

-
-
-

Original Filing

Public Utilities Commission of Nevada

Electronic Filing

Submitted: 8/15/2016 3:48:50 PM

Reference: b1dae8a5-3c93-485a-a3f2-e7f14dddc787

Reference:

Filed For: NPC

In accordance with NRS Chapter 719,
this filing has been electronically signed and filed
by: /s LynnDInnocenti

By electronically filing the document(s),
the filer attests to the authenticity of the electronic signature(s) contained therein.

This filing has been electronically filed and deemed to be signed by an authorized
agent or
representative of the signer(s) and
NPC

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF NEVADA

Application of Nevada Power Company d/b/a
NV Energy seeking approval of the Second
Amendment to its 2016-2035 integrated resource
plan.

Docket No. 16-08__

VOLUME 3 OF 7

TESTIMONY

DESCRIPTION	PAGE NUMBER
TESTIMONY	
James Doubek	3
Terry A. Baxter	27
Abdul Razack	47
Marc D. Reyes	56
Joseph R. Brignola	73
Patricia Rodriguez	79
Anita L. Hart	86
Kevin Geraghty	97
Jesse E. Murray	116
Marie Steele	129
Sachin Verma	137
Joseph E. Sinobio	142
Robert R. Kocour, Jr	148
Dr. David Harrison, Jr	164
Kevin Bethel	250

TESTIMONY

JAMES DOUBEK

1 **BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF NEVADA**
2 Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy
3 Second Amendment to the 2016 – 2035 Integrated Resource Plan
4 Docket No. 16-08 ____

5 PREPARED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

6 **James Doubek**

7 **I. INTRODUCTION**

8 **1. Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, JOB TITLE, BUSINESS**
9 **ADDRESS AND PARTY FOR WHOM YOU ARE FILING**
10 **TESTIMONY.**

11 A. My name is James Doubek. I am the Vice President, Resource Planning
12 and Analysis for Nevada Power Company d/b/a NV Energy (“Nevada
13 Power” or the “Company”) and Sierra Pacific Power Company d/b/a NV
14 Energy (“Sierra”, and together with Nevada Power, the “Companies”). My
15 business address is 6226 West Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. I am
16 filing testimony on behalf of Nevada Power.

17
18 **2. Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND**
19 **AND EXPERIENCE.**

20 A. I have been employed by the Companies since April 2005 and have served
21 as the leader of Resource Planning and Analysis since March 2010.

22
23 Prior to my assignment in Resource Planning and Analysis, I held the
24 position of Development Director, Renewable Energy. In that role I
25 worked on development, construction, and operations and maintenance
26 plans associated with potential Company-owned, utility scale, renewable
27 energy projects. Before joining the Renewable Energy department, I held

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

several management positions in the Generation Department focused on the operations and maintenance of the Companies' various conventional generation stations. I originally joined the Companies as the Plant Director of Lenzie Power Station.

I began working in the power generation industry in 1991 and have held positions of increasing responsibility in power generating stations and engineering support roles, primarily focused on the operations and maintenance of gas turbine power stations and cogeneration plants.

More details regarding my professional background and experience are set forth in my Statement of Qualifications, included as **Exhibit Doubek-Direct-1**.

3. Q. WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS VICE PRESIDENT, RESOURCE PLANNING AND ANALYSIS?

A. In my current position, I lead a staff of economists, planners, engineers and analysts in the development of the Companies' Integrated Resource Plans ("IRPs") and Energy Supply Plans ("ESPs"), and complex economic analysis of resource options. Working with other groups in the Companies, the Resource Planning and Analysis department develops and supports supply strategies, presents them to management for approval, and facilitates ongoing communication of the status of the supply plans.

1 4. Q. HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE PUBLIC
2 UTILITIES COMMISSION OF NEVADA (“COMMISSION”)?

3 A. Yes. I have testified in IRP dockets and ESP dockets before the
4 Commission, most recently in Sierra’s 2016 Triennial Integrated Resource
5 Plan, Docket No. 16-07001.
6

7 **II. OVERVIEW AND TESTIMONY ORGANIZATION**

8 5. Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR PRE-FILED DIRECT
9 TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE?

