

2015	CRES 2015 CO PUC Proceedings Tracker
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>15A-0089E Black Hills Energy Application for Refund of RS-3 (net metered) customers (2/10/15)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement:</b>	None, no intervenors.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	On February 10, 2015, Black Hills/Colorado Electric Utility Company, LP (Black Hills or the Company) filed an Application for a Commission decision approving a refund for retail customers who are billed under Rate Schedule RS-3 beginning on and after August 1, 2013. Rate Schedule RS-3 is applicable to residential net-metered customers with on-site solar photovoltaic (PV) systems. While Black Hills believes the compliance tariffs complied with Decision No. C13-0794, in recognition of a potential deficiency in the original customer notice with respect to rate RS-3, Black Hills has filed Advice Letter No. 695 to amend the rate charged customers under rate RS-3 to be equal to the rate charged residential customers under rate schedule RS-1. Consistent with this change, Black Hills is applying to refund certain monies collected through rate RS-3 to cure any alleged deficiencies associated with the original advice letter filing. Specifically, the Company is seeking approval to refund rate RS-3 customers the full difference in bills which results from the application of RS-3 and RS-1 rates since August 1, 2013, the effective date of rate RS-3. The Energy Charge under both RS-3 and RS-1 is the same. However, through application of the fixed Customer Charge, the rate difference between RS-3 and RS-1 is \$5.00 per customer, per month. Rate RS-3 Customer Charge is \$21.50 per month. Rate Schedule RS-1 Customer Charge is \$16.50 per month, or \$5.00 lower. The Company will apply compounded interest, at its currently-effective deposit rate of 0.34% per annum, to the refund amount issued to rate RS-3 customers. Through the filing of Advice Letter No. 695 concurrently with this Application, the Customer Charge for RS-3 and RS-1 will become identical.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Dec C15-0424 on May 5th, 2015 Grants approval of proposed refund explained above. **in a related Commissioner's Weekly Meeting, the Commissioners decided not to proceed with the PUC Staff's recommended show cause proceeding that may have levied certain fines and penalties against Black Hills for their actions. BHE claimed in this Application that they inadvertently left out the RS-3 tariff from the Phase II Compliance Tariffs.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	
<b>CRES Involvement:</b>	
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	
<b>2014</b>	<b>CRES 2014 CO PUC Proceedings Tracker</b>
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14V-0188E - PSCo Petition for Variance on RES Compliance filing dates (2/28/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None, only TASC and PSCo involved
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	PSCo is required to file its 2015-2017 RES Compliance Plan on or before March 14th, 2014 as required by Dec. No. C13-0275 in Proceeding No. 13V-008E. In this petition, PSCo is asking for two changes: 1) a waiver of the deadline from March 14th to 60 days after the 2014 RES Compliance Plan is complete (sometime this summer, most likely - 13A-0836E), and to separate the 2015-2017 RES Compliance Plan to a 2015 Plan and a 2016-17 Plan.
<b>Updates:</b>	3/7/14 The Alliance for Solar Choice ("TASC") filed to intervene and opposes PSCo's petition because TASC argues that separating the RES Plan adds more stops and starts and increases instability and harms the Colorado Solar industry in PSCo's territory.
<b>Updates:</b>	* 3/12/14 Dec. no. C14-0278 grants TASC petition to intervene as well as allowing PSCo to file its 2015-17 RES Plan 60 days after final decision in current (2014) RES plan, and orders a status conference on whether or not to split the 2015 plan from 2016 and 17 sometime before the final decision in 13A-0836E (2014 RES Plan).
<b>Updates:</b>	

<b>Final Decision</b>	July 1st - Decision No. C14-0729 approves settlement between psc and tasc to have PSCo file its next RES Compliance plan for the years 2015 and 2016 within 60 days after the final decision in the 2014 RES Plan (13A-0836E), and 2017 and beyond RES plan will be considered when PSCo files next ERP - by Oct 31, 2015. **Look to final decision from 2014 RES Compliance - eliminates need for 2015-16 RES Compliance.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14M-0235E - Net Metering Informational docket (03/18/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None as of today, but could make an appearance or give statement at April 9th Meeting, and/or written comments after meeting.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Miscellaneous docket initiated to consider net metering issues by a separate, future decision. Commission will use the April 9th meeting and any written responses after the meeting to figure out how to proceed with a net metering plan for the PUC/Colorado * The Commission decided to have at least three panel discussions and some legal briefs (due July 31) - 1st panel on July 24 - Costs, 2nd Oct 1st -Benefits and 3rd Dec 1 - examples from other states - NV, AZ, MN.
<b>Updates:</b>	* 4/9/14 Commission heard a series of formal presentations (all material avail on PUC E-File system) from PSCo, the joint solar parties (represented by Rick Gilliam and Kevin Fox), the Colorado Energy Office (Jeff Ackermann), the Staff of the Commission (Gene Camp), Western Resource Advocates, Leslie Glustrom and Karey Crist-Janer * PSCo wants an adjudicatory process at the PUC after workshops to decide NM fate; Solar industry wants series of workshops leading to NM study w/ IE. Comments on presentations; future decision for Workshop, Study, Rule Making, or company Application (Adjudication) due April 29th.
<b>Updates:</b>	* Jun 9, 2014 Dec. No. C14-0615 Requests Legal Briefs on NM and sets up 3 panels on NM (Costs, Benefits, other States) ** 1st Panel held July 24 before all 3 Commissioners with Alice Jackson for PSCo, Tom Beach and TJ Slocum for on-site solar, and Kent Singer for CREA to give presentations, along with written responses to PUC questions on Costs of net metering - much agreement on topic. Briefs on other legal questions due July 31st. ** 2nd Panel held Oct. 1st topic was Benefits - Many factors go into calculation. Solar industry wants independent evaluation of the many benefits. PSCo says DG solar puts strain on system and some areas.
<b>Updates:</b>	already under strain and may need upgrades. Question of analyzing all net metered states (under, equal and over production (compared to household use) vs just net energy exports from pv system. *** Panel 3 on Dec. 1st. Other states' experience: NV, AZ, and MN one commissioner each. AZ - recent proceeding ended up with \$.70/kWh for new solar (\$5-7 per mo). NV still trying to get solar going - 250 MW via lottery and 500 to 1000% oversubscribed. MN had Value of Solar Tariff. Also heard from Dan Arvizu (NREL Director). 4th Panel to be held April 23rd covering residential onsite storage and PV systems, distribution grid improvements, effects of solar system size and panel orientation, grid parity, and minimum monthly bill for net metered customers (with onsite solar).
<b>Final Decision</b>	4th Panel on April 23, 2015 covering Storage on the PSCo system, Distribution system design and ancillary benefits; System sizing and panel orientation; and minimum bill - currently a facilities and maintenance min bill of \$7.86 for avg Residential customer (includes RESA charge), PSCo proposed \$35.03 min bill, Solar groups proposed \$13.63 min bill. (Final comments due May 22nd, 2015)
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14A-0302E/0301E Xcel Application for approval of a Solar*Connect Program (04/03/2014)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None so far. * Deadline to intervene is May 7th. * The Alliance for Solar Choice (TASC); City of Boulder (Boulder); Colorado Solar Energy Industries Association (CoSEIA); Colorado Independent Energy Association (CIEA); NextEra Energy Resources, LLC (NextEra); Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA); Sunshare, LLC (Sunshare); and Western Resource Advocates (WRA), Interwest Energy Alliance, and OCC, and PUC Staff.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	To offer a voluntary program to customers to pay a charge to offset a certain percentage of their typical energy usage with solar energy from a large scale solar project, and receive a credit set by Xcel. Company will purchase 50 MW blocks of solar through competitive bids and customers can offset some or all of their annual energy use by purchasing a subscription for a year or more at prices and terms set forth on the Company's web site. Pay a charge and receive a credit that changes quarterly and is set by Xcel.
<b>Updates:</b>	Waiting for initial decision discussing petitions to intervene and setting Pre-hearing conference or schedule * Jun 9 Dec. No. C14-0616 (1) Set app for hearing en banc; (2) Granted all interventions; (3) Consolidated proceedings (4) Denying motion for expedited order on RFP, and 5) ordered supplemental direct testimony from PSCo. * Scheduled for hearings in early Nov. * 7/30/14 - currently in discovery/answer testimony phase
<b>Updates:</b>	Answer Testimony filed Sept 29th and Staff Filed Motion to Dismiss. Commission is still going to allow hearing before addressing Motion to Dismiss. Rebuttal and Cross-Answer Testimony Filed Oct. 3. Staff filed Motion to Strike, or in alternative to re-notice application due to rebuttal testimony of PSCo offering substantially new program.
<b>Updates:</b>	*Hearing held Nov. 3-5 and Statements of Position Filed Nov. 19th. Commission Deliberation Meeting Dec. 8 denied entire application - No parties approved of program - too many flaws; anti-competitive and other reasons. Epel would like to see program in ERP.

