

BEFORE THE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY)
OF OKLAHOMA (“PSO”) FOR COST RECOVERY)
AND APPROVAL OF A POWER PURCHASE)
AGREEMENT (“PPA”) BETWEEN PSO AND)
EXELON GENERATION, LLC, THE COST OF) PUD 200900099
INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR AND THE)
SOUTHWEST POWER POOL TRANSMISSION STUDY))
INCLUDING RECOVERY OF LONG-TERM FIRM)
SUPPLY CONTRACT EARNINGS THROUGH A)
LONG-TERM BASE LOAD PURCHASED)
POWER RIDER)

RESPONSIVE TESTIMONY OF

CRAIG R. ROACH, Ph.D.

AS THE INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR
FOR THE OKLAHOMA CORPORATION COMMISSION

JULY 14, 2009

BOSTON PACIFIC COMPANY, INC.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. QUALIFICATIONS 1

II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY..... 4

III. BACKGROUND ON OKLAHOMA’S COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT RULES 11

IV. RATIONALE AND ANALYSIS USED FOR THE SELECTION OF THE WINNING
BID..... 13

 A. Pre-Qualification..... 14

 B. Bids Submitted..... 15

 C. Conformance with the RFP..... 17

 D. Bid Evaluation to Select the Initial Short List 18

 E. Bid Evaluation to Select the Award Group..... 21

 F. Negotiation with the Top-Ranked Bidder..... 23

V. COMPLIANCE WITH COMPETITIVE BIDDING RULES..... 23

VI. CONSISTENCY WITH THE RULES AND PROCEDURES IN THE REQUEST FOR
PROPOSAL 26

1 **I. QUALIFICATIONS**

2

3 Q. Please state your name, business position, and business address.

4 A. My name is Craig R. Roach. I am the President of Boston Pacific Company, Inc. (Boston
5 Pacific). My business address is 1100 New York Avenue NW, Suite 490 East,
6 Washington, DC 20005.

7

8 Q. What is Boston Pacific’s interest in this proceeding?

9 A. Boston Pacific serves the Oklahoma Corporation Commission (the “Commission”) as its
10 Independent Evaluator (IE) for the 2008 Request for Proposals for Supply-Side Capacity
11 and Energy Resources (the “2008 RFP”) issued by Public Service Company of Oklahoma
12 (PSO). The Exelon power purchase contract for which cost recovery is being sought in
13 this proceeding was the winning bid in the 2008 RFP.

14

15 Q. Please summarize your relevant professional experience.

16 A. I have thirty-three years of experience with investments in, litigation concerning, and
17 policies for the electricity business and other energy businesses. More specifically,
18 Boston Pacific has extensive experience as an Independent Evaluator (IE) or market
19 monitor and I have had important roles in all of these engagements.

20

21 Boston Pacific has served as the monitor for auctions throughout the country, covering
22 multiple styles of procurement. Our monitoring engagements include (a) New Jersey’s
23 2007, 2008 and 2009 Basic Generation Service Auctions, (b) the 2005 through 2009
24 Standard Offer Service (SOS) RFPs for the District of Columbia, (c) Delaware’s 2006-

1 2007, 2007-2008, and 2008-2009 SOS RFPs, (d) Maryland's SOS RFPs in 2004, 2005,
2 and 2006 for all four utilities, (e) the 2006 Illinois Auction and the 2008 and 2009 Illinois
3 Ameren and ComEd RFPs, (f) the 2009 Ohio Auction for FirstEnergy, and (g) the 2009
4 Pennsylvanian RFPs for Allegheny Power. In all of these engagements Boston Pacific
5 reports to the relevant State Commission. In total, we have monitored or are currently
6 monitoring over 90,000 MW of electricity procurements of this sort.

7
8 Boston Pacific also designs and monitors solicitations for resource-specific power and
9 asset sales. For example, we currently serve the Oregon Commission as the IE for four
10 RFPs from PacifiCorp. These include the 2012 RFP for unit contingent or firm baseload
11 service, the 2008 All Source RFP, the 2008 R-1 Renewables RFP, and the 2009
12 Renewables RFP. For these projects our scope of work encompasses all the steps
13 necessary for a successful RFP and executed agreements.

14
15 In addition, Boston Pacific designed and managed a solicitation for the U.S. Virgin
16 Islands. The RFP invited the development of new renewable energy generation (and
17 other non-oil generation) in St. Croix and St. Thomas. The Virgin Islands Water and
18 Power Authority will sign a 20-year PPA with the winning bidders.

19
20 In a similar vein, Boston Pacific is advising the Mississippi Commission in its review of
21 Southern Company's proposed Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) facility.
22 The review covers the full range of issues in choosing among resource options.

23

1 Finally, since 2004, Boston Pacific has served as the Independent Market Monitor /
2 External Market Advisor to the Southwest Power Pool Regional Transmission
3 Organization (SPP RTO), which encompasses over 63,000 MW of generation capacity,
4 47,000 miles of transmission lines, and over 5 million customers across nine states. All
5 of Boston Pacific's work at the SPP is presented to the Board of Directors and vetted by
6 working groups made up of dozens of market participants. In our role, we have assisted
7 in the design and implementation of a real-time locational marginal pricing energy
8 imbalance market. This energy market successfully came on-line in February of 2007.
9

10 Q. Do you have experience as an expert witness?

11 A. Yes. I have extensive experience as an expert witness in the electricity business. I have
12 testified or submitted comments before the FERC on more than 30 occasions and before
13 24 State Commissions (some on multiple occasions). I also have testified in arbitrations,
14 in State Courts, in Federal Court, before a City Council, before three Canadian Provincial
15 Boards, and before a U.S. Congressional Sub-Committee. A list of my testimony and
16 other publications is attached as Exhibit CRR-01. My testimony has addressed a wide
17 range of topics, including the methods and results of many RFPs like that issued by PSO.
18

19 Q. Please summarize your education.

20 A. I earned my Ph.D. in Economics from the University of Wisconsin; I now serve on the
21 Advisory Board to Wisconsin's Department of Economics. I earned my B.S. in
22 Economics, *cum laude*, from John Carroll University.
23

1 **II. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY**

2
3 Q. What is the purpose of your Testimony?

4 A. The purpose of my Testimony is to respond to the Application filed on May 1, 2009 by
5 the Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO) “seeking Commission approval of
6 recovery of all costs from the Exelon contract, including the costs of the Independent
7 Evaluator (“IE”) and the Southwest Power Pool Transmission studies.”¹

8
9 Q. What is your bottom line response?

10 A. My bottom line response is that I support the Application for recovery of all these costs.
11 Obviously, the vast majority of the cost recovery is for the Exelon contract. As the
12 winner of PSO’s 2008 RFP, Exelon will sell electric capacity, energy, and ancillary
13 services to PSO, for nearly ten years, under a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) from a
14 520-MW share of an existing, natural gas-fired combined cycle facility located within
15 PSO’s balancing authority.²

16
17 Q. What is the basis for your support?

18 A. The basis for my support for granting cost recovery for the Exelon contract is that during
19 Boston Pacific’s in-depth involvement in the design and implementation of the RFP as

¹ *Application of Public Service Company of Oklahoma (“PSO”) for Cost Recovery and Approval of a Power Purchase Agreement (“PPA”) Between PSO and Exelon Generation, LLC, the Cost of the Independent Evaluator and the Southwest Power Pool Transmission Study Including Recovery of Long-Term Firm Supply Contract Earnings Through a Long-Term Base Load Purchased Power Rider, May 1, 2009, (Hereinafter as “PSO Application”), p. 4, item “(p)”.* PSO also sought other relief, but the Cause was bifurcated by Oklahoma Corporation Commission Order No. 568374. This testimony does not address any issues bifurcated from the cost recovery issues.

² Boston Pacific submitted a report to the Commission on the 2008 RFP on April 10, 2009. This Testimony covers the same topics as does that report.

1 the Commission's Independent Evaluator, or IE, I saw that the RFP process and outcome
2 was open, fair, and transparent.

3
4 PSO's IRP established a need for 450 to 600 MW (note that Exelon's bid is in the center
5 of this range). The 2008 RFP was created so PSO could acquire resources to meet that
6 need. From the start I made it clear that the ultimate goal of the 2008 RFP should be to
7 get the best deal possible for Oklahoma ratepayers in terms of price, risk, reliability and
8 environmental performance, given market and regulatory conditions.³ I believe that the
9 outcome of the 2008 RFP serves this goal.

10
11 Q. What are the primary ratepayer benefits of the Exelon contract?

12 A. My list of the primary ratepayer benefits of the Exelon contract can be summarized as
13 follows:

- 14 1. Exelon was the lowest cost option, by a substantial margin, no matter the assumptions
15 used. For example, costs over the life of the bid were, by our estimates, from 13.7% to
16 35.7% lower than in the other natural gas-fired bids in this RFP, and lower than in the
17 coal-fired bids by an ever greater margin;

- 18
19 2. Exelon guaranteed low capacity payments for ratepayers;

20

³ *A Note to Potential Bidders From the Independent Evaluator*, Boston Pacific Company, Inc., May 14, 2008.

- 1 3. Exelon guaranteed low heat rates (which will keep energy payments for ratepayers
2 lower);
3

- 4 4. The contract includes strong financial incentives/penalties for Exelon to keep reliability
5 (availability) high;
6

- 7 5. The contract offers lower costs to ratepayers than a proxy bid for cost-based rates (the
8 proxy reflected cost estimates in PSO's most recent Integrated Resource Plan (IRP));
9

- 10 6. The contract offers lower risks for ratepayers than the cost-based rate proxy (since, in
11 sharp contrast to the Exelon offer, cost-based rates do not offer guaranteed capacity
12 payments and heat rates nor strong incentives/penalties to keep reliability high);
13

- 14 7. There is no need for expensive transmission upgrades to assure reliable delivery of
15 Exelon's power;
16

- 17 8. There are no development and construction risks since the facility is already built; and
18

1 9. At 520 MW, the size of the winning bid is in the middle of the estimated range of
2 capacity need, 450 MW to 600 MW, established by PSO's IRP.

