

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

PROCEEDING NO. 24A-0299E

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF COLORADO FOR AN ORDER FINDING THAT THE CABIN CREEK FACILITY PROJECT WAS PRUDENT WITH UPGRADES TO BOTH GENERATING UNITS ALONG WITH AN EXPANSION OF THE FACILITY’S UPPER RESERVOIR.

**INTERIM DECISION
EXTENDING TIME FOR A COMMISSION DECISION,
SETTING PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE, SCHEDULING
EVIDENTIARY HEARING, AND GRANTING MOTION
FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AFFORDING
EXTRAORDINARY PROTECTION**

Issued Date: October 3, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. STATEMENT AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	2
II. TIME FOR A COMMISSION DECISION.....	6
III. PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE.....	9
A. Procedural Schedule	9
B. Evidentiary Hearing.....	10
C. Unified Numbering System for Hearing Exhibits	10
D. Advisements	10
IV. UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AFFORDING EXTRAORDINARY PROTECTION	11
V. ORDER.....	16
A. It Is Ordered That:	16

I. STATEMENT AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1. Public Service Company of Colorado (“Public Service” or “the Company”) initiated this matter on July 1, 2024, by filing its Verified Application with the Colorado Public Utilities Commission (“PUC” or “Commission”) seeking an order finding that its Cabin Creek Facility Project (“Cabin Creek”) was prudent.¹ The Application explains that the Cabin Creek Facility is a pumped storage hydroelectric plant in operation since 1967, which was in need of “major refurbishment and repairs” after 50 years of service.² The Company obtained a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (“CPCN”) in 2015 approving of the work.³ The repairs are “now substantially complete” and the plant is back in operation.⁴ Cabin Creek cost approximately \$109 million—an increase of \$21 million from the original 2015 cost estimate—“primarily due to the increased scope of work that was necessary to complete the project as additional issues were uncovered and due to regulatory requirements.”⁵ This Proceeding examines whether the Company acted prudently in completing Cabin Creek.

2. Contemporaneously with its Application, Public Service filed the following prefiled testimony and documents:

- Hearing Exhibit 101: Direct testimony of Jason J. Peuquet, Director of Regulatory Administration for Public Service, with one attached exhibit;
- Hearing Exhibit 102: Direct testimony of Darin W. Schottler, Director of Capital Projects for Xcel Energy Services Inc. (“XES”) and interim leader of the Energy Supply Strategic Capital Projects organization, along with seven attached exhibits, three of which were filed in both public and confidential versions;

¹ Verified Application of Public Service Company of Colorado, filed July 1, 2024, p. 1.

² *Id.* at p. 1, ¶ 1.

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.* at p. 2, ¶ 2.

⁵ *Id.* at pp. 2-3, ¶ 4.

- Hearing Exhibit 103: Direct testimony of Nicholas J. Detmer, Director of Market Operations and Analytics for XES; and
- Hearing Exhibit 104: Direct testimony of Arthur P. Freitas, Director, Revenue Analysis for XES, along with two attached exhibits.

3. On July 3, 2024, the Commission sent out a Notice of Application Filed (Notice) to interested persons. The Notice stated that Public Service “**has** filed testimony and is seeking a Commission decision within 120 days.”⁶ In addition, the Commission ordered that any person or entity seeking to intervene in this Proceeding do so within 30 days of the Notice, and noted that Staff may file its intervention “within seven (7) days after this Notice expires.”⁷

4. After the Commission’s issuance of the Notice, the Office of the Utility Consumer Advocate (“UCA”) and Trial Staff of the Commission (“Staff”), intervened as of right in this Proceeding. No other entities have intervened.

5. The Commission deemed the Application complete by minute entry on August 7, 2024, in accordance with § 40-6-109.5, C.R.S., and referred the matter to an Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) for disposition. The Proceeding was subsequently assigned to the undersigned ALJ.

6. By Decision No. R24-0641-I, issued September 6, 2024, the undersigned ALJ acknowledged the interventions of right of UCA and Staff and scheduled a prehearing conference for September 20, 2024, at 11:00 a.m. to discuss a procedural schedule in this Proceeding. Decision No. R24-0641-I also invited the parties to reach a consensus procedural schedule, hearing format, and proposed evidentiary hearing date(s), and, should they reach a consensus, to informally contact the ALJ by email with their proposed schedule.

