

RECEIVED
2010 MAY 28 PM 12:05
IDAHO PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF THE)	
APPLICATION OF ROCKY)	CASE NO. PAC-E-10-07
MOUNTAIN POWER FOR)	
APPROVAL OF CHANGES TO ITS)	Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman
ELECTRIC SERVICE SCHEDULES)	
AND A PRICE INCREASE OF \$27.7)	
MILLION, OR APPROXIMATELY)	
13.7 PERCENT)	

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CASE NO. PAC-E-10-07

May 2010

1 **Q. Please state your name, business address and present position with Rocky**
2 **Mountain Power (“Company”).**

3 A. My name is Mark R. Tallman. My business address is 825 NE Multnomah, Suite
4 2000, Portland, Oregon 97232. My present position is Vice President of
5 Renewable Resource Acquisition.

6 **Qualifications**

7 **Q. Please describe your educational and professional background.**

8 A. I have a Bachelor of Science Degree in Electrical Engineering from Oregon State
9 University and a Masters of Business Administration from City University of
10 Seattle. I am also a Registered Professional Engineer in the states of Oregon and
11 Washington. I have been the Vice President of Renewable Resource Acquisition
12 since December 2007. Prior to that, I was Managing Director of Renewable
13 Resource Acquisition from April 2006 to December 2007. I have worked at the
14 Company for more than 24 years in a variety of positions of increasing
15 responsibility, including the commercial and trading organization; the
16 Company’s engineering organization; the retail distribution organization; and five
17 years as a District Manager.

18 **Purpose and Overview of Testimony**

19 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

20 A. The purpose of my testimony is to demonstrate the prudence of the Seven Mile
21 Hill, Glenrock, Rolling Hills, Seven Mile Hill II, Glenrock III, High Plains and
22 McFadden Ridge I wind-powered generation resources (collectively the “Wind
23 Resources” and individually a “Wind Resource”). The Company is also adding

1 the Dunlap I wind-powered generation resource that is addressed in the testimony
2 of Mr. Stefan A. Bird.

3 **Q. Please summarize your testimony.**

4 A. I start by describing the Company's integrated resource plan ("IRP") and how it is
5 utilized to identify and quantify the need and timing of new supply-side resources.
6 I also provide an overview of the relevant MidAmerican Energy Holdings
7 Company ("MEHC") transaction commitments related to acquisition of renewable
8 resources. Finally, I provide a description of the Wind Resources, the decision-
9 making process leading to their acquisition and a description of updated
10 information for each Wind Resource.

11 **Q. What were the commercial operation dates for each Wind Resource?**

12 A. Each Wind Resource is in service. As shown in the table below, the commercial
13 operation date ("COD") varies by Wind Resource.

Wind Resource COD

Wind Resource	COD
Seven Mile Hill	December 31, 2008
Glenrock	December 31, 2008
Rolling Hills	January 17, 2009
Seven Mile Hill II	December 31, 2008
Glenrock III	January 17, 2009
High Plains	September 13, 2009
McFadden Ridge I	September 29, 2009

14 **Q. Please summarize each Wind Resource.**

15 A. The table below summarizes each Wind Resource, its location and its associated
16 investment.

Wind Resource Summary

Wind Resource	MW	Location	Investment	COD
Seven Mile Hill	99.0	Medicine Bow, WY	\$206,070,352	12/31/2008
Glenrock	99.0	Glenrock, WY	\$217,015,087	12/31/2008
Rolling Hills	99.0	Glenrock, WY	\$200,234,936	1/17/2009
Seven Mile Hill II	19.5	Medicine Bow, WY	\$41,304,822	12/31/2008
Glenrock III	39.0	Glenrock, WY	\$86,840,843	1/17/2009
High Plains	99.0	McFadden, WY	\$232,518,676	9/13/2009
McFadden Ridge I	28.5	McFadden, WY	\$56,511,031	9/29/2009

1 **Integrated Resource Plan**

2 **Q. Please briefly describe the IRP process.**

3 A. The IRP is a strategic planning tool that presents a framework for resource
4 acquisitions to ensure the Company continues to provide reliable, low-cost service
5 with manageable and reasonable risk to customers. The IRP builds on the
6 Company's prior resource planning efforts and reflects significant advancements
7 in portfolio modeling and risk analysis.