3

4 Q. Does your notion of "getting the best deal" link up to the traditional standard for the
5 Commission granting rate recovery?

6 A. Yes. The traditional standard is prudence. The heart of the prudence standard is that the
7 applicant assessed the full range of alternative ways to serve ratepayer needs and, based
8 on information known at the time of the decision, chose the alternative that best serves
9 ratepayers. The 2008 RFP was a more compelling way to determine prudence. As I will
10 document in this Testimony, PSO cast a wide net for alternatives, got a good diversity of
11 alternatives to assess, and then assessed them openly, fairly, and accurately.

12

13 Q. What do you mean by "more compelling"?

14 A. What I mean by more compelling is that, in contrast to the typical prudence review,
15 determining prudence through the 2008 RFP is more compelling since the "alternatives"
16 are real offers made and guaranteed by substantial companies, not just alternatives
17 conjured up solely for purposes of analysis.

18

19 Q. Are there additional, broader concerns addressed by the 2008 RFP?

20 A. Yes. More broadly, the successful conclusion of the 2008 RFP resolved the
21 Commission's primary concern when it rejected the results of PSO's previous RFP – the

1 2005 RFP. Specifically, the 2008 RFP assured the inclusion and evaluation of a full
2 range of alternatives; both coal and gas-fired bids were evaluated, as were a diversity of
3 transaction types. We should add for context that PSO also reports that it has completed
4 a separate RFP for electric generation using renewable fuels and is implementing a series
5 of steps for demand-side programs; separating these efforts was discussed in the
6 Collaborative process leading to the 2008 RFP and these efforts further address the
7 Commission's concern that a full range of alternatives be considered.⁴

8
9 In addition, because Exelon won fair and square against a significant number of bidders,
10 including AEP affiliate bids, I believe the competitive bidding process in Oklahoma has
11 gained credibility that will benefit ratepayers in future solicitations by attracting more
12 bidders and more aggressive bids.

13
14 Q. Is there other information relevant to the Commission's decision in this proceeding?

15 A. Yes. Also relevant to the Commission's decision is the issue of whether PSO met the
16 primary requirements in the Oklahoma competitive bidding rules.

17
18 Q. Did PSO meet those requirements?

19 A. Yes, I believe PSO has complied with all the rules. I will summarize that compliance
20 with three points.

21

⁴ PSO Application, p. 1-2, items "(b)" through "(e)".

1 First, as required by the Oklahoma Competitive Procurement Rules⁵ (the “rules”), on
2 April 7, 2009, PSO notified the Commission, the Attorney General, the IE and all bidders
3 of the successful bid. This notification explained to all parties the rationale and analysis
4 leading to the choice of the winning bidder. Since there were no complaints stating
5 objections filed by any of the parties in response to the notification by PSO, also as
6 required by the rules, we conclude that bidders felt that the decision was within both the
7 rules and the RFP, as well as the bid evaluation procedures contained therein. To this
8 point, we note that Boston Pacific, as the IE, independently ranked the bids for the Initial
9 Short List and came to agreement with PSO on the rankings. We also assessed additional
10 evaluation of risk, as called for by the RFP, which showed further that the Exelon offer
11 was the top choice under all specific scenarios – that is, it was the best deal no matter
12 how the future was assumed to unfold.

13
14 Second, the 2008 RFP was conducted in compliance with the Oklahoma competitive
15 bidding rules because it was “an open, transparent, fair and nondiscriminatory
16 competitive bidding process”⁶ which served the public interest. As I explain in more
17 detail later herein, I believe the 2008 RFP had many features to make it an attractive
18 opportunity for bidders to compete to serve the ratepayers of Oklahoma. Indeed, the
19 proof that it was a good opportunity is seen in the significant number of bidders
20 participating. The 2008 RFP also complied with the other, more specific requirements of
21 the bid rules.

⁵ Oklahoma Administrative Code, Title 165, Chapter 35, Subchapter 34 (OAC 165: 35-34)

⁶ OAC 165: 35-34-1(b)

1 Third, the 2008 RFP was consistent with the processes and guidelines specified in the
2 RFP documents including those stating bid evaluation procedures. While we say it was
3 consistent, we do not mean that there were no accommodations made for bidders.
4 Indeed, all of the bids were inconsistent (nonconforming) with the RFP in some way.
5 PSO's approach, which the IE supported, was to evaluate all the bids on the basis of price
6 and to let the ranking on price dictate which bidders made the Initial Short List. The only
7 bids rejected on the basis of non-conformance were those who were not able to provide
8 sufficient information for a price evaluation, did not indicate a willingness to sign the
9 contract upon notification of winning, or could not guarantee delivery of electricity into
10 SPP.

11
12 Q. Were there accommodations for the winning bidder?

13 A. Yes. For the winning bidder, the most notable accommodation was that, while the RFP
14 called for a minimum term of 15 years, the winning bidder offered a term of about 10
15 years. We did substantial analysis showing that the shorter term is not what allowed the
16 winning bidder to win – indeed, in the final analysis, the shorter term lessened the
17 winning bidder's cost advantage over the other bids. Further, while we explored the
18 possibility of extending the contract offer, we felt it was not in the best interest of
19 ratepayers to do so at this time.

20
21 Q. Were other terms negotiated with the winning bidder?

22 A. Yes. Negotiations with the winning bidder, Exelon, did not touch on the price offer, but
23 non-price terms of the PPA were negotiated. Two of the negotiated sections of the PPA

1 were notable. The first relates to credit and collateral. The second relates to
2 environmental change in law. Other sections of the PPA were deepened considerably in
3 the detail on how the PPA actually would be implemented and these also are notable.
4 The IE monitored the negotiation and, on balance, felt all the negotiated changes were
5 within the bounds of reasonableness and in the best interest of ratepayers.

6
7
8 **III. BACKGROUND ON OKLAHOMA’S COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT**
9 **RULES**

10
11 Q. You mentioned Oklahoma’s competitive procurement rules. What are the relevant
12 requirements of those rules?

13 A. Under Oklahoma’s Competitive Procurement Rules,⁷ (the “rules”) PSO must “promptly
14 submit its decision concerning the successful bid with the Commission and mail copies of
15 such submission to all bidders, the Independent Evaluator, and the Attorney General.
16 Included within that mailing, the utility shall provide the non-winning bidders the
17 rationale and analysis used for the selection of the winning bid.”⁸ The rules go on to
18 state the process that bidders, the IE, and the AG must follow thereafter:

19
20 “(1) Any unsuccessful bidder, the Independent Evaluator, or the Attorney General shall have
21 fifteen (15) days following submission of the successful bid decision with the
22 Commission to file with the Commission a complaint challenging the decision as not

⁷ OAC 165: 35-34

⁸ OAC 165: 35-34-3 (f)

1 meeting the criteria for decision specified in this subchapter or waiver previously
2 obtained pursuant to 165:35-34-3(e) and the RFP document and bid evaluation
3 procedures developed pursuant to 165:35-34-3(a).

4
5 (2) In the event of the filing of such a complaint, after notice to all bidders and hearing, the
6 Commission shall determine whether the utility's decision reveals either a clear
7 departure from the criteria stated in these rules or previously obtained waiver, the RFP
8 Document and bid evaluation procedures for decision or is erroneous, in which event
9 the utility shall be required immediately to rebid, in accordance with this Subchapter,
10 the items which were the subject of such determination.”

11
12 Q. Did PSO submit its decision to choose Exelon as the winning bid as required?

13 A. Yes.

14
15 Q. Were any complaints filed in response to PSO's filing?

16 A. No. Neither the Attorney General or any of the bidders filed a complaint. That's
17 encouraging. I read the absence of complaints as an indication that everyone felt that the
18 decision was within both the Oklahoma Competitive Procurement Rules and the RFP, as
19 well as the bid evaluation procedures contained therein. That is, that bidders found the
20 2008 RFP to be a fair place to win or lose.

21
22 Q. How is the remainder of your Testimony structured?

1 A. The remainder of my Testimony is divided into three sections, addressing my views on
2 (a) the rationale and analysis used to select the winner, (b) compliance with the
3 competitive bidding rules, and (c) consistency with the 2008 RFP document including bid
4 evaluation procedures.

5
6

7 **IV. RATIONALE AND ANALYSIS USED FOR THE SELECTION OF THE**
8 **WINNING BID**

9

10 Q. How do you picture the rationale and analysis for selecting the winning bidder?

11 A. As I picture it, the rationale and analysis for the selection of the winning bid is reflected
12 in the full scope of the 2008 RFP extending from pre-qualification of bidders through
13 contract negotiation with the winner. For that reason I think it is best to describe each
14 phase of the RFP.

15

16 Q. What is your overall conclusion based on these descriptions of each step?

17 A. My overall conclusion is that PSO's 2008 RFP was, as required by Oklahoma's bid rules,
18 "an open, transparent, fair and nondiscriminatory competitive bidding process" which
19 serves the public interest of all consumers.

20

21 Q. What are the key steps in the RFP process?

22 A. There are six key steps in the 2008 RFP: (a) pre-qualifying bidders; (b) bidder submittal
23 of offers; (c) assessing conformance of the bids; (d) evaluating the bids and selecting the

1 Initial Short List; (e) additional evaluation of the bids to determine the Award Group; and
2 (f) negotiation with the top-ranked (and eventually the winning) bidder.

3
4 Note, too, that a collaborative process (the “Collaborative”) was used to design the RFP
5 and this is another major step in the RFP process. There was active participation in the
6 Collaborative by Commission Staff, the Attorney General, potential suppliers, consumer
7 groups, and PSO. I discuss the resulting RFP design in a separate section later in this
8 testimony.

9
10 **A. Pre-Qualification**

11
12 Q. Let me ask you to describe the outcome of each of the six key steps. Please start with
13 pre-qualification.