⁶ Notice of Application Filed, filed July 3, 2024, p. 1.

⁷ *Id.*

7. Also by Decision No. R24-0641-I, the ALJ determined that, to ensure the parties and the ALJ had sufficient time to consider, address, and hold a hearing about the important issues raised by this Proceeding, it was necessary to extend the time for issuance of a Commission decision and, pursuant to § 40-6-109.5(1), C.R.S., the applicable statutory period was extended by an additional 130 days, up to and including April 14, 2025.

8. On September 6, 2024, Public Service filed its Motion for Extraordinary Protection, seeking extraordinary protection for highly confidential and competitively sensitive information associated with the Application in this Proceeding.

9. On Wednesday, September 18, 2024, counsel for Public Service, Chris Irby, informally contacted the undersigned ALJ with the following proposed procedural schedule to which the parties had unanimously agreed:

Event	Date
Answer Testimony	February 3, 2025
Rebuttal Testimony and Cross-Answer Testimony	March 14, 2025
Settlement Agreement and Settlement Testimony	April 4, 2025
Corrections, Cross-Examination Matrix, Witness and Exhibit Lists, and Prehearing Motions	April 4, 2025
Evidentiary Hearing	April 17-18, 2025
Statements of Position	May 9, 2025

10. In addition to the proposed procedural schedule, Mr. Irby stated that the parties unanimously agreed that, in light of numerous other ongoing proceedings at the Commission, they believed that a finding of extraordinary circumstances would be appropriate in this Proceeding. They therefore additionally sought to extend the statutory deadline by an additional 130 days, up

to and including August 22, 2025. Since the parties requested a finding of extraordinary circumstances, the parties did not seek to vacate the prehearing conference.

11. The Commission is permitted to extend the statutory timeline up to an additional 130 days, for a total of 380 days from the deemed complete date until a final Commission decision is due, but only “after notice and a hearing at which the existence of extraordinary conditions is established.”⁸

12. Because the adoption of an extended, 380-day statutory timeline requires that a hearing be held establishing that “extraordinary conditions” exist justifying the further extension of the time period, the ALJ held the scheduled prehearing conference on September 20, 2024, at 11:00 a.m. to discuss the procedural timeline.

13. If the time period for issuing a final Commission decision were extended by the full amount of 130 days allowed by § 40-6-109.5(4), C.R.S., the deadline for issuance of a final Commission decision would be extended to August 22, 2025.

14. At the September 20, 2024 prehearing conference, all parties appeared through the following representatives:

- Chris Irby appeared on behalf of Public Service;
- Bryan Kreykes on behalf of Staff; and
- Patrick Witterschein appeared on behalf of UCA.

15. This decision memorializes issues discussed at the prehearing conference, including finding that extraordinary conditions exist warranting a further extension of the statutory timeline, establishing a procedural schedule, and scheduling an evidentiary hearing. It also addresses Public Service’s outstanding Motion for Extraordinary Protection.

⁸ § 40-6-109.5(4), C.R.S.

II. TIME FOR A COMMISSION DECISION

16. Public Service's Verified Application was accompanied by the direct, supporting testimony of four individuals. As the Commission notes in its Notice of Application⁹, Public Service is therefore seeking a Commission decision within 120 days of the date on which its Verified Application is deemed complete.

17. Because the filing of the Verified Application falls under § 40-6-109.5(1), C.R.S., the time for a Commission decision to issue is 120 days after the Application is deemed complete. The Commission deemed Public Service's Verified Application complete on August 7, 2024. Pursuant to § 40-6-109.5, C.R.S., a Commission decision would be due on or before December 5, 2024.

18. However, if the Commission in its discretion finds additional time is required for a decision, the time period within which a Commission decision shall issue may be extended an additional 130 days.¹⁰ This was done in Decision No. R24-0641-I, which extended the statutory timeline by an additional 130 days (for a total of 250 days) as provided by § 40-6-109.5(1), C.R.S., up to and including April 14, 2025.

19. Section 40-6-109.5(4), C.R.S. creates an exception to the presumed maximum 250-day timeline discussed above. Specifically, it provides that when the Commission holds a properly noticed hearing at which the existence of extraordinary conditions is established to the Commission's satisfaction, the statutory deadline for a final Commission decision may be further extended by an additional 130 days, for a total maximum of 380 days from the date an application

⁹ Notice of Application Filed, p. 1.

