

RECEIVED
SEP 16 11 46 AM '06
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION)
OF IDAHO POWER COMPANY FOR A)
CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND) CASE NO. IPC-E-06-09
NECESSITY FOR THE RATE-BASING)
OF THE EVANDER ANDREWS POWER)
COMPLEX EXPANSION PROJECT)
_____)

IDAHO POWER COMPANY
DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
GREGORY W. SAID

1 Q. Please state your name and business address.

2 A. My name is Gregory W. Said and my business
3 address is 1221 West Idaho Street, Boise, Idaho.

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

6 A. I am employed by Idaho Power Company as the
7 Manager of Revenue Requirement in the Pricing and Regulatory
8 Services Department.

9 Q. Please describe your educational background.

10 A. In May of 1975, I received a Bachelor of
11 Science Degree in Mathematics with honors from Boise State
12 University. In 1999, I attended the Public Utility
13 Executive's Course at the University of Idaho.

14 Q. Please describe your work experience with
15 Idaho Power Company.

16 A. I became employed by Idaho Power Company in
17 1980 as an analyst in the Resource Planning Department. In
18 1985, the Company applied for a general revenue requirement
19 increase. I was the Company witness addressing power supply
20 expenses.

21 In August of 1989, after nine years in the
22 Resource Planning Department, I was offered and I accepted a
23 position in the Company's Rate Department. With the
24 Company's application for a temporary rate increase in 1992,
25 my responsibilities as a witness were expanded. While I

1 continued to be the Company witness concerning power supply
2 expenses, I also sponsored the Company's rate computations
3 and proposed tariff schedules.

4 Because of my combined Resource Planning and
5 Rate Department experience, I was asked to design a Power
6 Cost Adjustment (PCA) which would impact customers' rates
7 based upon changes in the Company's net power supply
8 expenses. I presented my recommendations to the Idaho
9 Public Utilities Commission in 1992 at which time the
10 Commission established the PCA as an annual adjustment to
11 the Company's rates. I have sponsored the Company's annual
12 PCA adjustment in each of the years 1996 through 2003.

13 In 1996, I was promoted to Director of
14 Revenue Requirement. At year-end 2002, I was promoted to
15 Manager of Revenue Requirement.

16 During 1999 and 2000, I directed the
17 preparation of the Company's 2000 Integrated Resource Plan
18 (IRP). I managed the Request for Proposals (RFP) process
19 that resulted from the Near-Term Action Plan identified in
20 that Resource Plan. I have also participated in the
21 preparation of subsequent IRPs and in several RFP processes.
22 I was the Company's principal witness in its applications
23 for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for both the
24 original Evander Andrews Power Plant Project and the Bennett
25 Mountain Project.

1 Q. Please outline the major topics you will
2 address in your testimony in this proceeding.

3 A. There are four major topics that comprise my
4 testimony. First, I will briefly describe the history that
5 preceded Idaho Power's issuance of the RFP on March 30,
6 2005. Second, I will describe the bid evaluation process
7 that led to selection of Siemens Power Generation, Inc.
8 (Siemens) as the winning bidder. Third, I will provide a
9 general description of the proposed expansion of the Evander
10 Andrews Power Plant (Project). Finally, I will discuss the
11 Company's proposed ratemaking treatment of the costs
12 associated with the Project.

13 Q. What were the major events that preceded the
14 selection of the Siemens proposal?

15 A. The major events leading up to the selection
16 of the Siemens proposal were the issuance of the 2004 IRP in
17 August 2004, the Commission's acceptance of the Company's
18 2004 IRP for filing on April 22, 2005 (Order No. 29762) and
19 issuance of the combustion turbine peaking resource RFP in
20 March 2005. The 2004 IRP is on file with the Commission
21 and, as such, Idaho Power requests that the Commission take
22 administrative notice of that document.

23 Q. What drives the need for Idaho Power to
24 acquire additional resources?

25 A. Customer growth is the primary driving force

1 behind Idaho Power Company's need for additional resources.
2 The number of households in the Company's service territory
3 is expected to increase from about 320,000 at the time the
4 2004 IRP was prepared to over 380,000 by the end of the 10-
5 year planning period of that IRP. Idaho Power must acquire
6 additional physical resources to meet the electrical energy
7 demands of these additional customers.