14 A. There was a significant response to PSO’s 2008 RFP in terms of the number of bidders
15 who sought pre-qualification as well as in the diversity of bids offered. Twelve different
16 bidders requested pre-qualification for 17 separate bids. Importantly, all requests for pre-
17 qualification were granted; no one who wanted to bid was denied the right to bid.

18
19 Q. What do you mean by diversity?

20 A. We found good diversity among the bids in terms of technology type, existing versus new
21 power plants, location of the power plants, and transaction type. Fourteen of the 17 pre-
22 qualified bids were natural-gas-fired combined cycle technology, while the other 3 bids
23 were coal-fired. Some geographic diversity also was achieved. Of the 17 bids seeking

1 prequalification, 12 were within the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) area and, of those, 7
2 were within PSO's area (the boundaries of its Balancing Authority). Finally, diversity
3 across transaction types was achieved. The bids seeking pre-qualification included 9
4 Tolling Service Agreements (TSAs), 5 Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs), and 3 Asset
5 Purchase and Sale Agreements (APSAs).

6
7 **B. Bids Submitted**

8
9 Q. How many of the pre-qualified bidders actually bid?

10 A. The response in terms of the number of actual bidders and bids also was significant.
11 Of the twelve bidders that completed the prequalification process, 8 bidders submitted
12 bids. These 8 submitted a total of 15 bids – 10 Base bids and 5 Alternate bids. The
13 number of bidders and bids indicates this was a competitive process.

14
15 Q. Did you find diversity at this stage as well?

16 A. Yes. We also found diversity among the actual bids in terms of technology type, existing
17 versus new power plants, the location of the power plants, and the transaction type. Of
18 the 15 submitted Base and Alternate bids, 9 were for natural-gas fired combined cycle
19 facilities and 6 were for coal-fired facilities. For context, note that one of the
20 Commission's chief concerns with the previous PSO RFP, in which the Commission
21 rejected the winning bid, was that a full range of alternatives were not evaluated. The
22 absence of natural gas-fired combined cycle facilities was explicitly noted by the

1 Commission.⁹ The Commission's explicit concern was resolved in the 2008 RFP since 9
2 gas-fired bids were offered in addition to 6 coal bids.

3
4 Q. Did the outcome of the 2008 RFP address in other ways the Commission's concern that a
5 full range of alternatives be assessed?

6 A. Yes. Also in the context of consideration of alternatives, please note that PSO has
7 completed a separate RFP for 200 MW of renewable power to be online by December 31,
8 2010, and is implementing demand-side management programs and embarking on
9 programs for more permanent demand-side measures.¹⁰ The decision to pursue separate
10 approaches for renewable generation and demand-side measures was discussed in the
11 Collaborative. The pursuit of these separate approaches is further support that the
12 Commission's concern over the 2005 RFP has been resolved.

13
14 Also important is the fact that during the Collaborative process there was substantial
15 interest in assuring that existing power plants bid into this RFP; the logic was that
16 ratepayers might benefit from lower power prices driven by the current excess of power
17 plant capacity in the area. That interest was satisfied since 11 of the 15 Base or Alternate
18 bids were offers from existing power plants.

19
20 Location was another possible kind of alternative. Location within SPP, or more
21 narrowly, within PSO's area, was thought to enhance reliability and to lessen the need for

⁹ Order No. 545239. *Application of Public Service Company of Oklahoma for a Determination that Additional Baseload Electric Generating Capacity Will be Used and Useful* at Attachment B at 100. (October 11, 2007) (Hereinafter as "Order No. 545239").

¹⁰ PSO Application, p. 1-2, items "(c-e)".

1 substantial transmission system upgrades. Six of the 15 Base or Alternate bids were in
2 SPP, with 4 of those bids, including the winning bidder, within the PSO area.

3
4 There also was consideration of alternatives in terms of transaction types. Eight of the
5 Base and Alternate bids were TSAs, 4 were APSAs, and 3 were PPAs. Again, in the
6 Collaborative there was interest in determining whether a comparison of the three types
7 would find existing asset sales through an APSA a real bargain. That question was
8 answered in the 2008 RFP.

9
10 **C. Conformance with the RFP**

11
12 Q. Did all of the bids conform to all of the requirements of the 2008 RFP?

13 A. No. The focus was on the acceptance of the model contract terms and conditions. The
14 2008 RFP set mandatory and non-mandatory contract provisions for bidders. Bidders
15 were not allowed to take exceptions to the former, but were allowed to take exceptions to
16 the latter in their bid submissions. Despite this, it is fair to say that all bids were non-
17 conforming in some way with respect to the mandatory provisions and/or by failure to
18 state exceptions explicitly.

19
20 Q. Were any of the bids rejected for non-conformance?

21 A. Yes. In the end, after providing bidders an opportunity to correct non-conformances,
22 three base bids were rejected because of significant non-conformance. As the IE, we
23 concurred with these decisions.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Still, in the spirit of getting the best deal for ratepayers, in the first phase of bid evaluation Boston Pacific evaluated the price offers of two of the three rejected bids alongside conforming bids; the third rejected bid did not provide sufficient price information, so it could not be evaluated. Again, all of the other bids also were non-conforming in less significant ways. However, we thought it would be best to assess as many price offers as possible and then, if the price was especially good for ratepayers, non-conformities could be addressed through negotiation.

Q. Would you briefly characterize the nature of the non-conformances?

A. Yes. Several of the bids were non-conforming in the sense that they did not agree to the mandatory provisions of the standard contract included in the RFP or did not specify the exceptions taken to the non-mandatory provisions of the contract. In addition, most of the bidders required negotiation on other important contract provisions such as the nature and extent of change-in-law provisions, heat rate guarantees, and credit/collateral requirements. The offers that were rejected were non-conforming by way of not providing sufficient information for a price evaluation, were not able to guarantee delivery of power from outside SPP to the SPP border, or were not willing to sign the contract at the time they were chosen as a winning bid.

D. Bid Evaluation to Select the Initial Short List

Q. How were bids chosen for the Initial Short List?

1 A. For the purpose of choosing the Initial Short List, the bids were ranked according to the
2 price offered by the bidder over the life of the contract. That is, the IE and PSO first used
3 the bidders' price to project the capacity, fuel, operations and maintenance, and potential
4 emissions cost payments ratepayers would make if that bidder won. We then calculated
5 the present value of the projected payments using PSO's cost of capital as the discount
6 rate. Finally we calculated the financial average payment over the life of the contract –
7 this financial average is called an “annuity” and it is the equal annual payment over the
8 life of the contract with the same present value as the projected payments. The annuity
9 was expressed in terms of dollars per megawatt.

10

11 Note that PSO intended to evaluate only Base bids for the Initial Short List, but, as
12 allowed under the RFP, the IE requested that Alternate bids also be evaluated.

13

14 Q. Please summarize your rankings for the Initial Short List.

15 A. Table One in Exhibit CRR-02 displays the ranking of the Base and Alternate bids as
16 determined by the IE using its own independent model and assumptions.

17

18 Most importantly, as can be seen in the Table, the top-ranked bid (ultimately, the winning
19 bid) was significantly lower in price than the other bids. Specifically, the competing
20 natural gas-fired bids were from 13.7% to 35.7% more expensive. The Table also
21 provides other descriptive information on each of the bids: transaction type, life of the
22 contract (or estimated remaining plant life for APSAs), location, size of the bid in MW,
23 and whether the power was from an existing or proposed (new) power plant.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Q. Were there other issues with choosing the Initial Short List that should be discussed here?

A. Yes. Three other issues were notable and are reflected in Table One. First we wanted to be sure that the primary non-conformity in the top-ranked bid – the fact that it was offered for about 10 years – was not the reason it was the top-ranked bid. We assessed this in several ways. As mentioned in the notes in Table One, we ranked it using an assumed 15-year contract; that is, we extended its payments out by extending the year-by-year escalation in its contract offer. Separately, with the Strategist model discussed below, PSO shortened the other bids to 15 years, while increasing Exelon to 15 years (making the bids all comparable in length) to see if that changed the ranking – it did not. We also assessed whether the generic fill-in technology – the power plant assumed to provide power after each contract ended – was making the winning bid look less expensive; the answer was no, the generic fill-in technology actually made the winning bid look more expensive.

Second, we were especially sensitive to the assumptions about bids that would have power sales beginning earlier than or later than 2012. For the two APSAs that offered an earlier start date, we looked at two different ways to model the cost of the early start – neither changed the ranking. One of the TSAs came on in 2013 instead of 2012. How we modeled the on-line date did change the ranking slightly, but this bidder still made it on to the Initial Short List. We note where we made different assumptions about the costs or cost savings of the early and late starts in Table One by using the term, “modified evaluation due to the on-line date.”

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Finally, we independently determined the Initial Short List. The RFP states that, in each category of technology, bids within 20 percent of the highest ranked proposal go to the Short List. As can be seen in Table One, there is a natural breaking point among natural gas bids just above the 20 percent level, which we used to chose the top four natural gas-fired bids. In addition, as prescribed in the RFP, we chose the one conforming coal-fired bid. Although PSO and the IE did independent rankings, we ultimately agreed on the five short-listed bidders. As required by the RFP, the five short-listed bidders were asked to demonstrate that they could meet the collateral requirement of the contracts. All five successfully made such a demonstration.

E. Bid Evaluation to Select the Award Group

- Q. What was the next stage of the 2008 RFP process?
- A. The next stage was a deeper evaluation of the five short-listed bids to determine the Award Group – the likely winner and backup bidder. The analysis involved the use of the commercially-available planning model, called Strategist, to conduct further evaluation of the five short-listed bids, most notably an evaluation of ratepayer risk under different scenarios of how the future may unfold. In addition, the evaluation at this stage included estimates of transmission integration costs and debt equivalence calculations for each bid. Although these added evaluation steps were thoroughly implemented and discussed, the final ranking of the bids was the same as found in Table One, based on the annuity calculation.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Q. Why was this added bid evaluation conducted in different scenarios?