¹⁰ § 40-6-109.5(1), C.R.S.

is deemed complete.¹¹ The parties and their counsel simply being busy does not establish the existence of extraordinary conditions.

20. As noted, the parties first presented their position that they collectively believe extraordinary conditions exist justifying an additional 130-day extension of the deadline for a final Commission decision per § 40-6-109.5(4), C.R.S., via email on September 18, 2024.

21. As required by § 40-6-109.5(4), C.R.S., the ALJ held the scheduled and duly noticed prehearing conference on September 20, 2024, to discuss whether such extraordinary conditions exist.

22. During the prehearing conference, counsel for Public Service, Mr. Irby, explained that extraordinary conditions exist due to numerous pending proceedings before the Commission, as well as some upcoming proceedings that will be filed in the near future, in which all of the three parties in this Proceeding are participating. Mr. Irby explained that the procedural schedules and scheduled hearing dates of these proceedings have made achieving a procedural schedule, evidentiary hearing, and final Commission decision in this Proceeding before April 14, 2025, very difficult.

23. Mr. Irby outlined the specific pending and upcoming proceedings which have led the parties to believe that extraordinary conditions exist under § 40-6-109.5(4), C.R.S. First, Mr. Irby noted that Decision No. R24-0641-I had asked the parties to select evidentiary hearing dates in the month of December, which would be difficult given the Christmas and New Year's holidays. Holidays aside, however, Mr. Irby stated that there are already two evidentiary hearings scheduled in December which involve the parties in this proceeding: 24AL-0275E (scheduled for hearing December 3-11, 2024) and 23AL-0635G (scheduled for hearing December

¹¹ § 40-6-109.5(4), C.R.S.

3-5, 2024). Additionally, there are significant hearing deadlines that will overlap with two other proceedings' procedural schedules, which are about to be approved by other ALJs: 24A-0327E (scheduled for hearing January 9-10, 2025) and 24AL-0307E (scheduled for hearing January 16-17, 2025). Finally, Public Service has other major proceedings that will be filed and/or worked on by the parties during that timeline, most significantly: 24A-0296E; the Company's Just Transition Solicitation docket, to be filed on October 15, 2025; and the Company's next Distribution System Plan, to be filed on November 15, 2025. While there are not hearings for these three proceedings scheduled yet, Mr. Irby noted their preparation and filing would be significant for the parties in this Proceeding.

24. The undersigned ALJ notes that previous Commission decisions have found extraordinary conditions warranting a further extension of the statutory time period. Specifically, Decision No. R23-0617 in Proceeding No. 23A-0356E found that the high volume of other pending matters and the crush of upcoming hearings made scheduling a hearing in that proceeding nearly impossible unless extraordinary conditions were found justifying a 380-day statutory timeline. Additionally, Decision No. R24-0055-I in Proceeding No. 23A-0471E also made this finding.

25. Based on the parties' representations, the high volume of proceedings both pending before the Commission and that are due to be filed in the near future, the scheduling difficulties created by the parties' full calendars, and the need to ensure adequate time for the parties to prepare their positions and for the Commission to issue a thorough and thoughtful final Commission decision, the undersigned ALJ finds and concludes that extraordinary conditions, as contemplated under § 40-6-109.5(4), exist justifying an additional 130-day extension of the statutory deadline for a final Commission decision. The ALJ is mindful that the timeline can be extended for a period

of time less than the full additional 130 days statutorily permitted, but finds and concludes that given the Commission and the parties’ full schedules, extending the timeline by the full time allowed is warranted.

26. Accordingly, the deadline for a final Commission decision will be extended by an additional 130-days—for a total of 380 days post-completion of the Verified Application—up to and including August 22, 2025, per § 40-6-109.5(4), C.R.S.

III. PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

A. Procedural Schedule

27. As noted above, on September 18, 2024, Mr. Irby contacted the undersigned ALJ informally via email on behalf of the Company and the other parties to this Proceeding and proposed a procedural schedule to govern this Proceeding.

28. As noted above, the parties unanimously agreed to the following procedural schedule:

Event	Date
Answer Testimony	February 3, 2025
Rebuttal Testimony and Cross-Answer Testimony	March 14, 2025
Settlement Agreement and Settlement Testimony	April 4, 2025
Corrections, Cross-Examination Matrix, Witness and Exhibit Lists, and Prehearing Motions	April 4, 2025
Evidentiary Hearing	April 17-18, 2025
Statements of Position	May 9, 2025

29. Given the extension of the statutory time period to a total of 380 days, the ALJ finds the proposed schedule reasonable and acceptable. It will be adopted, as ordered below.