8 Q. Please describe the major factor that formed
9 the basis of the 2004 IRP.

10 A. Idaho Power has an obligation to serve its
11 customers' loads regardless of the water conditions that may
12 occur. The 2004 IRP was prepared by evaluating the adequacy
13 of the Company's resources to meet customer needs based upon
14 planning criteria that included 70th percentile water
15 conditions and 70th percentile load conditions. This "worse-
16 than-median" level of water criteria received both public
17 input and regulatory support during the 2002 IRP process.
18 Use of these criteria lessens the Company's reliance on
19 market purchases during periods of low water and produces a
20 greater need for resource acquisition than pre-2002 analyses
21 that were based upon median water conditions.

22 Q. Based upon this assumption, what did the
23 Company conclude was required to satisfy future loads in the
24 planning horizon?

25 A. Idaho Power examined 12 resource portfolios

1 as part of the 2004 Integrated Resource Plan. Five of those
2 portfolios were selected for additional risk analyses.
3 Ultimately, the Company, with the support of the IRP
4 Advisory Council, selected a balanced portfolio containing
5 renewable resources, demand-side measures and thermal
6 generation to meet the projected electric demands over the
7 next ten years. The 2004 IRP identified specific actions in
8 the Near-Term Action Plan to be taken by the Company prior
9 to the next IRP in 2006.

10 Q. What specific actions did the 2004 IRP Near-
11 Term Action Plan recommend?

12 A. The 2004 IRP Near-Term Action Plan called for
13 the issuance of RFPs for 200 MW of wind resource, for 100 MW
14 of geothermal resource, for 12 MW of Combined Heat and Power
15 resource and for 88 MW of a combustion turbine peaking
16 resource. In addition, the 2004 IRP called for proceeding
17 with the Borah-West transmission upgrade and designing and
18 developing demand-side measures in coordination with the
19 Energy Efficiency Advisory Group (EEAG) and the Public
20 Utility Commissions of Idaho and Oregon.

21 Q. In addition to the combustion turbine peaking
22 resource RFP, has Idaho Power issued other RFPs consistent
23 with those recommendations?

24 A. Yes. Idaho Power issued an RFP for renewable
25 wind-powered generation on January 13, 2005. The Company's

1 RFP evaluation team has notified the wind generation bidders
2 who have been selected for the short list. Information
3 concerning the transmission requirements of the short-listed
4 wind proposals has been solicited from those bidders. That
5 information will be used to further evaluate the proposals.

6 On January 18, 2006, the Company issued a
7 draft RFP for a geothermal-powered generation resource.
8 Idaho Power solicited comments concerning that geothermal
9 proposal and intends to issue a formal RFP for a geothermal
10 resource this spring.

11 Q. The 2004 IRP Near-Term Action Plan also
12 called for issuance of an RFP for 12 MW of a Combined Heat
13 and Power (CHP) resource. Has that RFP been issued?

14 A. No. The 2004 IRP envisioned, in the Near-
15 Term, acquisition of 12 MW of a CHP resource and, later,
16 acquisition of an additional 36 MW of CHP-generated
17 electricity to be on-line in 2010. However, the Company is
18 presently negotiating with a cogenerator who proposes to
19 provide the Company with CHP-generated power in excess of
20 the amounts identified in the 2004 RFP. For that reason,
21 the Company has not issued an RFP for this resource.

22 Q. The 2004 IRP also stated that the Company
23 would proceed with upgrading the Borah-West transmission
24 line. What progress is the Company making in upgrading that
25 line?

1 A. Idaho Power is presently upgrading the
2 capacity of the Borah-West path. The transmission
3 improvements will increase the Borah-West transmission
4 capacity by 250 MW and are expected to be completed in May
5 2007.

6 Q. What demand-side measures does the 2004 IRP
7 identify for the Company to pursue as part of the Near-Term
8 Action Plan?

9 A. In its 2004 IRP, the Company identified six
10 DSM resources to pursue as part of its Near-Term Action
11 Plan. These resources included two demand response programs
12 and four energy efficiency programs. Each of these programs
13 targeted summer peak loads.

14 Q. Please describe the progress that the Company
15 has made toward the implementation of these six DSM
16 programs.

17 A. The six DSM programs included in the
18 Company's 2004 IRP final resource portfolio were designed
19 with input from the EEAG and successfully implemented during
20 2005. Funding for these DSM efforts was provided through an
21 increased Energy Efficiency Rider, Schedule 91, which became
22 effective June 1, 2005.

