

Williams · Bradbury

A T T O R N E Y S A T L A W

RECEIVED

2012 MAY -4 PM 2:01

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

May 4, 2012

Ms. Jean Jewell
Commission Secretary
Idaho Public Utilities Commission
472 W. Washington
Boise, ID 83702

Re: GNR-E-11-03

Dear Ms. Jewell:

Please find enclosed an original and nine copies of the Direct Testimony of Robert Looper on behalf of Dynamis Energy, LLC for filing in the above referenced case. The first copy of the testimony is designated as the reporter's copy, together with the requested CD-ROM for the reporter.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. Please feel free to give me a call should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. Williams

Ronald L. Williams

RLW/jr
Enclosures

RECEIVED

2012 MAY -4 PM 2:01

IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE COMMISSION'S)
REVIEW OF PURPA QF CONTRACT)
PROVISIONS INCLUDING THE)
SURROGATE AVOIDED RESOURCE)
(SAR) AND INTEGRATED RESOURCE)
PLANNING (IRP) METHODOLOGIES FOR)
CALCULATING PUBLISHED AVOIDED)
COST RATES.)
_____)

CASE NO. GNR-E-11-03

DYNAMIS ENERGY, LLC

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

ROBERT LOOPER

1 Q. Please state your name and business address.

2 A. My name is Robert D. Looper my business address is 1015 W. Hays
3 Street, Boise Idaho.

4 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

5 A. I am employed by and am the owner of Summit Energy, LLC. I am
6 appearing in this proceeding as a consultant to Dynamis Energy, LLC.

7 Q. What is your educational background?

8 A. I received a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering, 1978, from
9 Colorado State University. I am a registered Professional Engineer in the states of Idaho
10 (19 years) and Colorado (30 years).

11 Q. Please describe your professional and work experience.

12 A. For the past thirty-four years, I have been involved in the engineering,
13 development, financing, construction and operation of power plants. I have constructed
14 power plants using various technologies including natural gas fired turbines, landfill gas,
15 biomass, photovoltaic solar power, wind turbines and hydroelectric power. I was
16 President of Mountain View Power when it was awarded the bid and built the Bennett
17 Mountain Power Plant in Mountain Home for Idaho Power Company. Bennett Mountain
18 was a 162 MW large frame simple cycle gas fired combustion turbine operational in
19 March, 2005. I also led the effort for Summit Energy, as President of Lake Side Power,
20 LLC, in winning the bid and building the 535 MW two-on-one Lake Side combined cycle
21 natural gas fired power plant for PacifiCorp, south of Salt Lake City. I am an owner of
22 US Solar, a solar power developer with primary operations in Arizona and California. I
23 am also a principal in Idaho Energy Ventures, which has also unsuccessfully bid into
24 recent Idaho Power and PacifiCorp RFPs for gas fired or all-source generating resources.
25 I have advised Dynamis Energy in negotiating a PPA with Idaho Power and in planning

1 the development and operation of its Ada County landfill waste-to-energy power plant.
2 Attached as Exhibit No. 1001 is a more detailed summary of the power plants and power
3 projects I have been involved in.

4 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

5 A. The purpose of my testimony is to respond to Idaho Power witness Tessia
6 Park and Idaho Power's proposal to implement a new Schedule 74, to dispatch, or curtail,
7 generation from PURPA qualifying facilities, when the Company is experiencing certain
8 load conditions. In particular, I will address this proposal as it relates to the Dynamis
9 Energy Project for the Ada County landfill.

10 Q. In summary, what are the points you intend to address in your testimony?

11 A. The proposed Schedule 74 will severely damage the ability of IPP
12 Generators to develop and build QF power plants in Idaho. First, I disagree with the
13 assertion that Idaho Power has little or limited information available as to how much
14 renewable generation will be available on its system. Second, I disagree with the
15 characterization of Idaho Power's coal units and Langley Gulch as being "must run"
16 resources. I also believe Idaho Power has better alternatives than Schedule 74 for
17 managing the integration of renewable resources into their system. Finally, I will discuss
18 the inability for a developer to finance and build a new PURPA project, if Schedule 74
19 were to be approved by this Commission.