<b>Final Decision</b>	Dec. 16, final Decision denying both applications for Solar*Connect and rendering the Motion to Dismiss moot.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14A-0365E BHE App for approval of reallocation of Solar Capacity (04/21/2014)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None. No intervenors and application granted.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	To Reallocate unused solar capacity from Medium categories not being used, to small and medium categories that are closed. BHE Applied and was granted an order allowing it to move the 120 kW of solar capacity in Medium Tier 2 (30 - 60 kW) that has had no applications at all, and move it to the Small Category (less than 10 kW) that had only 2.25 kW left, and to the Tier 1 Med category (10 kW-30 kW) that had only 2.59 kW left
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	See Summary, but Dec. No. C14-0527 grants BHE application for moving unused capacity 120 kW to small and lower medium tiers.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14AL-0393E Black Hills Energy Phase I Rate Case (4/30/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - Intervenor list:CO PUC, OCC, The Board of Waterworks of Pueblo, Colorado and the Fountain Valley Authority, Holcim (U.S.) Inc., and Western Resource Advocates; City of Pueblo withdrew and became amicus status.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Black Hill Energy seeks to implement a revised General Rate Schedule Adjustment (GRSA) of 5.051 percent to be applied to all base rate components under all schedules. The Company further seeks to add a Clean Air Clean Jobs (CACJA) Adjustment clause to provide for cost recovery, beginning January 1, 2015, associated with the construction work in progress for its new LM6000 generating unit approved by the Commission by Decision No. C14-0007 in Proceeding No. 13A-0445E issued January 6, 2014. BHE also seeks to revise the energy and demand components of the base rates under all schedules to roll in the costs currently being recovered under the Transmission Cost Adjustment and the Purchased Capacity Cost Adjustment, which will be offset through a corresponding change to remove the costs from recovery under these current adjustments upon the effective date of the accompanying tariff pages.
<b>Updates:</b>	Corrected testimony was filed by BHE on June 27th. * July 28, 2014 OCC and PUC Staff file Answer Testimony. The Commission held two Public Comment Hearings, one on Sept. 4th and one on the 11th. Numerous customers commented and complained about the high rates and punitive reconnect charges, etc.
<b>Updates:</b>	Hearings held September 23-25. Statements of Position filed Oct. 10th. Waiting for initial decision. * Oct. 28th initial decision, R14-1298 rejecting PSCo revised tariffs and requiring new ones. * Exceptions filed Nov. 17, responses Nov. 24, and Dec. 18th a technical conference was called to give BHE and other parties a chance to work out revised tariffs based on updated info filed Dec. 16th.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Dec. 22. Dec. No. C14-1504 addresses exceptions and approves increase in BHE Base Rates of \$3 mil (GRSA of 1.965% vs the 5.051% initially asked for by BHE). Also reaffirms ALJ dec to approve ROE of 9.83% and WACC 7.55%. CACJA rider will recover \$1.73 mil in 15 and \$4.78 in 16. Next Rate Case no later than Dec 27, 2016. No RRR filed.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14R-0394EG Data Access and Privacy Rules for Electric and Gas Utilities (5/1/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	none - City of Boulder, Denver, PSCo, WRA, SWEEP, Boulder County, BHE, OCC, CNG, Arvada, Durango Mt. Utilities, Energy Outreach Colorado, Gas Producers, EIA, NRDC, Westminster, Aurora, and others all filed comments or reply to comments.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	The Colorado Public Utilities Commission issues this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NOPR) to amend its rules governing access and privacy of customer information in the possession of utilities to make its rules more effective and efficient. We propose revisions to Rules 3026 through 3031, referred to as the "Data Privacy Rules," in the Commission's Rules Regulating Electric Utilities, 4 Code of Colorado Regulations (CCR) 723-3 (Electric Rules), to simplify processes and provide clarification. In addition, we propose to amend the Commission's Rules Regulating Gas Utilities and Pipeline Operators, 4 CCR 723-4 (Gas Rules), to introduce similar data access and privacy rules for gas utilities. Many changes proposed including changing many definitions, and removing the \$1000 fine for disclosure of customer data, and changes to the Electric Rules - 3026(d), in which electronic access to customer usage data is made available without charge as part of "basic utility service."
<b>Updates:</b>	May 6, 2014 PUC issues Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NOPR) in Dec No C14-0461. Hearings held on 7/1/2014; 9/30/2014; 11/18/2014; and 2/18/2015. Many rounds of comments by many parties about the proposed changes. Decision Nos. R14-1001-I, R15-0073-I, and R15-0102-I solicited further comment on proposed changes to the rules utilizing redlined changes to prior versions, based upon comments at that point of the proceeding (Hearing Exhibits 2, 7, and 8 respectively)

<b>Updates:</b>	** May 1, 2015 Dec No R15-0406 orders that the Rules Regulating Electric and Gas Utilities contained in the attachments to the order are to be adopted, and on or before Oct 1, 2015, all electric utilities must file an appropriate application or advice letter addressing whether and how their respective customers may access and/or share his or her own customer data, both raw and utility maintained, in a consumer-friendly and computer-friendly way. **Any exceptions to this decision are due on May 21st, 2015.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14A-0414E PSCO App for Approval of Interim Restart of Solar*Rewards (5/5/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None- Settling parties = PSCO, SEIA, and COSEIA; the OCC intervened.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application for approval of a stipulation and agreement reached by the Company, the Solar Energy Industry Association (SEIA), and the Colorado Solar Energy Industry Association (COSEIA). The stipulation and agreement concerns the reopening of the Medium Solar*Rewards Program and the extension of the Small Solar*Rewards Program for the acquisition of on-site solar resources pending the issuance and implementation of the Commission's final decision on Public Service's 2014 Renewable Energy Standard (RES) Compliance Plan in Proceeding No. 13A-0836E. Up to 20 MW total in small category (up to 4 MW/mo - 3c/kW for Cust. Owned and 1c Third Party.) and 7 total MW in medium (6MW at 6c/kW and 1 MW at 5 c).
<b>Updates:</b>	The Office of Consumer Counsel Intervened by Right to question whether the interim rate in small program of up to 4 MW/mo and the 7 MW total capacity for the medium program at the proposed incentive levels are "just and reasonable" and "in the public interest." If the OCC is granted a hearing in this proceeding, it will effectively quash the Application because there will not be time to implement the agreement before the final decision in the 2014 RES Plan.
<b>Updates:</b>	** Motion to extend 2014 Solar Stipulation filed October 15. All 20 MW of the Small Program have been used, and all 7 of the Medium as well. The extension is for another 4 MW/mo for the Small Program only to tide the Industry over until the final decision in the current RES Compliance docket (13A-0836E). All capacity used would be taken out of the total capacity for the final 2014 RES Plan
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	June 25 Dec. No. C14-0701 Approves settlement - starts up Medium (7MW) and small (4MW/mo up to 20 total) until final decision in 2014 RES Plan ** Medium Program capacity fully reserved in less than a week after opening. **All 20 MW were reserved at 4/mo**
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14A-0535E BHE App for Approval of 2015-2017 RES Compliance Plan; w/ 0534E ECA/RESA adj. (5/23/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - other groups involved: The OCC, Staff, WRA, CEO, CIEA-Colorado Independent Energy Association
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	BHE is seeking approval of their 2015-17 RES Compliance Plan, and this proceeding is Consolidated with 14A-0534E - BHE App for approval of adjustments to its ECA and RESA fund (moving money from RESA to ECA which would reduce RESA charges and add more to ECA, thus potentially allowing for more renewable energy on the BHE system. BHE will not meet the overall goal of 20% for the 2015-17, but since it is charging the full 2% toward the RESA, BHE is exempt from meeting the standard, but BHE may still acquire more eligible energy resources depending on the RFPs in the last ERP
<b>Updates:</b>	A Prehearing Conference is scheduled Aug 12 to go over a number of issues and put together a schedule. ** Oct. 16 Answer Testimony and Exhibits filed by Staff and OCC; none from WRA, CIEA, or CEO. ** Hearings scheduled April 21 - 23rd 2015 to coordinate with Phase II deliberations from the 2013 ERP 13A-0445E
<b>Updates:</b>	**After separation of 14A-0534E (ECA/RESA realignment), new procedural schedule, and above hearings vacated for RES Compliance Plan. New schedule: per R15-0459-I (May 13, 2015) is Revised RES Plan and direct testimony due June 5, Answer Testimony due July 14, rebuttal/cross Aug 14, Hearing on Sept 9-10, and SOP due Sept 25.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	14A-0534E April 9, 2015 Dec. No C15-0317 Grants unopposed motion to Approve Settlement to allow BHE to recover \$5.5 mil through ECA over next two years and credit 3.8 million to the RESA account, which results in a reduction of the deferred account balance deficit (went down from \$9 mil in Feb to only \$5 million deficit in March).
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14AL-0660E PSCO Advice Letter No 1672 to revise CO-PUC No. 7 Electric tariff (Rate Case) (6/17/14)</b>