23 Idaho Power launched the Irrigation Peak
24 Rewards and A/C Cool Credit programs in accordance with
25 Order Nos. 29665 and 29702, respectively. The two demand

1 response programs achieved a combined peak demand reduction
2 in 2005 of 43 MW at the meter level or 48.7 MW at the
3 generation level, which was approximately 124% of the 2004
4 IRP target for demand response resources in 2005.

5 The Company expanded and modified the
6 Irrigation Efficiency (now known as Irrigation Efficiency
7 Rewards) and Industrial Efficiency programs to acquire the
8 energy savings identified in the 2004 IRP for those two
9 customer classes. The ENERGY STAR[®] Homes Northwest Program
10 was expanded to achieve the energy savings identified in
11 the 2004 IRP under the name Residential Efficiency (New
12 Construction).

13 The Company launched the Building Efficiency
14 Program in 2005 to acquire the energy savings identified in
15 the 2004 IRP under the name Commercial Efficiency (New
16 Construction). In 2005, these four energy efficiency
17 programs achieved a combined energy savings of 13,946 MWhs
18 at the meter level or 15,466 MWhs at the generation level,
19 which was approximately 93% of the 2004 IRP target for
20 energy efficiency programs in 2005.

21 Q. Has the Company filed with the Oregon Public
22 Utility Commission (OPUC) a request for authorization to
23 implement an energy efficiency tariff rider in Oregon?

24 A. Yes. The Company received authorization to

1 implement an Energy Efficiency Rider, Schedule 91, in Oregon
2 effective August 31, 2005. The Oregon Schedule 91 mirrors
3 the current Idaho Schedule 91. The Company has also
4 received authorization from the OPUC to operate the
5 Industrial Efficiency, Irrigation Peak Rewards, Irrigation
6 Efficiency Rewards, Building Efficiency and ENERGY STAR
7 Homes Northwest programs in Oregon.

8 Q. Has the Company continued to assess the
9 potential for additional cost-effective DSM as an
10 alternative to supply-side resources beyond the resources
11 identified in the 2004 IRP analysis?

12 A. Yes. Based on the recommendation of the 2004
13 IRP Advisory Council, the Company commissioned an expanded
14 assessment of DSM resources beyond those that target the
15 summer peak within the residential and commercial customer
16 classes. Quantum Consulting Inc. completed the Idaho Power
17 Demand-Side Management Potential Study in the fall of 2004
18 and the Company filed the study with the Commission on
19 December 15, 2004 as a supplement to the 2004 IRP. The
20 results of this study will provide guidance in the design of
21 two DSM retrofit programs for the commercial and residential
22 customer classes. Both of the DSM retrofit programs will be
23 analyzed as part of the Company's 2006 IRP as potential
24 base-load demand-side resources.

25 Q. Please describe the 2005 peaking resource RFP

1 issued by the Company.

2 A. Among the actions recommended by the 2004 IRP
3 was the acquisition of a targeted 88 MW simple-cycle,
4 natural gas-fired combustion turbine. Consistent with the
5 recommendations of the 2004 IRP, the peaking resource RFP
6 requested proposals for an 80 MW - 200 MW turnkey electric
7 generation resource located within the Company's service
8 territory that would meet anticipated peak energy demands.
9 The flexibility in plant capacity permitted under the RFP
10 allowed the developers to respond to the RFP with their most
11 cost-effective proposals. The RFP directed respondents to
12 locate the proposed facility at either the Company's Evander
13 Andrews Power Complex or the Bennett Mountain Power Plant
14 site or at a site of a respondent's choosing.

15 Q. Please describe the response the Company
16 received to the peaking resource RFP.

17 A. The Company received 31 proposals from nine
18 companies that offered generation units ranging in size
19 between 71 MW and 170 MW. The proposals included large and
20 small frame combustion turbines, aeroderivative combustion
21 turbines and reciprocating engines located at four proposed
22 sites. Both new and secondary market machines were proposed
23 and evaluated by the Company.

24 Q. Did the Company engage an independent third
25 party to review the Company's RFP and bid evaluation

1 process?

