

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO**

PROCEEDING NO. 23AL-0243E

---

IN THE MATTER OF ADVICE LETTER NO. 1923 - ELECTRIC FILED BY PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO TO REVISE ITS COLORADO P.U.C. NO. 8 - ELECTRIC TARIFF TO PLACE INTO EFFECT REVISED BASE RATES AND OTHER AFFECTED CHARGES FOR ALL ELECTRIC RATE SCHEDULES BY ELIMINATING THE GENERAL RATE SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT (GRSA) AND GENERAL RATE SCHEDULE ADJUSTMENT - ENERGY (GRSA-E) AS WILL BE ESTABLISHED BY THE COMMISSION IN PROCEEDING NO. 22AL-0530E, TO INITIATE TIME-DIFFERENTIATED GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION DEMAND CHARGES FOR SECONDARY GENERAL SERVICE (SCHEDULE SG) AND SECONDARY GENERAL CRITICAL PEAK PRICING SERVICE (SCHEDULE SG-CPP), TO INTRODUCE NEW ELECTRIC VEHICLE RATE OPTIONS FOR CUSTOMERS TAKING SERVICE AT THE PRIMARY DISTRIBUTION LEVEL, TO ADJUST THE PRIMARY GENERAL CRITICAL PEAK PRICING AND SECONDARY PHOTOVOLTAIC TIME-OF-USE SERVICE SECTION TIME-DIFFERENTIATED DEMAND CHARGES, TO MAKE SEVERAL ADMINISTRATIVE REVISIONS, AND TO RECEIVE APPROVAL OF DEFERRED ACCOUNTING TREATMENT FOR RATE CASE EXPENSES, TO BECOME EFFECTIVE JUNE 15, 2023.

---

**COMMISSION DECISION APPROVING, IN PART,  
AND DENYING, IN PART, APPLICATIONS FOR  
REHEARING, REARGUMENT, OR RECONSIDERATION  
FOR DECISION NO. C24-0117**

---

---

Mailed Date: April 11, 2024

Adopted Date: April 3, 2024

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. BY THE COMMISSION .....	2
A. Statement .....	2
B. Applications for RRR.....	3
1. Colorado Energy Consumers, Federal Executive Agencies, Climax Molybdenum Company, and Walmart, Inc. ....	3
a. Cost Allocation Methodology for Transmission and Distribution Substations ..	3
2. Energy Outreach Colorado.....	6
a. AMI Meter Cost Allocation .....	6

3. Colorado Solar and Storage Association and Solar Energy Industries Association ..7	7
a. Filing Date for Proposed New SG Rate Class .....	7
b. Holistic Review of Demand Charges .....	8
c. SG-TOU Pilot Program.....	9
d. Schedule SPV-TOU Enrollment Cap.....	9
4. Public Service Company .....	11
a. Rate Comparison Tool Deployment Date .....	11
b. Alternative CCOSS in Next Phase II Filing.....	12
c. Deferral of TOU Communication Expenses .....	13
d. IVVO Lost Revenue Recovery .....	13
e. PG-CPP Demand Charge Time Period .....	14
f. Exhibits Admitted During the Evidentiary Hearing.....	15
g. POD-PH Allocation Factors.....	15
II. ORDER.....	16
A. The Commission Orders That: .....	16
B. ADOPTED IN COMMISSIONERS’ WEEKLY MEETING April 3, 2024.....	17

---

**I. BY THE COMMISSION**

**A. Statement**

1. On May 15, 2023, Public Service Company of Colorado (Public Service or the Company) filed Advice Letter No. 1923-Electric with tariff sheets setting forth its base rates for retail electric utility service.

