved~~ proposed approval of these requirements in its ~~final~~ proposed  
6 Regional Haze Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for Wyoming published in the  
7 *Federal Register* on June 4, 2012. EPA subsequently ~~reiterated~~ finalized its approval  
8 of these requirements in its updated Regional Haze FIP for Wyoming published in the  
9 *Federal Register* on January 30, 2014. EPA's final approval made these emissions  
10 reduction compliance requirements at Jim Bridger Units 3-4 federally enforceable, in  
11 addition to being enforceable under state law.

12 **Q. How did the Company assess the benefits associated with the Jim Bridger SCR**  
13 **projects described?**

14 A. The Company began its detailed economic assessment of the projects in 2012 to  
15 support its Wyoming CPCN filing (Wyoming SCR CPCN) and its Utah Voluntary  
16 Resource Procurement Decision filings for the projects. The Company used the same  
17 analysis methodology and results to support its 2013 IRP filings and updates across  
18 its service territory states. The proceedings associated with these various filings  
19 provided stakeholders an opportunity for rigorous review of the projects prior to their  
20 implementation in the 2013 through 2016 timeframe, as facilitated by the statutes  
21 available and procedural schedules used by the public utility commissions in each  
22 state. The Company's economic analyses are detailed in the testimony of Mr. Link.