A. For Boston Pacific, the most important reason for conducting this further evaluation is that it embodied an explicit consideration of uncertainty. That is, five different scenarios were developed and the rankings were re-done in each of these scenarios. The point of re-ranking under each of these scenarios is to choose the bid that offers the best price to ratepayers no matter how the future unfolds. The five scenarios were entitled Base Case, Low Power Prices, Low CO₂ Price, High Power Price, and High CO₂ Price. The assumptions for all five scenarios were vetted in the Collaborative. A weighted average of the ratepayer costs for each bid under the five scenarios was calculated with the weights for each scenario announced by PSO in the Collaborative.

Q. Any other element of this added bid evaluation that is worth highlighting here?

A. Yes. Also included in the ranking was a hypothetical bid called the “IRP Reference Case”. This was a cost estimate for a natural gas-fired combined cycle plant based on the cost and performance estimates used in PSO’s 2008 Update of its Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). The use of this IRP Reference Case was meant to indicate whether the best estimate of a cost-of-service offer – the IRP Reference Case – would beat the other fixed-price offers. The analysis here suggested the answer is no, even before the higher ratepayer risk of a cost-of-service offer is considered.

Q. What is your primary conclusion from this added bid evaluation?

1 A. Again, the most important conclusion from the added evaluation using the Strategist
2 Model is this: the top-ranked bid from the Annuity Model – the bid from Exelon – was
3 also the top-ranked bid in all five scenarios. This means that the choice of the winning
4 bid is not sensitive to the scenario weights. And, much more importantly, it indicates that
5 the Exelon bid is able to offer the best deal to ratepayers no matter how the future
6 unfolds.

7

8 **F. Negotiation with the Top-Ranked Bidder**

9

10 Q. Were you involved in the negotiation of the final contract with Exelon, the winning
11 bidder?

12 A. Yes. The IE monitored the negotiation of the final contract between PSO and the
13 winning bidder. The negotiation clearly took more time than expected. However, the
14 length of time was not driven by the magnitude or number of exceptions to the contract
15 taken by the bidder, or by the contentiousness of the negotiation. Rather, it was driven in
16 large part by an effort to go into considerable detail on the day-to-day implementation of
17 provisions such as scheduling and dispatch, and into scheduled and forced outages. We
18 concluded that the negotiated changes were reasonable on balance.

19

20 **V. COMPLIANCE WITH COMPETITIVE BIDDING RULES**

21

22 Q. Let's turn to your second topic. Was the 2008 RFP run in a manner compliant with
23 Oklahoma's competitive bidding rules?

1 A. Yes. Boston Pacific believes the RFP was conducted in compliance with the State’s
2 competitive bidding rules. That is, as required by those rules, PSO conducted an “open,
3 transparent, fair and non-discriminatory competitive bid process.” All that was stated in
4 the previous section about bidder response to and the results of the RFP support this
5 conclusion. Beyond that there are many specific requirements embedded in the rules
6 which were met.

7
8 Q. Would you please summarize the key requirements of the rules met by PSO?

9 A. Yes. I can summarize those as follows:

10

11 1. Draft RFP documents were published and interested parties had an opportunity to
12 comment on key elements of those documents through a lengthy Collaborative process
13 and on the documents themselves through written comments after the collaborative.¹¹

14

15 2. An IE was engaged by the Commission and the IE was deeply involved in all stages of
16 the RFP. The IE independently ranked the bids and worked to achieve agreement with
17 PSO on that ranking. The IE and PSO also were able to come to agreement on the
18 selection of the winning bidder.¹²

19

20 3. No affiliate bias was detected by the IE. Most importantly, all bids, including bids from
21 the affiliate, were evaluated under the same rules and with the same analytic methods.¹³

22

¹¹ OAC 165: 35-34-3(a)(4)

¹² OAC 165: 35-34-3(b)

¹³ OAC 165: 35-34-3(c)

- 1 4. The evaluation was done in a way that sought the lowest reasonable costs for bids.¹⁴
- 2
- 3 5. As required, the IE was present at the opening of the bids and received original versions
- 4 of all bids.¹⁵
- 5
- 6 6. Bidders were not allowed to refresh their bid price.¹⁶
- 7
- 8 7. PSO did seek clarification of offers from all bidders and the IE monitored these
- 9 communications.¹⁷
- 10
- 11 8. PSO did not waive any evaluation criteria.¹⁸
- 12
- 13 9. Debt equivalent calculations were required by the RFP and were done, but had no effect
- 14 on the selection of the winning bidder.¹⁹
- 15
- 16 10. No penalty was imposed on purchased power.²⁰
- 17
- 18 11. PSO did not appear to discriminate in favor of its affiliate. In any event, the PSO affiliate
- 19 did not win the RFP.²¹
- 20

¹⁴ OAC 165: 35-34-3(d)(1)(A)

¹⁵ OAC 165: 35-34-3(d)(1)(B)

¹⁶ OAC 165: 35-34-3(d)(2)

¹⁷ OAC 165: 35-34-3(d)(3)

¹⁸ OAC 165: 35-34-3(d)(5)(A)

¹⁹ OAC 165: 35-34-3(d)(5)(B)

²⁰ OAC 165: 35-34-3(d)(5)(C)

²¹ OAC 165: 35-34-3(d)(5)(D)

1 12. The decision was announced and supported as required by the rules.²²

2
3 Q. Do the bidding rules state other, even more specific requirements?

4 A. Yes. The competitive bidding rules state just one explicit requirement for the contract
5 with the winning bid: “The contract shall contain appropriate guarantees, as set by the
6 Commission, regarding the reliability of services.”²³ The contract with the winning bid
7 does indeed have explicit and appropriate guarantees and penalties related to reliability.

8
9
10 **VI. CONSISTENCY WITH THE RULES AND PROCEDURES IN THE**
11 **REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**

12
13 Q. Let’s turn to your third and final topic. Was the 2008 RFP run in a manner consistent
14 with the rules stated in the RFP documents themselves?

15 A. Yes. Boston Pacific believes the choice of the winning bidder was done in a manner
16 consistent with the rules and procedures in the 2008 RFP. As documented above, these
17 rules and procedures succeeded in addressing and resolving the Commission’s primary
18 basis for rejecting the results of the 2005 RFP – the failure to evaluate a full range of
19 alternatives. PSO’s 2008 RFP is clearly an improvement over the 2005 RFP because it is
20 better designed to attract and fairly consider a full range of alternatives. For example, the
21 2008 RFP eliminated the requirement in the previous 2005 RFP that bidders have a \$500

²² OAC 165: 35-34-3(e)

²³ OAC 165: 35-34-3(g)(1)

1 million tangible net worth;²⁴ that requirement blocked the evaluation of natural gas-fired
2 combined cycle alternatives in the 2005 RFP.²⁵ The most important evidence in this
3 regard is the fact that the 2008 RFP did attract a significant number of bidders.

4
5 Q. What features of the 2008 RFP do you believe contributed most to the success of the
6 2008 RFP?

7 A. The most important rules of the RFP were those which helped attract a significant
8 number of bidders and allowed an evaluation of a full range of alternatives as required by
9 the Commission. As we have stated elsewhere, we see nine features contributing to this
10 and the choice of the winning bid is consistent with all nine.

11
12 1. Comparability: All bidders, including the utility affiliate, bid under the same rules and
13 were evaluated with the same methods. Affiliate bias was a substantial concern in the
14 Collaborative. For that reason it is crucial to note that an affiliate, while its bids were
15 fairly evaluated, did not win.

16
17 2. Transmission Transparency: Transmission integration requirements were determined
18 by an independent third party – the Southwest Power Pool Regional Transmission
19 Organization. As noted, in the end, the transmission integration cost estimates did not
20 influence the choice of the winning bid, but the independence of the estimates is still
21 noteworthy.

22

²⁴ Public Service of Oklahoma Request for Proposals for Baseload Capacity and Energy Resources, December 2005, Section 5.4.1.

²⁵ Order No. 545239

- 1 3. Indexing: In the face of perhaps unprecedented cost uncertainty, bidders with new
2 power plants were allowed to index 100% of their capacity price to approved,
3 publicly available price indexes during construction instead of having to take the risk
4 of cost forecasts and then embed higher risk premiums in their bid prices. Eligible
5 bidders requested indexing for capacity prices. Payments related to fuel use in PPAs
6 and TSAs were indexed to publicly available natural gas price indices as well.
7
- 8 4. Flexible Start Dates: To attract existing (already-built) generating resources, bidders
9 were allowed to offer a start date for sales of power well before the year 2012 in
10 which the new base load need is identified. To attract new-built resources that might
11 take a bit more time, start dates as late as 2015 also were allowed. Three of the
12 bidders took advantage of this feature and we carefully evaluated their offers.
13
- 14 5. Collateral Required Only At Contract Signature: With the ongoing credit crisis, a
15 collateral commitment is sometimes hard to come by. The 2008 RFP required
16 collateral only after a definitive contract is signed. After making the Initial Short
17 List, all five short-listed bids were asked to and were able to demonstrate an ability to
18 meet the eventual collateral requirements.
19
- 20 6. The IRP Sets the Context for Bid Evaluation: PSO's 2008 Integrated Resource Plan
21 (IRP) Update, which was vetted in the Collaborative, documented the base load need
22 solicited in this RFP (from 450 MW to 600 MW) and, more importantly, set the
23 assumptions and methods for evaluating bids such as construction costs, fuel costs,

1 emissions costs, and collateral requirements and method of handling debt
2 equivalence. As explained above in this testimony, the bid evaluations were
3 conducted in a thorough manner as prescribed in the RFP.

4
5 7. No Separate Non-Price Evaluation: This was a “price-mostly” bid evaluation which
6 enhances transparency. Although there are notable non-price benefits, there was not a
7 separate evaluation of non-price factors. The bid with the best price offer, as
8 indicated by the annuity calculation, won the RFP.