2. On February 23, 2024, the Commission issued Decision No. C24-0117 (Decision) permanently suspending the effective date of the tariff sheets filed with Advice Letter No. 1923-Electric and ordering Public Service to file compliance tariffs with new base rates for retail electric utility service consistent with the findings, discussion, and conclusions in the Decision. Among other things, the Commission: authorized Probability of Dispatch – Peak Hours (POD-PH) cost allocation for the Company’s production, transmission, and distribution substation

costs; set the Residential Service and Facilities (S&F) charge at \$7.10 per month; required the Company to make an advice letter filing by September 2, 2024 to address Residential and Commercial rate class time of use (TOU) periods; addressed issues of customers on Schedule SG and Schedules C/C-TOU; adjusted TOU periods for demand charges; and addressed cost allocation of Advanced Meter Infrastructure (AMI) meters, accepting the Company's proposal to allocate 83 percent of AMI meter costs as customer-related.

3. Through this Decision, the Commission addresses the Applications for Rehearing, Reargument, or Reconsideration (RRR) of Decision No. C24-0117 filed on March 14, 2024, by Public Service; Colorado Electric Consumers (CEC); Federal Executive Agencies (FEA); Walmart, Inc. (Walmart); Climax Molybdenum Company (Climax); Energy Outreach Colorado (EOC); and Colorado Solar and Storage Association and Solar Energy Industries Association (jointly, COSSA/SEIA).

4. As discussed below, we grant the Applications for RRR filed by CEC, FEA, Walmart, Climax, and EOC. We further grant, in part, and deny, in part the Applications for RRR filed by Public Service and COSSA/SEIA. We further provide clarification and correction of Decision No. C24-0117 as requested by Public Service.

## **B. Applications for RRR**

### **1. Colorado Energy Consumers, Federal Executive Agencies, Climax Molybdenum Company, and Walmart, Inc.**

#### **a. Cost Allocation Methodology for Transmission and Distribution Substations**

5. CEC, FEA, Climax, and Walmart each seek reconsideration of the Commission's authorization of the POD-PH cost allocation methodology and instead request that the

Commission instead approve the Four Coincident Peak – Average and Excess Demand (4CP-AED) methodology for allocating the costs of transmission and distribution substations.

6. CEC objects to the Commission’s determination that:

We do not find evidence in this record to support use of a cost allocation methodology for transmission and distribution substations that is different from that used for production assets, particularly with regard to the peaking hours associated with distribution substations. We also find merit in continuing to apply one cost allocation methodology for the demand-related costs of production, transmission, and distribution substations, absent compelling evidence that another approach is more accurate.<sup>1</sup>

7. CEC contends that the record provides substantial support for 4CP-AED for these costs citing the testimony of Public Service witness Knighten during the evidentiary hearing that while POD-PH is appropriate for production costs, which can fluctuate from hour to hour, transmission and distribution substations are not influenced by those cost factors and are instead influenced by peak demand.<sup>2</sup> CEC also points to its witness Higgins’ testimony that POD-PH is only appropriate for production plant and has no bearing on allocation of transmission and distribution substation costs<sup>3</sup> and to Climax’s witness Baron’s testimony that the 4CP-AED allocator assigns transmission costs in a manner that is representative of the cost drivers of transmission investment and cost.

8. CEC faults the Commission’s reliance on EOC witness Chernick’s testimony in regarding POD-PH for transmission and distribution substation costs, arguing that Mr. Chernick’s testimony was contradictory because he advocated POD for transmission and distribution substation costs but at the same time stated that POD is not well suited for these costs because the

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision No. C24-0117 at ¶ 58.

<sup>2</sup> Hrng. Exh. 108 Knighten Rebuttal at 25:20-21; Hrng. Tr. 12/22/23, 26:2-25, 166:8-16, 232:24-233:3.

<sup>3</sup> Hrng. Exh. 400 Higgins Answer at 14:2-17.

decisions about which types of generation to build do not have close analogues in transmission and distribution.

9. CEC also states that having two different cost allocation methodologies is not problematic, as Tucson Electric Power and El Paso Electric both use different allocation methodologies for production and transmission and distribution substation costs.