20 Q. How does Schedule 74 specifically impact the proposed Dynamis Energy
21 Project?

22 A. As a QF project, the Dynamis Project would be subject to an unknown
23 level of curtailment under conditions described in the Idaho Power filing. This
24 curtailment would reduce operating income for the Project. The PPA with Idaho Power
25 has been fully negotiated, executed and approved by the IPUC. The Project has moved

1 forward on this basis and is currently sourcing financing based on this PPA.

2 Q. During PPA discussions with Idaho Power, did Dynamis Energy make any
3 proposals to Idaho Power specifically regarding scheduling of generation for the
4 Dynamis Ada County landfill project?

5 A. Yes, in initial contract negotiations, Dynamis offered to allow Idaho
6 Power to schedule and dispatch generation from the Ada County waste fueled thermal
7 facility. A significant effort was made to define and guarantee operating parameters for
8 the Project, such as start-up and shut-down times, Pmin (minimum generation), Pmax
9 (maximum generation), and ramp rates which really define dispatchability for a power
10 plant. The Project was configured to allow Idaho Power to dispatch the plant during
11 periods of heavy loads, and ramp off the plant during lightly loaded hours. While some
12 good discussions were held on the ability and parameters of scheduling and
13 dispatchability, in the end, the Company declined this opportunity to have what I believe
14 would have been the first dispatchable QF on its system. In my opinion, the AURORA
15 model was unable to properly evaluate the value of a fully dispatchable unit and provide
16 additional value in the PPA to Dynamis for this service.

17 Q. Is the Dynamis facility an intermittent generating facility?

18 A. No, the generation is scheduled and considered a firm energy resource by
19 established industry standards. The PPA with Idaho Power has the energy delivery
20 scheduled for heavy load hours, with penalties if it operates during light load hours and
21 penalties applied if it does not generate within its available capacity during the scheduled
22 hours.

23 Q. If the unit is on during heavy load hours, and off during lightly loaded
24 hours, doesn't this achieve the goal of a dispatchable resource as far as Idaho Power is
25 concerned?

1 A. Only on a limited basis. The plant is block loaded during heavy load
2 hours, and completely off during light load hours. This does not allow Idaho Power the
3 ability to ramp the generation up and down 24 hours a day, to meet the requirements due
4 to other intermittent generation and loads. One of the concerns expressed by Idaho
5 Power in support of Schedule 74, appears to be just that, the ability to ramp on and off
6 generation to better meet Idaho Power's load profile. If Idaho Power is seeking relief via
7 Schedule 74, it should first strive to value dispatchability providing incentives to QF
8 projects who can meet dispatchable goals.

9 Q. What is the status of the generation interconnection of the Dynamis Project?

10 A. Idaho Power has supplied Dynamis with a proposed generation
11 interconnection agreement, or GIA, that requires Dynamis to install generator output
12 limiting controls, or GOLCs. It is my understanding of proposed Schedule 74, that using
13 the GOLCs, the Company could interrupt or limit Dynamis' generation any day of the
14 year, at any time.

15 Q. Ms. Park makes the statement that the Company has only a limited amount
16 of information available to it, as to when or how much intermittent QF generation it
17 might receive on a given day. Do you agree with this statement?

18 A. No. The output from the Dynamis Project is on a set schedule, delivering a
19 firm 20 MW per day from the hours of 6 am until 10 pm every day of the year.
20 Renewable resources such as the Dynamis Project and other MSW biomass projects can
21 be made to be fully dispatchable. As far as other renewable generators such as wind and
22 solar, forecasting tools have become more sophisticated and on site weather data
23 combined with regional weather stations are being used to monitor real time conditions.
24 Monitoring changes in wind currents and cloud conditions allow dispatchers to bring on
25 additional fast starting resources or ramp down larger facilities to anticipate the changes

1 in generation. In addition, improving technology for control of power factor at each
2 inverter combined with advanced technology will reduce the volatility of generation from
3 wind and solar farms. Other renewable resources such as run-of-river or run-of-canal
4 Hydroelectric, and Geothermal are inherently less volatile in their generation patterns and
5 although not considered dispatchable, can be mostly accommodated through day ahead
6 scheduling.