8 **Q. What is the main purpose of the IRP?**

9 A. The mandate for an IRP is to ensure that the Company has, on a long-term basis,
10 an adequate and reliable electricity supply at the lowest reasonable cost and to
11 ensure that such supply is provided or fulfilled in a timely and planned manner
12 consistent with the long-term public interest. The IRP serves as a strategic
13 roadmap to assist the Company in determining and implementing its long-term
14 resource strategy. In doing so, the IRP accounts for state specific IRP
15 requirements, expected customer resource needs, the current planning
16 environment, corporate business goals and certain commitments made by the
17 Company as part of MEHC's acquisition of PacifiCorp, including the acquisition
18 of renewable resources.

1 **Q. What is the outcome of the IRP process?**

2 A. The outcome of the IRP process is a preferred portfolio that represents a balance
3 of resource additions that meet future customer needs, minimize cost, balance
4 diverse stakeholder interests and address environmental concerns. The
5 Company's IRP includes an action plan that is intended to inform and provide
6 guidance for the Company's resource procurement activities.

7 **Q. How do the most recent IRPs address renewable resources?**

8 A. The 2004 IRP was filed with the Idaho Public Utilities Commission
9 ("Commission") on January 21, 2005, and the Commission acknowledged the
10 2004 IRP on August 26, 2005. The 2007 IRP was filed with the Commission on
11 May 30, 2007, and the Commission acknowledged the 2007 IRP on October 15,
12 2007. The 2008 IRP was filed with the Commission on May 29, 2009, and the
13 Commission acknowledged the 2008 IRP on September 15, 2009.

14 Each of these IRPs identifies a need to acquire 1,400 megawatts ("MW")
15 or more of cost-effective renewable resources.¹ Indeed, the acquisition of
16 renewable resources is the first action item listed for each such IRP. For example,
17 the 2007 IRP identifies over 2,000 MW of cost-effective renewable resources to
18 be acquired by 2013 and the 2008 IRP targets to acquire an incremental 1,400
19 MW by 2018, which is consistent with the target contained in the 2007 IRP. By
20 2018, acquisition of renewable resources reaches 2,540 MW in the 2008 IRP,
21 which includes over 1,400 MW of resources added from 2009 through 2018.

¹ Wind-powered generation resources served as the proxy resource in each IRP.

1 **Q. Do the referenced IRPs address the procurement process for renewable**
2 **resources?**

3 A. Yes. Generally, each IRP outlines a resource procurement strategy as part of the
4 IRP action plan.² The Company procures resources in accordance with the then-
5 current law, rules, and/or guidelines in each of the states in which PacifiCorp
6 operates. Meaning that if a jurisdiction has a requirement to issue a request for
7 proposal (“RFP”) then the Company would comply with the requirement.
8 Specifically, the Company has relied on periodic issuance of RFPs and pursuit of
9 opportunities through bilateral negotiations, contracting with Qualifying Facilities
10 defined by the Public Utilities Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 and self-
11 development for the addition of renewable resources to its portfolio. Reliance on
12 multiple procurement approaches enables the Company to achieve regulatory
13 compliance and react effectively to market developments.

14 **Q. Have other state commissions acknowledged the referenced IRPs and their**
15 **associated action plan on renewable resource acquisition?**

16 A. Yes. The commissions in Washington, Oregon, and Utah have acknowledged the
17 2008 IRP. The Wyoming Public Service Commission adopted Rule 253 in 2009,
18 which requires the Company to file an IRP but does not include an
19 acknowledgment proceeding. In California, the Company provides its IRP on an
20 informational basis and is not required to seek acknowledgement. Each state
21 commission acknowledged the earlier IRPs referenced, with the exception of the
22 Utah commission for only the 2007 IRP.

