

1 United States respectively. I have dealt extensively with wind generation, integration and
2 transmission issues.

3
4 Q Would you please identify what has been marked for identification as Exhibit 43-1 (RH-1).

5
6 A Exhibit 43-1 (RH-1) is a résumé of my educational background and employment experience.

7
8 Q Would you please describe and explain the value of wind energy resources to the State of
9 Washington and the Pacific Northwest.

10
11 A Wind resources, particularly in the Pacific Northwest, have several unique attributes
12 which make them especially valuable when compared to more conventional electricity
13 generating resources. Among these characteristics are price stability (because the fuel is
14 free), easy integration into the Northwest's hydro-based electric system, avoidance of
15 greenhouse gases and risk minimization for purchasing utilities. These and other
16 advantages are discussed in more detail below.

17
18 This need for wind resources is especially relevant over the next few years (i.e. 2007 –
19 2011) as regional electric loads grow beyond the capability of existing generation
20 resources. All Northwest investor owned utilities have already issued one or more
21 requests for future resources. For publicly owned systems, the Bonneville Power
22 Administration (BPA) has recently proposed a tiered rate system to be implemented
23 along with offering of its new power contracts in 2011. One of BPA's principal reasons
24 behind offering such contracts is to develop the infrastructure, (both for power resources

1 and additional transmission lines), to ensure the Northwest has “an adequate energy
2 supply in the future”.

3
4 For the last 15 years nearly all resource acquisition in the Northwest has been natural gas
5 fired combined cycle combustion turbines (CCCTs). This preference for gas fired
6 generation has occurred for several reasons. CCCTs can be built much faster than
7 baseload thermal plants. The price of natural gas was, for a considerable amount of time,
8 highly competitive with alternative power plant fuels. Their emissions (compared to coal
9 and oil fired generation) are comparatively low. And most importantly, because of the
10 location of major gas pipelines in the region, such turbines can be located near load
11 centers, thus minimizing the need for additional transmission line construction.

12
13 This preference for CCCTs, however, has created significant adverse consequences.
14 First, since the price of natural gas in the mid and long term tends to track world oil
15 prices, use of gas resources has created considerable price volatility, both for Northwest
16 electric utilities and their ratepayers. Over the last 12 months, oil prices have fluctuated
17 around \$65 – 78/bbl and regional natural gas prices have likewise varied from \$6 –
18 12/MM btu. The current five year forward price for natural gas is around \$8/MM btu.
19 For a new CCCT, this fuel price would produce an electricity price of roughly \$65 –
20 70/MWh. Most new wind resources in the Northwest are below this price threshold.

21
22 The second consequence of our reliance on natural gas generated resources is a function
23 of the unique nature of electricity itself. Electricity is markedly different from most other
24 commodities in two major respects: (1) there is no way to store it in the sense that other
25

1 commodities like grain can be stored, and hence the price dampening effect of regulating
2 inventory levels does not exist; and (2) it is so intrinsically intertwined with public health
3 and safety that we literally cannot, as a society, do without it for any substantial period of
4 time.

5
6 Taken together, these two characteristics preclude a normal supply/demand relationship
7 and produce an extreme degree of price volatility whenever supplies are tight. The
8 2000/2001 California electricity crisis, and its residual effect on Northwest retail
9 electricity rates, is a prime example of this phenomenon.

10
11 Development of sufficient wind resources in the Northwest will directly address this price
12 volatility. As mentioned above, wind is cost competitive with existing and projected
13 prices of CCCTs, and, because the fuel is free, wind is not subject to the wild price
14 fluctuations associated with gas and oil fired resources. Wind power's short construction
15 time and ability to capture varying wind currents (because of strategic turbine
16 positioning) within a single site also create built in hedges against the seasonal, and even
17 daily, price fluctuations inherent in gas fired resources.

18
19 Supplying 10 – 20 percent of a utility's energy from wind (the range of most state
20 renewable portfolio standards) will diversify away from the risks associated with reliance
21 on traditional resources. These historical and/or emerging risks are well known: for
22 hydro, they involve annual changes in precipitation and mandated fish protection
23 measures; for coal, price escalation due to transportation costs and regulatory risks of
24

1 greenhouse gas mitigation measures; and, for natural gas, the aforementioned price
2 volatility.

3
4 The benefits of supplying a reasonable amount of a utility's load from wind are similar to
5 those of diversifying your personal stock portfolio - - it minimizes your exposure to the
6 price and supply risks associated with any one resource experiencing an unusual series of
7 adverse impacts.

8
9 Despite the ongoing national and international debate over global warming and its
10 environmental consequences, there is an emerging consensus that this phenomenon is
11 occurring at a steadily increasing rate and that human induced greenhouse gas (GHG)
12 emissions (primarily from automobiles and fossil fuel fired power plants) are significant
13 contributors to it. This consensus is probably best demonstrated in the June 2006 report
14 by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) which states, in part, "There is sufficient
15 evidence from tree rings, boreholes, retreating glaciers and other 'proxies' of past surface
16 temperatures to say with a high level of confidence that the last few decades of the 20th
17 century were warmer than any comparable period in the last 400 years." While the NAS
18 report does not attempt to quantify the contributions of greater GHG emissions to global
19 warming, it seems intuitive that their effect is significant. As a result, it is likely that
20 future U.S. and state policies will seek to limit and/or tax emissions from fossil fuel
21 plants. In fact, California, Oregon and Washington already have various carbon
22 mitigation measures for certain types of fossil fuel resources.

