

**P-DP Post-2008 Proposed Allocation  
Public Information Forums  
Question & Responses**

Q. How were the 34 applicants in the first order of priority reduced?

A. There was some reduction because applicants submitted separate applications as part of aggregated groups. In addition, the Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest (NAVFAC SW) submitted multiple applications for individual military installations, but Western considered these applications as being from a single applicant (NAVFAC SW). One applicant submitted an application as an individual entity and as part of an aggregated entity.

Q. Were the largest load entities determined based upon capacity or energy?

A. Both capacity and energy were considered, however the three largest load entities which received 2 MW allocations had both the largest capacity and largest energy loads of the applicants.

Q. Is there a timeframe in which delivery arrangements must be in place?

A. Applicants are required to have third party transmission, displacement, and/or distribution service arrangements in place by April 1, 2008 that allow them to take delivery of power from Western.

Q. Are the displacement arrangements being referred to similar to the bill crediting arrangements used under the CRSP remarketing?

A. No. Applicants will be required to take physical delivery of the power. Under EPAMP, Western reserved the right to provide the economic benefits of its resources directly to Native American tribes, only if unanticipated obstacles to the delivery of the power arise.

Q. Who are the members of the Eastern Arizona Preference Pooling Association (EAPPA)?

A. The members are the City of St. Johns, the Town of Springerville, and the Town of Eagar in Arizona and the Village of Reserve in New Mexico. The Town of Pinetop/Lakeside in Arizona also applied to be a member of EAPPA but was determined to not be qualified.

Q. Why was a 2 MW allocation made for Indian Irrigation pumping?

A. Western is required by statute to give priority consideration to Indian irrigation pumping load adjacent to the Colorado River. The 2 MW of (summer capacity only) very closely matched the Indian irrigation pumping load identified in the application.

Q. Was only historical information for loads used?

A. Yes. Western only considered historical loads submitted for the period of time described in the Federal Register notices, not future projected loads.

Q. Did priority for Indian irrigation pumping supersede the order of priorities in the General Allocation Criteria?

A. Yes. Indian irrigation pumping adjacent to the lower Colorado River has legislative priority for Parker-Davis Project power in accordance with the Parker Dam Authorization Act of 1935.

Q. How is widespread use considered?

A. Considerations for widespread use included the locations of the applicants and types of entities (diversity of applicants) in addition to the number of customers or number of individuals impacted.

Q. Did Western consider that CRSP did not include the Colorado River Indian Tribes load in California in the CRSP Post-2004 allocations?

A. CRSP and Parker-Davis Project have separate marketing plans and marketing areas. The loads in both Arizona and California within the P-DP marketing area were considered.

Q. Was there a formula or a scoring of the applicants that was used to apply the factors considered in making the allocations?

A. There was not a formula or scoring used in deciding the allocations. The factors (widespread use, direct or indirect benefits from federal resources, load) contained in the Proposed Allocation Federal Register Notice of July 17, 2006, were evaluated for each applicant individually and then a decision was made as to which ones best met these factors.

Q. What criteria were used for deciding whether an entity was a member of a parent entity?

A. The definition from EPAMP was used to determine if an applicant was a member of a parent entity. In addition, during the public process it was determined that subcontractors for power from the Boulder Canyon Project would be considered members of a parent entity (70 FR 74806).

Q. What were the requirements for electrical utility status?

A. Electrical utility status means the applicant has responsibility for load growth, has a distribution system and is ready, willing, and able to purchase power from Western on a wholesale basis for resale to retail consumers.

Q. Can Western provide a list of applicants in the first priority for consideration?

A. The list of applicants in the first priority of consideration is attached.

Q. Does the phrase "has a distribution system" mean that the applicant must own a distribution system?

A. Owning a distribution system is one way to satisfy the requirement to have a distribution system. The distribution system requirement for electrical utility status could potentially be met through arrangements other than owning a distribution system.