² See 2004 IRP chapter 9, 2007 IRP chapter 8 and 2008 IRP chapter 9.

1 Q. In its acknowledgement of the 2004, 2007 and 2008 IRPs, did the
2 Commission object to the acquisition of renewable resources?

3 A. No. In fact, the Commission noted Staff's support for acquisition of cost-
4 effective renewable resources in the Commission's 2007 IRP Acceptance of
5 Filing.

6 MEHC Transaction Commitments

7 Q. Please provide an overview of the MEHC transaction commitments related
8 to the acquisition of renewable resources.

9 A. As part of the regulatory approvals related to the acquisition of the Company,
10 MEHC and the Company committed to:

- 11 • Bring at least 100 MW of cost-effective wind resources in service within one
12 year of the close of the transaction;
- 13 • Have 400 MW of cost-effective new renewable resources in the Company's
14 generation portfolio by December 31, 2007; and
- 15 • Reaffirm the Company's commitment to acquire 1,400 MW of cost-effective
16 new renewable generation resources.

17 Each of the Wind Resources was acquired consistent with these commitments
18 and, in particular, in support of the commitment to have 1,400 MW of cost-
19 effective new renewable resources in the portfolio.

20 Wind Resource Acquisitions

21 Q. Please generally describe the Wind Resources.

22 A. Each Wind Resource is an individual project consisting of wind turbine
23 generators ("WTGs" or a "WTG"), an electrical collector system, access roads,
24 and required communication and control facilities (e.g., metering, hardware,
25 software, and associated communication circuits). In the case of Seven Mile Hill,

1 Glenrock and High Plains, the project also included an operations/maintenance
2 (“O&M”) building, collector substation and interconnection facilities. While
3 Rolling Hills required its own collector substation, Seven Mile Hill II, Glenrock
4 III and McFadden Ridge I did not. Finally, Rolling Hills, Seven Mile Hill II,
5 Glenrock III, High Plains and McFadden Ridge I did not require the construction
6 of a new interconnection substation; respectively utilizing the Freezeout, Windstar
7 or Foote Creek substations instead.

8 **Q. What WTG do the Wind Resources utilize?**

9 A. The General Electric Company (“G.E.”) 1.5 MW model SLE WTG. The number
10 of WTGs at each Wind Resource is shown in the table below.

Wind Resource WTGs

Wind Resource	G.E. 1.5 MW WTGs
Seven Mile Hill	66
Glenrock	66
Rolling Hills	66
Seven Mile Hill II	13
Glenrock III	26
High Plains	66
McFadden Ridge I	19

11 **Q. Who owns the land where the Wind Resources reside?**

12 A. The Company is leasing land from private entities and the state of Wyoming for
13 each Wind Resource with the exception of Glenrock, Rolling Hills and Glenrock
14 III. Facilities associated with Glenrock, Rolling Hills and Glenrock III are
15 primarily located on land owned by the Company that was previously used to
16 support coal mining activities. Minor levels of facilities are located on state of
17 Wyoming lands.

1 **Q. Please elaborate on the Company-owned land.**

2 A. The Glenrock, Rolling Hills and Glenrock III resources are all located on property
3 owned by the Company that includes the location of the Company's now
4 reclaimed Dave Johnston coal mine. Mining operations took place from
5 approximately 1958 through September of 2000. After mining operations ceased,
6 the Company reclaimed the land pursuant to its Wyoming administered Federal
7 mining permit. The siting of these renewable resources at this location serves as a
8 testimonial to environmental stewardship and continued asset utilization for the
9 benefit of customers. This is the only instance I am aware of in the western
10 United States where wind projects have been located at the site of a reclaimed
11 coal mine.

12 **Q. What factors does the Company consider before acquiring new resources?**

13 A. The decision as to whether it is in the best interests of customers for the Company
14 to acquire a resource is made after reviewing a detailed overview of the project
15 including the contract support and counterparty guarantees, the risks, the need as
16 established by the IRP, the financial assessment, and the justification of the
17 project.