1 Given this probable regulatory trend, and the basic fact that fossil fuel plants produce
2 harmful GHGs, wind is ideally positioned as a viable alternative, non-polluting, energy
3 resource. Indeed, the proliferation of state mandated Renewable Portfolio Standards (20
4 states have now adopted such RPS) is driven principally by a desire to limit GHG
5 emissions.

6
7 Roughly 50 percent of all Pacific Northwest power is generated from hydroelectricity.
8 This predominance of hydro is unique in the United States, and it provides the ideal
9 mechanism through which to cost effectively integrate wind resources into the Northwest
10 electrical system. This integration capability exists because hydro dams can temporarily
11 ramp up their output, either within the hour or for one or two hours in advance, to meet
12 temporary variations in wind energy production. This capability allows wind to be easily
13 “firmed up” for serving retail loads, without having to build back up resources or use
14 more expensive CCCTs for real time load following. Therefore, because Northwest
15 integration costs are low, it is to the region’s economic advantage to maximize its
16 available wind potential for electricity generation.

17
18 Wind can be used cost effectively to meet about 10 – 15 percent of a utility’s total
19 generation portfolio (beyond 15 percent, the intermittent nature of wind limits its ability
20 to be integrated in a cost effective manner). This 15 percent level is in large part
21 responsible for the 2020 goal specified in Initiative 937 for a Washington State RPS, and
22 is also consistent with most RPS’s in other states. However, some states are even going
23 beyond this level. For example, California has established a 20 percent renewables goal
24 by 2010, and Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski has recently proposed a goal of 25% by
25

1 2025 and has appointed a working group to develop legislation to implement this goal
2 which is expected to be introduced in the 2007 legislative session.

3
4 This 10 – 15 percent level will probably allow Northwest utilities (based on the most
5 recent Northwest Power and Conservation Council load forecast) to meet all or most of
6 their load growth from wind (or other renewables) for at least the next 5 – 10 years. . .

7 The Integrated Resource Plans (IRP's) that have been submitted by Northwest utilities is
8 summarized in the following table.

9	Utility	IRP Wind Capacity (MW)	2016 Load (aMW)	IRP Wind Energy (aMW)	Wind Contribution to Load (percent)
10	Avista	400	1,424	132	9.3
11	Idaho Power	350	2,187	116	5.3
12	PacifiCorp West	600	2,678	198	7.4
13	Portland General Electric	200	3,075	66	2.1
14	Puget Sound Energy	845	2,790	279	10.0
15	Total	2,395	12,154	790	6.5

16
17
18
19
20 This interim reliance on wind, while not the long term solution to our energy needs, will
21 buy us time for several needed developments to occur. First, it should allow time for the
22 current technical challenges facing integrated coal gasification to be resolved. Second, it
23 will provide a period for demonstration of carbon sequestration for fossil fuel facilities.
24 Third, it will also provide time for construction of major new transmission lines (e.g.

1 from Montana or Wyoming) to transport clean coal resources to Northwest loads. By
2 buying the region some time to develop long term generation and transmission solutions
3 to our energy needs, wind can ensure the Northwest a reliable, cost effective energy
4 supply for the foreseeable future while still filling its long term role as part of each
5 utility's resources portfolio..

6
7 By November 2006, we will know if Initiative 937 will be state law. If this occurs, then
8 Washington State public and investor owned utilities will need to acquire roughly 1500 –
9 1700 average megawatts (or 4500 – 5000 megawatts of wind capacity) to meet the 15
10 percent RPS requirement by 2020. While 937 applies to all renewable resources (e.g.
11 biomass and geothermal), the vast majority of resources acquired to meet the standard
12 will be wind powered.

13
14 The Kittitas Valley Wind Power Project is well suited to help Washington utilities meet
15 this likely RPS requirement. It has a capacity factor comparable to other wind projects
16 and is capable of interconnecting to either the Bonneville Power Administration's or
17 Puget Sound Energy's transmission system in a cost effective manner. It is also located
18 closer to major load centers (e.g. the Puget Sound region) than most other proposed wind
19 project sites. Finally, it is located in a completely different area than the vast majority of
20 likely Northwest wind projects (i.e. the Columbia Gorge) and, therefore, can provide
21 utilities with some resource diversity relative to their likely purchases from other wind
22 projects.

1 **Conclusion**

2
3 All the above reasons point to maximizing the amount of cost effective wind capacity
4 potentially available to the Washington State consumer. In so doing, we will:

- 5 • minimize future price volatility
- 6 • diversify utility resource portfolios
- 7 • minimize our exposure to the price, regulatory and technology risks inherent
8 with fossil fuel resources, and give ourselves some time to resolve, or at least
9 better understand and quantify, such risks before making irrevocable long
10 term energy supply commitments.

11 -
12 Wind resources are finite natural resources. They are much like rivers which have in the
13 past provided abundant low cost electrical generation for the State of Washington. The
14 dams that produce this electricity had to be placed where the rivers ran. Similarly, wind
15 resources must be utilized where the wind blows. In this respect, wind will likely
16 become a prominent future renewable resource for the Northwest, much like the
17 historical role played by hydro in this region. Indeed, Governor Gregoire and PSE CEO
18 Steve Reynolds made this precise analogy in their remarks at the recent dedication for the
19 Wild Horse Wind Project.