



IN THE MATTER OF THE
APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE
COMPANY OF COLORADO FOR A
CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY
FOR THE SAN LUIS VALLEY –
CALUMET – COMANCHE
TRANSMISSION PROJECT

DIRECT TESTIMONY AND
EXHIBIT OF

THOMAS W. GREEN

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF)
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF)
COLORADO FOR A CERTIFICATE OF)
PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY) DOCKET NO. 09A-____E
FOR THE SAN LUIS VALLEY – CALUMET -)
COMANCHE TRANSMISSION PROJECT)**

DIRECT TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS OF THOMAS GREEN

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS

1 **Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.**

2 A. My name is Thomas Green. My business address is 550 15th Street, Denver,
3 Colorado 80202.

4 **Q. BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?**

5 A. I am employed by Public Service Company of Colorado (“Public Service” or
6 “Company”). I am an Electrical Engineer specializing in Transmission
7 Planning, and work in the department of Transmission Asset Management.

8 **Q. ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS DOCKET?**

9 A. I am testifying on behalf of Public Service. However I understand that my
10 testimony may also be used in support of the Tri-State Generation and
11 Transmission Association, Inc. (“Tri-State”) companion CPCN application for
12 this joint project.

13 **Q. HAVE YOU PREPARED A STATEMENT OF YOUR EXPERIENCE AND**
14 **QUALIFICATIONS?**

1 A. Yes. That statement is included as Attachment A to my testimony.

2 **Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?**

3 A. The purpose of my testimony is to address the need for the San Luis Valley –
4 Calumet - Comanche Transmission Project (“SLV–Comanche Project” or
5 “Project”). I describe why the project is needed both for regional reliability
6 and for accommodating potential resources in Energy Resource Zones
7 (“ERZs” or “Zones”) 4 and 5 consistent with Senate Bill 07-100 (“SB07-100”).
8 I describe the evaluation of system alternatives, and explain the criteria and
9 objectives used for the studies.

10 **II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT**

11 **Q. DESCRIBE THE SAN LUIS VALLEY – CALUMET – COMANCHE**
12 **TRANSMISSION PROJECT.**

13 A. As the name implies, the Project consists of establishing new
14 transmission between the San Luis Valley and the Comanche Substations,
15 connecting to a new Calumet Substation in between. Although we view this
16 transmission project as a single project, it is comprised of four major
17 components:

18 1. The San Luis – Calumet Transmission Segment: The first transmission
19 component consists of approximately 95 miles of new double-circuit 230
20 kV transmission between the San Luis Valley Substation and the new
21 Calumet Substation. This is the San Luis Valley to Calumet Segment.
22 Each transmission circuit in this Segment will have a thermal capability of
23 at least 600 MVA each, using 1272 kcmil conductors.

24 2. The Calumet – Comanche Transmission Segment: The second
25 transmission component consists of approximately 45 miles of new

1 double-circuit 345 kV transmission between the Calumet Substation and
2 the existing Comanche Substation near Pueblo Colorado. This is the
3 Calumet to Comanche Segment. Each line or circuit in this Segment is
4 being designed to have a thermal capability of carrying at least 1700 MVA
5 each, using bundled 1272 kcmil conductors.

6 3. The Calumet Substation: Another major component is the new Calumet
7 Substation, which is planned to be located near Walsenburg, Colorado
8 and the existing Walsenburg Substation. Original transmission plans
9 contemplated building new transmission from the existing San Luis Valley
10 Substation to the existing Walsenburg Substation. However, due to space
11 limitations at Walsenburg Substation, a new substation will be required.
12 The Calumet Substation will be located approximately six miles north of
13 Walsenburg Substation. It will be located adjacent to, and also
14 interconnect with the existing Walsenburg – Comanche 230 kV line. The
15 substation will allow for 230 kV and 345 kV operation by including two
16 230/345 kV autotransformers, and transmission line termination
17 equipment. The substation will be constructed so that it can
18 accommodate potential generation interconnections.