<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None. Deadline to intervene is August 11. Many intervenors including: Staff, OCC, Climax, Clean Energy Action, WRA,TASC, SWEEP, Kroger, Colo Health Care Electric Coord Counsel, Federal Executive Agency, Energy Outreach Colorado, Colorado Energy Consumers Group, CF&I-Evraz, and Wal-Mart
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	June 17, 2014, Public Service Company of Colorado (Public Service or Company) filed Advice Letter No. 1672 with supporting testimony and exhibits. The proposed effective date of the tariffs filed with Advice Letter No. 1672 (Attachment A) is July 18, 2014. Public Service seeks to increase its base rates revenues by \$157.6 million. As part of that increase, \$19.9 million in costs presently recovered in its Transmission Cost Adjustment rider would be shifted to base rates, resulting in a net revenue increase of \$137.7 million. The Company asserts the proposed increase in revenues will allow it to recover the costs of plant investment and related expenses such as property taxes and depreciation. Public Service anticipates that approximately \$2 billion in new capital investments will go into service during the period January 1, 2014 through December 31, 2015. Further, the Company has calculated its revenue requirement based on a proposed return on equity of 10.35 percent, which results in an overall rate of return of 7.86 percent.
<b>Updates:</b>	Answe Testimony due Nov. 7th, Public Hearing on Nov. 20th from 5-7pm at PUC, CAT/Rebuttal Due Dec. 17th, final PHC Jan 21st, and Hearing scheduled for Jan 26-30 and Feb 2-4. Chariman Epel asked for briefs from parties on questions regarding decoupling and DSM. ** Nov. 5, Dec. No. C14-1331-I Dismissed Decoupling from Proceeding and required issue stricken from direct testimony. ** Nov 7th Answer Testimony filed, and Dec. 17th Cross-answer and Rebuttal filed.
<b>Updates:</b>	**Jan 23, Settlement agreement with many attachments filed along with motion to approve and to vacate hearing schedule, and new hearing on Settlement set for Feb. 13, 2015.
<b>Final Decision</b>	March, 31, 2015 Dec No. C15-0292 grants motion to approve settlement, and application to decommission Arapahoe gen station (0680E - PSCo needs to file an application for approval of depreciation and amortization rates for retired facilities no later than April 1, 2016, and to file in 2017 another electric base rate proceeding for rates starting Jan 1, 2018), and establishes rates. Key provisions of settlement: Resulting GSRA is down 2.88% to 14.19%; company will propose no new riders before 2017 rate case; CACJA Rider approved for the eligible CACJA projects including: the new natural gas combined cycle plant at Cherokee station, including interconnection equipment; the selective catalytic reduction (SCR) and particulate scrubber at Pawnee; and the SCR equipment at Hayden (Collecting approx \$97 mil in 2015, \$114.7 in 2016, and 111.5 in 2017 allocated to rate classes based on last Phase II Rate Case in 2009 - 09AL-299E); WACC to go from 8.08% to 7.55%; Cap structure same = 56% equity to 44% debt (w PSCo attempting to reduce equity component by next rate case); Cost of Debt down from 5.63% to 4.67%; ROE set at 9.83% down from the 10.25% proposed in rebuttal.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14A-0818E PSCo Application for approval of ECA costs (8/1/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None. Only the Office of Consumer Counsel was and Leslie Glustrom motioned to intervene and Leslie's Motion was denied. Ruling on Glustrom Exception to denial is pending.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	For PSCo to gain PUC approval for the expenses incurred from Jan 13- Dec 13 in the Electric Commodity Adjustment. Application seeking Commission approval of the fuel, purchased energy and purchased wheeling expense incurred from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013, that have been reflected in the Company's Electric Commodity Adjustment ("ECA"). Furthermore, Public Service seeks approval of the Company's calculation of the 2013 short-term sales margins that have been used to adjust the 2014 Electric Commodity Adjustment deferred balance.
<b>Updates:</b>	OCC's three initial issues: a. The allocation of renewable energy costs between the Renewable Energy Standard Adjustment (ÖRESAÖ) account and the ECA. b. The reasonableness of the proportion of coal obtained through long-term contracts rather than coal obtained through the spot market. c. The apparent failure to use Powder River Basin (ÖPRBÖ) coal or a blend of PRB coal with Colorado coal for some power plants
<b>Updates:</b>	Schedule: AT - Oct 30, RT - Nov 25; PHC Dec 19; Hearing Jan 7-8; SOP Jan 23 ** Oct 29th OCC withdraws intervention and request for hearing. Nov. 14, R14-1370 Grants withdrawal of OCC and vacates hearing. ** Dec 2nd Glustrom files Exceptions to R14-1370 stating approval of ECA immature and Commission needs to examine Xcel's almost 1 billion in costs passed through before determining they are "Just & reasonable" ** Dec. C14-1418 Stays R14-1370.
<b>Updates:</b>	Cont- Dec. stayed until Commission determines Glustrom standing and whether or not to grant hearing in docket. ** Still waiting to find out status of Glustrom Exceptions to intervention decision and then her Exceptions to R14-1370.

<b>Final Decision</b>	C15-0174 issued Feb 23, 2015 Denies Glustrom RRR of C15-0038 of Jan 13, 2015, which Denied Glustrom's Exceptions and adopted recommended decision (R14-1370) to approve the Application finding that the exhibits attached to the direct testimony of Public Service's witnesses comport with the filing requirements and contain all necessary data in which to determine whether to approve the expenses incurred during 2013 that were recovered through the ECA. In addition, Public Service provided the necessary data in order to consider approval of its short-term sales margins for 2013 that have been used to adjust the 2014 Electric Commodity Adjustment deferred balance. In her RRR, filed February 2, 2015, Ms. Glustrom argues that by denying her request for permissive intervention, the Commission violated her constitutional due process rights and Colorado law. She also argues that her interests were not adequately represented by the OCC. According to Dec No C15-0174, Ms. Glustrom raises no new arguments, facts, or law relevant to the Commission's discretion to deny intervention to parties that are not permitted to intervene as of right under § 40-6-109(1), C.R.S.; Rule 1401 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure, 4 Code of Colorado Regulations 723-1. Because we addressed these arguments in our previous decision,2 we deny her RRR.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14A-0923E BHE DG Interim Solar Plan (9/9/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None. Deadline for intervention was the 17th of October. Only OCC has intervened.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	To Approve an interim On-site and CSG programs for Black Hills Energy until final decision in the 2015-17 RES Compliance plan (14A-0535E). BHE wants to implement an interim solar program but change incentive levels to that proposed in the 2015-17 RES plan (.05c/kWh for .5-30kW and .075 for 30-100 kW, OCC intervened and asks for .02 and .06 instead. PUC asked for testimony from BHE supporting their plan by Oct. 31.
<b>Updates:</b>	Nov. 18. Dec. No. C14-1383 Grants interim Solar plan for BHE. BHE conferred with all parties in RES Compliance docket 14A-0535E, Staff, CEO, and WRA do not oppose, CIEA no position, and only OCC intervened to object to REC and overall cost of interim plan.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Dec. No. C14-1383 Grants interim Plan for Solar Program as follows: Decision sides with BHE and grants application for Small (0.5-10kW) 460kW @ \$0.05 (capped at 5kW) and Med 1 (10-30kW) 345kW @\$0.05; Med 2 (30-60kW) 245 kW @ \$0.075, and Med 3 (60-100kW) 100kW @ \$0.075/kWh
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14A-1057EG PSCo 2015/16 DSM Electric and Gas Plan (10/30/14)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - Colorado Energy Consumers, City of Boulder, Energy Outreach Colorado, CMC/CF&I Steel, SWEEP, EnerNOC, EEBC, WRA, OCC, Staff, CEO, Joint Cities Aurora + 12 others intervened.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Public Service seeks Commission approval of several items set forth in its 2015 through 2016 DSM Plan. For example, the Company seeks approval of its proposed electric and gas demand reduction goals for 2015 and 2016 and its proposed electric and gas budgets for calendar years 2015 and 2016. Public Service proposes to achieve 407.3 GWh in energy savings and 79.7 MW of demand reduction in 2015 from its electric efficiency programs, and 408.6 GWh in energy savings and 76.2 MW in demand reduction in 2016. Public Service expects to spend \$81.6 million in 2015 and \$78.7 million in 2016 on electric efficiency programs. The Gas DSM portfolio is designed to save 595,960 DTH in 2015 and 628,895 DTH in 2016. The proposed budgets for Gas DSM are \$13.1 million in 2015 and \$13.6 million in 2016. The Company also seeks approval of its proposed budgets for Saver's Switch and the proposed Demand Response Pilots of \$13.7 million and \$13.5 million, respectively, for 2015 and 2016. The Company has designed its proposed Demand Response Program to achieve a cumulative level of demand response (total controllable load) of 485 MW in 2015 and 496 MW in 2016. Public Service further seeks approval of the updated avoided costs and technical assumptions, including deemed savings, and net-to-gross ratios used for purposes of developing the 2015 through 2016 DSM Plan.
<b>Updates:</b>	Feb 13, and 17, Answer Testimony from OCC and WRA filed. ** March 2nd, 2015 Stipulation and Settlement Agreement and Motion to Approve it filed. ** March 13, 2015 Staff, WRA, and OCC file Cross-Answer Testimony, and PSCo files rebuttal.
<b>Updates:</b>	3/30-3/31/2015 Hearings held. April 17th, Statements of Position (SOP) filed. * Awaiting Recommended Decision by ALJ G. Harris Adams
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>14M-1160E - Potential Storage Options for PSCo System (12/08/2014)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Miscellaneous docket to explore options and costs for storage on the Public Service Company of Colorado Electric System.

