

## All Source Request for Proposal - 2016 Resource Question and Response Version: December 12, 2011

---

### October 11, 2011

---

**Question 1:** It is stated in the RFP that;

“The Company will not accept proposals where the Bidder retains the option to displace any resource for economic reasons and/or where the Bidder holds the unilateral option to select one or more alternate Point(s) of Delivery. “

If the proposal allows PacifiCorp the unilateral option to displace or change delivery points will that be acceptable?

**Answer to Question 1:** No.

---

**Question 2:** If the Bidder offers an exchange for greater than 5 years with the rights for the exchange to be assignable to PacifiCorp, then will PacifiCorp accept an asset backed exchange under the RFP?

**Answer to Question 2:** No, Resource Alternative 7 in the Draft RFP only allows bids that restructure an existing exchange that must result in incremental capacity.

---

**Question 3:** Can PacifiCorp show the amount of transmission that is expected to be available at the following delivery points without any system upgrades or the amount of transmission that is available in 2016?

**Answer to Question 3:** [Attachment 20](#) provides the cost and incremental transmission capacity associated with the points of delivery. Please refer to [OASIS](#) for any existing transmission.

- Salt Lake Valley
  - ▶ Connected to a major 138 kV or 345 kV substation in the Wasatch Front load area south of the Ben Lomond substation and north of the Camp Williams substation.
- PacifiCorp Sites
  - ▶ Currant Creek
- Mona 345 kV
- Glen Canyon 230 kV
- Nevada/Utah Border:
  - ▶ Gonder-Pavant 230 kV line known as “Gonder 230 kV”
  - ▶ Red Butte – Harry Allen 345 line known as “NUB” or Red Butte 345 kV
- Crystal 500 kV
  - ▶ West of Naughton
  - ▶ Connected to a major 230 kV or 345 kV substation west of Naughton substation to the Utah border.

---

**Question 4:** Will PacifiCorp reconsider moving the minimum capacity proposal to 40 MW Instead of 100 MW?

**Answer to Question 4:** No, unless the eligible resource falls under the exceptions (Resource Alternative 8 in the Draft RFP).

All bid proposals must be for a capacity greater than 100 MW except for:

- (i) QF or Eligible Renewable Resources which must have 10 MW or greater of installed capacity; and
- (ii) end-use customers or an aggregate of the Company's customers with physical load curtailment proposals for a minimum of 25 MW each.

---

### November 28, 2011

---

**Question 5:** Please clarify that on page 8 of the RFP, it shows a total of approx. 20MW of solar, requested by Oregon, through 2015. Is this correct, and does that reflect the total accepted solar for the RFP?

**Answer to Question 5:** No, the All Source RFP is for up to 600MW. This is not a solar RFP however, solar can compete with the other resources.

---

**Question 6:** Also, where is there more information on what constitutes and is acceptable, to be an "Eligible Renewable Resource"?

**Answer to Question 6:** The All Source RFP defines what an Eligible Renewable Resource in Section 8.Resource Alternative Exceptions under Eligible Renewable Resources.

---

### December 12, 2011

---

**Question 7:** Is it possible to deliver power to NOB? If this is not acceptable can you explain why?

**Answer to Question 7:** NOB is not in PacifiCorp balancing authority. If you delivery to this POD then you will need to purchase firm transmission and deliver it to the PacifiCorp balancing authority.

---

**Question 8:** Is it possible to deliver power to from the same resource at multiple delivery points for different periods of time? For instance, can I deliver power at MONA for 5 years and then deliver power to Midpoint in Idaho when the Gateway project is completed?

**Answer to Question 8:** You can deliver power to Mona. Power delivers to a point which is contingent on firm transmission being built will not be accepted.

**Question 9:** It appears that each interconnection must be upgraded for a 600 MW resource. What is the cost for upgrading the interconnections for a 100 MW resource at the following interconnections and/or transmission paths?

- Salt Lake Valley
  - ▶ Connected to a major 138 kV or 345 kV substation in the Wasatch Front load area south of the Ben Lomond substation and north of the Camp Williams substation.
- PacifiCorp Sites
  - ▶ Currant Creek
- Mona 345 kV
- Glen Canyon 230 kV
- Nevada/Utah Border:
  - ▶ Gonder-Pavant 230 kV line known as “Gonder 230 kV”
  - ▶ Red Butte – Harry Allen 345 line known as “NUB” or Red Butte 345 kV
- Crystal 500 kV
  - ▶ West of Naughton
  - ▶ Connected to a major 230 kV or 345 kV substation west of Naughton substation to the Utah border.

**Answer to Question 9:** The cost of the upgrade will be prorated based on the megawatt submitted. This is an estimate of the costs and not an actual cost.

---