

**AN OFFICIAL FILING
BEFORE THE
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WISCONSIN**

**Joint Application of Dairyland Power
Cooperative, Northern States Power
Company-Wisconsin, and Wisconsin Public
Power, Inc., for Authority to Construct and
Place in Service 345 kV Electric Transmission
Lines and Electric Substation Facilities for the
CapX Twin Cities-Rochester-La Crosse Project,
Located in Buffalo, Trempealeau, and La Crosse
Counties, Wisconsin**

Docket No: 05-CE-136

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF TIM NOELDNER

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

3 A. My name is Tim Noeldner and my business address is 1425 Corporate Center Drive
4 Sun Prairie, Wisconsin 53590.

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

6 A. I am employed by WPPI Energy (“WPPI”) as the Assistant Vice President of Special
7 Projects.

8 **Q. Please describe your educational background and professional experience.**

9 A. I graduated from the University of Wisconsin – Madison in 1984 with a Bachelor of
10 Science Degree in Electrical Engineering. Following graduation, I worked for various
11 utilities in the wholesale power marketing and resource and transmission planning areas.
12 Since 2002, I have been employed by WPPI and I am currently the Assistant Vice
13 President of Special Projects. As part of my job as Assistant Vice President of Special
14 Projects, I serve as WPPI’s representative on several CapX2020 committees and have

1 represented WPPI at numerous open houses and hearings related to the Hampton –
2 Rochester – La Crosse 345 kV Project. My resume is attached as **Ex.-Applicants-**
3 **Noeldner-1.**

4 **Q. For whom are you testifying?**

5 A. I am providing testimony on behalf of WPPI, one of the Applicants (with Northern States
6 Power Company, a Wisconsin corporation and Dairyland Power Cooperative) in this
7 docket. Applicants seek approval from the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin
8 (“PSCW”) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (“WDNR”) to construct
9 the Wisconsin portion of the Hampton – Rochester – La Crosse 345 kV Project. The
10 Wisconsin portion includes a 345 kV line from Alma, Wisconsin to a new transmission
11 substation located in Holmen, Wisconsin and associated 161 kV system interconnections
12 at the new substation. These facilities are together termed the “La Crosse 345 kV
13 Project” or “Project”.

14 **Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony?**

15 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide testimony related to WPPI’s involvement in
16 the Hampton – Rochester – La Crosse 345 kV Transmission Project.

17 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits with your testimony?**

18 A. Yes. I am sponsoring the following exhibits to my testimony:

19 Ex.-Applicants-Noeldner-1: Resume of Tim Noeldner;

20 Ex.-Applicants-Noeldner-2: Wind Energy Transmission Economics Assessment; and

21 Ex.-Applicants-Noeldner-3: Model results – Value of power transfer capability between
22 Minnesota and Wisconsin based on Wind Capacity Factor
23 Differentials.

1 **Q. Can you provide some background information on WPPI?**

2 A. WPPI is a not-for-profit regional power company serving 51 customer-owned electric
3 utility members. Through WPPI, these public power utilities share resources and own
4 generation to provide reliable, affordable electricity to more than 195,000 homes and
5 businesses in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Upper Michigan. WPPI develops and owns
6 generation, negotiates and holds power purchase agreements, and arranges transmission
7 service and congestion protection on behalf of its member utilities. WPPI provides
8 services to its members, and to customers of its members, including conservation and
9 load management programs. All WPPI members and their customers are located within
10 the Midwest Independent Transmission System Operator Inc. (“MISO”) footprint, and
11 WPPI is a MISO participant. WPPI pays the MISO network transmission rate for all of
12 its load. WPPI does not currently own transmission directly, but is a minority owner of
13 American Transmission Company. This ownership helps to “hedge” WPPI’s
14 transmission delivery costs in eastern Wisconsin and in the Upper Peninsula. WPPI
15 currently has no mechanism in place to hedge its transmission delivery costs in western
16 Wisconsin.

17 **Q. What were WPPI’s peak demand and energy requirements in 2010 and 2011?**

18 A. WPPI’s overall system peak demand in 2010 was 1,007 MW, and in 2011 was 1,045
19 MW. WPPI served member energy requirements in 2010 of 5,336 GWH.

20 **PARTICIPATION IN CAPX2020**

21 **Q. Please describe WPPI’s involvement with the CapX2020 Initiative.**

22 A. WPPI has been an active participant in the CapX2020 Initiative since 2006 and in the
23 Project, in particular, since 2007 under the La Crosse Project Development Agreement

1 (“PDA”). WPPI intends to own 3.0 percent of the total 345 kV Project as a tenant-in-
2 common in undivided ownership interests.