2 A. Yes, as in our previous RFP evaluations, the
3 Company utilized an independent third party to assist in the
4 development of the 2005 peaking resource RFP and evaluation
5 criteria and to provide assistance in the review and
6 evaluation of bids. Power Engineers acted as independent
7 consultant for this RFP.

8 Q. Please describe the process that resulted in
9 selection of the proposal from Siemens Power Generation,
10 Inc. as the successful RFP respondent.

11 A. The Idaho Power RFP team received all the
12 bids on or before the June 2, 2005 submission deadline. The
13 Company did not prepare a self-build proposal. On June 3,
14 2005, the RFP evaluation team opened the proposals and began
15 the initial screening process based on predetermined price
16 criteria and non-price criteria established with the
17 assistance of Power Engineers. In September 2005, based
18 upon initial screening, the top fifteen proposals received
19 from four different companies were short-listed and face-to-
20 face meetings with representatives of the short-listed
21 entities were scheduled for October 2005. Prior to these
22 scheduled meetings, the Company sent a document to each
23 short-listed bidder summarizing the Company's understanding
24 of the bidder's proposal.

25 Q. Whom did the Company ultimately select as the

1 preferred bidder?

2 A. Following the meetings with the short-listed
3 bidders, the RFP evaluation team selected Siemens as the
4 preferred bidder due to that company's ranking based upon
5 the pre-determined price and non-price criteria set out in
6 the Evaluation Manual developed for this RFP. The RFP
7 evaluation team made its recommendation to the Company's
8 management on November 22, 2005 and on March 16, 2006, the
9 Company's management recommended to the Idaho Power Board of
10 Directors that Siemens be selected as the preferred bidder.
11 Board authorization of the expenditure of funds for
12 construction of the new Evander Andrews Power Plant by
13 Siemens is expected next month.

14 Q. Please give a general description of the
15 Project.

16 A. The Project will consist of a new Siemens-
17 Westinghouse SGT6-5000F simple-cycle, natural gas-fired
18 combustion turbine rated at 170 MW with ultra dry low NO_x
19 combustion system, together with typical balance of plant
20 facilities and equipment. The Project is currently
21 scheduled to begin generating in June of 2008. The Project
22 will be located at the existing approximate forty (40) acre
23 Evander Andrews Power Complex located in Elmore County,
24 north of Mountain Home, Idaho. The site currently hosts two
25 45 MW gas-fired units owned by Idaho Power.

1 The Project will be interconnected to the
2 Company's 230 kV transmission system located approximately
3 seven miles from the Evander Andrews site. The combustion
4 turbine will connect to an existing gas line at the site for
5 fuel supply. Sufficient capacity exists in this gas line to
6 accommodate the requirements of the existing facilities and
7 the new Project and no upgrades are anticipated.

8 Water for generation will be pumped from an
9 existing well on the Evander Andrews premises. Both
10 substantial water supply capacity and prior water rights
11 exist for the existing and proposed facilities. The
12 Project's waste water will be discharged to an existing
13 waste water system located on the site. The Project will
14 operate in compliance with all appropriate DEQ air and water
15 quality standards. A map showing the location of the
16 Project is attached to the Company's Application for a
17 Certificate of Convenience and Necessity filed concurrently
18 with this testimony.

19 Q. The Company's 2004 IRP Ten-Year Resource Plan
20 recommends that this Project be on-line in 2007. Why is the
21 Project delayed by one year to 2008?

22 A. Idaho Power must make significant additional
23 investment in its generating resources and its transmission
24 and distribution infrastructure over the 10-year planning
25 period covered in the 2004 IRP. Because of this increased

1 capital budget pressure, the Company evaluated the most
2 prudent use of its resources and determined that other
3 short-term alternatives other than this Project could meet
4 the projected peak energy needs for the summer of 2007.

5 The Company determined that an additional 50
6 megawatts of market purchases and associated transmission
7 could be made for heavy load hours during the summer of 2007
8 from the eastern side of Idaho Power's system. This firm
9 energy purchase enables the Company to delay the Project for
10 one year while, at the same time, meeting the capacity
11 planning criteria established in the 2004 IRP.

12 This 50 megawatt east side purchase reduces
13 the overall projected peak-hour deficit to 61 megawatt which
14 falls within the 75 megawatt deficit limit established by
15 the planning criterion in the 2004 IRP. Based on this
16 analysis, the Company adjusted the on-line date of the
17 Project to 2008.