Q. Are the loads of any of the proposed allottees less than the 1 MW allocation amount?

A. All the proposed allottees have loads greater than the minimum capacity allocation of 1 MW. Two allottees have total annual energy usage that is less than the maximum energy associated with a 1 MW allocation.

Q. Does the requirement for aggregated entities to have a satisfactory contractual arrangement in place by April 1, 2006 mean a contractual arrangement among the members?

A. Yes. The contractual arrangement is an agreement among the members of the aggregated group.

Q. Will questions be allowed at the public comment forums?

A. The public information forums are intended to take questions. The purpose of the public comment forums is for Western to receive comments. Western will answer questions, if at all possible, through the public information forums. To the extent that they cannot be answered at the public information forums we will make every attempt to answer them before the public comment forums. The questions and answers from the public information forums will be posted on the P-DP remarketing website.

Q. Will the comments be posted after the close of the comment period.

A. Yes.

Q. Did Western review each application individually and verify and check the loads presented in those applications?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Western check each application from each member of an aggregated entity and check the aggregation agreement documents submitted?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Western check each municipal use application in accordance with the criteria that was set forth?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Western encourage applicants to submit any and all data that applicants felt would be supportive of their case?

A. Yes, verbally and by written notice.

Q. Did Western offer to meet with all of the applicants?

A. Yes.

Q. The public process was explained in public information and comment forums before [the final allocation procedures] were published in December 2005 in the Federal Register?

A. Yes.

Q. Western accepted and did not refuse any filings or supplements that an applicant desired to put on record before the close of the comment period.

A. Western accepted applications through January 30, 2005 and accepted additional application information or updates through April 1, 2006. Comments have been accepted during the comment periods announced in the Federal Register notices during the public process.

Q. Western's evaluation of the applications is based upon the criteria cited in the public information forums and published in the Federal Register?

A. Yes.

Q. Does Western intend to offer individual applications to the public for comment?

A. No.

Q. Was each application judged by Western on the merits of the application and the criteria cited in the public information forums and published in the Federal Register?

A. Yes.

Q. Will the final decision on these allocations be at the discretion of Western?

A. Yes.

Q. Did Western made a distinction between a member of a parent entity with a contract with Western for federal power resources and a customer of such an entity?

A. Retail customers of an electrical service provider are not intended to be included in the definition of member of a parent entity.

Q. Will the contracts offered to new customers be similar to those for the existing customers?

A. Yes. There will be some minor differences but they will be very similar.

## **First Priority of Consideration Applicants**

Adaman Irrigation Water Delivery District #36  
Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians  
Blythe Mesa Electrical District  
Central Arizona Irrigation & Drainage District  
Cibola Valley Irrigation & Drainage District  
City of Yuma, AZ Public Works Department  
Corona, CA., City of  
Eagar, Town of (EAPPA)  
Escondido, CA., City of  
Hillander "C" Irrigation District  
Hohokam Irrigation & Drainage District  
Maricopa Stanfield Irrigation & Drainage District  
Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center (NAVFAC SW)  
Marine Corps Air Station Miramar (NAVFAC SW)  
Marine Corps Base Camp Pendleton (NAVFAC SW)  
Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow (NAVFAC SW)  
Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego (NAVFAC SW)  
Naval Air Station Coronado (NAVFAC SW)  
Naval Base Point Loma (NAVFAC SW)  
Naval Base Ventura County (NAVFAC SW)  
Naval Medical Center San Diego (NAVFAC SW)  
Naval Station, 32nd Street, San Diego (NAVFAC SW)  
Naval Surface Warfare Center Corona (NAVFAC SW)  
Paloma Irrigation & Drainage District  
Pechanga Band of Luiseño Mission Indians  
Reserve, NM. Village of (EAPPA)  
San Luis Rey River Indian Water Authority  
Springerville, AZ., Town of (EAPPA)  
St. Johns, AZ., City of (EAPPA)  
Town of Gilbert, AZ Utility Department  
Town of Marana Water Department  
Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians  
Williams, AZ. City of  
Yuma County Water Users' Association