9
10 8. Tolling Service Agreement Added: A new transaction type, a Tolling Service
11 Agreement, was added to the options of a Power Purchase Agreement and, for the
12 existing resources, an Asset Purchase and Sale Agreement. Both of these additional
13 transaction types were used by actual bidders giving diversity to the bids.

14
15 9. Transparency on the Debt Equivalence Issue: Information on winning bids with and
16 without the debt equivalence calculation was provided as required by the RFP.
17 Again, the debt equivalence calculation did not change the ranking and the choice of
18 the winning bid.

19
20 Q. Where were the concepts for these nine features mainly proposed?

21 A. Most of these important features emerged from the Collaborative process. Boston Pacific
22 notes, once again, that we very much appreciate the substantial and substantive
23 participation of all parties in the Collaborative including, but not limited to, personnel,

1 legal counsel, or consultants from AES Corporation, AEP Service Corporation, Office of
2 the Attorney General, Calpine Corporation, Commission Staff, LS Power Associates,
3 Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers, PSO, Quality of Service Coalition, Redbud
4 Energy, and Wal-Mart Stores East.

5
6 Q. Was the Collaborative process time consuming?

7 A. Yes. This was a time-consuming effort for everyone involved. The Collaborative had
8 many meetings and conference calls over more than six months from late December 2007
9 into June 2008. And parties were well prepared, often producing written documents
10 summarizing a position prior to the meeting or teleconference. The Collaborative did not
11 come to a consensus on all the major issues. We believe, however, that all the major
12 issues were openly discussed and that substantial progress was made on each of them.
13 While all of the major issues were vetted in the Collaborative, we did not vet the key
14 documents such as the RFP document itself or the key contracts such as the Power
15 Purchase Agreement (PPA). Comments on the RFP and contracts were solicited during
16 the 25-Day comment period following the issuance of the Draft 2008 RFP.

17
18 Q. Does this conclude your Testimony?

19 A. Yes.

**LIST OF TESTIMONY AND OTHER PUBLICATIONS
FOR CRAIG R. ROACH, Ph.D.**

TESTIMONY

Direct Testimony concerning Mississippi Power Company's Application to construct and operate an Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) facility. Phase One of the Mississippi Public Service Commission Docket No. 2009-UA-014 [July 2009]. For the Mississippi Commission.

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony concerning a service agreement between TransCanada Energy Ltd. and British Columbia Transmission Corporation for long term firm point-to-point transmission service. British Columbia Utilities Commission Project No. 3698539 [March and April 2009]. For TransCanada Energy Ltd.

Report responding to the Commission's inquiries on emissions costs, construction costs, and fuel costs, Minnesota Public Utility Commission Docket No. CN-05-619 [October 2008]. For the Minnesota Commission.

Testimony concerning the design of the 2008 RFP, Oklahoma Corporation Commission Cause No. PUD 200700418 [June 2008]. Filed as the Oklahoma Commission's Independent Evaluator.

Comments concerning PacifiCorp's proposed acquisition of the Chehalis power plant, Oregon Public Utility Commission Docket No. UM 1374 [June 2008]. Filed as the Oregon Independent Evaluator.

Reply comments concerning the 2008 Procurement Process, before the Illinois Commerce Commission [May 2008]. Filed as the Procurement Monitor.

Comments concerning the 2008 Procurement Process, before the Illinois Commerce Commission [May 2008]. Filed as the Procurement Monitor.

Direct Testimony concerning the proposed acquisition of TXU by private equity investors, Public Utility Commission of Texas Docket No. 34077 [September 2007]. For the Texas Commission.

Comments concerning PacifiCorp's proposal to amend and delay its 2012 RFP, Oregon Public Utility Commission Docket No. UM 1208. [November 2007]. Filed as the Oregon Independent Evaluator.

Affidavit concerning allegations of above-market prices and price manipulation in the 2006 Illinois Auction, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. EL07-47-000. [June 2007]. Filed as the Auction Monitor.

Support for settlement of an electric transmission rate case, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER06-186-000. [March and April 2006]. For the City of Vernon.

Testimony concerning market power mitigation measures for the Southwest Power Pool energy imbalance services market, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER06-451-000. [January 2006]. Filed as the Southwest Power Pool's Independent Market Monitor.

Comments on the Maryland procurement process for Standard Offer Service, Maryland Senate Special Commission on Electric Utility Deregulation Implementation. [August 2005]. Appearing as the Technical Consultant for the Maryland Public Service Commission.

Direct and Supplemental Testimony concerning market power mitigation measures for the Southwest Power Pool energy imbalance services market, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER05-1118-000. [June and August 2005]. Filed as the Southwest Power Pool's Independent Market Monitor.

- Comments on the open access status of a transmission line, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER05-1072-000. [June 2005]. Filed as the Southwest Power Pool's Independent Market Monitor.
- Direct Testimony regarding the benefit of continuing PUCT Capacity Auctions in Texas, Public Utility Commission of Texas, Docket No. 30882. [May 2005]. For Reliant Energy, Inc.
- Expert Report regarding the basis for and quantification of damages, 249th Judicial District Court (Texas) Cause No. C-2002-00267. [March 2005]. For Ponderosa Pine Energy, L.L.C.
- Panelist on transmission market power and barriers to entry, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Technical Conference Docket No. RM04-7-000, Washington, DC. [December 2004].
- Expert Report concerning damage estimates regarding power sales contract, American Arbitration Association Case No. 71 198 00323 01. [October 2004]. For Ponderosa Pine Energy Partners, LTD.
- Panelist on solicitation processes for public utilities, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Technical Conference Docket No. PL04-6-000, Washington, DC. [June 2004].
- Affidavit and Supplemental Affidavit concerning the competitive effects of the proposed acquisition of Illinois Power by Ameren Corp., Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. EC04-81-000, Washington, DC. [May and June 2004]. For Aquila Merchant Services, Inc.
- Direct Testimony on FirstEnergy's proposed Rate Stabilization Plan, Public Utilities Commission of Ohio Case No. 03-2144 EL-ATA, EL-AAM, EL-UNC. [February 2004]. For Reliant Resources, Inc. and Constellation Power Source.
- Panelist on market power mitigation and measurement, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Technical Conference on Supply Margin Assessment Screen and Alternatives Docket No. PL02-8-000, Washington, DC. [January 2004].
- Direct and Answering Testimony concerning approval of affiliate power purchases by Entergy under the *Edgar* standard using a competitive solicitation test. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER03-583-000. [November 2003 and April 2004]. For Calpine Corporation.
- Direct and Answering Testimony and Cross-Answering Testimony concerning approval of an affiliate acquisition by AmerenUE under the *Edgar* standard using a competitive solicitation and benchmark data. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. EC03-53-000. [August and September 2003]. For the Electric Power Supply Association.
- Affidavit concerning the application of the *Mobile-Sierra* doctrine to a Standard Offer Wholesale Sales Agreement for a supplier in bankruptcy. United States District Court (District of Columbia) Case No. 03-1189. [July 2003]. For NRG Power Marketing Inc.
- Direct Testimony concerning Entergy's proposed Agreement in Principle including certain affiliate power sales, New Orleans City Council Docket Nos. UD-01-04 and UD-03-01. [April 2003] For Reverend C.S. Gordon, Jr., et al.
- Expert Report concerning correct interpretation of power sales contract standards, American Arbitration Association Case No. 71 198 00323 01. [April 2003] For Tenaska IV Texas Partners, LTD.
- Expert Report concerning the correct discount rate to be used in determining an award, American Arbitration Association Case No. 00 199 00199 02. [March 2003]. For TM Delmarva Power L.L.C.
- Affidavit concerning market-based rate authority using the Supply Margin Assessment (SMA), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER03-618-000. [March 2003]. For Reliant Energy Choctaw, LLC.

- Expert Report concerning opportunities for reverse tolling transactions with Entergy, utility dispatch rules, and antitrust damages, Louisiana State Court Suit No. 467,116; Div. "N". [January 2003]. For Energy Transfer Group.
- Affidavit concerning market-based rate authority using the Supply Margin Assessment (SMA), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER03-382-000. [January 2003]. For Reliant Energy Solutions, LLC.
- Direct and Rebuttal Testimony concerning Track B issues including types of competitive solicitation, products to be procured, and affiliate codes of conduct, Arizona Corporation Commission Docket No. E-00000A-02-0051, et al. [November 2002]. For Panda Gila River, L.P.
- Panelist concerning the Resource Adequacy Requirement within the Standard Market Design, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Technical Conference Docket No. RM01-12-000, Washington, DC. [November 2002].
- Affidavit concerning market-based rate authority using the Supply Margin Assessment (SMA), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER03-81-000. [October 2002]. For Reliant Energy Solutions West, LLC.
- Affidavit concerning the method for determining natural gas prices for purposes of calculating refunds in California, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket Nos. EL00-95-045, et al. [October 2002]. For Reliant Energy Power Generation, Inc.
- Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony concerning affiliate asset transaction and competitive procurement, Wisconsin Public Service Commission Docket No. 05-CE-117. [August and September 2002]. For Midwest Independent Power Suppliers.
- Direct and Responsive Testimony concerning affiliate asset transfer and competitive procurement, Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission Cause No. 42145. [July and October 2002]. For Midwest Independent Power Suppliers.
- Direct and Rebuttal Testimony concerning Track A issues including asset transfer, market power, and codes of conduct, Arizona Corporation Commission Docket No. E-00000A-02-0051, et al. [May and June 2002]. For Panda Gila River, L.P.
- Affidavit concerning the triennial update for market-based rate authority using the Supply Margin Assessment (SMA), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER01-3103-002. [June 2002]. For Reliant Resources, Inc.
- Affidavit concerning market-based rate authority using the Supply Margin Assessment (SMA), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER02-1762-000. [May 2002]. For Reliant Energy Solutions East, LLC.
- Direct Testimony concerning Arizona Public Service Company's request for approval of variance and affiliate power purchase agreement, Arizona Corporation Commission Docket No. E-00000A-02-0051, et al. [March 2002]. For Panda Gila River, L.P.
- Direct Evidence concerning a proposal for transmission congestion management and expansion cost allocation, Alberta Energy and Utilities Board Application No. 1248859. [March 2002]. For TransCanada Energy Ltd.
- Direct Evidence concerning competitive procurement and pricing for transmission must-run and other ancillary services, Alberta Energy and Utilities Board Application No. 1244140. [February 2002]. For Ancillary Services Group.