19 4. The Calumet – Walsenburg Transmission Segment: The final component
20 consists of a new six-mile 230 kV transmission line that will be added
21 between Calumet Substation and the Walsenburg Substation. Since the
22 new Calumet Substation will interconnect the existing Walsenburg –
23 Comanche 230 kV line, it will create a Walsenburg – Calumet 230 kV line
24 and a Calumet – Comanche 230 kV line. There is an existing 115 kV line
25 that runs parallel to the Walsenburg – Calumet 230 kV line (the
26 Walsenburg – West Station 115 kV line). Between Calumet and
27 Walsenburg, that line will be rebuilt to a double-circuit 230 kV capable
28 transmission line. One of the circuits will consist of the existing 115 kV
29 line. The other circuit will create a second 230 kV circuit from Calumet to
30 Walsenburg.

31 **Q. DOES THE PROJECT PROVIDE FOR GENERATOR**
32 **INTERCONNECTIONS?**

33 A. Yes. As part of the project, Public Service intends to install termination
34 equipment at both the San Luis Valley and Calumet Substations to allow for
35 generator interconnections. This interconnection equipment is not included in
36 the current cost estimates.

1 because of cost. As a result, Tri-State has been exploring a Walsenburg –
2 San Luis Valley 230 kV transmission line for several years. The San Luis
3 Project will provide a second transmission source to the region and increase
4 reliability by allowing continuous service for both system intact and
5 contingency conditions. This benefits both Public Service and Tri-State
6 customers.

7 Another way that this Project improves reliability is the increased
8 flexibility it creates for system operation and future improvements. By
9 providing a second transmission source to the San Luis Valley, existing
10 transmission elements can be taken out of service when needed for upgrades
11 to allow the addition of more generation resources in the future.

12 In addition, the Project will eliminate Tri-State's Comanche -
13 Walsenburg remedial action scheme. If a single outage event occurs on Tri-
14 State's existing Comanche-Walsenburg 230 kV transmission line, the 115 kV
15 West Station - Stem Beach - Walsenburg line overloads. The remedial action
16 scheme immediately trips the Walsenburg-Gladstone 230 kV line, which
17 reduces the load serving capability on the 115 kV system in northeast New
18 Mexico. This forces Tri-State to remove load in northeast New Mexico.

19 Tri-State witness Andrew Leoni discusses the reliability issues in more
20 detail in his direct testimony.

21 **Q. HOW DOES THE PROJECT ACCOMMODATE NEW GENERATION**
22 **RESOURCES?**

1 A. As Mr. Stellern explains in his direct testimony, the Company has identified
2 five ERZs pursuant to SB07-100. This Project will affect both Zones 4 and 5,
3 which have been shown to have the highest potential in the state for solar
4 generation development. Studies have demonstrated that the transmission
5 capacity in Zones 4 and 5 is constrained. This Project creates new high-
6 voltage transmission that will allow energy from Zones 4 and 5 to be delivered
7 to customers along the Front Range and throughout Colorado.

8 **Q. DESCRIBE HOW THE PROJECT WILL ALLEVIATE THE TRANSMISSION**
9 **CONSTRAINTS IN ZONE 4.**

10 A. The San Luis Valley lies within Zone 4. Just as there are constraints in
11 bringing power into the area to serve loads, the same constraints limit the
12 amount of power that can be delivered out. Any additional generation
13 development would have to exit the region using the two lines described
14 previously. An outage of either line would result in tripping off the generation
15 and would likely cause loss of load as well. Some studies have shown that
16 around 100 MW of new generation could be developed without any new
17 transmission, but during peak loading conditions, most of the power would
18 likely be consumed in the valley. Building two new high-voltage transmission
19 circuits out of the San Luis Valley relieves the constraints that presently exist
20 and will facilitate the development of new generation resources in Zone 4.

21 **Q. DESCRIBE HOW THE PROJECT WILL ALLEVIATE THE TRANSMISSION**
22 **CONSTRAINTS IN ZONE 5.**

1 A. The Calumet, Walsenburg, and Comanche Substations are all within Zone 5.
2 Public Service has done some preliminary analysis through generator
3 interconnection request studies. The studies indicate that the transmission
4 system as planned for 2011 can accommodate at least 300 MW in Zone 5 at
5 or near Comanche. Any generation development beyond that level will
6 require additional transmission to be built. With this Project, two new 345 kV
7 transmission circuits will be built from Calumet Substation to Comanche. The
8 two 345 kV lines from Calumet will carry power from the San Luis Valley 230
9 kV lines as well as new generation interconnected at Calumet, and deliver it
10 to customers along the Front Range. This will relieve constraints and
11 facilitate the development of new generation resources in Zone 5 at or near
12 Walsenburg.