10. CEC further argues that that use of the POD-PH here is contrary to principles of cost causation and rate stability. CEC notes that Company proposed use of 4CP-AED for transmission and distribution substation costs in its Rebuttal Testimony because 4CP-AED is more appropriate because the associated costs are caused by coincident peak demand during summer months.

11. FEA likewise contends that POD-PH is not appropriate for transmission and distribution plant because it is designed to reflect production costs related to peak hours and the dynamic nature of how the system is planned and resources dispatched.

12. Climax and Walmart support the arguments made by CEC.

13. We grant the requests of CEC, FEA, Climax, and Walmart on this issue and authorize Public Service to recalculate base rates using the 4CP-AED methodology for allocating the costs of transmission and distribution substations. Although the 4CP-AED allocator falls short in terms of the limited number of hours it relies upon for cost allocation, especially when viewed in the context of the dynamic changes occurring to Public Service's system in terms of generation resources and loads, the evidence in the record tends to support its adoption relative to the alternatives presented in this Proceeding when used to establish new base rates for each rate class overall. However, the approval of the 4CP-AED allocator for allocating the costs of transmission and distribution substations here does not signal a precedent for future electric rate

cases submitted by Public Service. Instead, we expect Public Service to, in future rate proceedings, provide more clarity and analysis of the drivers of the costs for transmission and distribution substation investments, especially in light of the changes to the Company's system that were just beginning to be identified in this Proceeding.

## **2. Energy Outreach Colorado**

### **a. AMI Meter Cost Allocation**

14. EOC requests reconsideration of the Commission's findings in Paragraph 64 of the Decision, directing AMI costs be allocated as 64 percent customer-related rather than 83 percent as approved. EOC requests that the remainder of Paragraph 64 remain unchanged and that the Company still be directed to provide a more robust analysis of AMI costs in the next Phase II proceeding.

15. In support of its request that 64 percent of AMI costs be allocated as customer-related, EOC requests the Commission require Public Service to use actual meter costs from the 2022 Test Year data instead of the 2019 data the Company used in its calculation in this Proceeding to determine AMI meter cost allocation.

16. EOC notes that this change will not affect the approved Residential S&F charge and aligns the record with that approved rate.

17. We grant EOC's request on this issue. We agree with EOC that using 2022 test year data for meter costs is appropriate in proceeding. The Company's contention that complete data on meter costs will not be available until all AMI meters are deployed is insufficient. The Company also did not show that actual data trends regarding incurred meter costs since 2019 are flawed or unrepresentative of costs to be recovered when new base rates will be in effect.

18. Paragraph 64 of the Decision shall thus be modified as follows:

64. The Commission finds that the record in the Proceeding on this issue is inadequate to order changes to the allocation of AMI costs but also finds that there are system-wide benefits of AMI that should be better reflected in the allocation. Therefore, the Commission directs the Company to maintain allocation of AMI costs as 64 percent customer-related for this Proceeding but directs the Company to provide a more robust analysis of these costs and identification of the scale and proper allocation of benefits associated with AMI when it files its next Phase II rate case.

**3. Colorado Solar and Storage Association and Solar Energy Industries Association**

**a. Filing Date for Proposed New SG Rate Class**

19. At Paragraph 84 of the Decision, Public Service is directed to file an advice letter by or before September 2, 2024 proposing new Residential and Commercial TOU rate schedules. At Paragraph 94 of the Decision, the Commission further directed the Public Service to propose, in its next Phase II base rate tariff filing, a new rate class for customers with demand between 50 and 100 kW. The new rate class is to have a TOU component and a demand component of less than 40 percent.

20. In its Application for RRR, COSSA/SEIA requests the Commission require the Company to include the development of a new small secondary general (SG) rate class in the September 2024 advice letter filing, not in the next Phase II filing. COSSA/SEIA contends this is appropriate because the new SG rate is to include a TOU component. Alternatively, COSSA/SEIA suggests the Commission could set a date by which Public Service must make a Phase II filing.