18 Q. What is the firm contract price for the
19 Project?

20 A. The firm contract price for the 170-megawatt
21 Project is \$49,999,000.00.

22 Q. Was this the only factor used to evaluate the
23 various bids?

24 A. No. All of the bids were evaluated on the
25 basis of price and non-price criteria that had been

1 identified prior to the bid opening. Included among the
2 criteria were fuel costs assumptions, transmission costs and
3 bidder experience and financial strength.

4 Q. What fuel cost assumptions were used in
5 evaluating the bids?

6 A. Forecasted natural gas prices from the 2004
7 IRP were used in the bid evaluation. Forecasted natural gas
8 prices have gone up substantially since the issuance of the
9 2004 IRP, but the same price forecast was utilized in the
10 evaluation of all of the natural gas-fired project proposals
11 and, as a result, projects with lower guaranteed heat rates
12 had lower fuel costs on a dollar per megawatt basis.

13 Q. Were there other material considerations used
14 in evaluating the bids?

15 A. Yes. The selected bidder had to demonstrate
16 sufficient financial strength and experience to provide
17 Idaho Power with a high level of confidence that output from
18 the project would be available June 1, 2008.

19 Q. In the Company's opinion, does Siemens Power
20 Generation, Inc. have the financial strength and experience
21 to assure that the Project will produce electricity by June
22 2008?

23 A. Yes. Idaho Power can rely on the financial
24 strength and experience of not only Siemens Power
25 Generation, Inc. but also of its parent company, Siemens

1 Corporation, to assure the performance of the agreement and
2 the successful completion of the Project.

3 Q. Would you please describe what you believe
4 are the significant provisions of the turnkey construction
5 arrangement with Siemens Power Generation, Inc. for
6 acquisition of the Project?

7 A. One of the most significant attributes of the
8 Siemens turnkey Project is that Siemens will furnish all of
9 the labor, equipment and materials and perform all of the
10 engineering and construction of the Project. Unlike the
11 Bennett Mountain project, Siemens will work directly with
12 Idaho Power. As a result, the "middle man" project
13 coordinator has been eliminated with this proposal.
14 Completion of construction and all performance testing of
15 the Project, including guaranteed capacity and guaranteed
16 heat rate, are scheduled to be completed by April 1, 2008.
17 Project ownership will transfer to Idaho Power at that time
18 provided that all Provisional Acceptance Criteria identified
19 in the agreement been satisfied. If that criteria is not
20 met, Idaho Power has the opportunity to assess liquidated
21 damages against Siemens.

22 Q. Are there other attributes of the Project
23 that you believe are important to the Commission's
24 consideration?

25 A. Yes, there are. The Project is located at

1 the Company's Evander Andrews Complex near the Company's
2 existing 230 kV transmission system. Although the
3 transmission system will require additional investment in
4 order to integrate the Project, those improvements will
5 provide capacity during all seasons and improve the
6 reliability of the Company's transmission system.

7 By selecting this Project, the Company will
8 expand an existing site and benefit from the anticipated
9 economies of using the present staff to operate the new
10 facility. Operations, in effect, will be centralized.

11 Environmental compliance reporting is
12 anticipated to be simplified by expanding generation at an
13 existing plant versus development of the facility at an
14 entirely new location. Local approval and acceptance of the
15 Project at the Evander Andrews site is more likely since
16 combustion turbines are a permitted use in this Elmore
17 County location and the Company will not be required to seek
18 approval of a Conditional Use Permit in order to construct
19 the new facility.

20 Q. Will a new substation be constructed as part
21 of this Project?

22 A. Yes. A new 230kV substation will be built
23 adjacent to the existing 138 kV substation at the site. The
24 two substations will be interconnected.

25 Q. Is the Company providing a "commitment"

1 estimate for the capital cost portion for the Project?

2 A. Yes. The Company is willing to commit to the
3 Commission that the total cost of the Project to be included
4 in the Company's rate base will not exceed \$60 million
5 (Commitment Estimate). This amount includes the Siemens
6 contract amount, plus additional costs the Company knows it
7 will incur but cannot precisely quantify at this time.
8 These additional costs include, but are not limited to,
9 sales taxes, Allowances for Funds Used During Construction
10 (AFUDC), the cost of Idaho Power oversight of the project
11 and the cost of capitalized start-up fuel. The Commitment
12 Estimate amount also covers contingencies such as change
13 orders. However, the Commitment Estimate is subject to
14 adjustment to account for documented legally-required
15 equipment changes and material changes in assumed escalation
16 rates. Transmission and substation costs are not included
17 in the Commitment Estimate.