13 **Q. HOW MUCH NEW GENERATION WILL THE PROJECT ACCOMMODATE?**

14 A. The amount of generation varies, depending on how the generation is
15 operated at each of the San Luis Valley and Calumet Substations. Studies
16 indicate that the Project will accommodate at least 750 MW of generation at
17 San Luis Valley, if no generation is added at Calumet. The Project can
18 accommodate approximately 1400 MW of new generation at or near Calumet
19 if there is no new generation at San Luis Valley. However, the numbers
20 cannot be added together to get the overall simultaneous level, since there is
21 interaction between the two locations. Depending on system conditions, the
22 simultaneous level can be as low as 750 MW, and as high as 1500 MW.

1 The studies are described in Exhibit No. TWG-1, the San Luis Valley –
2 Calumet - Comanche Transmission Project Study Report.

3 **IV. SYSTEM ALTERNATIVES/STUDY REPORT**

4 **Q. WERE STUDIES PERFORMED TO DETERMINE THE APPROPRIATE**
5 **TRANSMISSION UPGRADES TO ACCOMMODATE MORE GENERATION**
6 **RESOURCES IN ZONES 4 AND 5?**

7 A. Yes. Tri-State and Public Service led study efforts, including benchmark and
8 alternative evaluations, and the results have been summarized in a Study
9 Report, filed with my testimony as Exhibit No. TWG-1.

10 **Q. COULD YOU DESCRIBE YOUR STUDY PROCESS?**

11 A. According to requirements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the
12 transmission planning process is open to all affected parties and interested
13 stakeholders. The planning process is intended to facilitate the development
14 of electric infrastructure that maintains reliability and responds to service
15 requests.

16 In addition to their local transmission planning process, Public Service
17 planners coordinate their transmission planning with other transmission
18 providers and stakeholders in the Rocky Mountain region, and the Western
19 Interconnection as a whole, including active participation in the Colorado
20 Coordinated Planning Group (“CCPG”). After SB07-100 was passed, a
21 Subcommittee was formed within the CCPG whose purpose was to focus on
22 developing transmission plans for each of the SB07-100 ERZs. CCPG is a

1 forum that facilitates open discussion and joint planning efforts for the
2 transmission system in the Rocky Mountain Region, which is primarily
3 Colorado and southeastern Wyoming. The purpose of the SB07-100
4 Workgroup is to provide an open forum for electric load-serving entities
5 (“LSE’s”) and other interested stakeholders to participate in the SB07-100
6 transmission studies. The SB07-100 Workgroup met on a regular basis
7 throughout 2008. In November 2008, Public Service filed with the
8 Commission an informational document that listed each of the transmission
9 plans that were developed. It also provided a priority ranking for each of the
10 projects. The Project was listed as the top priority for proceeding with a
11 CPCN.

12 **Q WHAT OBJECTIVES WERE USED IN THE SYSTEM STUDIES?**

13 A. The basic objectives were to:

- 14 1. Improve the reliability of the regional transmission networks in accordance
15 with North American Electric Reliability Council (“NERC”) Standards and
16 Western Electricity Coordinating Council (“WECC”) Criteria.
- 17 2. Identify a transmission plan that will reliably alleviate constraints to ERZs 4
18 and 5 to accommodate a reasonable amount of beneficial generation
19 resources capable of meeting or exceeding resource needs.
- 20 3. Quantify the potential costs of the transmission plan.
- 21 4. Allow for future expansion of the transmission network when required.

1 5. Conduct joint studies in a coordinated, open and transparent manner,
2 including coordination with CCPG planning activities and the plans of
3 other load-serving entities.

4 **Q. HOW WAS RELIABILITY MEASURED?**

5 A. Public Service and Tri-State adhere to Planning Standards set forth by the
6 NERC and Reliability Criteria published by the WECC. The specifics of those
7 criteria are discussed in the Study Report. Reliability can be measured by
8 how well an alternative meets study criteria. The NERC Standards and
9 WECC Criteria state that following a disturbance and/or outage on the
10 system, the power loading on transmission elements must remain within
11 acceptable limits.