7 Q. Idaho Power suggests that Schedule 74 is required because they have
8 “must run” facilities and therefore must curtail QF generation. Do you agree with this
9 statement?

10 A. No. Although Idaho Power does have what would traditionally be
11 considered “must run” coal facilities, circumstances in gas pricing and technology have
12 changed and a designation of “must run” must be looked at in a new light.

13 Q. Ms. Park states that the Company must keep at least 300 MW of its
14 thermal units – the three coal plants and Langley Gulch – running and able to ramp up to
15 600 MW to serve load during heavy load hours. Do you agree that Langley Gulch should
16 be considered “base load” and that it is cannot be cycled on and off, on a short term
17 basis?

18 A. Langley Gulch is a 300 MW 1v1 (one combustion turbine, one steam
19 turbine) natural gas fired power plant, with additional duct fired capacity. Langley Gulch
20 is a dispatchable resource, and would not be considered a “must run” unit. From the
21 Idaho Power Corporate website:

22 *“In addition to providing electricity for Idaho Power’s customers, Langley*
23 *Gulch will also help to integrate the large amount of wind and other*
24 *renewable resources Idaho Power expects to have on its system in the*
25 *near term.*

26 *The new plant will be able to increase or decrease generation quickly to*
27 *respond to the variable and intermittent nature of renewable resources.”*

1 The 300 MW Langley Gulch was always intended to provide capability for multiple
2 starts and stops, certainly on a seasonal schedule, but also on a weekly schedule. This is
3 not the characteristics of a “must run” resource.

4 Q. Ms. Park also seems to testify that some of the Company’s coal plants
5 must remain on-line and available at all times, because once taken off line, they cannot,
6 for several or more days, be brought back on. In such instances, Ms. Park testifies that the
7 Company would need to start its higher cost, less efficient natural gas peaking units. Do
8 you agree?

9 A. I agree with the statement that coal plants cannot quickly be cycled up or
10 down, but disagree with the premise that this operational constraint means the Company
11 must, at virtually all times, have the ability to ramp-up all or most of its coal units. I also
12 disagree with the assertion that the Company’s coal fleet is “must run” twelve months of
13 the year.

14 Using cost data provided by Idaho Power to dispatch and operate coal plants,
15 it is clear that as natural gas prices have declined, the cost of starting and stopping gas
16 fired peaking plants is becoming more economical and lower risk than operating the coal
17 plants. It is apparent that Idaho Power has not used current pricing of natural gas in their
18 analysis, and has not incorporated the risk of carbon adders to the cost of coal generation.

19 Q. What do you mean by Lower Risk?

20 A. Idaho Power has not included the potential cost of green house gas
21 emissions in their estimates for dispatching their coal and natural gas generating
22 resources. Idaho Power, in their Response to Request No. 12, has provided a 20 year
23 levelized avoided cost of energy for the four sample QF Projects including Baseload,
24 Canal, Solar PV and Wind should a carbon cost adder be utilized in accordance with the
25 2011 IRP. The results increased the levelized avoided cost of power in a range from

1 \$18.70-25.44/MWh.

2 Using a heat rate of 10,000MMBtu's/kWh that might represent a gas fired
3 peaking plant, and using the current average price of natural gas for the next five years of
4 approximately \$3.10/MMBtu of natural gas as published on NYMEX, the fuel cost of
5 dispatching a gas fired peaker would be approximately \$31/MWh. The incremental cost
6 of CO2 emissions when operating coal as opposed to natural gas units, range from \$5-
7 15/MWh, should greenhouse gas regulations be implemented. Using the middle of this
8 range of \$10/MWh for coal, the fuel cost of dispatching a coal unit as owned by Idaho
9 Power would be over \$40/MWh. The cost of dispatching gas fired peakers can be more
10 economical than dispatching Idaho Power coal fired resources. This is a significant
11 conclusion in driving future decisions on how Idaho Power is to economically dispatch
12 their generating resources. For Idaho Power to conclude that the coal is "must run"
13 because it is the most economical to do so for ratepayers, is not a valid conclusion when
14 incorporating reasonable expectations for CO2 emission cost adders.