21. We deny COSSA/SEIA's requests on this point. We acknowledge the need to address the potential rate class for customers with demand between 50 and 100 kW, but a proposed new rate class cannot be appropriately reviewed in the September 2024 TOU advice

letter filing, which will evaluate TOU periods but will not be a full Phase II proceeding with an updated Class Cost of Service Study (CCOSS). We maintain our direction to Public Service to include in its next Phase II rate case a rate class for customers with monthly demand between 50 kW and 100 kW. We also decline to establish a date by which the Company must file its next Phase II rate case.

**b. Holistic Review of Demand Charges**

22. COSSA/SEIA acknowledges the Commission's directive in the Decision that Public Service present a proposed new rate class for commercial customers with monthly demand between 50 kW and 100 kW and a rate design for that new rate class with limits on any proposed demand charge. However, COSSA/SEIA maintains that a broader, more holistic review of all demand charges is appropriate and requests the Commission provide clear directives to the parties to conduct a holistic review and analysis of demand charges in future rate cases.

23. For instance, COSSA/SEIA requests the Commission provide explicit direction as to the type of data and input that such a holistic review would require, including load data that would allow comparisons of time-variant demand rates and volumetric TOU rates might impact price signals.

24. We decline to direct to direct parties to undertake the types of data analysis and review as suggested by COSSA/SEIA in its Application for RRR. The record in this Proceeding does not support providing explicit direction as to the type of data to be used in a such a review.

**c. SG-TOU Pilot Program**

25. Through its testimony in this Proceeding, COSSA/SEIA requested that the Commission make the Schedule SG-TOU pilot program permanent. The Commission declined to do so in the Decision.

26. In its Application for RRR, COSSA/SEIA requests the Commission modify the pilot so that if a customer signs up for service under Schedule SG-TOU, that customer can continue to take service under that rate for a set number of years, even if the pilot is terminated. COSSA/SEIA suggests a period of 20 years be allowed. COSSA/SEIA contends that this assurance is necessary to provide potential customers certainty that they will have sufficient time on the rate to justify investments in demand response technologies and storage options that will allow them to benefit from the pilot's rates.

27. We grant COSSA/SEIA's request, in part. We agree that some assurance that Schedule SG-TOU will not abruptly terminate is necessary to potentially improve participation in the pilot. However, we decline to ensure the availability of the rate schedule for a period of 20 years. In light of our related directives for the development of both a new SG rate class for customers with monthly demand between 50 kW and 100 kW and new SG rates to include a TOU component, we find that five-year period for continuation of service under the pilot rate is sufficient to provide additional certainty to customers. We thus direct Public Service to modify Sheet No. 51 of its Colorado P.U.C. NO. 8 - Electric Tariff accordingly.

**d. Schedule SPV-TOU Enrollment Cap**

28. In its Answer Testimony in this Proceeding, COSSA/SEIA recommended that participation in Public Service's Solar\*Rewards program no longer be a requirement for eligible customers to take service under Schedule SPV-TOU. In its Rebuttal Testimony, the Company

eliminated the Solar\*Rewards participation requirement but added a cap of 15 MW to limit to the total number of customers taking service under that rate.

29. COSSA/SEIA requests in its Application for RRR that the Commission reconsider the 15 MW annual enrollment cap for Schedule SPV-TOU. COSSA/SEIA contends that broadening eligibility is the reason it sought the elimination of the Solar\*Rewards requirement for Schedule SPV-TOU, and the 15 MW total enrollment cap should likewise be removed.

30. We grant COSSA/SEIA's request, in part. We recognize that the 15 MW (nameplate alternating current) corresponds to the maximum capacity of the Solar\*Rewards Commercial & Industrial Program for programs years through 2025 pursuant to the settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Proceeding No. 21A-0625EG.<sup>4</sup> We further recognize that the continuing availability of Schedule SPVTOU also stems from the terms of an approved settlement agreement, specifically the multi-proceeding comprehensive settlement agreement approved by the Commission in consolidated Proceeding Nos. 16AL-0048E, 16A-0055E, and 16A-0139E.<sup>5</sup> That agreement addressed issues raised in both a Phase II electric rate case for Public Service and the Company's 2017-2019 Renewable Energy Compliance Plan. In the Phase II electric rate case, Public Service had proposed to close service under Schedule SPVTOU to new customers. The comprehensive settlement agreement kept the rate option available but further capped the service under Schedule SPVTOU to the approved amount of annual capacity for the Solar\*Rewards medium program.