10 A. I provide overall policy support for Nevada Power’s Second Amendment
11 to its 2016-2018 Action Plan (“2nd Amendment”). In Section III, I
12 introduce the witnesses supporting the various components of the 2nd
13 Amendment. In Section IV, I discuss the Company’s Request to acquire
14 the South Point Energy Center (“South Point”). Finally in Section V, I
15 discuss issues that relate to performing long term resource planning,
16 including: the Company’s proposal for a 70 percent/30 percent split of the
17 South Point acquisition with Sierra and the Companies’ continued use of
18 a 38 percent capacity contribution for solar PV resources. Together with
19 Kevin Bethel and Rob Kocour, I support Nevada Power’s request to lease
20 30 percent of South Point to Sierra.
21

22 **III. INTRODUCTION OF WITNESSES**

23 6. Q. WHO ARE THE WITNESSES AND WHAT DOES EACH
24 SUPPORT?
25
26
27

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

A. The following is a listing by subject matter of the witnesses supporting this 2nd Amendment:¹

Load, Fuel and Purchased Power Price Forecasts

Mr. Terry A. Baxter, Manager of Load Forecasting, sponsors the Load Forecast and Market Fundamentals Volume, Section 1 (“Long-Term Load Forecast”) and Technical Appendix Items LF-1 through LF-14.

Mr. Abdul Razack, Specialist, Load Forecasting, supports and explains two new techniques that were employed in developing load forecast drivers: 1) Temporal Disaggregation, and 2) Auto Regressive Integrated Moving Average Method to forecast number of hotel rooms in Las Vegas.

Mr. Marc D. Reyes, Manager of Market Fundamentals, sponsors market fundamentals discussion and the wholesale power and natural gas price forecasts that are presented in Section 4 of the narrative and Technical Appendix items FPP-1 and FPP-2.

Mr. Joseph R. Brignola, Manager, Coal Operations and Procurement, sponsors the coal fundamentals discussion and coal price forecast portions of the narrative, Section 4.

Ms. Patricia Rodriguez, Manager, Gas Transportation Planning, sponsors the natural gas portions of the Fuel Supply Plan, Section 6.B.

¹ Energy Supply Plan subject matter and supporting witnesses are introduced separately in my ESP testimony.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Energy Efficiency and Demand-Side Resources

Ms. Anita L. Hart, Director, Demand Side Management, sponsors the Demand Side Plan.

Generation Resources (including Purchased Power)

Mr. Kevin Geraghty, Senior Vice President, Energy Supply, sponsors the discussion regarding the asset assessment, acquisition and integration of South Point into NV Energy’s fleet, and the conventional generation discussion in the narrative.

Mr. Jesse E. Murray, Director, Renewable Energy Program, sponsors the Renewable Energy Plan section of the narrative.

Ms. Marie Steele, Electric Vehicle and Renewable Energy Program Manager, Ms. Steele, sponsors and supports Nevada Power’s request for feedback on the proposed Subscription Solar program.

Transmission Resources

Mr. Sachin Verma, Manger, Network and IRP Transmission Planning, sponsors the Transmission Plan section, of the narrative, Section 6.C.

Distribution Planning

Mr. Joseph E. Sinobio, Manger, Distribution Planning, sponsors the Distribution Planning section, of the narrative, Section 8.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Integrated Economic Analysis

Mr. Robert R. Kocour, Jr., Manager, Long-Term Resource Planning, sponsors the selection of the preferred and alternate plans including the inputs, assumptions and methodology used to perform the economic analysis, the economic analysis of the Preferred and Alternative Plans, as well as the economic analysis of the responses to the open source request for proposals, the long-term avoided costs calculations and the Loads and Resource (“L&R”) tables.

Dr. David Harrison, Jr., economist and Senior Vice President at NERA Economic Consulting, sponsors the discussion and analysis of environmental externalities contained in the narrative, Section 6.E.8., as well as Technical Appendix Item ECON-17.

Financial Resources

Mr. Kevin Bethel, Senior Vice President and CFO, sponsors the financial plan narrative of the 2nd Amendment and the discussion of the lease arrangement for the South Point.

IV. THE 2ND AMENDMENT TO 2016-2018 ACTION PLAN

7. Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THIS 2ND AMENDMENT FILING.

A. This filing represents Nevada Power’s 2nd Amendment to its 2016-2018 Action Plan. This filing contains new load, and fuel and purchased power forecasts. It also contains updates to the generation, transmission, demand-side management (“DSM”) and renewables plans. The primary objective of the filing is to seek Commission approval of the acquisition of South Point and Nevada Power’s decision to lease 30 percent of South Point to

1 Sierra. This resource will be acquired at a very favorable price and provide
2 attractive and economic capacity to meet the needs of Nevada Power's
3 customers for many years. The lease agreement also provides an
4 opportunity for Sierra to benefit from the acquisition by adding a needed
5 resource. The filing seeks Commission approval of other items, including
6 a modification to the DSM plan. This request is sponsored by Ms. Hart.