- Comments concerning market power mitigation by RTOs, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Technical Conference on Standard Electricity Market Design Docket No. RM01-12-000, Washington, DC. [February 2002].
- Direct Testimony concerning prices and other terms and conditions for imbalance energy from Entergy, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket EL02-46-000. [January 2002]. For Generator Coalition.
- Direct Testimony concerning energy market conditions and energy availability in New Orleans, City Council of New Orleans Docket No. UD-00-2. [January 2002]. For Thomas Lowenburg, et al.
- Initial and Reply Comments concerning the development of market-based mechanisms to evaluate proposals to construct or acquire generating capacity, Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. R-26,172. [December 2001 and January 2002]. For Sempra Energy Resources.
- Expert Witness concerning abrogation of power sales agreement by Entergy, State of Alabama Circuit Court for Jefferson County, Civil Action Number CV9925070. [2001]. For Southern Company Services.
- Direct Testimony and Supplemental Direct concerning the competitive effects of the proposed merger of Orion Power Holdings, Inc. and Reliant Resources Inc., Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. EC02-11-000. [October 2001 and January 2002]. For Applicants.
- Comments and Request For Intervention concerning a proposed refund condition for market-based rates and methods of measuring market power, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. EL01-118-000. [December 2001]. For Boston Pacific Company, Inc.
- Comments concerning the role of market monitoring by RTOs, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Conference on Electricity Market Design and Structure Docket No. RM01-12-000. [October 2001].
- Affidavit concerning updated market power analysis in support of Carr Street Generating Station, L.P.'s market-based rate application, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER98-4095-001. [October 2001]. For Orion Power Holdings, Inc.
- Expert Report concerning calculation of damages due to a breach of contract, United States District Court (Eastern Texas) Case No. 1:00CV-283. [August 2001]. For EPCO Carbon Dioxide Products, Inc.
- Direct Testimony concerning prudence of Wisconsin Electric Power Company's Power The Future-2 proposal, Public Service Commission of Wisconsin Docket No. 6630-DR-104. [June 2001]. For Midwest Independent Power Suppliers Coordination Group.
- Direct Evidence Concerning Hydro Quebec's transmission rate application, Régie de L'Énergie Case R-3401-98. [February 2001]. For Ontario Power Generation, Inc.
- Presentation of guiding principles for monitoring market power in markets run by the California ISO, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Technical Conference Docket Nos. EL00-95-000, et al. [January 2001]. For the Electric Power Supply Association.
- Affidavit concerning breach of contract by a utility and the resulting damages through the imposition of a cap on a rate discount known as the LEE Credit, Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-22801. [August 2000]. For Star Enterprise.
- Direct, Supplemental Direct, Surrebuttal, and Rebuttal Testimony concerning the prudence of passing through the fuel adjustment clause certain electricity purchase costs and the costs of some utility-owned generation, New Orleans City Council Docket No. UD-99-2. [April and December 2000; March and August 2001]. For Reverend C.S. Gordon, Jr., et al.

- Direct and Rebuttal Testimony concerning the pricing of Reliability Must-Run (RMR) Service to the California ISO, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket Nos. ER98-496-006 and ER98-2160-004. [December 1999 and March 2000]. For Duke Energy Power Services.
- Direct, Rebuttal, and Rebuttal to Staff Testimony concerning the prudence of electricity purchase costs passed through the fuel adjustment clause and the underlying, inter-company procurement practices and methods of economic dispatch, Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-23356. [July and November 1999; July 2000]. For Linda Delaney, et al.
- Affidavit concerning the competitive effects of the proposed merger of Sempra Energy and KN Energy, Inc., Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. EC99-48-000. [May 1999]. For Questar Pipeline Company.
- Direct and Oral Rebuttal Testimony concerning the competitive effects of the proposed merger of AEP and CSW, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket Nos. EC98-40-000, ER98-2770-000, and ER98-2786-000. [April 1999]. For The Dayton Power and Light Company.
- Direct, Supplemental, and Rebuttal Testimony concerning a rate proposal for the Associated Branch Pilots of the Port of New Orleans, Louisiana Public Service Commission. [October 1998]. For the Associated Branch Pilots.
- Direct and Rebuttal Testimony concerning claims for damages by Public Service of Colorado based on alleged improper billings under a power purchase agreement with Tri-State, American Arbitration Association No. 77 Y 181 00230 97. [September and October 1998]. For Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.
- Testimony concerning a public records request, 19th Judicial District Court, Parish of East Baton Rouge, State of Louisiana Suit No. 449,691 Div. "A". [August 1998]. For CII Carbon, L.L.C.
- Direct, Cross-Answering, and Surrebuttal Testimony concerning standby rates for self-generators, Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-20925-SC. [June, July, and August 1998]. For CII Carbon, L.L.C.
- Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony concerning reliability, market power, functional unbundling, divestiture, default supplier, balancing and other restructuring issues, New Jersey Board of Public Utilities Docket No. EX94120585Y, et al. [March and April 1998]. For Mid-Atlantic Power Supply Association.
- Declaration concerning antitrust issues made by Florida Power in a motion for summary judgment, United States District Court (Miami, Florida) Case No. 96-594-CIV-LENARD. [February 1998]. For Metropolitan Dade County and Montenay Power.
- Comments concerning market power, market structure, reliability, and related topics in restructuring, Arkansas Public Service Commission Docket Nos. 97-451-U, 97-452-U, and 97-453-U. [February 1998]. For Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers.
- Direct, Rebuttal, and Surrebuttal Testimony concerning a methodology for determining avoided cost prices, Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-22739. [November and December 1997; January 1998]. For CII Carbon, L.L.C.
- Direct Testimony concerning Virginia Power's proposals for stranded cost recovery, Virginia State Corporation Commission Case No. PUE 960296. [December 1997]. For Virginia Independent Power Producers, Inc.
- Rebuttal Testimony concerning rules for affiliate transactions in the proposed merger of Pacific Enterprises and Enova Corporation, California Public Utilities Commission No. A.96-10-038. [August 1997]. For Kern River Gas Transmission Company.

Direct Testimony concerning the proposed merger of Pacific Enterprises and Enova Corporation, California Public Utilities Commission No. A.96-10-038. [August 1997]. For Kern River Gas Transmission Company.

Rebuttal Testimony concerning the calculation of damages for the Abrogation of Tenaska's power purchase agreement by BPA, American Arbitration Association No. 77-198-0224-95. [July 1997]. For Tenaska, Inc.

Testimony concerning Ex-Im Bank and OPIC, before the Subcommittee on Tax, Finance, and Exports, Committee on Small Business, U.S. House of Representatives. [May 1997].

Testimony concerning the abrogation of Tenaska's power purchase agreement by BPA, American Arbitration Association No. 77-198-0224-95. [February 1997]. For Tenaska, Inc.

Direct Testimony concerning rolled-in rates on Transco, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket Nos. RP95-197-000 and RP95-197-001 (Phase II). [January 1996]. For KCS Energy Marketing, Inc.

Direct Testimony concerning estimates of avoided costs by Louisiana Power & Light, Louisiana Public Service Commission Docket No. U-21384. [October 1995]. For Calciner Industries, Inc.

Surrebuttal Testimony concerning estimates of avoided costs by Empire District Electric Company, Missouri Public Service Commission Case No. EC-95-28. [June 1995]. For Ahlstrom Development Corporation.

Affidavit concerning Duke's market power study, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. ER95-760-000. [April 1995]. For North Carolina Municipal Power Agency Number 1 and Piedmont Municipal Power Agency.

Direct Testimony concerning estimates of avoided costs by Empire District Electric Company, Missouri Public Service Commission Case No. EC-95-28. [January 1995]. For Ahlstrom Development Corporation.

Direct Testimony concerning a proposal for rolled-in rates by Pacific Gas Transmission, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. RP94-149-000. [November 1994]. For Alberta Department of Energy.

Direct Testimony concerning proposal for market-based rates under Rate-K, Michigan Public Service Commission Case No. U-10625. [October 1994]. For Michigan Cogeneration Coalition.

Preliminary Written Comments concerning the need for and form of a request for proposals (RFP) by Carolina Power & Light, South Carolina Public Service Commission Docket No. 94-469-E. [August 1994]. For Carolina Competitive Energy Producers.

Initial and Reply Comments concerning guidelines for evaluation of unsolicited private power proposals, North Carolina Utilities Commission Docket No. E-100, Sub 64. [September and October 1993]. For Carolina Competitive Energy Producers.

Direct Testimony concerning Section 712 issues, Florida Public Service Commission Docket No. 921288-EU. [September 1993]. For Florida Competitive Energy Producer's Association.

Oral Testimony concerning Section 712 issues, Maryland Public Service Commission Case No. 8568. [August 1993]. For Mid-Atlantic Independent Power Producers.

Direct Testimony concerning Section 712 issues, Georgia Public Service Commission Docket No. 4384-U. [July 1993]. For Electric Generation Association.

Direct Testimony concerning the proposed merger of Entergy and Gulf States, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Dockets Nos. EC92-21-000 and ER92-806-000. [March 1993]. For Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers.

Direct Testimony concerning New York curtailment proposals, New York Public Service Commission Case Nos. 92-E-0814 and 88-E-081. [February 1993]. For J. Makowski Associates, Inc.

Direct Testimony concerning Georgia Power Company's Integrated Resource Plan, Georgia Public Service Commission Dockets No. 4131-U and 4134-U. [June 1992]. For Mission Energy Company.