31. The history of Schedule SPVTOU and the longstanding caps on the number of customers eligible to take service under that rate persuades us to maintain some limit on the

---

<sup>4</sup> Decision No. C22-0678, issued on November 3, 2022, Proceeding No. 21A-0625EG, Attachment A, Settlement Agreement, p. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Decision No. C16-1075, issued November 23, 2016, Proceeding Nos. 16AL-0048E, 16A-0055E, and 16A-0139E, Attachment A, Settlement Agreement, pp. 22-23.

number of customers who are eligible to take service under the rate. Nevertheless, the imposition of caps through settlement agreements and the Company's willingness in its Rebuttal Testimony to lift the requirement of Solar\*Rewards participation provides us with little information on why the Company requires any cap. Again, in light of our related directives for the development of both a new SG rate class for customers with monthly demand between 50 kW and 100 kW and new SG rates to include a TOU component, we adopt a cap on total participation under Schedule SPVTOU of 25 MW (nameplate alternating current). This cap will be subject to review in future base rate proceedings involving the Phase II design of the Company's base rate schedules.

#### **4. Public Service Company**

##### **a. Rate Comparison Tool Deployment Date**

32. In the Decision, the Commission expressed concern that Public Service had not yet provided a rate comparison tool for Schedule SG customers who could be eligible for Schedule C/C-TOU, as required in the Company's 2020 Phase II proceeding. Paragraph 95 of the Decision thus directed the Company to make that comparison tool available by March 31, 2024, and to have a process in place so that customers would have a single point of contact to discuss and change their rate schedule.

33. In its Application for RRR, the Company requests the Commission revise the deadline for the Company to launch its rate comparison tool from March 31, 2024 to April 30, 2024, the date by which the Company states it could have the rate comparison tool ready. The Company states that it will have a webpage for commercial customers with demands of less than 50 kW ready by March 31, 2024, and will direct customers to contact customer service for additional assistance prior to the launch of the rate comparison tool. After the rate

comparison tool is activated, the webpage will contain a link to the rate comparison tool page. Public Service states that when the rate comparison tool is available it will inform all Schedule SG customers with measured demand of less than 50 kW.

34. Public Service also states that it is in the process of adjusting its procedures in compliance with Paragraph 93 of the Decision (*i.e.*, using a previous occupant's usage records to determine the appropriate rate schedule for new commercial customers) and requests a May 31, 2024, implementation date for this new default process. The Company further states that it will made a compliance filing in this Proceeding when the new process is in effect.

35. We agree that deploying the rate comparison tool by April 30, 2024, is reasonable, and modify Paragraph 95 of the Decision accordingly:

95. The Commission is also concerned that Public Service has not fully complied with the requirements of the directive in the 2020 Phase II rate case regarding customer notice as to the option to take service under Schedule C or C-TOU and the deployment of a rate comparison tool, which the Commission anticipated would be accomplished by the end of 2022 based on information previously provided by the Company. We therefore direct Public Service to make its commercial rate comparison tool available to customers by **April 30, 2024**, and have a process in place through which customers will be able to speak directly to a single point of contact to clarify their rate schedule and make any appropriate changes. When the rate comparison tool and process are available, the Company shall file a notice to the Commission in this Proceeding.

36. We also establish May 31, 2024, as the implementation date for the new commercial customer default rate process and require a compliance filing in this Proceeding when the new process is in effect, as suggested by Public Service.