B. Evidentiary Hearing

30. In his September 18, 2024 email, Mr. Irby conveyed that the parties had all agreed to a fully remote evidentiary hearing.

31. The ALJ notes that the Commission can conduct in-person, remote, or hybrid hearings. A remote hearing is one in which all of the participants appear and participate from remote locations over the Zoom web conferencing platform. A hybrid hearing involves the ALJ and at least one party and/or witness participating from one of the Commission's hearing rooms in Denver, and the remaining party(ies) and witness(es) participating from one or more remote locations using the Zoom web conferencing platform. An in-person hearing is one in which the ALJ and all parties and witnesses participate in the hearing at the same location.

32. The ALJ finds that given the parties' agreement, a remote evidentiary hearing is appropriate. The ALJ will therefore schedule a remote hearing for April 17 and 18, 2025, the hearing dates proposed by the parties.

C. Unified Numbering System for Hearing Exhibits

33. In order to efficiently organize the numbering and preparation of exhibits for the hearing, the parties shall use a unified numbering system for all hearing exhibits. Blocks of hearing exhibit numbers are assigned as follows:

- Public Service Company of Colorado Hearing Exhibits 100-199
- UCA Hearing Exhibits 200-299
- Staff Hearing Exhibits 300-399

D. Advisements

34. The Parties are advised and are on notice that this proceeding is governed by the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure found at 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* ("CCR")

723-1. The ALJ expects the Parties to be familiar with and to comply with these rules. The rules are available on the Commission's website (puc.colorado.gov/pucrules).

35. The parties are also on notice that failure to appear at the scheduled evidentiary hearing may result in decisions adverse to their interests, including granting the complete relief opposing parties seek, dismissing interventions, and dismissing or granting the Application.

36. **Informal Video-Conference Practice Session:** The ALJ will hold an informal practice video-conference session if requested by any party to give the parties an additional opportunity to practice using Zoom and box.com before the hearing.

37. The parties may contact a Commission Legal Assistant by email at casey.federico@state.co.us and stephanie.kunkel@state.co.us, to schedule an informal practice video-conference session.

38. The parties will receive information and a link to participate in the informal practice session by email.

IV. UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER AFFORDING EXTRAORDINARY PROTECTION

39. On September 6, 2024, Public Service filed its Unopposed First Motion of Public Service Company of Colorado for a Protective Order Affording Extraordinary Protection for Highly Confidential Information. In the Motion, Public Service seeks to protect “highly confidential and competitively sensitive [information] associated with the Company’s Application.”¹² The information Public Service seeks to protect includes the following:

- (1) Proprietary, non-public, commercially, and otherwise highly sensitive information related to the Cabin Creek Facility, including studies, infrastructure information, and engineering and design documentation.

¹² Unopposed First Motion of Public Service Company of Colorado for a Protective Order Affording Extraordinary Protection for Highly Confidential Information, p.1, filed Sept. 6, 2024.

(2) Proprietary, non-public, commercially, and otherwise highly sensitive information related to the Cabin Creek Facility Project, including the Company's contracts with contractors for the Project and those contractors' proprietary and confidential information relating to the Project.¹³

40. For the first category of information, Public Service goes on to describe the information in further detail, identifying it as

information about the Cabin Creek Facility, including engineering information about the design, construction, and operation of the facility that is sensitive for public safety and/or commercial competitiveness reasons. For example, this category includes documentation regarding the design of the facility which may be relevant to the issues in this proceeding but which include detailed Facility, system, design, and location data that may create a security, safety, or other risk if disclosed publicly. This category includes non-public filings with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") relating to the Facility...[and] information that is protected as Critical Energy Infrastructure Information ("CEII") under Section 215A(d)(1) of the Federal Power Act, 16 U.S.C. § 824o-a(d)(1), and which is exempt from mandatory disclosure under the federal Freedom of Information Act and under state public disclosure laws, and protected from disclosure in the Company's proceedings in front of FERC. The information contained in this documentation is therefore considered to be extraordinarily confidential and highly proprietary, and is treated as such.¹⁴

41. As to the second category of information, Public Service describes the information in further detail, identifying it as

information about the Cabin Creek Facility Project, such as the Company's contracts with its third-party vendors and design and engineering information, that is sensitive for public safety and/or commercial competitiveness reasons. For example, this category includes documentation regarding the designs for the Cabin Creek Facility Project which may be relevant to the issue in this proceeding but which include detailed Facility, system, design, and location data that may create a security, safety, or other risk if disclosed publicly. This category includes non-public filings with the FERC related to the project. It also includes information that is protected as CEII. The information contained in this documentation is therefore considered to be extraordinarily confidential and highly proprietary, and is treated as such.¹⁵

¹³ *Id.* at p. 2-3.