3 **Q. Why did WPPI specifically seek involvement in the Hampton – Rochester – La**
4 **Crosse 345 kV Project?**

5 A. WPPI is involved in the Hampton – Rochester – La Crosse 345 kV Project for the same
6 reasons as the other co-applicants:

- 7 • Improve local reliability and maintain compliance with North American Electric
8 Reliability Corporation reliability standards, especially for the communities of
9 Rochester, La Crosse, and Winona;
- 10 • Support regional reliability – this can involve items like the need for flexibility to
11 respond to the results of recent and new environmental regulations, ability to meet
12 operating challenges posed by the addition of additional intermittent generation
13 (e.g., wind), and future load growth; and
- 14 • Facilitate the regional market – increased transfer capability allows access to
15 lower cost generation resources located west of Wisconsin, primarily renewables.

16 Additionally, WPPI is interested in owning its load ratio share of transmission in the
17 pricing zone encompassing western Wisconsin where the following five WPPI member
18 utilities are located: Black River Falls, New Richmond, River Falls, Westby, and
19 Whitehall.

20 **Q. How important is transfer capability for WPPI’s customers?**

21 A. As detailed in the direct testimony of Amanda King, the 345 kV Project is designed to
22 provide an essential 345 kV link into Wisconsin that will enable approximately 1200
23 MW of transfer capability when a 345 kV connection is made further to the east. WPPI

1 relies upon remote generation to meet member utilities' electrical capacity and energy
2 requirements. Absent transmission transfer capability, use of remote generation for this
3 purpose would not be possible. Power transfer capability has provided WPPI with lower-
4 priced resources over the years in two ways: 1) The direct cost of remote purchases from
5 (or ownership of) Minnesota and Illinois generators is lower on a delivered basis than that
6 of other options available at the time these purchases were made, and 2) Having the
7 ability to reach remote resources has given WPPI a wider range of opportunities when
8 considering the economics of resource options inside and outside of Wisconsin. Thus,
9 the availability of power transfer capability (from Minnesota and points west as well as
10 from Illinois) has reduced the cost of electricity for WPPI's members and their
11 customers. The anticipated near-term and long-term power transfer capability
12 improvements provided by the Project are needed in the future to provide similar
13 benefits. Transfer capability also enables WPPI to meet its renewable energy
14 requirements. WPPI currently purchases 80 MW (nameplate) under long term power
15 purchase agreements from wind farms located west of Wisconsin and owns 1.8 MW
16 (nameplate) of a wind farm located near Worthington, Minnesota.

17 **Q. Has WPPI attempted to quantify the value of transfer capability?**

18 A. Yes. WPPI's experience has been that transfer capability has a significant positive value,
19 both for WPPI's wind energy purchases and for delivery of energy produced by remote
20 WPPI-owned generation resources. With regard to wind resources, the best regional
21 wind resources are located west of Wisconsin. This is borne out by generation
22 interconnection requests. The December 15, 2011 MISO generation interconnection
23 queue for Minnesota and the Dakotas is mostly wind generation – 88 percent of the

1 generation on active status in Minnesota, and 96 percent of generation in the Dakotas, is
2 wind. WPPI sponsored development of a spreadsheet model in 2010 working with Burns
3 & McDonnell to generically assess the prospective value of power transfer capability
4 based on the difference in wind generation capacity factors between various locations and
5 states where wind generation could be located. The concept and methodology used by
6 this model are described in the Wind Energy Transmission Economics Assessment
7 (“Assessment”), which is attached as **Ex.-Applicants-Noeldner-2**.

8 **Q. Why did WPPI undertake the Assessment?**

9 A. At the time, various transmission proposals were being discussed (including a 765 kV
10 line) for delivering wind from the best wind resource locations in this region (i.e., the
11 Dakotas and Minnesota) to Wisconsin and points east. WPPI wanted to determine at a
12 conceptual screening level how much transmission investment could be justified by the
13 fundamental difference in average wind speeds (and the resulting differences in capacity
14 factor and busbar cost of that generation) between locations with different wind quality.

15 **Q. Is the Assessment the types of data typically relied upon by utilities when forming
16 opinions on the subject?**

17 A. Yes. Electric utilities typically rely upon outside consultant resources to perform
18 analyses like the Assessment.