**b. Alternative CCOSS in Next Phase II Filing**

37. As discussed in part earlier, the Decision requires Public Service to provide a CCOSS in its next Phase II rate case that shows the base rate revenue requirement for Schedule SG without customers whose demand is less than 50 kW and the base rate revenue requirement

for Schedule C/C-TOU with these customers and to propose in that Phase II case a new rate class for customers with demand between 50 kW and 100 kW. In its Application for RRR, the Company asks for flexibility in the manner it complies with these directives, noting that load shapes for these customers are created with sample data and that the Company may not have sufficient load research to produce statistically significant sample data.

38. We acknowledge that, based on available data, the Company might require flexibility regarding the manner in which the alternative CCOSS is produced. However, we emphasize that this flexibility does not negate the requirement to provide a reasonable and credible CCOSS that the Commission can use to form its decisions in that future proceeding.

**c. Deferral of TOU Communication Expenses**

39. Paragraph 85 of the Decision directs Public Service to begin customer communication regarding potential changes in TOU periods by October 2024. In its Application for RRR, the Company requests permission to defer expenses related to these communications consistent with Commission decisions in Proceeding Nos. 19AL-0687E and 20AL-0432E.

40. We authorize the Company to defer customer communication expenses incurred with compliance with the directives of the Decision in the same manner as authorized in Proceeding Nos. 19AL-0687E and 20AL-0432E.

**d. IVVO Lost Revenue Recovery**

41. In Direct Testimony, Public Service initially proposed to terminate recovery of lost revenue associated with energy reductions caused by the implementation of Integrated Volt-Var Optimization (IVVO) through the Company's Electric Commodity Adjustment (ECA) based on a 2023 Test Year. The Decision at Paragraph 123 reflects this proposal, finding that IVVO-related lost revenue recovery through the ECA is not necessary. However, in its Application for

RRR, Public Service requests a correction, noting that because the Settlement Agreement approved in the Phase I proceeding was based on a 2022 Test Year, which did not include the full IVVO-related energy reductions in its billing determinants and provided for the end of the Company's revenue decoupling adjustment pilot, the Company removed its request to terminate the IVVO-related lost revenue recovery through the ECA.

42. We modify Paragraph 123 of the Decision to authorize Public Service to continue IVVO lost revenue recovery and clarify that lost revenue attributable to IVVO-related energy reductions will be determined in future Annual ECA Prudence Reviews:

123. The Commission finds that by using the 2022 Test Year data, the Public Service will continue IVVO-related lost revenue recovery through the Electric Commodity Adjustment.

**e. PG-CPP Demand Charge Time Period**

43. Paragraph 128 of the Decision approves Schedule PG-CPP demand charges on demand measured between 3:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. However, the Company had requested that the period for measuring demand be from 2:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., aligning Schedule PG-CPP time-differentiated demand charges with the Company's other C&I Primary time-differentiated demand calculations.

44. We reiterate the concerns we raised in the Decision regarding the adequacy of the Company's TOU periods to reflect system load and curtailment of renewable resources. However, we correct Paragraph 128 to reflect the period for measuring demand for Schedule PG-CPP as 2:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., as shown below:

128. Consistent with our finding for the Schedule SG, we approve the Schedule PG-CPP time-differentiated demand charges be based on demand measured between 2:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. on non-holiday weekdays to align with the Company's other C&I Primary time-differentiated demand calculations.

**f. Exhibits Admitted During the Evidentiary Hearing**

45. Public Service requests a correction of Paragraph 15 of the Decision listing exhibits admitted into evidence during the evidentiary hearing.