18 **Q. Did the Company follow this general process in the acquisition of each Wind
19 Resource?**

20 A. Yes. The Company followed this process in determining that each Wind
21 Resource is prudent and in the public interest to pursue.

1 **Q. Was the decision to acquire the Wind Resources consistent with the decision**
2 **making process the Company has used in adding other renewable resources**
3 **that have been before this Commission?**

4 A. Yes. Some of the renewable resources that have previously been before this
5 Commission include the Leaning Juniper I, Marengo, Goodnoe Hills and
6 Marengo II wind-powered generation resources.

7 **Q. Did the Company perform an evaluation of the wind potential for each Wind**
8 **Resource?**

9 A. Yes. The Company commissioned a third-party to perform an evaluation of the
10 wind potential for each Wind Resource. The Company's decision to acquire each
11 Wind Resource took into account the technical wind study.³

12 **Q. What other factors did the Company take into consideration when making**
13 **the decision to acquire each Wind Resource?**

14 A. The Company took into account both quantitative and qualitative factors. The
15 quantitative factors included an economic analysis of the resource. *See*
16 Confidential Exhibit Nos. 20 through 26.

17 **Q. Were the economics of each Wind Resource in line with the alternative**
18 **undifferentiated power market?**

19 A. Yes. Each Wind Resource compares favorably with the expected non-
20 differentiated power market. *See* economic analysis results contained in
21 Confidential Exhibit Nos. 20 through 26.

³ The decision to proceed with Seven Mile Hill II was informed by the wind study associated with Seven Mile Hill and the decision to proceed with Glenrock III was informed by the wind studies associated with Glenrock and Rolling Hills.

1 **Q. What qualitative factors did the Company take into account when making**
2 **the decision to acquire each Wind Resource?**

3 A. The Company took the following qualitative factors into account: the
4 specifications of the specific Wind Resource; the availability of major equipment
5 (e.g., WTGs); the availability, or lack thereof, of alternative sites; applicable state
6 and federal tax advantages; the availability of a construction contractor; available
7 infrastructure; terminal value; and the timing of net power cost benefits and
8 renewable energy credits (“RECs”).

9 **Q. What is terminal value?**

10 A. Terminal value is the value associated with the right to re-power a resource at cost
11 when the asset reaches the end of its initial economic life. Terminal value
12 includes all aspects of the resource, including its location, favorable land rights,
13 the existence of or favorable location to infrastructure, and other beneficial
14 attributes.

15 **Q. Does terminal value apply to each Wind Resource?**

16 A. Yes. While the Company conservatively excluded terminal value in its
17 quantitative analysis of Seven Mile Hill, Glenrock, Rolling Hills, Seven Mile Hill
18 II and Glenrock III, an estimate of terminal value associated with the High Plains
19 Wind Resource can be seen in Table 3 of Confidential Exhibit No. 25 and an
20 estimate of terminal value associated with the McFadden Ridge I Wind Resource
21 can be seen in Table 3 of Confidential Exhibit No. 26.

22 **Q. Are there other qualitative factors associated with the Wind Resources?**

23 A. Yes. The Seven Mile Hill II resource is located adjacent to the Seven Mile Hill

1 resource and, as such, the Company is able to further utilize certain infrastructure
2 that was necessary for the Seven Mile Hill resource. Likewise, similar synergies
3 exist with the Rolling Hills and Glenrock III resources (being adjacent to the
4 Glenrock resource) and the McFadden Ridge I resource being adjacent to the
5 High Plains Wind Resource. This further utilized infrastructure includes
6 transmission interconnection substations (Freezeout, Windstar and Foote Creek)
7 as well as project transmission assets from High Plains to Foote Creek and from
8 Glenrock to Windstar. In addition, O&M buildings, land rights and roads are
9 further utilized.

10 **Q. What independent benefit will the Windstar substation have?**

11 A. In constructing the Windstar substation, the Company was able to establish a key
12 point of interconnection that can be used for numerous other third party requests
13 for interconnection (generation and other). In addition, the Windstar substation
14 now represents the key starting point in Wyoming for the Company's multibillion
15 dollar Energy Gateway transmission project that will, among other things,
16 facilitate further integration of renewable and non-renewable resources.