7
8 **8. Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COMPANY'S NEW LOAD FORECAST.**

9 A. The Company has prepared a new load forecast taking into account
10 updated economic and population data and projections. The Company
11 included the migration of Wynn and MGM Resorts to transmission and
12 distribution only service in its "base" load forecast now labeled 704B-2.
13 The updated load forecast is sponsored by Mr. Baxter.

14
15 **9. Q. DID THE COMPANY PREPARE NEW FUEL AND PURCHASED
16 POWER FORECASTS.**

17 A. Yes. The Company also developed a new market fundamentals analysis
18 and new projections for fuel and purchased power pricing based on
19 updated assessments of regional market conditions and environmental
20 drivers. The market fundamentals, purchased power and natural gas price
21 forecast sections are supported by Mr. Reyes. Mr. Brignola sponsors the
22 coal price forecast.

23
24 **10. Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COMPANY'S NEAR-TERM
25 RESOURCE NEED.**

26 A. The Company's tolling agreement with the Griffith facility terminates at
27 the end of the summer season of 2017. After taking into account the

1 capacity contributions of the Company’s proposed portfolio of DSM
2 projects, the remaining Emissions Reduction and Capacity Replacement
3 (“ERCR”) renewable resources, as well as other load reducing resources
4 (e.g., private generation as described in the load forecast volume and Mr.
5 Baxter’s testimony), the Company requires additional capacity by 2018 to
6 reliably meet the needs of its customers. Without supply-side capacity
7 additions, Nevada Power’s open capacity position in 2018 grows to nearly
8 350 MW. This level of market exposure requires Nevada Power to secure
9 incremental capacity resources.² To address customers’ increasing
10 resource needs in a very cost effective manner, the Company is proposing
11 to acquire South Point, an existing 504 MW gas-fired combined cycle
12 generating unit located in Arizona near the Nevada border. The Company
13 also is proposing to lease 30 percent of the asset to Sierra leaving 70
14 percent to be controlled by Nevada Power.

15
16 The analysis of alternatives and the selection of the Preferred Plan are
17 sponsored by Mr. Kocour and the details of the lease arrangement are
18 sponsored by Mr. Bethel.

19
20 **11. Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY THE PREFERRED PLAN INCLUDES A**
21 **REQUEST TO ACQUIRE SOUTH POINT?**

22 A. The pricing negotiated for South Point is very favorable, making it the
23 least-cost source of incremental capacity available today. South Point is
24 an existing efficient gas-fired resource, with a proven operating record.

25
26 _____
27 ² In Docket 15-07004, the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada directed the company issue a request for
proposals to address the 2018 open position.

1 Acquisition of South Point in 2017 will reduce Nevada Power’s need to
2 rely on the wholesale market for an additional 350 MW of capacity,
3 furthering the Company’s ability to continue to provide cost effective and
4 reliable service in 2017 and beyond. In short, the acquisition makes sense
5 in every load scenario – it provides cost-effective capacity that mitigates
6 future open capacity positions and enhances reliability.

7
8 **12. Q. DID THE COMPANY USE THE RESULTS OF AN RFP TO**
9 **ASSESS THE COMPETITIVENESS OF THE SOUTH POINT**
10 **ACQUISITION ALTERNATIVE FOR NEVADA POWER?**

11 A. Yes. As directed by the Commission in its Modified Final Order in Docket
12 No. 15-07004, in February 2016, Nevada Power went to market with an
13 open resource request for proposals (“RFP”) for 400 to 700 MW of
14 incremental capacity for delivery by the summer of 2018. The results of
15 the open resource RFP provide a robust test of the current market. The
16 proposed South Point acquisition beat all conforming bids submitted in
17 the open resource RFP and represents a great deal for Nevada Power’s
18 customers. The lease agreement provides an opportunity for Sierra’s
19 customers to benefit from the acquisition too. The Companies’ successful
20 bilateral negotiation of this economically advantageous acquisition is
21 evidence that in and of itself, an RFP does not guarantee the best outcome
22 for customers. Nonetheless, the results of the RFP serve to confirm the
23 economic attractiveness of the South Point acquisition. Mr. Geraghty
24 supports the RFP, and the due diligence performed on South Point.