12 **Q. DID YOU PERFORM A BENCHMARK ANALYSIS DURING YOUR STUDY**
13 **PROCESS?**

14 A. Yes. A normal practice in performing transmission planning studies is to
15 perform benchmark analysis. This is done to determine the loading
16 conditions of the existing system prior to including additional generation
17 resources in our powerflow models. In the analysis, we benchmarked system
18 performance without additional generation resources. Then, with the new
19 generation added to the study models, transmission alternatives were
20 evaluated based on their ability to achieve at least the same level of
21 performance as was observed with the benchmark case.

22 **Q. WHY IS PERFORMING A BENCHMARK ANALYSIS IMPORTANT?**

1 A. It is important because it allows us to assess the system performance of the
2 existing system to determine its limitations prior to making system
3 modifications. When generation is added to the system, there is the potential
4 for unacceptable loading conditions on the existing transmission network. By
5 performing benchmark analysis, the impacts of new generation can be
6 distinguished from the impacts due to other regional loading conditions.
7 Unless other agreements are made, the mitigation of unacceptable
8 transmission performance due to load growth is the responsibility of the utility
9 that serves that load. In other words, if benchmarking studies show that a
10 neighboring system needs to upgrade its transmission systems to serve its
11 load growth regardless of other system changes or generation additions, it is
12 not the responsibility of the entity interconnecting new generation to improve
13 other transmission systems merely because new generation is being added.

14 When the transmission alternatives were evaluated, the resulting
15 system performance was compared with the performance of the benchmark
16 model without additional generation resources. The benchmarking analysis is
17 explained in Exhibit No. TWG-1.

18 **Q. WHAT TRANSMISSION PROJECTS WERE INCLUDED IN THE**
19 **BENCHMARK MODELS?**

20 A. Our study used system models that represented 2015 peak summer
21 conditions. The transmission network, customer loads, and generation
22 resources were adjusted for those conditions. In addition to the existing
23 system, transmission that is planned to be in service in the 2015 time frame

1 was modeled in the benchmark study cases. This includes Public Service
2 planned projects such as the Comanche – Daniels Park 345 kV Transmission
3 Project, the Midway – Waterton 345 kV Transmission Project, and the
4 Pawnee – Smoky Hill 345 kV Transmission Project. Some projects identified
5 through the Colorado Long Range Transmission Planning Group (“CLRTPG”)
6 and SB07-100 studies were also included such as new high-voltage
7 transmission from Lamar to Comanche. Since Tri-State was already planning
8 two 230 kV reliability projects in the region, the benchmark analysis included
9 those projects. Those projects were the San Luis Valley – Walsenburg 230
10 kV project, and the Boone – Stem Beach – Walsenburg 230 kV project.

11 **Q. WHAT DID THE BENCHMARK ANALYSIS CONCLUDE?**

12 A. First, the benchmark analysis identified several areas of the regional
13 transmission system that were susceptible to unacceptable performance,
14 even without new generation additions. These areas were monitored during
15 the course of studies. The benchmark analysis also identified areas of the
16 system that appeared to be sensitive to the addition of generation in the area.
17 These areas were also monitored. Overall, the studies concluded that the
18 benchmark system, which included a single 230 kV line from San Luis Valley
19 to Walsenburg to Boone, would provide the needed reliability to the region.
20 The benchmark analysis also determined how much generation could be
21 added at San Luis Valley and Walsenburg with only Tri-State’s original 230
22 kV single-circuit transmission plan.

1 **Q. HOW MUCH NEW GENERATION COULD THE BENCHMARK SYSTEM**
2 **ACCOMMODATE?**

3 A. The benchmark system, consisting of a single 230 kV line from San Luis
4 Valley – Walsenburg – Boone, could accommodate at least 1100 MW on a
5 simultaneous basis.

6 If measures are taken to mitigate contingency overloads on the San
7 Luis Valley 230/115 kV transformers, approximately 600 MW of generation
8 could be added at San Luis Valley. Without making those improvements,
9 approximately 450 MW of generation could be added at or near San Luis
10 Valley. When we analyzed adding 450 MW to the San Luis Valley 230 kV
11 bus, the San Luis 230/115 kV transformers showed a tendency to load to
12 100% of their rated capacity. In addition, approximately 500 MW could be
13 added at Walsenburg when San Luis Valley generation is at 600 MW.