<b>Updates:</b>	12/08/2014 - PSCo submits 30 page report on Potential Storage Options on Its System. 12/16/2014 - C14-1481 - Decision opening proceeding to receive compliance report on PSCo System (from the 2011 ERP proceeding 11A-869E) some time before the filing of their next ERP (due Oct 31st, 2015)
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Proceeding open to receive report on Potential Storage Options for PSCo System - Report Filed, proceeding open, but not active.
<b>2013</b>	<b>CRES 2013 CO PUC Proceedings Tracker</b>
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13A-0407E BHE Wind RFP (4/23/13)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None -
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	BHE soliciting up to 30 MW of wind. Because of the extension of the PTC, BHE submitted this Request for wind for BHE's wholesale renewable distributed generation. BHE has to ask for waivers necessary to acquire the resources on a restricted timeline.
<b>Updates:</b>	Bids are due by June 14th, Evidentiary hearing Sept. 4-6, Initial decision sought by Oct 11th, 2013, and any RRR Decision is set to be delivered by Nov. 19th.
<b>Updates:</b>	Hearing held Sept 4-6th 2013. Statements of Position submitted Sept. 16th. Oct. 16th Initial Decision Denying Application. The Commission specifically rejected Black Hills' request for approval to enter into a purchased power agreement (PPA) for wind energy with its affiliate, Black Hills IPP. The Commission determined that Black Hills had not met its burden of proof that entering into a PPA with Black Hills IPP, or "Bidder B" is a cost effective resource acquisition.
<b>Updates:</b>	RRR submitted by BH on Nov. 5th.
<b>Final Decision</b>	Nov. 18th. RRR Denied. The Commission does not have sufficient information about the proposed build transfer project to direct the Company to enter into negotiations with Bidder A. In addition, the Commission is not in a position to approve the bid evaluation inputs and assumptions for determining the expected savings from this new proposal in this proceeding. However, Black Hills does not need our permission to move forward with negotiations, and we do not intend to prohibit the Company from reaching agreement on a build-transfer contract with Bidder A.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13A-0445E BHE 2013 ERP/RES Compliance (4/31/13) (Consolidated w/ 13A-0446E, and -0447E)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	Southeast Colorado Solar Coalition intervened with CRES/SECRES support similar to 12A-1207E (BHE App to continue on-site solar).
<b>Purpose / Summary:</b>	Application by BHE for Approval of their 2013 Electric Resource Plan (ERP) and Approval of 2013-2014 Renewable Energy Standard Compliance Plan (13A-0445E) consolidated with Application by BHE for approval of a CPCN for 40 MW gas turbine peaking plant to fulfill CACJA Plan. And (13A-0447E) Application for Approval of CPCN to retire Pueblo 5 & 6. The ERP/RES Compliance Plan docket (13A-0445) was consolidated with the related BHE applications to build a new 40 MW simple cycle gas turbine (13A-0446) and to retire Pueblo 5 and 6 generating units (9 and 20 MW Gas generators) by Dec. 31st, 2013 (13A-0447E).
<b>Updates:</b>	Deadline for intervention is June 7th. * The SCSC petitions for intervention and by Dec. No. C13-0762-I, it is granted. Currently in "Discovery" phase. Hearing set for Nov. 12-15, 2013. * SCSC participated in discovery and hearings on Nov. 12-14th. On and opposed the Settlement signed by BHE, OCC, Staff of PUC, and later signed on by the CEO, RMELC, CIEA, WRA, and CO Gas Producers. * Statements of Position submitted on Nov. 25th and SCSC, AIM, Pueblo BOWW/Fountain Valley Auth. and the City of Pueblo opposed settlement.
<b>Updates:</b>	On Jan. 6th, the Commission entered the "Phase I" decision approving the settlement approving the 2013 ERP/ 2013-14 RES Compliance (no change in on-site solar from 12A-1207E), and approving 40 MW peaking plant, as well as retirement of Pueblo generating stations 5 & 6. Solar program details include Continuing the allotment from Dec. No. R13-0791 of 12A-1207E, which covers 2013 and 2014 with small (less than 10 kW) 233.4 kW at \$0.1267/kWh PBI and medium combined is 10 to 100 kW and a total of 350.2 kW at \$0.16/kWh.
<b>Updates:</b>	** Nov. 26, 2014 BHE Files 120 Day Report gives 3 top proposals to the Commission for review: 1) 46.4MW solar + 10 MW waste to energy. 2) 60 MW solar. 3) 60 MW wind. - Wind bid seems to be lowest cost and most benefit to RESA and to getting BHE closer to RES Compliance. ** Dec. 23, 2014 Accion Group (independent Auditor) files report on BHE 2014 All Source Solicitation. Main purpose is to make sure the RFP process is run fairly.

<b>Final Decision</b>	By Decision No. C14-0007, issued January 6, 2014, the Commission approved: (1) a Settlement Agreement reached by Black Hills and certain intervenors; (2) the Company's Electric Resource Plan (ERP), with modifications; and (3) its 2013-2014 RES Compliance Plan, with modifications. The Commission also granted the Company a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) to construct and own a 40 MW LM6000 unit at its Pueblo Airport Generating Station and a CPCN to retire its Pueblo generating Units 5 and 6. 2/25/14 - Decision addressing RRR by BHE - BHE did not contest the order, but sought clarification on 4 issues: the main issue of importance was a clarification of in service dates for eligible energy resources from 2017-18 to end of 2016 to take advantage of the ITC. ***Phase II decision C15-0199, Feb 27, and RRR Decision C15-0373 Denied approval of any of the resource acquisition choices before them, and denied RRR, upholding the decision not to allow BHE to contract for 60 MW of wind at this time.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13D-0498E - PSCo Petition for Declaratory Orders regarding City of Boulder Muni and serving County (5/9/13)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - PSCo, City of Boulder, OCC are intervenors and Black Hills and CREA, DMEA, Holy Cross, PVREA, and United are Amicus
<b>Purpose / Summary:</b>	Public Service explains that the Petition concerns Boulder's planning and modeling assumptions regarding approximately 5,800 electric customers of Public Service located within Boulder County, but outside Boulder's municipal boundaries. Public Service contends that all of Boulder's plans and models assume that these customers will automatically become customers of a Boulder municipal utility if Boulder proceeds with municipalization. Public Service argues that the goal of the Petition is to obtain certainty regarding the Company's right to continue to serve these customers, before Public Service and Boulder spend significant resources litigating a plan that is based upon a fundamental assumption that Public Service alleges is erroneous as a matter of law. Public Service thus seeks Commission declarations that: (1) if a municipal utility seeks to serve customers located outside the city's boundaries, it is subject to the certificate jurisdiction of the Commission; (2) the Commission has already granted to Public Service a certificate of public convenience and necessity covering the territory in Boulder County, outside the Boulder city boundaries, in which the 5,800 customers are located; (3) under Colorado law, there can only be one certificated utility per geographic area; (4) the certificate of an existing utility cannot be taken away without due process of law, which requires a hearing before the Commission and proof by substantial evidence that the existing certificated public utility is unwilling or unable to serve the certificated area; and (5) the need to construct replacement facilities as a result of actions taken by a challenging utility does not constitute an inability to serve.
<b>Updates:</b>	In its Objection, Boulder urges the Commission to decline to open a proceeding to consider the Petition. Boulder believes there is a lack of justiciable controversy because Public Service has misconstrued Boulder's assumptions. Boulder states that it has not taken the position that it can automatically serve the customers in unincorporated Boulder County in the event of municipalization. Instead, Boulder argues its position is that inclusion of these customers in the potential municipal utility's service territory would be best from a technical perspective. Further, Boulder argues that the Commission lacks jurisdiction over eminent domain and condemnation of utility facilities by home rule cities such as Boulder.
<b>Updates:</b>	Aug 15th parties submit Statements of Position. Aug 30th, 2013 replies are submitted. Public Comment filed throughout.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Oct 29th, Commission enters Decision C13-1350 Issuing Declaratory Rulings addressing the fourth and fifth statements listed in paragraph 25 of the Petition by clarifying that the Commission has regulatory authority over electricity services provisioned by a municipal utility formed by the City of Boulder to customers located in unincorporated Boulder County, and that the doctrine of regulated monopoly as delineated by rulings of the Colorado Supreme Court governs any application filed by the City of Boulder seeking transfer of Public Service's certificate of public convenience and necessity (CPCN). The potential that the City of Boulder may file a condemnation action to obtain Public Service's CPCN does not affect the Commission's regulatory authority, the doctrine of regulated monopoly, or the standards governing transfer of Public Service's CPCN. Further, Commission proceedings addressing the transfer of Public Service's CPCN or other plant, equipment, and facilities used to provide service to customers located in unincorporated Boulder County are to be completed before the City of Boulder initiates a condemnation action for such property. ** Dec 18, 2013 Dec. C13-1550 Denies COB RRR.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13A-0527E - PSCo Application to modify 2011/2012 RES Compliance Plan and Continue Solar Program (5/15/13)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - COSEIA, SEIA, and PSCo involved in settlement and OCC also intervened.