1 **13. Q. IS THE COMPANY REQUESTING PERMISSION TO ADD**
2 **OTHER GENERATING CAPACITY?**

3 A. No. The Preferred Plan does not request approval to pursue any additional
4 generating resources. All of the Company's alternative plans include
5 "placeholder" resource additions (both conventional and renewable) to
6 facilitate appropriate analysis of the alternatives to meet the current need.
7 Nevada Power *is not* seeking approval of "placeholder" resources, nor is
8 it requesting approval of any expenditures related to "placeholder"
9 resources in the action plan period.
10

11 **14. Q. DOES NEVADA POWER NEED TO INVEST IN ADDITIONAL**
12 **TRANSMISSION RESOURCES DURING THE REMAINDER OF**
13 **THE ACTION PLAN PERIOD?**

14 A. No.³ An update to the Company's transmission plan, specifically, an
15 update on the previously approved Harry Allen 500/230 kV transformer
16 addition project, is supported by Mr. Sachin Verma.
17

18 **15. Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE COMPANY'S REQUESTS FOR**
19 **COMMISON APPROVAL IN THIS AMENDMENT?**

20 A. The Company is seeking Commission approval of its Preferred Plan,
21 including the following items:

- 22 1) Nevada Power's request to expand the DSM program's Energy
23 Assessments approved in Docket No. 15-07004 to include a new
24

25
26 _____
27 ³ Nevada Power does need approval of the transmission service agreement necessary to delivery the output
of the South Point facility to Nevada Power's balancing authority area as part-and-parcel of the asset
purchase agreement (if the Commission approves the acquisition of South Point).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Direct Install component and significantly increase the number of participants; and

2) The acquisition of South Point; and

3) Authorization to provide Sierra 30 percent of this resource through a long-term lease agreement.

The filing contains other requests, such as acceptance of the load forecast and the fuel and purchase power price forecast. Each specific request is listed in the application.

Nevada Power is not requesting authority to proceed with the construction of any future generating units at this time. Once need and timing has been refined and further analyzed, Nevada Power will bring the Commission requests for authorization to proceed with new resource commitments in a future IRP or IRP amendment.

16. Q. IS THE COMPANY ASKING FOR ACTION PLAN APPROVAL FOR ANY NEW ITEMS RELATED TO NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION?

A. No. Presently, no new gas transportation contracts are recommended and no contracts will be discontinued. A complete discussion of Nevada Power’s natural gas transportation plan is contained in the narrative and is supported by the testimony of Ms. Rodriguez.

V. RESOURCE PLANNING ISSUES

A. Joint Planning and the South Point Acquisition

17. Q. DID THE COMPANY CONSIDER THE OPPORTUNITY FOR JOINTLY PLANNING FOR RESOURCE NEEDS FOR NEVADA POWER TOGETHER WITH SIERRA?

A. Yes. The Companies are proposing an acquisition of South Point that will share the capacity associated with and energy produced by this generating station, effectively jointly planning for both utilities’ needs. By jointly planning for (or acquiring) this resource, the Companies’ customers all enjoy the benefit of adding a low cost, reliable generating resource to serve system needs.

18. Q. WHY IS THE COMPANY PROPOSING A 70 PERCENT/30 PERCENT SHARING RATIO FOR NEVADA POWER AND SIERRA IN THE SOUTH POINT ENERGY CENTER?

A. A 70 percent/30 percent ratio represents the approximate share each utility contributes to overall 2018 joint open capacity position.⁴ The tables below show the open capacity position.

Table 1: Average Open Position

Open Position	AVERAGE 2017-2026	AVERAGE 2018-2026	AVERAGE 2017-2019	AVERAGE 2018-2020
71%	68%	76%	50%	77%
29%	32%	24%	50%	23%
100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

⁴ The Load Forecast used in determining the Open Positions discussed in this section do not include the departure of existing Nevada Power customers seeking to migrate to distribution and transmission only service. Impacts of these departures on the Open Position ratio is discussed in Q22.