14 **Q. HOW WERE TRANSMISSION ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPED?**

15 A. As I stated, studies showed that the benchmark system could accommodate
16 1100 MW with a single 230 kV line from San Luis Valley to Walsenburg to
17 Boone. However, transmission alternatives were developed to evaluate how
18 the benchmark 230 kV system could be expanded to get even higher
19 amounts of generation out of Zones 4 and 5. Each of the alternatives looked
20 at increasing the transmission capacity from San Luis Valley to Calumet to
21 Comanche.

22 **Q. WHAT TRANSMISSION ALTERNATIVES DID THE COMPANY**
23 **CONSIDER?**

1 A. Five basic alternatives were considered:

2 Alternative 1: San Luis Valley – Calumet double-circuit 230 kV; Calumet –
3 Comanche double-circuit 345 kV and Calumet – Walsenburg
4 single-circuit 230 kV.
5

6 Alternative 2: San Luis Valley – Walsenburg double-circuit 230 kV;
7 Walsenburg – Stem Beach – Comanche – Boone single-
8 circuit 230 kV.

9 Alternative 3: San Luis Valley – Comanche single-circuit 345 kV; San Luis
10 Valley – Walsenburg single-circuit 230 kV; Walsenburg –
11 Stem Beach – Comanche - Boone single-circuit 230 kV..

12 Alternative 4: San Luis Valley – Calumet double-circuit 230 kV; Calumet –
13 Walsenburg single-circuit 230 kV; Calumet – Comanche
14 single-circuit 345 kV.

15 Alternative 5: San Luis Valley – Calumet double-circuit 345 kV; Calumet –
16 Comanche double-circuit 345 kV; Calumet – Walsenburg
17 single-circuit 230 kV.

18 Alternative 1 is the Project. Alternatives 2 and 3 were evaluated prior
19 to evaluating the Project. These two alternatives were briefly studied, but
20 were discarded early in the process. Although they provided reliability
21 benefits and could allow new generation at San Luis Valley, they did not allow
22 for new generation injections in Zone 5. Therefore other alternatives looked
23 at developing a new Calumet Substation that could provide generator
24 interconnections in Zone 5.

25 Alternative 3 also did not accommodate new generation in Zone 5, or
26 near Walsenburg, so it was also discarded.

27 The remaining alternatives (4 and 5) were variations of the Project
28 (Alternative 1). Alternative 4 looked at having only a single 345 kV line
29 between Calumet and Comanche. That alternative did not allow a significant
30 amount of generation to be added to Zone 5, so it was discarded. Alternative

1 5 evaluated replacing the double-circuit 230 kV line between San Luis Valley
2 and Calumet with double-circuit 345 kV transmission.

3 **Q. HOW DID ALTERNATIVE 5 COMPARE TO THE PROPOSED**
4 **ALTERNATIVE 1?**

5 A. Studies showed that if the transmission system between San Luis Valley and
6 Calumet were operated at 345 kV instead of 230 kV, the level of simultaneous
7 generation from Zones 4 and 5 did not change significantly.

8 Alternative 5 was not preferred for several reasons. First, the
9 additional cost to construct the San Luis Valley to Calumet Segment at 345
10 kV is estimated to be \$54 million. Second, Alternative 5 did not improve
11 performance from Zone 5 compared to the Project. Perhaps most important,
12 both Alternative 1 and Alternative 5 are limited by similar regional
13 performance issues that constrain injection capacity, thus there is no clear
14 advantage to Alternative 5 over the Project.

15 **Q. CAN YOU EXPLAIN WHAT YOU MEAN BY OTHER REGIONAL ISSUES?**

16 A. One of the significant findings from the studies is that the level of San Luis
17 Valley generation is not limited by the Project, but by other transmission
18 limitations in the region and beyond. In other words, the amount of
19 generation that could be added at San Luis Valley was limited by several
20 transmission elements, but not the new transmission alternatives. This was
21 found to be true for both Alternative 1 and Alternative 5. In order to fully
22 utilize the capabilities of either alternative, each of these other limitation
23 issues will need to be addressed.