¹⁴ *Id.* at p. 4-5.

¹⁵ *Id.* at p. 6.

42. Public Service states that it has received discovery requests from Staff that seek information within the two categories of highly confidential information, and that they anticipate receiving additional discovery requests seeking proprietary and non-public information within the two categories.¹⁶

43. Public Service asserts that disclosure of the information could harm the Company's competitive position as it relates to the operation of the facility and its system.¹⁷ They also note that documents in these categories that were prepared by third-party vendors or that relate to contracts with third-party vendors are subject to confidentiality provisions with those vendors, as disclosure of this sensitive and highly confidential proprietary information could cause substantial harm to the Company's and/or its vendors' competitive positions.¹⁸ Finally, Public Service states that the documents are subject to copyright protection and contain proprietary, intellectual property.¹⁹ The documents may also include admonitions that they may not be copied, reproduced, or transmitted in any form or by any means, and must be kept confidential by the Company, and are subject to limited distribution even within the third-parties' businesses.²⁰

44. Public Service stated that they will make public, redacted versions of documents containing highly confidential information available to the parties if practicable and required for the needs of this proceeding.²¹ For documents that are highly confidential in their entirety, or for documents that are "voluminous and contain substantial amounts of [h]ighly [c]onfidential

¹⁶ *Id.* at 4.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 5, 6.

¹⁸ *Id.*

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.* at 5, 6-7.

²¹ *Id.* at 8.

[i]nformation throughout,” Public Service argues it is unreasonable and impractical to create a separate, public version of the documents.²²

45. Public Service also notes that in Proceeding No. 22AL-0046G they sought and received a protective order governing documents similar in nature to those in the categories of documents discussed in the current Motion for Extraordinary Protection.²³

46. Based on these representations, Public Service seeks an order imposing highly confidential protections for the above-listed categories of Highly Confidential Information. Public Service requests that access to the documents be limited to the Commissioners, ALJs, the Commission’s advisory staff and advisory attorneys, and Staff and UCA and their respective counsel, as all of them must have signed appropriate non-disclosure agreements to access highly confidential information. In accordance with Rule 1101(b)(V), 4 CCR 723-1, the motion was accompanied by a specific form of nondisclosure agreement that Public Service requests be used in this Proceeding.

47. Public Service represents that the Motion for Protective Order is unopposed. The ALJ notes that the time period for responding to the Motion for Protective Order has expired but no party has filed an objection to the Motion for Protective Order.

48. Under Rule 1101(b), 4 CCR 723-1, a motion seeking highly confidential protection:
- (I) shall include a detailed description and/or representative sample of the information for which highly confidential protection is sought;
 - (II) shall state the specific relief requested and the grounds for seeking the relief;
 - (III) shall advise all other parties of the request and the subject matter of the information at issue;
 - (IV) shall include a showing that the information for which highly confidential protection is sought is highly confidential; that the protection afforded by the

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.* at 7.

Commission's rules for furnishing confidential information provides insufficient protections for the highly confidential information; and that, if adopted, the highly confidential protections proposed by the movant will afford sufficient protection for the highly confidential information;

- (V) shall be accompanied by a specific form of nondisclosure agreement requested;
- (VI) shall be accompanied by an affidavit containing the names of all persons with access to the information and the period of time for which the information must remain subject to highly confidential protection, if known; and
- (VII) shall include an exhibit, filed in accordance with the procedures established in paragraph (a), containing the information for which highly confidential protection is requested. Alternatively, the movant may show why providing the subject information would be overly burdensome, impractical, or too sensitive for disclosure.