Table 2: Open Position By Company

	<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>	<u>2024</u>	<u>2025</u>	<u>2026</u>
NPC OPEN POSITION	0	875	948	1277	1362	881	1090	1165	1139	1266
SPPC OPEN POSITION	334	350	269	281	285	264	307	311	427	796
NPC %	0%	71%	78%	82%	83%	77%	78%	79%	73%	61%
SPPC %	100%	29%	22%	18%	17%	23%	22%	21%	27%	39%

19. Q. WHY DID THE COMPANY SELECT THE USE OF THE OPEN CAPACITY POSITION RATIO IN 2018 AS THE BASIS FOR SHARING THE SOUTH POINT RESOURCE?

A. The Company evaluated three alternatives for determining the appropriate sharing ratio for the South Point capacity. All but the use of the immediate resource planning decision paradigm, namely the 2018 open capacity position that is the subject of the incident decision, are susceptible to the influence of future resource planning decisions that will be made independently by the separate utilities. Stated differently, because the Companies remain separate legal entities and separately regulated, neither utility is guaranteed that its sister utility will be able to make future resource planning decisions that incorporate a joint planning viewpoint. Until modified in the future, planning regulations and statutes require that some resource planning decisions must be made independently by a single utility: *e.g.*, asset retirement decisions about individually owned assets that are made exclusively based on the interest of the owning utility. I will note that retirement decisions are not yet ripe for consideration in this incident docket, but that the Commission has directed the Company to consider resource *additions* in a joint planning framework. Accordingly, by applying a joint planning structure that looks exclusively at the immediate

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

decision -- that is, evaluating the contribution of each utility to the total open position that is being addressed -- the “need” of each utility is weighed contemporaneously with the decision being made to add a resource to address the overall system or joint “need.”

The 70 percent/30 percent split represents the approximate ratio of each Company’s 2018 open capacity position (the additional planning resources necessary to meet projected requirements including planning reserves) as a function of the combined 2018 resource planning open capacity positions of approximately 1,200 MW. The joint and individual 2018 needs are the primary driver requiring the Companies to take action to secure a new resource. Because the Companies desire to “jointly plan,” using an open capacity position ratio method recognizes each Company’s “need” at the time of this resource planning decision. In so doing, costs and benefits are shared without regard to any future resource planning decisions that may be made independently or jointly.

20. Q. WHAT OTHER METHODS WERE CONSIDERED?

A. The Company considered load ratio, load ratio average over time, and average open position over time. Each is discussed below.

1. Load ratio: This method considers the overall level of demand each utility puts on the joint system. Therefore, the load ratio clearly shows the share of the total resource requirements of each utility. Each hour the combined resources of both utilities are optimized to meet the combined load. However, because the Companies remain separate entities, they also bring to the system their individually owned portfolio of resources. A load ratio methodology does not account for the resources

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

previously planned for and supplied. If, for example, Nevada Power had ample resources to meet its capacity and energy requirements on a standalone basis, it would be problematic to argue that Nevada Power should participate financially in an acquisition of even more capacity based on its load (approx. 75 percent of the total at this time). For this reason, a load ratio methodology was assessed but found to be inappropriate for determining an investment cost sharing ratio.

2. Load ratio average over time: The load ratio average as computed over three years or 10 years (or any period) suffers from the same shortcomings discussed in the load ratio section above. Additionally, the use of projected future load introduces uncertainty that increases the further out in time is considered. Economic and population variables as well as the planning decisions (retirements and additions) noted above make the use of such a method undesirable. For this reason, a load ratio methodology was assessed but found to be inappropriate for determining an investment cost sharing ratio.

3. Average open position over time: Using the projected open capacity position averaged over time suffers from the same drawbacks discussed above. Fundamentally, resource planning decisions that have not been solidified or formally concluded introduce uncertainty. Since the Companies remain separate entities with separately owned assets and are required by statute and regulation to file “separate” resource plans, future resource planning decisions add potential bias to this methodology. For example, if either utility makes a decision to retire a resource earlier than projected when computing and applying the investment split, they will have understated the share of “need” they bring to the combined system. Even if joint planning were to be required for all future planning decisions,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

the separate ownership of existing assets provides each utility the incentive to look out for its own interest. For these reasons, an average open capacity position over time methodology was assessed but found to be inappropriate for determining an investment cost sharing ratio.