19 **Q. Do you consider Burns & McDonnell to be a reliable vendor?**

20 A. Yes. WPPI has a long-standing relationship with Burns & McDonnell. Burns &
21 McDonnell provided consulting services to WPPI that have included generation siting
22 studies (*e.g.*, siting of the South Fond du Lac combustion turbines), technology
23 evaluations (*e.g.*, characteristics of various types of peaking, intermediate, and baseload

1 generation technologies) to assist WPPI in selecting the appropriate upgrades to our
2 generation mix, and services as Owners Engineer during WPPI's participation in the
3 Prairie State Energy Campus development (later WPPI withdrew from this project).
4 Several staff members of WPPI, including a Senior Vice President of Power Supply
5 (now retired).

6 **Q. What was your role in the Assessment?**

7 A. I was the project manager. I scoped out the analysis and concept description and
8 directed Burns & McDonnell to build WPPI a model that would perform this task. I also
9 oversaw development of the Assessment.

10 **Q. Please describe generally the results of that Assessment.**

11 A. The key output of the analysis was that the difference in wind generation capacity factors
12 has a measurable value. The Assessment contains a graph (Figure 5-1) showing the
13 breakeven cost of power transfer capability as a function of differences in capacity factor
14 of wind generation. Figure 5-1 of the Assessment is based on an underlying source
15 location capacity factor of 40 percent and a sink location capacity factor of 20 percent.
16 The breakeven transmission capital cost is the amount one could justify spending on
17 transmission improvements to enable the transfer of wind energy from the source to the
18 load (i.e., power transfer capability). If the transmission capital cost necessary purely to
19 achieve the transfer of wind energy (i.e., incremental to the cost of satisfying reliability
20 requirements, the value of reducing congestion, etc.) is below the "Breakeven
21 Transmission Capital Cost," it is more economical to build the transmission and site the
22 wind generation in the better quality wind area rather than near the load. Another way of
23 looking at this is that if two transmission improvement alternatives both meet a local

1 reliability need but provide differing levels of power transfer capability, the Breakeven
2 Transmission Capital Cost quantifies the value that extra power transfer capability could
3 provide if used to transmit wind energy from the source.

4 Figure 5-1 illustrates how the value of power transfer capability varies with differences in
5 wind capacity factor. To apply this concept to the 345 kV Project one must update the
6 model to reflect the specific wind energy capacity factors expected in Minnesota versus
7 Wisconsin because the 345 kV Project would increase the power transfer capability
8 across that interface as testified by Ms. King.

9 **Q. Have you updated the Assessment model as necessary to apply it to this Project?**

10 A. Yes. At the time the model was originally developed, the National Renewable Energy
11 Laboratory (“NREL”) had published wind energy potential by state at a level of 50
12 meters. The Assessment extrapolated the 50 meter information to 80 meters, a more
13 appropriate level given the height of today’s wind turbines. Since that time, NREL
14 published estimates of Wind Energy Potential by state at a level of 80 meters. Thus, it is
15 no longer necessary to extrapolate to the typical wind turbine hub height, so I updated the
16 model accordingly. I also updated the model inputs to specifically use NREL’s wind
17 capacity factor estimates for Minnesota and Wisconsin instead of the more generic range
18 used in Figure 5-1.

19 **Ex.-Applicants-Noeldner-3** shows the results obtained when applying the updated
20 model to estimate the wind-transfer-related value of power transfer capability from
21 Minnesota to Wisconsin, which the 345 kV Project would enhance. **Ex.-Applicants-**
22 **Noeldner-3** displays results for a number of additional runs I investigated to determine
23 how sensitive the results are to input assumptions. I used modeling information vetted

1 and agreed to through the Eastern Interconnection Planning Collaborative to establish
2 several of the sensitivity ranges.

3 **Q. Looking at wind resources in Minnesota for delivery in Wisconsin, do you have an**
4 **opinion regarding the value of transfer capability based on the Assessment?**

5 A. My analysis indicates that the value of power transfer capability is in the range of \$130 to
6 \$250 (\$ per kW of power transfer capability) based on the differential in expected
7 capacity factor of wind generation located in Minnesota versus that of wind generation
8 located in Wisconsin. Other economic benefits available from such power transfer
9 capability are not captured by this screening level analysis and are addressed by other
10 witnesses.

11 **CONCLUSION**

12 **Q. Does this complete your direct testimony?**

13 A. Yes.

14

4414795v1