46. After review of the exhibits, we add the omitted exhibits identified by the Company in its Application for RRR but retain Hearing Exhibit 606 in the list, which was admitted during the hearing.<sup>6</sup>

47. Accordingly, revised Paragraph 15 of the Decision reads as follows:

15. The evidentiary hearing on the tariffs was held before the Commission *en banc* on December 11, 12, 14, and 15, 2023. The following exhibits were admitted into evidence during the course of the hearing: Hearing Exhibit No. 1700 (the spreadsheet listing the most recent versions of pre-filed electronic hearing exhibits) and the pre-filed electronic testimonies and attachments listed in the exhibit. Also admitted during the hearing: Hearing Exhibit 101 and Attachment JRK-3, Hearing Exhibit 109 Rev. 1, Hearing Exhibit 109 Attachment DSK-11 Rev. 1, Hearing Exhibit 111, Hearing Exhibit 112, Hearing Exhibit 113, Hearing Exhibit 114, Hearing Exhibit 115, Hearing Exhibit 301, Hearing Exhibit 400, Hearing Exhibit 401, Hearing Exhibit 402, Hearing Exhibit 405, Hearing Exhibit 503, Hearing Exhibit 601 Rev. 1, Hearing Exhibit 601 Rev. 2, Hearing Exhibit 603 Rev. 1, Hearing Exhibit 604, Hearing Exhibit 605, Hearing Exhibit 606, Hearing Exhibit 608, Hearing Exhibit 609, Hearing Exhibit 626, Hearing Exhibit 628, Hearing Exhibit 632, Hearing Exhibit 700 Rev. 2, Hearing Exhibit 701 Rev. 1, Hearing Exhibit 800 Rev. 2, Hearing Exhibit 800C Rev. 2, Hearing Exhibit 805, Hearing Exhibit 807, Hearing Exhibit 809, Hearing Exhibit 1402, Hearing Exhibit 1404, Hearing Exhibit 1405, Hearing Exhibit 1502, Hearing Exhibit 1503, and Hearing Exhibit 1802.

**g. POD-PH Allocation Factors**

48. In its Application for RRR, Public Service requests clarification that the POD-PH methodology the Commission directed it to use in the CCOSS should have three different allocation factors: one factor for production, one for transmission, and one for distribution substations.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Dec. 11, 2023 Hrg. Trans. p. 199:6-22.

49. This request for clarification is moot. As discussed above, the Company is directed to use the 4CP-AED cost allocation methodology for transmission and distribution substations.

**II. ORDER**

**A. The Commission Orders That:**

1. The Application for Rehearing, Reargument, or Reconsideration of Decision No. C24-0117 filed by Colorado Energy Consumers on March 14, 2024, is granted consistent with the discussion above.

2. The Application for Rehearing, Reargument, or Reconsideration of Decision No. C24-0117 filed by Climax Molybdenum Company on March 14, 2024, is granted consistent with the discussion above.

3. The Application for Rehearing, Reargument, or Reconsideration of Decision No. C24-0117 filed by the Federal Executive Agencies on March 14, 2024, is granted consistent with the discussion above.

4. The Application for Rehearing, Reargument, or Reconsideration of Decision No. C24-0117 filed by Walmart, Inc. on March 14, 2024, is granted consistent with the discussion above.

5. The Application for Rehearing, Reargument, or Reconsideration of Decision No. C24-0117 filed by Energy Outreach Colorado on March 14, 2024, is granted consistent with the discussion above.

6. The Application for Rehearing, Reargument, or Reconsideration of Decision No. C24-0117 filed by Colorado Solar and Storage Association and Solar Energy Industries

Association on March 14, 2024, is granted in part, and denied in part, consistent with the discussion above.

7. The Application for Rehearing, Reargument, or Reconsideration of Decision No. C24-0117 filed by Public Service Company of Colorado on March 14, 2024, is granted in part, and denied in part, consistent with the discussion above.

8. The 20-day time period provided by § 40-6-114, C.R.S to file an application for rehearing, reargument, or reconsideration shall begin on the first day after the effective date of this Decision.

9. This Decision is effective on its Mailed Date.

**B. ADOPTED IN COMMISSIONERS' WEEKLY MEETING  
April 3, 2024.**

(S E A L)



ATTEST: A TRUE COPY

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

ERIC BLANK

\_\_\_\_\_

MEGAN M. GILMAN

\_\_\_\_\_

TOM PLANT

\_\_\_\_\_

Commissioners

Rebecca E. White,  
Director