21. Q. DID THE COMPANY INCLUDE CHANGES IN THE LOAD FORECAST RELATED TO 704B APPLICATIONS WHEN DETERMINING THE RATIO?

A. No. At the time the Companies needed to develop and begin evaluating alternative resource options for Sierra’s 2016 IRP filing (Docket No. 16-07001), the outcome of pending NRS Chapter 704B exit applications were uncertain. Since then, the MGM and Wynn have taken steps, including projecting exit dates that remove most of the uncertainty associated with the applications. The Company did not restructure the supply alternatives being evaluated for Sierra’s 2016 IRP in response to these developments, and consequently Nevada Power’s share of South Point remained approximately 350 MW or 70 percent. However, the Commission has the ability to accept, reject, or modify the Company’s plan and could certainly adjust the participation ratio if it determines that such was appropriate in light of these or other events. Assuming MGM and Wynn complete their migration to transmission and distribution-only service, the 2018 open capacity position ratio changes to 35 percent for Sierra and 65 percent for Nevada Power. Presuming that any ratio selected provides for full recovery of 100 percent of the total investment necessary to acquire the asset, a range of sharing ratios is reasonable.

1 22. Q. WHAT ARE THE PROS AND CONS OF USING THE
2 PROJECTED OPEN CAPACITY POSITION RATIO IN 2018 AS
3 THE BASIS FOR SHARING THE SOUTH POINT ACQUISITION?

4 A. The Companies have considered this question and concluded the
5 following:

6
7 **Pros:** Using a simplified open position ratio approach to splitting
8 investment costs provides an understandable platform for proceeding with
9 regulatory approvals, for fixing and minimizes accounting and financial
10 complexity involving transactions between the Companies. The
11 Commission approved joint dispatch agreement that is currently in place,
12 appropriately allocates variable costs to the benefiting utility regardless of
13 the ultimate dispatch profile of the entire portfolio of resources. The
14 impacts of future resource planning decisions, that are not yet ripe for
15 consideration, are eliminated from influencing the investment cost sharing
16 split.

17
18 **Cons:** Depending on perspective, the favorability of an ownership share
19 may be pursued on behalf of the interests of a single utility. For example,
20 if a Sierra centric view is held, and the belief is that the acquisition
21 represents a very favorable economic opportunity, Sierra might press for
22 a higher ownership share. On the other hand, a less anxious participant
23 may suggest not participating at all in South Point, and that Sierra simply
24 lean on its sister utility via the joint dispatch agreement, leaving Nevada
25 Power customers with responsibility for all of the fixed costs. In the
26 Companies' view, pitting the customers of the two utilities against one
27 another in this fashion, even if only academically via planning proposals,

1 is a clear “con.” An additional disadvantage to this approach is that a single
2 year of need does not incorporate projections of growth or consider
3 retirement timing of existing resources over the planning horizon.
4 However, as discussed above, the difficulties of incorporating future
5 planning decisions outweigh any benefits that may be sought by using
6 longer term projections.
7

8 **23. Q. DO YOU HAVE ANY CONCERNS ABOUT THE SHARING**
9 **RATIO?**

10 A. I do not have any concern about the appropriateness of the 30 percent/70
11 percent ratio. However, as I have stated to the Commission in multiple
12 prior proceedings, it is critically important that the sharing ratio be
13 determined now and fixed. It should not be recalculated or re-evaluated
14 after the planning decision has been made. Resource planning decisions
15 must be made with the best information available at the time and should
16 not be “unmade” later if actual experience or circumstances change.
17

18 **B. Thirty Eight Percent Capacity Contribution for Solar PV**

19 **24. Q. DOES THE COMPANY CONTINUE TO ASSIGN A 38 PERCENT**
20 **CAPACITY CONTRIBUTION TO SOLAR PV RESOURCES?**

21 A. Yes. The Commission has ordered Nevada Power to complete an update
22 to the study on capacity value of solar PV to be filed in Nevada Power’s
23 next IRP. Nevada Power will file that update on July 1, 2018. In the
24 meantime, the Companies have used the best information available at the
25 time of preparing this filing - namely, the existing Pacific Northwest
26 National Laboratory study included and discussed extensively in Nevada
27

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Power's 2015 IRP proceedings (Docket No. 15-07004) - to ascribe capacity to solar PV projects for long-term resource planning purposes.

VI. CONCLUSION

25. Q. WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THIS IRP AMENDMENT FILING?

A. This 2nd Amendment to Nevada Power's 2016-2018 Action Plan presents the Company's Preferred Plan for reliably meeting the projected needs of its customers in a cost effective way over the remaining action plan period and beyond. The addition of South Point included in the Preferred Plan provides superior performance across multiple sensitivity scenarios and represents excellent value for Nevada Power's customers.