<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Agreement between PSCo and COSEIA/SEIA to add 33.6 MW in 7 additional 4.8 MW steps to the small solar categories (customer owned and third party). By May 2nd, steps 1-4 of the solar rewards customer-sited small category were fully subscribed. In order to avoid termination of on-site solar, the industry sought relief from the General Assembly and PSCo stepped in to work with COSEIA/SEIA to negotiate the additional 7 steps. Each step has a decreasing PBI associated with it. Customer owned projects get PBI payments for 10 yrs and 3rd party PBIs are paid over 20 years.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	June 18, 2013 Dec. No. C13-0703 Approves settlement and grants motion for expedited consideration. Small program of Solar*Rewards back up and running.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13A-0686EG PSCo DSM Strategic Issues Plan (6/17/13)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES Successfully intervened and plans on filing Answer Testimony, among other strategies to be determined. **CRES filed answer testimony by Lorrie McAllister (then Exec. Dir.), Leslie Martel Baer, Dr. Robert Kingston, and Mr. Paul Bony. Lorrie testified that PSCo should lead by example and offer a better, bigger DSM plan, and not cut it back, and that renewable thermal sources should have their place in the program. Leslie advocated for more thermal renewables and testified that the Total Resource Cost test multiplier should be larger to more accurately represent the value of avoided emissions and other social benefits, among other points. Mr. Kingston testified to the benefits of solar thermal technologies and recommends their inclusion in PSCo's DSM plans. Mr. Bony testified to a wide array of solar thermal technologies such as solar thermal, geothermal heat pumps, and biomass heat production should be practically included in a broader approach to DSM.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	This application from PSCo is designed to seek Commission re-examination and approval of the overall objectives and structure of their DSM initiatives to guide PSCo in the specific design of future biennial DSM plans. PSCo is looking for the following: 1. Approval of the Company's proposed modifications to our electric Energy Efficiency and associated DR goals for 2015 through 2020. 2. Approval of certain demand reduction levels from load management and demand response programs for each of the years 2015 through 2020; 3. Approval of certain non-traditional Energy Efficiency programs including Behavioral Change programs, Distribution Voltage Optimization ("DVO") and a Light Emitting Diode ("LED") Street Light Replacement program; 4. Approval of a proposed plan for the recovery of capital and operations and maintenance ("O&M") expenses associated with the DVO product; portfolio beginning in 2015 5. Approval of a new incentive mechanism for specific DVO; 6. Approval of a modified DSM incentive mechanism as it relates to the Company's Energy Efficiency portfolio. 7. Approval to continue to be permitted to exercise our discretion regarding whether to solicit bids for aspects of our energy efficiency and demand reduction portfolios within the context of our approved DSM plans and not as part of our resource plans; 8. Approval of certain methods for the accounting of and measuring of savings, persistence for Behavioral programs, and how such savings and net benefits should be used in an incentive mechanism; and, 9. Guidance on the Company's proposal to budget approximately \$12m/yr on gas DSM starting with the 2014 DSM Plan filed in 13A-0773EG, and spend similar levels in the 2015-16 DSM Plan as well.
<b>Updates:</b>	Original schedule was vacated when Commissioner Tarpey announced he was stepping down. New shedule has rebuttal/ cross-answer testimony due Dec. 20th; surrebuttal testimony due Jan. 21st; PSCo response to surrebuttal due Feb. 21st; corrected testimony due Apr. 14th; evidentiary hearing is April 22nd - 24th at the PUC. **CRES did not file any Cross answer or Surrebuttal testimony. * 4/14/14 all corrected testimony filed and witness examination matrix and hearing exhibit list filed.
<b>Updates:</b>	Hearings held April 22nd - 24th. All pre-filed testimony - including CRES Answer Testimony was entered into record. Many participants from Sierra Club to SWEEP, Colorado Energy Consumers, and others cross examined Public Service witnesses, and had their witnesses cross examined. * Statements of Position filed May 6, 2014, including CRES and COSEIA and all other parties. * Awaiting initial Commission decision. * Rally hosted by Sierra Club, Frack Free CO, and Clean Energy Action to expand and not weaken DSM Electric and Gas Goals held in Denver on May 6th.
<b>Updates:</b>	July 1, 2014, Dec. C14-0731 issued granting App w/ mod and establishing energy savings and demand reduction goals for 2015-2020. ** will be final decision pending applications for RRR by PSCo and SWEEP submitted July 21st. Decision includes: - Significant denial of Xcel's requested DSM bonus modification & increase, and denial of 2nd round of Xcel's program cuts, with a sig focus on and concern for low income segment. - request for further study of DSM rate impact on non-participant vs participant, and recognition of the limits of Xcel RIM test logic; - gas DSM: from MTRC to SCT (Societal cost test) - pge 25 of 41: authorized (this is a new win) but not demanded, to reach a min \$12M annual budget (pretty much Xcel's budget proposal).

<b>Final Decision</b>	~cont. - Use of bond rate instead of WACC in some calcs - this is a win too. - Pge 35/36: NEBs, cost of carbon from fed regs: instructs PSCO to calc a \$0/ton and a new \$20/ton + inflation scenario -this is a win. - If MTRC fails with \$0, it can consider the \$20 scenario to include a program or technology. - instructed to do a new market potential study in next filling (pge 39); - requires new DSM Strat issues filling 1st Qrter 2017. Only mention of Solar Thermal was to say that ST would be better addressed in biennial plans.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13AL-0695E - PSCo Advice Letter 1641 - Changes to Service Lateral and Extension Policies (6/17/13)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - Vote Solar Intervened.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	The advice letter reflects substantial changes to the service lateral and line extension policies for electric service. The most significant changes to line extension policy include: 1) Customers seeking a line extension who will be either standby service customers or net metering will be provided a construction allowance that is proportional to that of an average traditional service customer; 2) the Company defines a new class of "uneconomic" line extensions; 3) the Company is also proposing that it be permitted to allow governmental entities the option to remit the construction payment plus carrying costs (at the AFUDC rate) after completion rather than prior to construction.
<b>Updates:</b>	Vote Solar and PUC Staff submitted answer testimony on Oct. 4th. Oct 21st, PSCo Submitted rebuttal testimony. ** Rebuttal testimony by PSCO stated they would take out their proposal regarding net metering.
<b>Updates:</b>	** Hearing on Oct. 30th. Statements of Position filed by PSCO and Richard Barton of Coal Creek Village Development on Nov. 12th.
<b>Final Decision</b>	Dec. 18th Corrected Advice Letter approved by recommended decision and on Feb. 7th Decision addressing Exceptions entered approving the modified tariff sheets, and denying the CCVD exceptions and approving the PSCO exceptions.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13A-0773EG - PSCo 2014 DSM Plan (7/01/13)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None -
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	This is PSCO's mandatory biennial DSM Plan docket. The goal of the biennial DSM docket is to establish energy savings and peak demand reduction goals to be achieved by taking into account the utility's cost-effective DSM potential, the need for electricity resources, the benefits of DSM investments, and other factors. In this filing, PSCO is permitted to 1) implement cost-effective electric DSM programs to reduce the need for additional resources that would otherwise be met through a competitive acquisition process; 2) given an opportunity for its investments in cost-effective DSM programs to be more profitable to it than any other utility investment that is not already subject to special incentives; and 3) to be required to submit an annual report to the Commission describing the DSM programs it had implemented in the previous year. Also, the Commission must ensure that all classes of customers be given an opportunity to participate in electric DSM programs and give due consideration to the impact of DSM programs on nonparticipants and on low-income customers.
<b>Updates:</b>	Hearing held Dec. 20th. Statements of Position filed Jan 23rd. Decision pending.
<b>Final Decision</b>	** 4/11/14 Dec. no. R14-0389 approved 2014 DSM Plan settlement setting goals of 384.4 GWh in electric energy savings, 86.3 GW incremental savings in 2014, and 623,453 Dth in natural gas savings in 14. Parties discussed new programs to add to 2015/16 Plan. * approved Settling Parties recommendation that the Commission approve a total DSM portfolio budget for 2014 of \$100,069,452, including \$87,763,495 for electric DSM programs and \$12,305,957 for natural gas even though the OCC objected to electric costs being too high.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13A-0836E - PSCo 2014 RES Compliance Plan (7/24/13)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - COSEIA, OCC, PUC Staff, CEO, WRA, TASC, Denver, Boulder, IREC, SEIA, Climax, and CO Gas Producers are intervenors
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	PSCO's mandatory plan to meet all requirements of the RES for 2014. PSCO's Recommended Plan generally maintains their acquisition of on-site solar at present levels; it updates their Windsource program, and adds both a Recycled Energy Program and a Non-Solar REC program to their portfolio. The biggest controversy is their recommended changes to the net metering strategy. Basically, PSCO wants to get the PUC to allow them to categorize net metering as a subsidy (subsidy rates determined with study that had no public or PUC review), and then PSCO wants to recover money they lose from solar from the RESA, and finally to reduce the net metering bill credit arrangement. * Dec. C14-0219-I Grants CEO Motion to sever Net metering issues from docket.