17 **Q. Will the Company receive production tax credits ("PTCs") and RECs from**
18 **each Wind Resource?**

19 A. Yes.

20 **Q. Did the Company benefit from any Wyoming specific tax benefits?**

21 A. Yes. The Company benefited from a Wyoming sales tax exemption for each
22 Wind Resource. The benefit was in the form of an avoided cost. The Wyoming
23 sales tax exemption sunsets December 31, 2011.

1 **Q. Has the Company obtained a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity**
2 **(“CPCN”) for each Wind Resource?**

3 A. Yes. The Company obtained a CPCN for each Wind Resource from the
4 Wyoming Public Service Commission. Because each Wind Resource is in
5 Wyoming, application for a like certificate in Idaho was not required.

6 **Update for Most Recent Capacity Factor Projections**

7 **Q. In completing the construction process, did the Company obtain third-party**
8 **technical studies updating the capacity factor estimates for each Wind**
9 **Resource?**

10 A. Confidential Exhibit Nos. 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 are the final build design energy
11 projections for the Seven Mile Hill, Glenrock, Rolling Hills, Seven Mile Hill II
12 and Glenrock III resources, respectively. A final build design energy projection
13 has yet to be completed for the High Plains and McFadden Ridge I resources.

14 **Q. Please summarize the final build design energy projections for these**
15 **resources.**

16 A. The table below provides a summary of the final build design energy projection
17 estimate (“FBDE”) for each Wind Resource as well as the projection at the time
18 the decision was made to acquire the resource. The summary shows estimated
19 annual capacity factor (“CF”) at the probability fifty (P50) level and megawatt-
20 hours (“MWh”). Because actual CF is dependent on the weather and other
21 factors, a P50 estimate means that the actual production in any given year can be
22 expected to be higher or lower over the life of the resource.

Wind Resource FBDE

Resource	Acquisition Decision (CF)	Acquisition Decision (MWh)	Updated w/FBDE (CF)	Updated w/FBDE (MWh)
Seven Mile Hill	41.3%	358,170	40.3%	349,948
Glenrock	38.6%	334,755	37.4%	324,348
Rolling Hills	31.0%	268,844	33.8%	293,127
Seven Mile Hill II	39.3%	67,132	40.3%	68,840
Glenrock III	31.0%	105,908	36.4%	124,357
Total MWh Average CF	36.2%	1,134,810	37.6%	1,160,170
High Plains	35.7%	309,605		n/a
McFadden Ridge I	34.5%	86,133		n/a
Total MWh Average CF	35.9%	1,530,547	36.9%	1,555,907

1 **Q. Is it unusual for capacity factor estimates to vary over time as the**
2 **construction of wind-powered generation facilities progress?**

3 **A. No.** As more information is acquired, it is not unusual for capacity factor
4 estimates to be updated.

5 **Q. Why were the estimated capacity factors of these resources updated?**

6 **A.** The update in estimated capacity factor reflects normal changes that resulted in
7 the final construction design of the resources, as well as additional information on
8 wind climatology for the sites.

9 **Q. Is the average capacity factor of the Wind Resources in line with the average**
10 **capacity factor for the Company's Wyoming power purchase contracts with**
11 **wind-powered generation resources?**

12 **A.** Yes. The average capacity factor for the Company's Wyoming power purchase
13 contracts with wind-powered generation resources is approximately 32.0 percent.

1 Q. **Is the average capacity factor predicted for the Wind Resources in line with**
2 **the proxy capacity factor assumed for Wyoming wind resources in the**
3 **Company's IRP?**

4 A. Yes. The Company's 2007 IRP and 2008 IRP used a 35 percent⁴ capacity factor
5 to model proxy wind projects for building the Company's portfolio of renewable
6 energy resources. In reality, some renewable resources will have capacity factors
7 above 35 percent and others will be lower than 35 percent.