26. Q. DOES THIS COMPLETE YOUR TESTIMONY.

A. Yes, it does.

STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

JAMES DOUBEK
EXECUTIVE, RESOURCE PLANNING AND ANALYSIS
NV Energy
6226 W. Sahara Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89146
702-402-5761

EDUCATION

MBA University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, Nevada

B.S.M.E. Rutgers University College of Engineering, New Brunswick, New Jersey

EXPERIENCE

1/15-Present **NV Energy-Vice President, Resource Planning and Analysis**

4/13-1/15 **NV Energy-Executive, Resource Planning and Analysis**

3/10-4/13 **NV Energy-Director, Resource Planning and Analysis**

Reporting to various Senior Executives, responsible for leading the development of the companies Long and Short Term planning strategies including the development and filing of the companies' Integrated Resource Plans and Energy Supply Plans. These strategies are developed and presented to management for approval by leading a team of economists, planners, engineers and analysts in the assembly of these plans for filing and procedural hearings with the Public Utilities Commission of Nevada (PUCN).

6/08-3/10 **NV Energy-Renewable Energy, Development Director**

Reporting to the Executive, Renewable Energy, responsible for the development of renewable energy projects and evaluation of third party renewable projects for purchase contracts to meet the renewable portfolio standard for utilities in Nevada. Capture industry standard operational expertise to allow successful partnership participation in Renewable Energy projects with various counterparties. Prepare and manage capital and operating budgets for proposed Renewable Energy projects.

4/07-6/08 **NV Energy-Generation Department, Generation Executive**
(temporary)

Reporting to the Sr. V.P. Energy Supply, responsible for the operations and maintenance of NV Energy's fleet of conventional fueled power stations, including coal and gas fired boilers as well as simple cycle and combined cycle gas turbines. Directed the activities of corporate generation engineering support

staff. Developed and implemented strategic programs to enhance plant safety, environmental performance, standardized maintenance activities and efficient power production. Implemented cost reduction initiatives to enhance competitive performance and reduce consumer's energy costs. Oversaw capital and operating budgets of approximately \$250 million annually. Lead operations portion of due diligence and acquisition teams in support of \$500 million Big Horn plant acquisition. Responsible for managing human resources of entire generation division, approximately 600 employees.

1/06-4/07 NV Energy-LNZ/SHS/HA Power Complex, Plant Director

Reporting to the Generation Executive, responsible for the operations and maintenance of a three-plant power generation complexes. Plant technologies included GE gas and steam turbines and Siemens gas turbines. Developed strategic programs to ensure complex safety, environmental compliance and efficient and cost-effective power production. Prepared and managed capital and operating budgets of approximately \$50 million annually. Oversaw the activities of all plant personnel.

4/05-1/06 NV Energy-Lenzie/Harry Allen Power Station, Plant Director

Reporting to the Generation Executive, responsible for the operations and maintenance of a gas-fired 1150 MW 2x2x1 GE 7FA combustion turbine combined cycle power plant and 75 MW 2x GE 7EA simple cycle peaking power plant. Coordinated production in accordance with market demands, power trading activities and system demand. During initial start-up and construction served as a construction representative for operations department. Completed initial staffing and participated initial plant start-up. Organized effective work teams for ongoing plant operations and maintenance. Prepared and managed capital and operating budgets of approximately \$25 million annually. Participated on due diligence and acquisition teams in support of \$200 million Silverhawk plant acquisition. Supervised activities of all plant personnel.

3/99-3/05 Dynegy-Rockingham Power, Plant Manager

Reporting to the Sr. V.P. Operations, responsible for the operations and maintenance of a dual fuel 900 MW five W501F combustion turbine simple cycle peaking plant. Coordinated production in accordance with market demands, power trading activities and short term capacity contracts. During initial start-up and construction, served as a construction representative for off-site Dynegy construction management. Completed initial staffing and organized effective work teams for ongoing plant operations. Prepared and managed capital and operating budgets of approximately \$4 million annually. Supervised activities of all plant personnel.

7/96-3/99 Dynegy-High Sierra Cogen, Plant Supervisor

Under the direction of the O&M Manager, responsible for the operations and maintenance of a 50 MW twin LM2500 gas turbine cogeneration plant. Coordinated production in accordance with steam, power and O&M contracts. Established and administered maintenance activities contributing to 100% availability at capacity for 1996 bonus peak months. Prepared and managed capital and operating budgets