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony concerning Baltimore Gas and Electric's CPCN filing and Cogen Technologies' proposed QF, Maryland Public Service Commission Case No. 8241-Phase II. [August and September 1991]. For Mission Energy Company.

Direct Testimony commenting on Jersey Central Power & Light Company's request for proposals dated August 31, 1990, Docket No. 8010-678B. [December 1990]. For State of New Jersey Department of the Public Advocate [Co-sponsored].

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony concerning the sale/leaseback and restated agreement transaction for Springerville and San Juan power, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket Nos. EL89-17-001 and EL89-18-001. [May and June 1990]. For Century Power Corporation.

Direct and Rebuttal Testimony concerning the proposed merger of Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas and Electric, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Docket No. EC89-5-000. [November 1989 and January 1990]. For Century Power Corporation.

ARTICLES & SPEECHES

"Financial Incentives for Utilities to Purchase Resources: The Right Reasons the Right Way." Presented to the Harvard Electricity Policy Group Fifty-Second Plenary Session (October 3, 2008).

"Market and Auction Monitoring: Requirements, Philosophy, and Tools of the Trade." Presented to Edison Electric Institute Transmission and Wholesale Markets School (August 13, 2008).

"Boston Pacific's Comments on NARUC [Competitive Bidding] Study" Submitted to NARUC (October 2008).

"Financial Incentives for Utilities to Purchase Resources: The Right Reasons, The Right Way" Presented to Harvard Electricity Policy Group Fifty-Second Plenary Session, Chicago, Illinois (October 2008).

"Market and Auction Monitoring: Requirements, Philosophy and Tools of the Trade" Presented to EEI Transmission and Wholesale Markets School, Madison, Wisconsin (August 2008).

"Summary of the 2007 State of the Market Report for SPP's EIS and Transmission Markets" Presented to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (June 2008).

"Summary of the 2006 State of the Market Report for SPP's EIS and Transmission Markets" Presented to the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (May 2007).

"State-of-the-Art Fair Utility Procurement Practices: An Independent Monitor's Perspective" Presented at the Northwest Independent Power Producers Coalition's Annual Meeting, Union, WA (September 2005).

"SPP Market Power Monitoring and Mitigation" Presented at the Energy Bar Association's Midwest Conference, Kansas City, MO (March 2005).

"Balance Sheet Penalties for Purchased Power" Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association's Fall Membership Meeting, Washington, DC (November 2004).

"Getting the Best Deal for Consumers: An Independent Monitor's View" Presented at the Energy Bar Association's Mid-Year Meeting, Washington, DC (November 2004).

- “Getting the Best Deal for Illinois Electric Customers” Presented at the Post 2006 Symposium, Chicago, IL (April 2004).
- “A Framework for Enhancing Reliability Through Consumer-Focused, Profitable Innovation” Presented at the National Electrical Manufacturers Association’s 2004 Spring Conference, Charleston, SC (April 2004).
- “Solicitations for Longer-Term Power Purchases” Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association’s Fall Membership Meeting, Washington, DC (October 2003).
- “Standards for Longer-Term Power Markets” Co-Presented at the North American Energy Standards Board’s Annual Meeting, Austin, TX (September 2003).
- “The Case for Competition in the U.S. Electricity Business,” The Electricity Journal Vol. 16 Issue 6 (2003), pp. 18-26.
- “The Right Perspective and Right Tools for Risk Assessment” Presented at CBI’s Annual Conference on Private Power in Central America, Miami, Florida (June 2003).
- “Standard Market Design (SMD): Helping Electricity Markets Work” Presented as a Briefing for Congressional Staff, Washington, DC (November 2002).
- “Making Markets Work Under SMD” Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association’s Fall Membership Meeting, Washington, DC (October 2002).
- “How Much Scrutiny is Too Much? How Much Control Can a Market Bear?” Presented at Walking the Beat: FERC as Market Monitor, A Platts Conference, Washington, DC (October 2002).
- “Measuring Market Power in the U.S. Electricity Business,” Energy Law Journal 23, No.1 (2002), pp. 51-62.
- “Market Monitoring and Market Power” Presented to the Energy Bar Association, Washington, DC (November 2001).
- “Choosing a Market Power Standard for Market-Based Rates” Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association’s State Issues & Summer Membership Meeting, Washington, DC (July 2001).
- “Energy Experts Debate Capping Electricity Prices in California,” The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer (May 2001).
- “Price Caps: An Apparent Short-Term Solution That Creates Long-Term Problems” Presented at Energy and Power Risk Management’s Annual Conference, Houston, Texas (May 2001).
- “Assuring Restructured Markets are Effectively Competitive” Presented to National Governors’ Association, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (April 2001).
- “Who Lost California?” Presented to Gulf Coast Power Association, Houston, Texas (March 2001).
- “What Lessons Can New England Learn From California’s Wholesale Power Markets” Presented at Northeast Energy and Commerce Association’s Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts (December 2000).
- “Auction Debate: Last Price v. Pay-as-bid Auction Methods” Moderator and Speaker for the Electric Power Supply Association Regulatory Affairs Committee Meeting (December 2000).
- “Congestion Management: Setting the Stage for Consensus” Moderator and Speaker for the Electric Power Supply Association Regulatory Affairs Committee Meeting (May 2000).

- “Protecting the Consumer by Promoting Competition” Presented at “Trusting Markets-ISO Experiences” a workshop during the Electric Power Supply Association Fall Membership Meeting (October 1999).
- “Renegotiating Power Purchase Agreements When Establishing Competitive Energy Markets” Presented at “Second Generation Issues in the Reform of Public Services” an international conference sponsored by the Inter-American Development Bank (October 1999).
- “Presumptions About Customers That Drive Key Decisions in a Restructured Electricity Business” Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association/Fortune Magazine’s Executive Conference (January 1999).
- “How External Factors Drive the Success of Your Investment and Strategic Decisions” Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association’s Risk Management Conference (December 1998).
- “Assessing Market Power at the Retail Level” Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association’s Summer Membership Meeting (July 1998).
- “The Right Market Power Analysis for Retail Restructuring Proceedings” Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association’s State and Regional Issues Meeting (March 1998).
- “Managing Today’s Significant Risks” Presented at “International Power Project Development and Finance” (February 1998).
- “Managing Today’s Significant Risks” Presented at the Electric Power Supply Association’s Risk Management Conference (December 1997).
- “Managing Risk in a Restructured U.S. Electricity Business” Presented at the Council of Industrial Boiler Owners’ Annual Meeting (October 1997).
- “A Risk Assessment Checklist for Power Project Acquisitions” Presented at “Mitigation Risk for International Power Projects” (July 1997).
- “A Risk Assessment Checklist for International Power Projects” Presented at “Oil and Gas Companies in Global Power Project Development” (January 1997).
- “A Risk Assessment Checklist for International Power Projects” Presented at “Financing Strategies for International IPP Projects” (November 1996).
- “Addressing Municipalization and Bypass Concerns in a Restructured Electricity Business” Presented at EEI Municipalization and Bypass Conference (October 1996).
- “Performance-Based Ratemaking in an Electricity Business Restructured for Competition” Presented at “Performance-Based Ratemaking for Electric & Gas Utilities” (October 1996).
- “A Risk Assessment Checklist for International Power Projects” Presented at “Neutralizing Risk for International Power Projects” (September 1996).
- “The Right Competitive Strategy For A Restructured U.S. Electricity Business” Presented at “POWER-GEN Americas ‘95” (December 1995).
- “Practical Lessons Learned from Past Project Failures” Presented at “Risk Mitigation for International Power Projects” (November 1995).
- “The Due Diligence Process: New Views for the Lender and Investor” Presented at “Project Finance Tutorial” (November 1995).

- “State Regulatory Trends” Presented at “Electric Industry Restructuring: Understanding the Implications for the Natural Gas Industry” (October 1995).
- “Summary of State of Competition Opinion Survey” Presented at NARUC Summer 1995 Committee Meeting (July 1995).
- “Spin-Off Services of Retail Competition” Presented at “Giving Customers More Options: The Key to Success in the New Power Market” (May 1995).
- “The Latin American Power Market” Presented at “New Opportunities in the Evolving World Power Market” (November 1994).
- “Transmission Access and Pricing: Evolving Commercial and Regulatory Approaches” Presented at “Competitive Power Congress ‘94” (June 1994).
- “Section 712: A Surprise Ending” Independent Energy (May/June 1994), pp. 55-59.
- “Non-Traditional Competition For Industrial Loads” Presented to Oglethorpe Power (April 1994).
- “Section 712: Southeast Roundup” Presented at “The Southeast Power Market in a New Age of Competition” Southeast Power Report and Independent Power Report (December 1993).
- “The Emerging Latin American Power Market” Presented at “International Power Market” (December 1993).
- “Structural Change in the Electricity Business” Presented at “Annual Fall Policy Roundtable” Council on Alternative Fuels (November 1993).
- “Power Project Siting and Community Relations: Six Elements of a Win-Win Strategy” (Coauthored) Cogeneration & Resource Recovery (July/August 1993).
- “How to Gain a Competitive Advantage in the Electricity Business” Presented at “Bidding For Power” The Institute For International Research (March 1993).
- “The Energy Policy Act of 1992: Its Effect on Market Opportunities in the Short- and Long-Run” Presented at “Market Opportunities for Utilities in the Energy Policy Act of 1992” Power Engineering and EL&P (February 1993).
- “Natural Gas v. Coal: Comparisons of Cost, Risk, and Environmental Performance” Institute of Public Utilities (December 1992).
- “How to Gain a Competitive Advantage in the Electricity Business” Presented at “Competitive Bidding for Power Contracts” Infocast (May and October 1991; March 1993).
- “Designing a Bidding System to Get the Best Deal for Ratepayers” Presented at “Competitive Bidding for Power Contracts” Infocast (May 1991).
- “Accommodating Renewables in Utility Bidding Systems: Toward a Level Playing Field” Institute of Public Utilities (December 1991).
- “The Successful Independent Power Producer” Presented at “Alternate Energy ‘90” Council on Alternate Fuels (April 1990).
- “Alternative Approaches to Transmission Access” Institute of Public Utilities (1988).
- “The Coming Boom in Computer Loads” (Coauthored) Public Utilities Fortnightly (December 1986), pp. 30-34.