1 **Q. WHAT ARE THE OTHER TRANSMISSION LIMITATION ISSUES?**

2 A. As the study report Exhibit No. TWG-1 shows, there are several areas of the
3 system that limit the generation output at San Luis Valley. These include:

- 4 1. The San Luis Valley 230/115 kV transformer;
- 5 2. The San Luis Valley – Poncha 115 kV line;
- 6 3. The 69 kV system between San Luis Valley and Poncha;
- 7 4. The West Canon 230/115 kV transformer;
- 8 5. The Walsenburg 230/115 kV transformer;
- 9 6. The transmission system west of Poncha;
- 10 7. The Black Hills system north of Comanche;
- 11 8. The Colorado Springs Utilities system north of Midway; and
- 12 9. The transmission system in the South Metro Denver area.

13 Some of these issues may be addressed through operating
14 procedures, or by allowing higher loading during contingency conditions.
15 However, those measures will only work to a certain extent before significant
16 upgrades or additional transmission will be required. Due to the number of
17 issues, and also since some of the issues are on other entities' systems, it is
18 impossible to quantify the cost of complete resolution. Additional detailed
19 studies involving all affected parties will be required to develop
20 recommendations and costs for mitigation.

21 **Q. WHY CAN'T PUBLIC SERVICE DEVELOP A PROJECT THAT AVOIDS**
22 **OTHER SYSTEM LIMITATIONS?**

1 A. That is generally a primary goal of transmission planning. One of the major
2 objectives is to develop projects that can increase transfer capacity or allow
3 for generator interconnections without impacting other transmission systems.
4 However, given the integrated nature of the transmission systems, that
5 cannot always be the case. In Zones 4 and 5, we are looking at building
6 large-scale transmission to accommodate around 1000 MW of new
7 generation. We are required to evaluate performance based on the loss of
8 any single element. This is referred to as contingency, or N-1 analysis. Due
9 to the fact that the transmission system is interconnected, new generation
10 gets distributed over the existing network and the new transmission network,
11 regardless of the size of the new transmission project. As the generation
12 level is increased, the impacts to the parallel networks also increase.
13 Regardless of whether the San Luis Valley – Calumet Segment is 230 kV or
14 345 kV, the regional contingency issues will have to be addressed to achieve
15 more than 1500 MW of simultaneous generation in Zones 4 and 5. Since
16 those issues could easily run into the hundreds of millions of dollars, Tri-State
17 and Public Service did not feel it was cost effective to “upsized” the proposed
18 project. In addition, a project that can allow upwards of 1500 MW of new
19 generation can meet resource requirements for years to come.

20 **Q. WHAT DID THE STUDY REPORT CONCLUDE REGARDING THE**
21 **PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE?**

22 A. The Project meets study objectives and is the preferred alternative. As
23 mentioned previously, there are currently significant transmission constraints

1 between the Zones 4 and 5 and the Front Range load centers. The Project is
2 a prudent solution that will allow approximately 1500 MW of new resources
3 from Zones 4 and 5 to Front Range loads under the study conditions. As it is
4 now designed, the Project will be a building block for future upgrades when
5 the needs or resource development requires it. Building the San Luis Valley –
6 Calumet - Comanche Transmission Project is the recommended project. The
7 Project:

- 8 1. Improves the reliability of the regional transmission networks
- 9 2. Alleviates constraints to Energy Resource Zones 4 and 5 and
10 accommodates approximately 1500 MW of new generation resources.
- 11 3. Is the most cost-effective solution. Alternative 1 costs are estimated to
12 be \$180 million. Alternative 5 costs are estimated to be about \$54
13 million higher, or \$234 million. Included in that cost is the requirement
14 for more right-of-way, and larger structures, each of which degrade the
15 aesthetic impacts of the project.
- 16 4. Allows for future expansion. The report lists several areas of the
17 system for which future upgrades and expansion can increase the
18 amount of generation that can be allowed in the region. These include
19 replacing or adding 230/115 kV transformers at San Luis Valley,
20 replacing or adding 230/115 kV transformers at Walsenburg, building
21 new transmission from San Luis Valley to Poncha, and building new
22 transmission from Poncha to Midway or Comanche.

1 5. Has been coordinated through CCPG planning activities and the plans
2 of other load-serving entities.