8 Q. **Does the Company currently have wind resources or contracts with wind**
9 **resources in its portfolio with capacity factors below 35 percent?**

10 A. Yes, excluding any of the Wind Resources, the Company currently has 21 such
11 resources with projected annual capacity factors below 35 percent. These
12 resources are located inside and outside of Wyoming. *See Confidential Exhibit*
13 *No. 32.*

14 Q. **Does the net power cost study in this case include the FBDE?**

15 A. Yes. The Company believes the most recent capacity factor projection is
16 appropriate to use for setting rates and, as such, the Company included the FBDE
17 updates in the net power cost study sponsored by Company witness Dr. Hui Shu
18 in this case.

19 Q. **Has the Company included the value of PTCs and RECs in its filing?**

20 A. Yes. The value of PTCs, RECs or other known tax-related benefits and burdens
21 for each Wind Resource are included in the Company's filing.

⁴ 35% is in line with the proxy wind assumptions used in the 2004 IRP.

1 **Q. Did the Company acquire the Wind Resources for the purpose of complying**
2 **with renewable portfolio standards in Oregon, Washington, California or to**
3 **meet the requirements of carbon reduction legislation in Utah?**

4 A. No, each Wind Resource was acquired on the basis of its economics, other
5 quantitative factors and qualitative factors.

6 **Conclusion**

7 **Q. What are the overall benefits of Wind Resources to Idaho customers?**

8 A. Customers benefit from the Wind Resources because they represent cost effective
9 renewable resources. The 2004, 2007 and 2008 IRPs specify that cost effective
10 renewable resources (using wind-powered generation resources as a proxy)
11 should be steadily added to the system. The Wind Resources benefit customers as
12 their acquisitions were both cost effective and consistent with the Company's
13 robust long-term planning efforts through the IRP process. Customers further
14 benefit from these renewable resources because they provide a zero incremental
15 cost fuel source, thus reducing exposure to potentially volatile commodity and/or
16 fuel risks.

17 **Q. Are there other benefits the Commission should consider?**

18 A. Yes. The Wind Resources are multi-shafted generation resources that diversify
19 the impact of individual generator failures and provide the Company with
20 continued ownership and operational experience with utility-scale wind projects.
21 Each Wind Resource utilizes G.E. wind turbines, thus complementing the
22 Company's operating experience with other G.E. based projects, spare
23 optimization and procurement of O&M services.

1 **Q. Was each Wind Resource acquired consistent with the Company's then-**
2 **current IRP and does it represent the least cost/risk option available for the**
3 **long-term benefit of customers?**

4 **A. Yes**

5 **Q. Was each Wind Resource prudently acquired, in the public interest and is**
6 **each Wind Resource used and useful?**

7 **A. Yes**

8 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony?**

9 **A. Yes.**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 20

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

Seven Mile Hill

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 21

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

Glenrock

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 22

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

Rolling Hills

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL
Case No. PAC-E-10-07
Exhibit No. 23
Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL
Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman
Seven Mile Hill (II)

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL
Case No. PAC-E-10-07
Exhibit No. 24
Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL
Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

Glenrock III

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL
Case No. PAC-E-10-07
Exhibit No. 25
Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL
Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

High Plains

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL
Case No. PAC-E-10-07
Exhibit No. 26
Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL
Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

McFadden Ridge

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 27

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

CH2MHill Technical Memorandum for Seven Mile Hill

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 28

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

CH2MHill Technical Memorandum for Glenrock

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 29

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

CH2MHill Technical Memorandum for Rolling Hills

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 30

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

CH2MHill Technical Memorandum for Seven Mile Hill (II)

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 31

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

CH2MHill Technical Memorandum for Glenrock III

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**

CONFIDENTIAL

Case No. PAC-E-10-07

Exhibit No. 32

Witness: Mark R. Tallman

BEFORE THE IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER

CONFIDENTIAL

Exhibit Accompanying Direct Testimony of Mark R. Tallman

PPA Wind Capacity Factors

May 2010

**THIS EXHIBIT IS CONFIDENTIAL
AND IS PROVIDED UNDER
SEPARATE COVER**