BOOKS

“Policy Models and Policymakers: The Case of Industrial Energy Use.” In Coal Models and Their Use in Government Planning, pp. 23-36. Edited by James Quirk, Katsuki Terasawa, and David Whipple. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1982.

“Coal Substitution.” In Energy-Policy Analysis and Congressional Action, pp. 97-113. Edited by Raymond C. Scheppach and Everett M. Ehrlich. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company, 1982.

CONSULTING REPORTS (PUBLIC ONLY)

Report of the Commission’s Consultant Regarding FirstEnergy’s 2009 Standard Service Offer Auction. For the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. Washington, DC, [2009].

Annual Final Report on the 2009 BGS FP and CIEP Auctions. For the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities. Washington, DC, [2009].

Annual Final Report on the 2008 BGS FP and CIEP Auctions. For the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities. Washington, DC, [2008].

Final Report on the 2007 BGS FP and CIEP Auctions and the RECO SWAP RFP. For the New Jersey Board of Public Utilities. Washington, DC, [2007].

Final Report of the Technical Consultant on Delmarva’s 2008-09 Request for Proposals for Full Requirements Wholesale Supply to Delaware’s Standard Offer Service Customers. For the Delaware Public Service Commission. Washington, DC, [2009].

Final Report of the Technical Consultant on Delmarva’s 2007-08 Request for Proposals for Full Requirements Wholesale Supply to Delaware’s Standard Offer Service Customers. For the Delaware Public Service Commission. Washington, DC, [2008].

Final Report of the Technical Consultant on Delmarva’s 2006-07 Request for Proposals for Full Requirements Wholesale Supply to Delaware’s Standard Offer Service Customers. For the Delaware Public Service Commission. Washington, DC, [2007].

The Oregon Independent Evaluator’s Final Closing Report on PacifiCorp’s 2008R-1 Renewables RFP. For the Oregon Public Utility Commission. Washington, DC, [2009].

The Oregon Independent Evaluator’s Assessment of PacifiCorp’s 2008R-1 Renewables RFP Design. For the Oregon Public Utility Commission. Washington, DC, [2008].

An Analysis of PacifiCorp’s Waiver Request for the Chehalis Power Generating Plant. For the Oregon Public Utility Commission. Washington, DC, [2008].

The Oregon Independent Evaluator’s Assessment of PacifiCorp’s 2012 RFP Design, Part One: Evaluation Criteria, Methods and Computer Models. For the Public Utility Commission of Oregon. Washington, DC, [2007].

Assessment of SPP’s Market Monitoring Plan and Market Power Mitigation Measures. For the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) Energy Imbalance Services (EIS) Market. Washington, DC, [2007].

Quarterly Metrics Report. For the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) Energy Imbalance Services (EIS) Market. Washington, DC, [2007].

April 2007: Monthly Metrics Report. For the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) Energy Imbalance Services (EIS) Market. Washington, DC, [2007].

- March 2007: Monthly Metrics Report. For the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) Energy Imbalance Services (EIS) Market. Washington, DC, [2007].
- February 2007: Monthly Metrics Report. For the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) Energy Imbalance Services (EIS) Market. Washington, DC, [2007].
- 2008 State of the Market Report, Southwest Power Pool, Inc. For the Southwest Power Pool Board of Directors. Washington, DC, [2009].
- 2007 State of the Market Report, Southwest Power Pool, Inc. For the Southwest Power Pool Board of Directors. Washington, DC, [2008].
- 2006 State of the Market Report, Southwest Power Pool, Inc. For the Southwest Power Pool Board of Directors. Washington, DC, [2007].
- 2005 State of the Market Report, Southwest Power Pool, Inc. For the Southwest Power Pool Board of Directors. Washington, DC, [2006].
- 2004 State of the Market Report, Southwest Power Pool, Inc. For the Southwest Power Pool Board of Directors. Washington, DC, [2005].
- Getting the Best Deal for Electric Utility Customers: A Concise Guidebook for the Design, Implementation, and Monitoring of Competitive Power Supply Solicitations in the Electricity Business. For the Electric Power Supply Association. Washington, DC, [2003]. (Pre-publication Draft).
- Still Waters Run Deep. For the Electric Power Supply Association. Washington, DC, [2002].
- Assessing the “Good Old Days” of Cost-Plus Regulation. For the Electric Power Supply Association. Washington, DC, [2001].
- An Initial Analysis of Recent Wholesale Prices, Price Caps and Their Effect on Competitive Bulk Power Markets. For the Electric Power Supply Association. Washington, DC, [2000].
- RTOs Must Manage Transmission, Not Power Markets. Facilitated by Boston Pacific for the Electric Power Supply Association. Washington, DC, [2000].
- Competing For Global Power Projects: A White Paper on the Role of the Export-Import Bank of the United States and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation in the Global Electric Power Business. For the International Energy Development Council. Washington, DC, [1997].
- Stating Their Differences: A Report on State Legislators’ Views Concerning Electric Industry Restructuring. Washington, DC: Electric Generation Association, [1996].
- The State of Competition: A Survey of State Commissions on Competition in the Electricity Business. Washington, DC: Electric Generation Association, [1995].
- What Contribution Can Environmental Valuation Make to the Cost Competitiveness of Renewables in Current Bidding Systems for the Electricity Business? A Sourcebook for State Regulatory Commissions. For the Global Change Division, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, [June 1991].
- Electric Resources and Environmental Impacts. For the California Legislature’s Joint Committee on Energy Regulation and the Environment. Sacramento, CA, [1990].
- An Analysis of the Transmission Access and Pricing Policies of State Governments. Washington, DC: Boston Pacific Company, Inc., [1989].

Office Productivity Tools for the Information Economy: Possible Effects on Electricity Consumption. Palo Alto, CA: Electric Power Research Institute, [October 1988].

Competitive Procurement of Generating Capacity: Summary of Procedures in Selected States. For Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress. Washington, DC: Boston Pacific Company, Inc., [1988].

Competitive Bidding in the Electricity Business: An Analysis of State Bidding Programs for QFs. Washington, DC: Boston Pacific Company, Inc., [1987].

Key Demographic Events for a Long-Term Forecast of Economic and Market Conditions. Palo Alto, CA: Electric Power Research Institute, [Working Paper 1985].

Transition to an Information Economy: Implications for the Electric Utility Industry. Palo Alto, CA: Electric Power Research Institute, [Working Paper 1984].

Coal Use by Industry: Forecasts and Analysis. Washington, DC: ICF Incorporated, [1982].

Prospects for Synthetic Fuels: Selected Topics. Washington, DC: ICF Incorporated, [1981].

A Policy Paper on the Environmental Consequences of the Emerging Synfuels Industry. Washington, DC: ICF Incorporated, [1980].

Methanol from Coal: Prospects and Performance as a Fuel and as a Feedstock. Washington, DC: ICF Incorporated, [1980].

A Report to the President's Commission on Coal: Possible Findings and Policy Recommendations for Hastening the Substitution of Coal for Imported Oil. Washington, DC: ICF Incorporated, [1979].

CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

A Strategy for Oil Proliferation: Expediting Petroleum Exploration and Production in Non-OPEC Developing Countries. Washington, DC: The Congressional Budget Office, [1979].

Replacing Oil and Natural Gas with Coal: Prospects in the Manufacturing Industries. Washington, DC: The Congressional Budget Office, [1978].

President Carter's Energy Proposals: A Perspective (coauthored). Washington DC: The Congressional Budget Office, [1977].

Financing Waterway Development: The User Charge Debate. Washington, DC: The Congressional Budget Office, [1977].

Alton Locks and Dam: A Review of the Evidence. Washington, DC: The Congressional Budget Office, [1976].

DISSERTATION

Coal Use by Industry and the Associated Air Pollution Emissions in the Period From 1980 to 2000 Under Alternative Market and Regulatory Conditions. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

TABLE ONE
IE'S RANKING OF BIDS FOR THE INITIAL SHORTLIST

NATURAL GAS TECHNOLOGY

Bid	% Price Above Low-Cost Bid	Description				
		Type	Length	Location	MWs	New/Exist
A	--	PPA	10	PSO	520	Exist
B	13.7%	TSA	20	PSO	535	Exist
C	18.6%	TSA	35	PSO	382	New
D	21.4%	TSA	15	Outside SPP	502	Exist
C*	23.9%	TSA	35	PSO	382	New
E	24.9%	TSA	20	PSO	515	New
F Alt*	31.8%	APSA	22	SPP	625	Exist
F Alt	32.8%	APSA	22	SPP	625	Exist
F	33.0%	APSA	20	SPP	625	Exist
G Alt*	34.5%	APSA	28	Outside SPP	502	Exist
G	35.3%	APSA	26	Outside SPP	502	Exist
G Alt	35.7%	APSA	28	Outside SPP	502	Exist

COAL TECHNOLOGY

H	49.4%	TSA	20	Outside SPP	100	Exist
I	52.6%	PPA	30	Outside SPP	150	New
J	—	TSA	20	Outside SPP	102	Exist

Type: Power Purchase Agreement (PPA), Tolling Services Agreement (TSA), Asset Purchase and Sale Agreement (APSA)

Notes:

Bids that are struck through (E, I, and J) were deemed non-conforming and ultimately rejected. Bid A price annuity assumes a 15-year term. A 10-year term produces a price annuity about 4 percent lower.

Bids C*, F Alt*, and G Alt* reflect a modified evaluation due to the on-line date.

Bids H, I, and J offered alternative bids, of different megawatts, that are not shown in the table. Bid H had physical delivery into SPP.