15 Q. How does this factor into the proposed Schedule 74?

16 A. Idaho Power's future of generation mix should be focused on use of
17 existing, and construction of new flexible fast start gas fired peaking generation, to better
18 integrate renewable resources while looking at turning off some of the "must run" coal
19 units which may carry higher cost for rate payers (certainly higher rate risk) and are less
20 desirable from a renewable perspective. There would be no need for a proposed
21 Schedule 74 following this policy on future generation.

22 To further illustrate, Rocky Mountain Power, in its testimony before the
23 Wyoming Public Service Commission, has recommended converting the Naughton Coal
24 Plant Unit #3 to natural gas, as opposed to expending dollars to clean up the coal plant
25 emissions. PacifiCorp (Rocky Mountain Power) is using a "Base Case" of \$16/MMBtu

1 and a high case of \$34/mmBtu for CO2 emission costs. For the 2010 Request for Offer,
2 PacifiCorp used a \$9/MWh adder for CO2 emissions in their evaluation of generation
3 resources when comparing to natural gas fired resources. This is how our neighboring
4 utility views "risk" associated with future of coal fired resources.

5 Q. If Schedule 74 were to be adopted, what impact do you believe it would
6 have on the ability to finance new PURPA projects in Idaho?

7 A. A rate schedule or tariff, as open ended as such proposed schedule 74,
8 would impose a huge burden for any PURPA project to be developed, if that
9 development needs to rely on debt financing. It would be foolish for a pure equity
10 investor to develop a QF plant, knowing that the revenue stream for such a project could
11 be interrupted at any time by the utility, with limitation. Schedule 74 makes it virtually
12 impossible for a project to develop reasonably accurate *pro forma* revenue projections,
13 for the reason that no one can predict to what level, and how often, the Company would
14 implement a Schedule 74 interruption. Without assurance of a steady revenue stream,
15 debt financing and loan prepayment become virtually impossible.

16 If the Company's goal is not to purchase some amount or level of QF
17 generation during light load hours, in light load seasons, there are other, much less
18 dramatic ways for the Idaho Power to achieve this result. For example, the Dynamis PPA
19 contains a provision where it does not generate during light load hours. As I mentioned
20 earlier, Dynamis offered, but the Company rejected, the ability to dispatch the Dynamis
21 power deliveries. Dispatching would have provided additional value to Idaho Power, as
22 discussed by Ms. Park. But, Idaho Power should have to negotiate for and compensate
23 Dynamis for this right, and this benefit to the Idaho Power system. Instead, the Company
24 is asking for a tariff based dispatch ability, without having to pay any compensation to
25 Dynamis for this right. Idaho Power should not have the right, through a tariff, to

1 indiscriminately interrupt or dispatch all existing and future QFs, without any limitations
2 on the use of this interruption right, and without there being compensation paid.

3 The proposed Schedule 74 sends a message to the Finance Community that
4 the State of Idaho is no place for IPP generation. If Idaho is willing to curtail generation
5 retro-active to existing PPA contracts, what further changes may be in store for a PPA
6 holder from Idaho Power? What is the true value of a long term bilateral PPA contract if
7 the IPP cannot rely on guarantee of the underlying utility to buy its energy?