3 **Q. HOW DOES THE SAN LUIS VALLEY – CALUMET – COMANCHE**
4 **PROJECT FIT IN WITH LONGER RANGE TRANSMISSION PLANS IN THE**
5 **STATE?**

6 A. The Project has also been identified in studies performed by the CLRTPG
7 and in studies for SB07-100. The CLRTPG and SB07-100 study groups are
8 workgroups of the CCPG. The CLRTPG was formed to jointly evaluate the
9 development of coordinated long-range (2018) transmission plans for the
10 CCPG footprint. Most of the participants in the SB07-100 Work Group were
11 also involved with the CLRTPG Workgroup. The CLRTPG and SB07-100
12 groups performed studies and concluded that a high-voltage transmission
13 project from San Luis Valley to Walsenburg to Comanche could
14 accommodate approximately 2000 MW in Zones 4 and 5. However, the goal
15 of the report was to develop high-voltage backbone plans, and not all
16 underlying system issues were addressed in that study. This study is
17 consistent with the CLRTPG study in that it recommends high voltage
18 transmission between San Luis Valley and Comanche. However, since the
19 analysis evaluated impacts to the underlying system, the simultaneous
20 injection level was found to be reduced to 1500 MW.

21 **Q. DID YOU CONSIDER HOW THE TRANSMISSION SYSTEM COULD BE**
22 **FURTHER DEVELOPED IN THE FUTURE TO ACCOMMODATE EVEN**
23 **MORE RESOURCES IN THE REGION?**

1 A. Yes. As mentioned previously, studies identified several areas of the system
2 that are susceptible to contingency overloads, and therefore limit the amount
3 of generation development in Zones 4 and 5. The first step towards
4 increasing the amount of generation in Zones 4 and 5 is to address each of
5 the local area issues. The issues are not confined to a single area, and would
6 entail improvements to other entity's systems, including Black Hills, Colorado
7 Springs, and Western Area Power Administration.

8 The next step would be to implement low cost options such as
9 operating procedures including opening lines and curtailing generation.
10 Higher cost options, but less than the incremental cost of Alternative 5, would
11 include additional high-voltage transmission out of the San Luis Valley. One
12 alternative would be to build new, or rebuild existing transmission north of the
13 San Luis Valley to Poncha and then on into the Front Range. Generally
14 speaking, if an additional 230 kV line was built out of the San Luis Valley,
15 there would be four 230 kV lines to deliver power out of Zone 4.
16 Theoretically, if each 230 kV line had a continuous rating of 600 MW, then a
17 total of approximately 2000 MW of generation could be developed in the San
18 Luis Valley alone under that configuration; however, the limitations outside of
19 the San Luis Valley would still exist so these levels would not be possible
20 without significant, costly and wide spread upgrades to the transmission
21 system

22 **Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?**

23 A. Yes.

Attachment A
Statement of Qualifications
Thomas W. Green

B.S., Electrical Engineering, University of Colorado, 1984.
Registered Professional Engineer, State of Colorado.

Over twenty-five years experience in performing planning and operating studies to analyze the power transmission system. Over ten years experience with Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) Transmission Asset Management. Interim Manager of Transmission Reliability and Assessment between July 2004 and November 2005. Helped manage the planning studies for the 2003 Least Cost Resource Plan. Directly or indirectly involved with the preparation of transmission studies, testimonies and exhibits during Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) processes for the following projects:

- Pawnee – Smoky Hill 345 kV Transmission Project
- Midway – Waterton 345 kV Transmission Project
- Comanche – Daniels Park 345kV Transmission Project
- Chambers 230/115kV Interconnection Project
- Midway – Daniels Park Rebuild Project
- Steamboat Looped 230kV Transmission Line.

Broad comprehension of the Western Electricity Coordinating Council (“WECC”) electrical system, with particular understanding of the Denver-metro and Colorado regions. Experienced in the evaluation of electrical system performance and capabilities, and planning for necessary system upgrades. Ability to determine transfer capability for both static and dynamic limitations. Knowledge of regional and federal guidelines and criteria for system planning, including WECC and North American Electric Reliability Council (“NERC”) regulations. Familiar with processes of load forecasting, regional planning, and modern concepts and technologies such as HVDC operation. Participant on many engineering committees and study groups, both regional and WECC wide.