<b>Updates:</b>	A week before hearing, PUC accepted CEO motion to sever net metering issues from docket. The Vote Solar Initiative had motioned at beginning of docket to sever net metering and then The Alliance for Solar Choice had motioned to strike testimony about net metering, but both were denied. Original schedule has been vacated. Commissioners will chose how net metering will be discussed in a separate docket TBD. ALJ will discuss how the rest of the RES Compliance plan issues will proceed in this docket.
<b>Updates:</b>	* Dec. C14-0219-I Grants CEO Motion to sever Net metering issues from docket and sets following timeline: 3/12/14 all parties must file revised testimony with net metering issues stricken from record, and PSCO must file new plan and supplementmlntal direct testimony. * 3/17/14 Prehearing Conference scheduled to schedule new hearing and possibly address outstanding motions. * 3/26/14 supplemental answer testimony due * 4/9/14 supplemental Cross-answer testimony due. * Hearing scheduled for May 7, 8 and 9th. * PHC scheduled for May 2nd to cover witness order and exhibit lists.
<b>Updates:</b>	* All parties have filed their supplemental testimony after the commission severed Public Service's proposal to reflect a net metering incentive in its RESA with a corresponding adjustment to its ECA. * 4/7/14 R14-0368-I Deny's TASC motion to strike sections of OCC testimony for addressing net metering issues severed. * 4/10/14 Dec. no. R14-0381-I denying Jan 27 COSEIA motion to restart medium program. * Hearings held 4/7 and 4/8. Statements of Position due 6/6, and responses on any topic of SOP not deemed in scope of proceeding due 6/13.
<b>Final Decision</b>	July 31, 2014 R Dec R14-0902 approve Compliance plan w/modifications. Aug 20 Exceptions filed, Sept 2, Reply to exepitons. Nov 6, PSCo files info about cost and RESA impacts of R Dec, and Nov 12, responses filed. Dec. 26, Decconfirming approval of Plan and Addressing Exceptions filed. RRR filed Jan. 15, 2015. Feb 9, 2015 Dec C15-0142 Granting PSCo RRR and denying all others. Final Plan is 24 MW/ year for 2015 and 2016 (2 MW/mo) in small program at 2c/kWh Cust Owned, and 1 c third party, and 12 MW/yr (1/mo) in Medium Program (25 kW and up), at 5c/kWh and Solar*Rewards Community min set at 6.5 MW and Max set at 30 MW, with provision that no RESA funds may be forwarded.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13AL-0958E - PSCo Advice Letter 1649 new payment method for Qualifying Facilities (QF's) (8/27/13)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - PUC Staff, Vote Solar, and Western Colorado Power Company are intervenors.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	To implement new methods to derive payment rates for Qualifying Facilities with a design capacity between 10 and 100 kilowatts (kW) in Public Service's Electric Purchase - Small Power Production and Cogeneration Facility Policy Section of PSCo's P.U.C. No. 7 - Electric tariff. Accompanying the Advice Letter were tariff sheets that, if in effect, would implement the new methods. Staff of the Commission, Vote Solar, and Western Colorado Power Co, LLC intervened to work out new rates for payment of capacity and energy rates for Qualifying Facilities (10kW-100kW). In other words, this Proceeding involves setting the avoided capacity payment rate and the avoided energy payment rate for the Company's purchase of capacity and energy from small QFs. A small power production facility, generally speaking, "produces electrical energy solely by the use of, as a primary energy source, biomass, waste, renewable resources, geothermal resources or any combination thereof; and [in combination with other facilities located at the same site,] has a power production capacity [that] is not greater than 80 megawatts[.]" Section 796(17)(A) of 16 U.S.C. In Order No. 69, FERC interpreted the term renewable resources to include solar, water, and wind. These rules (FERC Order 69) provide that electric utilities must purchase electric energy and capacity made available by [QFs] at a rate reflecting the cost that the purchasing utility can avoid as a result of obtaining energy and capacity from these sources, rather than generating an equivalent amount of energy itself or purchasing the energy or capacity from other suppliers.
<b>Updates:</b>	On Sept. 16th and 17, Vote Solar and Western Colorado Power Co filed Objections/Protests and asked for a hearing. Nov. 18th, Rec. Dec. No. R13-1443-I granted interventions, scheduled hearing, and procedural schedule, etc. Testimony, hearings, SOP, Rec. Dec, Exceptions and responses have ocured or have been filed. VS filed for RRR and pending Decision on RRR. The costs which an electric utility can avoid by making such purchases generally can be classified as "energy" costs or "capacity" costs. Energy costs are the variable costs associated with the production of electric energy (kilowatt-hours). They represent the cost of fuel, and some operating and maintenance expenses. Capacity costs are the costs associated with providing the capability to deliver energy; they consist primarily of the capital costs of facilities.

<b>Updates:</b>	The Recommended Decision approved several components of the capacity and energy methodologies proposed by Public Service, but because individual elements of Public Service's proposed methods are non-compliant with the forward-looking requirement for determining rates under PURPA and implementing rules, the ALJ disapproved Public Service's methodologies in whole. The ALJ ordered Public Service to file a new application and use the Recommended Decision as guidance. By this Decision, we deny the exceptions filed by WCPC and grant, in part, and deny, in part, the exceptions filed by Public Service, Staff, and Vote Solar. We permanently suspend the tariff sheets filed under the Advice Letter; we approve, with modifications, the Company's proposed method to derive the capacity payment rate component of the standard rate; and, we approve with modifications all but one aspect of the Company's proposed method to derive the energy payment rate component of the standard rate. We remand to the ALJ for further hearings and findings the consideration and approval of a method for establishing system-wide, forward-looking marginal energy costs, as discussed below.
<b>Updates:</b>	Oct 27, 2014. Interim Dec R14-1288-I Remanded for further hearings on issue of approval of method for establishing system-wide, forward-looking marginal energy costs as initial step in calculating the energy payment rate component. New round of Direct, Answer, Cross/Rebuttal, and Discovery for all, and Hearings on remand issue scheduled May 21-22, 2015; SOP June 8, 2015.
<b>Final Decision</b>	
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>13M-1052EG - Possible Revisions to Rules for Elec and Gas Data Privacy</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None. PSCo, Energy Outreach Colorado, City of Boulder, City and County of Denver, Co Nat Gas, BHE, Atmos Energy Co, Rocky Mt. Gas, Inst for market Transformation, Boulder County, and SWEEP all participated by entering comments or filing a report.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	This Decision opens the Commission's inquiry into issues related to data access and privacy for regulated electric and natural gas utilities in Colorado, including without limitation, potential revision to the Data Privacy Rules, 4 Code of Colorado Regulations (CCR) 723-3-3026 through 3031 of the Commission's Rules Regulating Electric Utilities. In opening this administrative proceeding, we seek input from interested participants, schedule an initial workshop, and direct Staff of the Commission (Staff) to conduct workshops and solicit further comments.
<b>Updates:</b>	The Data Privacy Rules were adopted in Proceeding No. 10R-799E and became effective February 14, 2012. These rules were enacted to balance the interest of respecting ratepayer privacy while allowing local government and certain commercial interests to have access to a customer's electric meter data upon informed consent.
<b>Updates:</b>	This proceeding arises, in part, from Decision No. C13-0442, Proceeding No. 12R-500ALL issued April 16, 2013. In that decision, the Commission revised the Rules of Practice and Procedure, 4 CCR 723-1, including amending the definition of and process related to personal information. Specifically, the revised rules provide a broad protection of data defined as "personal information" pursuant to Rule 1004(x), but allow that industry-specific rules may provide for narrow disclosure procedures upon informed customer consent. To conform to this updated framework in industry-specific rules, the Commission indicated that it would review and revise the Data Privacy Rules in the near future. See, Decision No. C13-0442, ¶ 11.
<b>Updates:</b>	We invite written comment and direct Staff to work with interested participants to gather relevant information, including conducting workshops or soliciting further comments that Staff deems necessary or useful.
<b>Final Decision</b>	Workshop held 11/19/13 and parties filed final comments Jan 17 and 31st, and on April 30, the Commission closed this proceeding and eventually filed a NOPR (see 14R-0394EG - 5/1/14)
<b>2012</b>	<b>CRES 2012 CO PUC Proceedings Tracker</b>
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>12M-041E - PUC Workshop on Electricity Scenario Planning (3/19/12)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES ED Lorrie McAllister and Vince Calvano attended this first workshop on CRES's behalf.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	The CO PUC asked for help with scenario planning to help gauging a range of possible futures for Colorado's Electricity future. The PUC hosted a workshop on March 19th led by a San Fran based energy consulting firm (E3). The PUC invited various energy related groups (CRES, WRA, Xcel, etc) to participate in these and future workshops) in a non-adversarial situation to help shape the PUC's involvement in CO's electricity future.
<b>Updates:</b>	If we have comments or info to share we can upload them to this docket via the CO PUC E-File system. The initial date to enter comments was March 30th, but there is no real time limit. * 4/3012 * PUC Memo Summarizes comments and input they have received to date. Draft scenarios to be presented June 25th.

<b>Updates:</b>	* July 2nd Staff summary report filed of key scenario drivers from initial workshop for the July 11th technical conf. * July 11 technical conf held with presentation from E3. Next steps are to pick 2-4 scenarios and present them to public in September and incorporate the scenarios in resource planning, transmission and DSM dockets. * No new updates – No Sept. presentation.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Feb 13th Scenario Planning Report by E3 filed. Feb. 19th Staff Scenario Planning Report Filed. Feb. 26th - Dec. No. C14-0214 filed closing proceeding.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>12A-851E - BHE ERP/RES Compliance Application (7/31/12)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES/SeCres along with some solar installer companies in the Pueblo and surrounding areas, and Sustainable Pueblo, have jointly filed for intervention (late) as the Southeast Colorado Solar Coalition
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Black Hills Energy is applying to approve its 2012 Electric Resource Plan for the 2012-2017 Resource Acquisition Period and its 2013-2014 Renewable Energy Standard Compliance Plan. BHE states they can meet their 2013-2014 RES requirements without any additional eligible energy resources (all their renewable distributed generation through Busch Ranch Wind). But starting in 2016, they will fall short of the mandated 30% RES. They propose to not fund any more solar programs due to the RESA deficit and only carry over previous years unsubscribed capacity from 2011 and 2012. This goes against the 2011 Settlement agreement from 10A-805E and would hurt the solar industry in SE CO.
<b>Updates:</b>	Filed for intervention Sep 28 and will have to wait for any party response, then Commission to decide to accept or deny petition to intervene out of time.
<b>Updates:</b>	10/3/12 – order C12-1145 grants SECSC late intervention.
<b>Updates:</b>	10/25/12 Order C12-1223 Dismisses this application over BHE decision to modify Clark Station without PUC review. BHE has until Jan 18th to resubmit a proper Application (all parties will have to reapply for intervention at that time). * 11/19/12 Order C12-1347 dismisses BHE Motion to stay Order C12-1223 dismissing their original App. BHE Energy has filed for RRR that will be addressed before Jan 18th.
<b>Final Decision</b>	Dec. 14th - Dec. C12-1434 Order granting, in part, and denying in part BH RRR. Confirms dismissal of docket and allows BH to file continuation of solar docket and sets next deadline for ERP/RES App to May 1st.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>12AL-1052E - BHE Phase II Base Rate Case (10/1/12)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None - OCC, Staff, Board of Water Works of Pueblo/Fountain Valley Authority (Public Intervenors), AIM, City of Pueblo, Cripple Creek Mine and Holcim Intervenors
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	The proposed tariffs incorporate into base rates the 7.868 percent General Rate Schedule Adjustment (GRSA) Rider authorized by Decision Nos. C11-1373 and C12-0143. The approved GRSA is designed to collect a \$10,485,814 revenue increase effective January 1, 2012. Accordingly, this is a cost allocation or “Phase II” rate case. Black Hills represents that this Phase II rate case is the first redesign of base electric rates since March 1, 2005. The purpose of this proceeding is to reallocate among the customer classes, the total annual revenue requirement based primarily upon a new class cost of service study (CCOSS) that has determined the cost to serve each individual customer class. Black Hills indicates that the tariff and base rate design, as proposed, will approximately recover the authorized total annual revenue requirement of \$224,159,974 based on the 12-month adjusted test period beginning on January 1, 2010 and ending December 31, 2010. In addition to the base rate adjustments, Black Hills proposed three modifications to its current Energy Cost Adjustment (ECA) rate rider. First, Black Hills recommended that the costs of fuel and purchased energy be removed from base rates and recovered exclusively through the ECA. Second, Black Hills proposed filing new ECA rates quarterly to be effective March 1st, June 1st, September 1st, and December 1st of each year. Third, Black Hills proposed that costs authorized to be recovered through the ECA be projected for each calendar quarter.
<b>Updates:</b>	Jan 28, 2013 Answer Testimony filed by most parties; Feb 25 - Cross Answer and Rebuttal filed; March 5, stipulation and motion to approve issues related to ECA redesign and construction allowance filed.
<b>Updates:</b>	Hearings on 3/11, 3/12, and 3/14/13. March 29, SOP filed.
<b>Updates:</b>	May 14- Rec Dec R13-0562 filed. Exceptions to that decision filed June 3, 2013. Dec No C13-0794 filed on June 28.