8 Q. Do you know if other Utilities have had to address this oversupply issue
9 identified by Idaho Power?

10 A. In March 2012, Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) filed its own
11 version of Schedule 74 with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. BPA identified
12 the same issue as Idaho Power, oversupply of renewable energy (predominantly wind)
13 during periods of abundant hydroelectric generation and minimum loads. In their filing
14 with the FERC, BPA proposes to curtail the generation but compensate the generation
15 owners for lost revenue. Quoting from the BPA Journal, April 2012 edition;

16 *“Under the protocol, BPA would cover the costs of compensating*
17 *generators this spring from its transmission reserve account until a*
18 *rate can be established to recover the cost. BPA will initiate a new*
19 *rate case in which it will propose dividing compensation costs roughly*
20 *equally between users of BPS’s federal base system and generators*
21 *eligible for compensation from BPA.”*

22
23 This approach leaves the generator and its PPA contract whole, while addressing the
24 scheduling needs of the Utility.

25 Q. Would you support Idaho Power’s proposed Schedule 74 if it included full
26 compensation for lost revenue to generators in accordance with their PPAs ?

27 A. Yes

28 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

1

A. Yes.

CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 4th day of May, 2012, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing document upon the following individuals in the manner indicated below:

Donovan E. Walker
Jason B. Williams
Idaho Power Company
PO Box 70
Boise, ID 83707-0070
dwalker@idahopower.com
jwilliams@idahopower.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Michael G. Andrea
Avista Corporation
1411 E. Mission Avenue – MSC-23
Spokane, WA 99202
michael.andrea@avistacorp.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Daniel E. Solander
PacifiCorp dba Rocky Mountain Power
201 South Main, Suite 2300
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
daniel.solander@pacificorp.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Donald L. Howell, II
Kristine A. Sasser
Idaho Public Utilities Commission
472 W. Washington (zip: 83702)
PO Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0074
don.howell@puc.idaho.gov
kris.sasser@puc.idaho.gov

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Peter J. Richardson
Gregory M. Adams
Richardson & O’Leary, PLLC
PO Box 7218
Boise, ID 83702
peter@richardsonandoleary.com
greg@richardsonandoleary.com
**Attorneys for NIPPC, J.R. Simplot Co.,
Grand View, Exergy Development Group,
Board of County Commissioners of
Adams County, Idaho and Clearwater
Paper Corporation**

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Robert D. Kahn
NIPPC, Executive Director
1117 Minor Ave., Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98101
rkahn@nippc.org

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Don Sturtevant
Energy Director
J.R. Simplot Company
P.O. Box 27
Boise, ID 83707-0027
don.sturtevant@simplot.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Robert A. Paul
Grand View Solar II
15690 Vista Circle
Desert Hot Springs, CA 92241
robertapaul08@gmail.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

James Carkulis
Managing Member
Exergy Development Group of Idaho, LLC
802 West Bannock Street, Suite 1200
Boise, ID 83702
jcarkulis@exergydevelopment.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Don Reading
Exergy Development Group of Idaho, LLC
6070 Hill Road
Boise, ID 83703
dreading@mindspring.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Bill Brown, Chair
Board of Commissioners of Adams County
PO Box 48
Council, ID 83612
bdbrown@frontiernet.net

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Marv Lewallen
Clearwater Paper Corporation
601 W. Riverside Ave., Suite 1100
Spokane, WA 99201
Marv.lewallen@clearwaterpaper.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

John R. Lowe
Consultant to
Renewable Energy Coalition
12050 SW Tremont Street
Portland, OR 97225
jravenesanmarcos@yahoo.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

R. Greg Ferney
Mimura Law Offices, PLLC
2176 E. Franklin Road, Suite 120
Meridian, ID 83642
greg@mimuralaw.com
Attorneys for Interconnect Solar

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Bill Piske, Manager
Interconnect Solar Development, LLC
1303 E. Carter
Boise, ID 83706
billpiske@cableone.net

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Wade Thomas
General Counsel
Dynamis Energy, LLC
776 E. Riverside Drive, Suite 150
Eagle, ID 83616
wthomas@dynamisenergy.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

C. Thomas Arkoosh
Capitol Law Group, PLLC
205 N. 10th St., 4th Floor
PO Box 2598
Boise, ID 83701
tarkoosh@capitollawgroup.com
**Attorneys for Twin Falls Canal Company
And North Side Canal Company**