18 Q. Were transmission and substation costs
19 considered when evaluating the total cost of the Project?

20 A. Yes. The total Project costs, including
21 estimated transmission and substation costs, were evaluated
22 within the selection process. However, transmission and
23 substation costs have not traditionally been included in the
24 Company's commitment estimates for power project since those
25 costs do not require issuance by the Commission of a

1 Certificate of Convenience and Necessity. While the Company
2 is satisfied that the approximately \$22.8 million estimate
3 for transmission and substation costs associated with this
4 Project is a reasonable upper limit estimate, no definitive
5 studies have been completed and the Company is not including
6 transmission costs in its Commitment Estimate.

7 Q. How is fuel supply handled for the Project?

8 A. Because the Project will ultimately be owned,
9 operated and maintained by Idaho Power Company, the Company
10 will coordinate the fuel supply and transportation for the
11 Project concurrently with the fuel supply and transportation
12 requirements of the existing Evander Andrews units and the
13 Bennett Mountain Power Plant. Idaho Power has purchased
14 firm fuel transportation rights that can be used for all of
15 the Evander Andrews units. Idaho Power anticipates that
16 management of the fuel transportation and fuel supply will
17 be either by Idaho Power personnel or by Idaho Power
18 personnel in conjunction with a third party such as IGI
19 Resources, Inc.

20 Q. Why does the Company's request include
21 recovery of AFUDC?

22 A. Even though the Project will be owned by
23 Siemens until ownership is transferred to Idaho Power in
24 April 2008, AFUDC is appropriate for recovery as a Project
25 cost because the Company is helping to finance the Project

1 by making progress payments during construction. Such
2 financing by the Company allows for a lower total cost to
3 customers than if Siemens were to finance the Project in a
4 different manner.

5 Q. How does the Company propose that the
6 Commission treat the costs associated with construction and
7 operation of the Project for ratemaking purposes?

8 A. Provided that the Project costs are less than
9 the Commitment Estimate of \$60 million, Idaho Power Company
10 would expect the Commission to ultimately approve the total
11 Project investment to be included in the Company's rate base
12 for ratemaking purposes. Fuel costs should be approved for
13 PCA inclusion prior to full review of operational costs in a
14 general revenue requirement proceeding.

15 Q. How do the total costs of the selected
16 Project compare to other bids received by the Company in
17 response to the RFP?

18 A. The Siemens bid offered the lowest capital
19 cost per installed kilowatt of capacity of all the short-
20 listed bids. When projected transmission interconnection
21 costs and plant operating costs were considered, the Siemens
22 bid ranked lower, but competitively, with other bids in
23 terms of lowest capital cost. However, when consideration
24 of the non-price attributes of the bids were included, the
25 Siemens proposal received the best combined price and non-

1 price score. On that basis, the Siemens proposal was
2 determined to be the most attractive bid.

3 Q. What non-price attributes contributed to the
4 Siemens proposal rising above other bids with somewhat lower
5 overall capital costs?

6 A. The Siemens proposal ranked significantly
7 higher than the other bids in terms of site and community
8 attributes. These non-price attributes consider factors
9 such as permit status, land ownership/control, location and
10 regulatory requirements and community support. The
11 Siemens proposal also ranked slightly higher than the other
12 bids in terms of plant operation efficiency and the impact
13 of required transmission improvements on the Company's
14 transmission system.

15 Q. The Company is requesting that the Commission
16 expedite its review of this Application. Please explain
17 why.

18 A. Siemens has located an existing, new
19 Generator Step-Up Transformer (GSU) that is available for
20 the Project at significant cost savings in comparison to
21 identical transformers that are being manufactured today.
22 Company personnel has examined the available GSU and
23 determined that it is suitable for the Project. In order to
24 take advantage of the cost savings, the Company must act
25 expeditiously. Nonetheless, Idaho Power has advised Siemens

1 that a condition precedent to issuance of the Notice to
2 Proceed is receipt of an acceptable Certificate of
3 Convenience and Necessity from the Idaho Public Utilities
4 Commission

5 Q. Does this complete your testimony?

6 A. Yes.