<b>Final Decision</b>	On May 14, 2013, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Paul C. Gomez issued Decision No. R13-0562 (Recommended Decision) permanently suspending the tariffs filed with Advice Letter No. 662. For purposes of establishing the rates to be included in Colo. PUC No. 9, the Recommended Decision approved two unopposed settlement agreements reached by Black Hills and certain parties in the case. The first settlement addressed the proposed TOU pilot program, and the second settlement addressed the ECA as well as certain modifications to the Company's construction allowance. The Recommended Decision also addressed various contested issues surrounding the Company's proposed cost allocations and base rates to be set forth in Colo. PUC No. 9. we grant the exceptions filed by Black Hills and the Public Intervenors and deny the exceptions filed by the OCC. The Commission ordered: Black Hills shall make a compliance advice letter tariff filing that includes a rate design incorporating the directives and modifications contained in Decision No. R13-0562 as amended by this Order. The rate design should explain the implementation of ¶ 104 of Decision No. R13-0562. The compliance tariffs shall be effective on not less than one business day's notice. ** No parties filed RRR to this decision.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>12A-1207E - BHE Solar Program Continuation (11/19/12)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	SECRES and CRES (as part of the SCSC) will be filing for intervention by the Dec. 12th deadline for intervention. (11/28/12 Order #C12-1369-I)
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	BHE Applying to approve the continuation of their on-site solar program that was is due to expire on Dec 31st of this year - leaving BHE without a Commission approved RES compliance plan after that time. BHE wants to use 120kW of the unsubscribed capacity from their 2011-2012 compliance plans as the plan for 2013 and 120kW in a solar gardens program for 2014.
<b>Updates:</b>	Dec 27, 2012 Order R12-1472-I Grants Intervention for SCSC, sets PHC for Jan 9th, 2013. * Jan 9th PHC sets schedule for discovery/ testimony/ hearings/ settlement date and allows for extra notice for Solar Gardens program. * Jan 25 WRA intervenes. * SCSC working on discovery requests and Answer Testimony.
<b>Updates:</b>	March 25, 2013 Settlement Proposal from BHE, SCSC, WRA, and OCC Submitted to PUC. Settlement calls for 583.59 kW for 2013 and carried over to 2014. No up-front rebates. CSG to start in 2014 * 3/28/13 Hearing on Settlement at PUC before ALJ. ALJ decides Settlement is deficient regarding CSG billing. * Amended settlement filed April 26, 2013 and awaiting decision from ALJ.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	June 27th, 2013 Dec. R13-0791 grants Settlement Agreement. * The BHE solar program will re-open for applications beginning at 8:00am Tuesday August 6th.
<b>2011</b>	<b>CRES 2011 CO PUC Proceedings Tracker</b>
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>11AL-080E - PSCo App for revision of Rate Schedule for PV customers and RESA (1/28/11)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES is not an intervening party in this docket.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application for the PUC's approval for a temporary suspension and revision of the tariffs and rate schedule for PV Service and RESA. Approval of this tariff and schedule revision would result in an annual revenue increase of \$154, 821 by charging PV customers a "fair share" charge.
<b>Updates:</b>	5/13/11 PSCo files third amended Advice Letter; 5/20/2011 COSEIA filed an objection to the Advice Letter and the PUC temporarily suspended the Tariff, set the matter before an ALJ and set an intervention period and procedural schedule. COSEIA, WRA, GEO, and the OCC petitioned to intervene.
<b>Updates:</b>	July 14, 2011 PSCo files Motion to withdraw advice Letter and accompanying tariffs.
<b>Final Decision</b>	Aug 3, 2011 ALJ grants motion to withdraw and closes proceeding.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>11A-135E - PSCo Reduction in Standard Rebate Offer (upfront rebates for Solar Rewards) (2/16/11)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES filed a petition to intervene in this docket on February 23, 2011 and received approval by the PUC to intervene on March 4, 2011.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application for the PUC's approval of a rebate reduction for Xcel's Solar Energy Program. Due to the increasing costs associated with Xcel's Solar Rewards Program, \$4.5M above RESA funds, Xcel applied for approval of a rebate reduction and temporary suspension of the Solar Rebate Program.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Settlement was reached and approved. Xcel will continue it's solar rebate program with the minimum rebate capped at an up front rebate of \$1.75/watt plus an annual rebate of 4 cents/watt for the top tier and an annual rebate of 15 cents/watt for the second tier.

<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>11A-325E - PSCo Application for CPCN for Pawnee Emmissions Control Project (4/11/2011)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES, combined with Joint Intervenors, filed a petition to intervene in this docket on May 11th and received approval to intervene from the PUC on June 13th. Nov. 22nd ALJ issued Rec. Decision granting CPCN, and Dec.13th CRES as Joint Intervenors submitted exceptions to R. Dec. saying CPCN should be withheld- taking issue with narrowed scope (only cost estimates) and saying the cost estimates were still not of CPCN quality
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application for the PUC's approval of Xcel's detailed cost budget, project schedules, and other details for the previously-approved project for the implementation of emissions reduction technology at the Pawnee Plant. As part of a decision rendered in a previous docket, Xcel is proposing an estimated cost budget and project timeline for the implementation of emissions reduction technology at the Pawnee Plant.
<b>Updates:</b>	CRES and other intervening parties have been accepted as intervenors in this docket. The scope of the docket has been limited to "consideration of detailed cost estimates for these technologies to achieve approved emissions reductions, project schedules, and other details of the project." Pre-hearing Conference scheduled for July 12th. Hearing over and recommended decision entered, with exceptions from numerous parties. Still waiting for final decision.
<b>Updates:</b>	* 9/20/12 PSCO semi annual report filed. * 10/29/12 Glustrom Filing of notice of changes in coal industry (and costs). *11/2/12 opposition/objection to Glustrom filing submitted by CO Mining Assoc. * 11/6/12 Glustrom response to CMA opposition.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Decision # C12-0159 Grants CPCN for Xcel and denies all requests for exceptions and deemed Joint Intervenor's exceptions late-filed, and didn't consider them. RRR filed by Leslie G, and CIEA. **Decision No. C12-0345 entered April 3rd denying Applications for RRR.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>11A-418E PSCo 2011-12 RES Compliance Plan (5/13/2011)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES filed a petition to intervene in this docket on June 10, 2011 and was granted intervention.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application for the PUC's approval of Xcel's 2012 Renewable Energy Standard Compliance Plan. PSCo's Application for Approval of their 2012 RES Compliance Plan. PSCo puts forth 3 plans: Min (10MW), Recommended (30), and High (54) (all come with 6MW allotted for Solar Gardens, aka Solar*Rewards Community Program.
<b>Updates:</b>	CRES and other intervening parties have petitioned for intervention in this docket. Interventions granted and discovery completed, trial and evidence admitted, briefs/statements of position given, and now waiting for Decision from PUC. *Recommended Decision entered March 8th approving medium plan (36MW). CRES submitted testimony supporting the 134 MW plan supported by the Solar Alliance and COSEIA. Numerous exceptions and responses and a few requests for rehearing, reargument and reconsideration filed. Awaiting final decision.
<b>Updates:</b>	R.Dec. # R12-0261 entered March 8th Approving Application (medium plan of 36MW) with modifications. Decision entered March 23rd granting extension of time to file exceptions. * numerous exceptions filed and many responses to exceptions filed as well. Still waiting for final decision. * 6/8/12* order C12-0606 addresses exceptions by granting and denying in part PSCo's exceptions and denying all others, and upholding the Rdec.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	July 26th Final Decision C12-0856 – order Denying requests for RRR and finalizing R12-0261 Decision approving medium (36 MW) plan with modifications.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>11A-419E BHE 2011-12 Renewable Energy Standard (RES) Compliance (5/16/2011)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None. Only COSEIA intervened to make sure terms of the 2011 settlement were integrated into the 2012 Solar Program Plan.