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Brian Olmstead
General Manager
Twin Falls Canal Company
PO Box 326
Twin Falls, ID 83303
olmstead@tfcanal.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Ted Diehl
General Manager
North Side Canal Company
921 N. Lincoln St.
Jerome, ID 83338
nscanal@cableone.net

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Ted S. Sorenson
Birch Power Company
5203 South 11th East
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
ted@tsorenson.net

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Dean J. Miller
McDevitt & Miller, LLP
420 W. Bannock Street (zip: 83702)
PO Box 2564
Boise, ID 83701
joe@mcdevitt-miller.com
**Attorneys for Idaho Windfarms, LLC and
Renewable Northwest Project**

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Glenn Ikemoto
Margaret Rueger
Idaho Windfarms, LLC
672 Blair Avenue
Piedmont, CA 94611
glenni@envisionwind.com
margaret@envisionwind.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Megan Walseth Decker
Senior Staff Counsel
Renewable Northwest Project
421 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 1125
Portland, OR 97204
megan@rnp.org

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

M. J. Humphries
Blue Ribbon Energy LLC
4515 S. Ammon Road
Ammon, ID 83406
blueribbonenergy@gmail.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Arron F. Jepson
Blue Ribbon Energy LLC
10660 South 540 East
Sandy, UT 84070
arronesq@aol.com

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Benjamin J. Otto
Idaho Conservation League
710 N. Sixth Street (zip: 83702)
PO Box 844
Boise, ID 83701
botto@idahoconservation.org

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Liz Woodruff
Ken Miller
Snake River Alliance
PO Box 1731
Boise, ID 83701
lwoodruff@snakeriveralliance.org
kmiller@snakeriveralliance.org

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

Tauna Christensen
Energy Integrity Project
769 N. 1100 E.
Shelley, ID 83274
tauna@energyintegrityproject.org

- Hand Delivery
- US Mail (postage prepaid)
- Facsimile Transmission
- Federal Express
- Electronic Transmission

/s/ *Ronald L. Williams*

Ronald L. Williams

BEFORE THE
IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

CASE NO. GNR-E-11-03

DYNAMIS ENERGY, LLC

**LOOPER, DI
TESTIMONY**

EXHIBIT NO. 1001

ROBERT LOOPER, P.E.

Principal, Idaho Energy Ventures

Robert D. ("Bob") Looper, P.E., is a founder and Principal of Idaho Energy Ventures, a joint venture established to develop power plants in Idaho and the surrounding region. Mr. Looper is a Civil Engineering graduate with honors from Colorado State University and has worked in the energy industry since 1978. He has been directly involved as a principal in the construction of over \$2 billion in power plants over the last ten years.

Principal Ventures:

Mr. Looper is a founder of US Solar Holdings LLC, with over 200 MW of Solar PV under signed PPA's and another 450 MW under development. Mr. Looper has been directly involved in the development and construction of over 4,500 MW of new power plants primarily in partnership with several large private and public energy companies. Mr. Looper has over 30 years' experience working principally with private industries involved in the development and operation of water, power and general civil projects.

Mr. Looper is a key principal in major power companies which include Summit Power Equipment, LLC (Hydroelectric Power), Summit Energy, LLC (Gas Fired Power) and US Solar Holdings LLC (Solar Power). Current projects under development and/or construction include the Kapuskasing Hydroelectric Project (20MW), Borrego Springs Solar PV (26MW), Blythe II Combined Cycle Project (570 MW), and the Desert Southwest Transmission Line (118 miles-500 kV).

Mr. Looper serves on the Board of Directors for the Brundage Mountain Ski Resort (McCall, ID) and Payette Brewing Company (Boise, ID). Mr. Looper has been active as a Bogus Basin Ski Resort Board Member (9 years) and now a Member of the Bogus Basin Recreation Association, a non-profit ski area near Boise, ID.