49. Public Service provides a detailed description of the information for which it seeks protection and a showing that it deserves and needs highly confidential protection. It's Unopposed First Motion of Public Service Company of Colorado for a Protective Order Affording Extraordinary Protection for Highly Confidential Information includes a proposed form of nondisclosure agreement to be signed by individuals who may encounter the information during this Proceeding and by legal counsel. It also provided the affidavit of Jason J. Peuquet, the Director of Regulatory Administration for Public Service. Mr. Peuquet's Affidavit identified the individuals and departments within Public Service that have access to the information it describes as highly confidential.

50. However, Public Service has not filed a public version of the subject information with its Motion. Public Service stated it will make public, redacted versions of documents containing highly confidential information available to the parties "if practicable and required for the needs of this proceeding."²⁴ For documents that are highly confidential in their entirety, or for documents that are "voluminous and contain substantial amounts of [h]ighly [c]onfidential

²⁴ *Id.* at 8.

[i]nformation throughout,” Public Service argues it is unreasonable and impractical to create a separate, public version of the documents.²⁵ However, Public Service did note that it has received discovery requests from Staff for the types of documents contained in the two categories of highly confidential information and expects to receive more discovery requests from the other parties. Highly confidential information disclosed in response to discovery requests “shall not be filed with the Commission.”²⁶

51. Public Service has thus satisfied each of the requirements of Rule 1101(b) and has shown good cause for highly confidential protection of the identified information. Accordingly, Public Service’s Unopposed First Motion of Public Service Company of Colorado for a Protective Order Affording Extraordinary Protection for Highly Confidential Information will be granted

V. ORDER

A. It Is Ordered That:

1. Pursuant to §§ 40-6-109.5(1) and (4), C.R.S., the applicable period for issuance of a Commission decision is extended by an additional 130 days, up to and including August 22, 2025.

2. A remote evidentiary hearing is scheduled as follows:

DATE:	April 17 and 18, 2025
TIME:	9:00 a.m.
LOCATION:	Commission Hearing Room 1560 Broadway, Suite 250 Denver, Colorado
WEBCAST:	Commission Hearing Room

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ Rule 1101(e) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* (“CCR”) 723-1.

METHOD: By video-conference using Zoom at the link provided to the established parties in an e-mail prior to the scheduled hearing, as addressed above.

3. The parties and witnesses may not distribute the Zoom link and access code to anyone not participating in the remote hearing.

4. **Video-Conference Participation.** Counsel for the parties, parties, and witnesses will participate in the evidentiary hearing by video-conference using the Zoom platform.

5. **Instructions for Remote Hearings Via Zoom:** Detailed instructions governing participation in and procedures for remote hearings conducted via Zoom are set out in Attachment A to this order, which is incorporated into and made part of this order.

6. The ALJ will hold an informal Zoom practice session upon request.

7. The following procedural schedule is adopted:

Event	Date
Answer Testimony	February 3, 2025
Rebuttal Testimony and Cross-Answer Testimony	March 14, 2025
Settlement Agreement and Settlement Testimony	April 4, 2025
Corrections, Cross-Examination Matrix, Witness and Exhibit Lists, and Prehearing Motions	April 4, 2025
Evidentiary Hearing	April 17-18, 2025
Statements of Position	May 9, 2025

8. **Evidence Presentation at the Evidentiary Hearing.** Because the hearing may accommodate remote participation by videoconference, all evidence must be presented electronically. Each party is responsible for ensuring that they and their respective witnesses: (a) have access to all pre-filed exhibits; and (b) can download and view documents available from box.com during the hearing.

9. Instructions for Preparation and Presentation of Exhibits at Hearing:

In addition to other requirements of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* (“CCR”) 723-1 (e.g., Rule 1202 regarding pre-filed testimony), detailed additional instructions governing the preparation and presentation of exhibits at the hearing are set out in Attachment B to this order, which is incorporated into and made part of this order.

10. The parties shall adhere to the following numbering system for their respective exhibits:

- Public Service Company of Colorado Hearing Exhibits 100-199
- UCA Hearing Exhibits 200-299
- Staff Hearing Exhibits 300-399

11. Public Service’s Unopposed First Motion of Public Service Company of Colorado for a Protective Order Affording Extraordinary Protection for Highly Confidential Information filed on September 6, 2024, is granted.

12. This Decision is effective immediately.

(S E A L)



THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

ALENKA HAN

Administrative Law Judge

ATTEST: A TRUE COPY

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rebecca E. White".

Rebecca E. White,
Director