<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application for the PUC's approval of Black Hills 2012 Renewable Energy Standard Plan. Qualifying Retail Utilities (QRUs) operating in Colorado, such as Black Hills Energy, generally are required to generate, or cause to be generated, electricity from eligible energy resources in the following minimum amounts: 12 percent of their retail electricity sales in Colorado for the years 2011 through 2014; 20 percent of their retail electricity sales in Colorado for the years 2015 through 2019; and 30 percent of their retail electricity sales in Colorado for the years 2020 and thereafter. See, § 40-2-124(1)(c)(I), C.R.S. In addition to the percentage of retail sales requirement and as a subset, House Bill 10-1001 requires the distributed generation resource acquisitions in the following minimum amounts: 1 percent of their retail electricity sales in Colorado for the years 2011 through 2012; 1.25 percent of their retail electricity sales in Colorado for the years 2013 through 2014; 1.75 percent of their retail electricity sales in Colorado for the years 2015 through 2016; 2 percent of their retail electricity sales in Colorado for the years 2017 through 2019; and 3 percent of their retail electricity sales in Colorado for the years 2020 and thereafter. Further, at least one-half of the yearly distributed generation requirement must come from retail distributed generation. See, § 40-2-124(1)(c)(II)(A), C.R.S.
<b>Updates:</b>	Pursuant to Rule 3657(a), Black Hills Energy is required to file an application that contains "its proposed plan detailing how the QRU intends to comply with [Rule 3650 et seq.,] during the next compliance year." Rule 3657 establishes the content of the Application. In this docket, Black Hills Energy seeks a decision approving its 2012 QRU Compliance Plan (2012 Compliance Plan) as set out in the Application and Appendices.
<b>Updates:</b>	The Settlement establishes higher PBI payments paid over a shorter period of time (108 or 120 months, depending on the category of the system as discussed below). The purpose of this proposal is to assist the solar companies in recouping their investment faster while still ensuring that the RESA account is brought into balance within a reasonable period of time. In the small system categories (customer owned and third party owned), a system may be as large as 10,000 watts. In the Company's service territory, the average size of the existing small customer systems is 5,800 watts. In order to make the limited amount of RESA dollars available to more customers, under the settlement proposal the maximum number of watts for which incentives will be paid is 6,000 watts. Small systems may continue to be as large as 10,000 watts (but not to exceed 120% of the annual average consumption) but the rebate will be calculated on the basis of 6,000 watts and PBI payments will only be paid for the production from 6,000 watts.
<b>Updates:</b>	The Settlement creates three solar program categories for BHE 2012 Solar Program: <b>Small Customer Owned Systems</b> . The small customer owned systems category is for systems no larger than 10 kW. This category has been divided into the following two tiers: <3 kW (115 kW at \$1/W upfront and \$0.0945PBI/kWh for 108 mo) and 3 - 6 kW (252 kW at \$.75/W upfront and \$0.0945 PBI/kWh for 108 mo); <b>Small Systems Owned by Third Party Developers</b> . This is a new category to allow for third party financed small systems (up to 10 kW) in the Company's service territory. It is divided into the same two tiers: 50 kW total capacity to 3 kW each at no upfront and PBI of \$0.1224 for 120 mo, and 72 kW for 3 to 6 kW range at no upfront and \$0.1080 /kWh for 120 mo; and <b>Medium Systems</b> greater than 10 kW but less than 60 = 324 kW total capacity at \$0.25 upfront /W and \$0.2250 PBI /kWh for 108 mo; next medium category greater than 60 kW but less than 100 kW capacity of 216 kW at \$0.23/W upfront and \$0.2160 PBI /kWh for 108 mo, and greater than or equal to 100 kW capacity of 120 kW at \$0.20 upfront /W and \$0.2070 PBI per kWh for 108 mo.
<b>Final Decision</b>	9/19/11 Order C11-1009 Approves BHE 2012 RES Compliance Plan settlement with solar program described above.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>11A-833E PSCo Windsorce Application (8/13/11)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application for approval of revisions to Windsorce Program. Along with changes to existing program, Xcel requests approval for additional new long
<b>Updates:</b>	All intervenor answer testimony and exhibits filed by Feb 23rd and now rebuttal testimony phase (Xcel). Final PHC March 19th and Evid Hearing scheduled March 22nd and 23rd. * Evid Hearing held March 22nd and 23rd and testimony given and exhibits entered by various groups (Xcel, PUC staff, WRA, Gas Producers and others). Public Comments filed March 28th Hearing reports filed with E-file system. * 3/22; 3/23; 4/03* evidentiary hearings held and parties submit Statements of Position. * 5/14* PUC interim order regarding ext of time for commiss. Dec. until Sept due to prolonged procedural schedule.
<b>Updates:</b>	* 9/24/12 order C12-1107 denying Windsorce Application. * 10/15/12 Glustrom Request motion for RRR. * 11/2/12 Glustrom RRR denied by final
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	*Sept 24th Initial Decision C12-1107 Order Denying Application (asking to change premium to 0.01/kWh). *** 11/2/12 Order C12-1263 denying
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>11A-869E - PSCo 2011 Electric Resource Plan (ERP) (8/31/2011)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES granted intervention on Dec. 13th, 2011.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application by PSCo for approval of their 2011 Electric Resource Plan. PSCo projects estimated 292 MW incremental resource need from 2011-
<b>Updates:</b>	Procedural schedule set at PHC Jan 18th. Apr 13 answer testimony. Rebuttal/ Cross June 15. Prehearing motions June 22nd. Settlement deadline

<b>Updates:</b>	June 14th PUC files Dec. No. C12-0638-I Denies Ms. Glustrum's Motion requesting that the PUC consider Electric Commodity Adjustment cost
<b>Updates:</b>	*discovery still taking place, and hearing structure and schedule being discussed by parties. (Late Sept – early Oct) * Testimony and exhibits filed early to mid Oct. * 10/29 – 10/30 – evidential hearings held at PUC * 11/8/12 second round of evidential hearings held at PUC. * 11/26/12 Statements of Positions submitted by parties. * Jan 24th 2013, Dec. No. C13-0094 issued and parties are now preparing RRR.
<b>Final Decision</b>	Jan 24th 2013 Dec. No. C13-0094 Phase I Decision Granting Application For Approval of 2011 Electric Resource Plan; Denying Application for Acquisition of the Brush Generating Facilities; and Granting Application to Retire Arapahoe Unit No. 4 and Enter Into a Transaction with Southwest Generation Operating Company In Part
<b>2010</b>	<b>CRES 2010 CO PUC Proceedings Tracker</b>
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>10M-245E - Xcel (PSCo) plan to comply with the CACJA (4/21/10)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES did not petition to intervene in this docket. However, this docket is important because its decision has an impact upon docket #11A-325E of which CRES is currently an intervening party.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	To determine an emissions reduction plan for all rate-regulated utilities operating coal-fired energy units in accordance to the Clean Air Clean Jobs Act. As part of compliance with the CACJA, the PUC filed this docket to implement the CACJA requirement that requires the emissions reduction plan to cover 900 megawatts of power or 50% of a utilities coal-fired generating units; whichever is smaller.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Decision issued approving the retrofitting of the Pawnee Plant with SRC, LSD, and sorbent injection controls as needed and in the public interest for emission reduction purposes. Estimated cost of the project is \$236.5 M. Approved controls for Hayden 1 and 2 (total controls = 742MW w retrofits), and also approved the early retirement of Arapahoe 3 Cherokee 1, 2, and 3, and Valmont 5 (551MW early retired), as well as fuel switching from coal to Natural gas for Cherokee 4 and Arapahoe 4 (463 MW switched with a new 569 MW 2x1 CC) includes new gas pipeline to Cherokee. All actions are to occur on or before Dec. 31st, 2015.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>10M-254E - BHE plan to comply with the CACJA (4/22/10)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	None
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	To determine an emissions reduction plan for BHE in accordance to the Clean Air Clean Jobs Act. As part of compliance with the CACJA, the PUC filed this docket to implement the CACJA requirement that requires the emissions reduction plan to cover early retirement (Dec, 13, 2013) of the only coal plan on BHE system, the Clark Station.
<b>Updates:</b>	8/13/10, BHE files it's initial emission reduction plan. Options given are convert 2 coal units at Clark Station to woody biomass or retire and replace the 42 MW with utility owned natural gas fired generation at the PAGS station in Pueblo.
<b>Updates:</b>	Evidentiary hearing Nov 18 and 20, 2010
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Final Decision</b>	Commission Approves plan to retire Clark Station by Dec 13, 2013, and BHE may replace with new gas-fired generation of which 42 MW is approved, and the extra 50 MW is BHE's burden to demonstrate the usefulness of it. Costs of retirement and replacement must be less than 5% increase in Company's revenue requirements.
<b>Proceeding (Date filed):</b>	<b>10A-805E BHE Application for Approval of 2011 RES Compliance Plan (11/05/2010)</b>
<b>CRES Involvement</b>	CRES filed a petition to intervene in this docket on Dec. 8, 2010 and received approval by the PUC to intervene on December 29, 2010.
<b>Purpose/Summary:</b>	Application for the PUC's approval of Black Hills 2011 RES Compliance Plan--This docket focuses primarily on the suspension of its solar program. As part of it's 2011 RES Compliance Plan, Black Hills temporarily suspended accepting or processing any new solar applications as a result of the increased costs associated with an overbalance of RESA funds.
<b>Updates:</b>	2/18/2011 CRES files Answer Testimony of Executive Director Tony Frank on behalf of CRES addressing concerns with BHE calculations of Retail Rate Impacts of Renewable Energy and are using the wrong calculations.
<b>Updates:</b>	
<b>Updates:</b>	

**Final Decision**

A settlement was reached between the parties stipulating a resumption of Black Hills Solar Program. The parties agreed to a rebate program for 2011 and 2012 that shifts the rebate program from up front rebates to longer-term performance based incentives which will help to manage RESA funds.