List of Power Projects for which Robert Looper was a Principal:

Borrego Solar 1 – US Solar Holdings LLC was principal developer for this 26 MW solar PV project currently under construction in Borrego Springs, CA. Other projects scheduled for construction in 2012 include the 150 MW Campo Verde solar PV project near Imperial Valley, CA, and Phase 1 of the 100 MW solar PV project on the airport near Blythe, CA.

Kapuskasing Hydroelectric Project – A 20 MW run-of-river hydroelectric project consisting of four cascading powerhouses located near the City of Kapuskasing, Ontario, Canada. Summit Power Equipment, LLC (SPE), provided all of the supply, installation, and commissioning for this project now 50% complete and expected for full commercial operation in December 2012. SPE has worked on over ten hydroelectric projects, totaling over 50 MW in Canada and the US over the last ten years.

Blythe Energy Project I & II – Two natural gas fired combined cycle projects located near Blythe, CA. Blythe I, 520MW placed into commercial operation in 2003. Blythe II, a fast start combined cycle technology 570 MW plant permitted with the CEC and

planned for construction next year. The project will ramp up to 340 MW in under ten minutes from a warm start. Summit Energy, LLC, under contract with Caithness Energy LLC, completed the development for these two large scale utility projects which sell power into the California ISO.

Lake Side I & II – Two natural gas fired combined cycle projects located near Orem, UT. Lake Side Power LLC, for which Mr. Looper was President, completed the development and construction for the Lake Side I, a 535 MW combined cycle project placed in service in 2007. Lake Side II is currently under construction and will be in commercial operation in 2013. The Projects are owned and operated by PacifiCorp.

160 MW Bennett Mountain Power Plant - Mountain View Power, Inc. (MVP) was selected in a competitive RFP process to construct the 160 MW Bennett Mountain Power Plant for Idaho Power. The project was sited and permitted in the City of Mountain Home, ID approximately 40 miles east of Boise, ID. Mr. Looper was President of MVP and led the project team in the development, engineering design, procurement and construction for the plant. The plant started construction in May 2004 and was available for commercial operation in March 2005. This project will provide peak power into the Idaho transmission system during times of high energy demand.

Desert Southwest Transmission Line – A 118 mile-500 kV transmission line to be constructed in three segments between Devers Substation near Palm Springs, CA and a terminus eight miles east of the new (under construction May 2012) Colorado River Substation. Mr. Looper serves as a Senior Vice-President for Caithness Energy on this venture.

Other Projects for which Mr. Looper served as Project Manager:

- Sewell Creek, Georgia: 410 MW simple cycle using Siemens Westinghouse V84.2 and two Siemens Westinghouse V84.3; commercial operation in 6/00.
- SMARR, Georgia: 220 MW simple cycle using two Siemens Westinghouse V84.2; commercial operation in 7/99.
- Griffith Energy, Arizona: 600 MW 2X1 combined cycle with heavy duct firing using GE7241FA; commercial operation in 5/01.
- St. Francis No. 2, Missouri: 260 MW combined cycle single shaft 1X1 using Siemens Westinghouse V84.3A; commercial operation in 4/01.
- Choteau Project, Oklahoma: 520 MW 2X1 combined cycle with duct firing using Siemens Westinghouse V84.3A; commercial operation in 6/00.
- St. Francis No. 1, Missouri: 260 MW combined cycle single shaft 1X1 using Siemens Westinghouse V84.3A; commercial operation in 12/99.

- Bridgeport Energy Project, Connecticut: 340 MW simple cycle using Siemens Westinghouse V84.3A; commercial operation in 6/98. Further developed into 520 MW 2X1 combined cycle; commercial operation in 6/99. Oil added in 2001.
- Collett Dam & Reservoir, California: Dam and storage reservoir for power generation; completed in 1991. Malacha Power Project, Inc was General Partner and Operator of the project.
- Muck Valley Hydro, Fall River Mills, California: 32.5 MW hydroelectric facility; commercial operation 12/88. Malacha Power Project, Inc., was General Partner and Operator of the project.