

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.1.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

1.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.1, lines 18-23

1.1.1 Please confirm that “the ageing transmission system through which 80% of the Island’s electricity requirements are delivered” is not *all* planned to be zero-rated in 2007.

RESPONSE:

This Information Request is out of scope.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.1.2 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

1.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.1, lines 18-23

1.1.2 Please specify how many MWs of reliable capacity will be eliminated when the HVDC line is zero-rated, and at what date.

RESPONSE:

This Information Request is out of scope.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.1.3 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

1.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.1, lines 18-23

1.1.3 Please confirm that BC Hydro intends to keep the HVDC line in service during and after it is zero-rated.

RESPONSE:

BCTC's Transmission System Capital Plan, filed with the Commission on 31 May 2004, outlines in section 3.1.4.3 projects in progress and future projects to sustain the HVDC system. Capital investments for the HVDC system are directed at replacing and upgrading system components that are either failing or have a high risk of failure, to ensure that firm capacity is maintained until 2007 and that emergency capacity is maintained thereafter.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.2.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

2.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.1, lines 25-27, and lines 11-12

- 1.2.1 Please reconcile the statement that the 1994 examination of Vancouver Island's electricity supply and demand addressed "demand-side resources" (as well as supply-side resources) with the statement that "the economic consequences of load shedding, other than in exceptional circumstances, are not acceptable."

RESPONSE:

The 1994 RFP sought requests for proposals from proponents of supply-side and demand-side projects. The latter statement refers to BC Hydro's and the Commission's shared view that an unreliable power system is unacceptable given its economic consequences.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.3.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

3.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.1, lines 27-30

- 1.3.1 Please confirm that the electrical generation facility recommended by the 1994 process was a co-generation facility, whereas the proposed Duke Point Power plant is not a co-generation facility.

RESPONSE:

Confirmed, although both projects are based on similar combined cycle gas-fired generation technologies.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.4.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

4.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.2, lines 1-9

- 1.4.1 Please specify for the proposed Duke Point Power plant each of the corresponding descriptions provided for the proposed VIGP.

RESPONSE:

This Information Request is out of scope.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.5.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

5.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.2, lines 26-27

1.5.1 Please confirm that BC Hydro expects the Commission to approve or disallow the EPA (or part of it), in the course of reviewing the EPA.

RESPONSE:

The Commission's powers regarding the EPA are enumerated in section 71 of the *Utilities Commission Act*.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.6.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

6.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.2, line 28, “competitive and transparent CFT process”

- 1.6.1 Please confirm that BC Hydro’s description of the CFT process as being “transparent” (here and elsewhere in the CFT Report) is intended to mean that the CFT process was transparent to the participating bidders, as distinct from being transparent to the public.

RESPONSE:

All major aspects of the CFT were made available to participating bidders *and* all interested parties through postings on BC Hydro’s website at www.bchydro.com/VICFT.

7.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.25, lines 3-4.

The Commission Panel stated the following on November 20, 2004:

“The issue as to whether or not B.C. Hydro conducted the CFT in accordance with its terms is not an issue for this review. And the independent reviewer need not be called in this proceeding.” [Transcript, Vol.2, p.314, lines 11-14]

1.7.1 To what extent, if any, has the Commission’s statement, quoted above, changed BC Hydro’s position that “the central issue now before the Commission is whether the [CFT] process was fair, transparent and appropriate to reach a solution in the best interests of ratepayers”?

RESPONSE:

BC Hydro believes that the question of whether the CFT process was fair, transparent and appropriate is still an important issue for this review.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.8.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

8.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.7, “EPA amended to allow for a minimum 90-day period for a BCUC hearing”; Appendix N, s.3.1 “Regulatory Review Termination”

1.8.1 Please confirm that BC Hydro would not suffer any financial penalty pursuant to the EPA if the Commission were to disallow all or part of the EPA.

RESPONSE:

If, within the time frames set out in Section 3.1 of the EPA, the BCUC were to make an order disallowing all or part of the EPA within the time frame indicated in Section 3.1 of the EPA, and assuming that BC Hydro were to exercise its right to terminate the EPA within the time frame indicated in Section 3.2 of the EPA, BC Hydro would not suffer any financial penalty under the EPA for such termination.

8.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.7, “EPA amended to allow for a minimum 90-day period for a BCUC hearing”; Appendix N, s.3.1 “Regulatory Review Termination”

1.8.2 If the answer to the previous question is in the negative, please identify any provisions of the EPA pursuant to which BC Hydro might incur a financial penalty if the Commission were to disallow all or part of the EPA.

RESPONSE:

As indicated in BC Hydro’s response to GSXCCC IR 1.8.1 and based on the assumptions in that response, there would be no financial penalty.

9.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.7, lines 5-8

- 1.9.1 Please list the factors causing the Quantitative Evaluation Methodology to “favour[...] projects aggregating at the minimum portfolio size (150 MW) relative to those aggregating at the maximum portfolio size (300 MW).”

RESPONSE:

The QEM calculates the Net Portfolio Cost for each portfolio on an NPV basis; the portfolio with the lowest Net Portfolio Cost is selected as the winning portfolio. This cost includes the fixed cost minus the Energy Margin for each tender in the portfolio. The Energy Margin represents the value of the energy generated relative to the electricity price forecasts.

It is unlikely that the incremental Energy Margin would exceed the incremental fixed costs for any technology type, especially for a gas-fired project, since a 50% weighting is given to the 25% Partial Recovery gas-electricity price scenario. Therefore, a 150 MW portfolio will tend to have a lower Net Portfolio Cost than a 300 MW portfolio.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.10.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

10.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.7, lines 5-8

1.10.1 How many bidders accounted for the “6 VIGP projects” among the 22 projects that were pre-qualified?

RESPONSE:

Section 2.6 of the CFT Report is incorrect. Among the 22 projects that were pre-qualified, eight were VIGP type projects. These were submitted by five bidders.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.10.2 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

10.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 10-18

1.10.2 Please confirm that 20 of the 22 projects proposed by pre-qualified bidders were natural gas based.

RESPONSE:

Confirmed.

10.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 10-18

1.10.3 Please list the respective capacities in MWs of the 22 projects.

RESPONSE:

(in ascending order)

27
29
45
45
46
50
50
50
63
90
92
100
100
113
150
200
265
277
285
285
291
295

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.10.4 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

10.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 10-18

1.10.4 How many projects did Duke Point Power (or corporate affiliates) propose?

RESPONSE:

Two: one VIGP-type with duct firing and one VIGP-type without duct firing.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.10.5 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

10.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 10-18

1.10.5 Please state the reason for disqualification of the bidder of the coal plant, the bidder of the wind farm, and the bidder of the biomass/coal plant, respectively.

RESPONSE:

Please see the response to BCUC IR 2.69.2, which asked a similar question and which was ruled out of scope.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.11.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

11.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 22-26

1.11.1 For how many proposed projects did the nine pre-qualified bidders provide detailed descriptions?

RESPONSE:

Seventeen.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.11.2 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

11.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 22-26

1.11.2 How many of the proposed projects at this point were natural gas based?

RESPONSE:

Sixteen, including four dual-fuel projects.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.11.3 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

11.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 22-26

1.11.3 How many of the proposed projects at this point were VIGP projects?

RESPONSE:

Ten.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.11.4 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

11.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 22-26

1.11.4 How many bidders accounted for the VIGP projects at this point?

RESPONSE:

Five.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.11.5 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

11.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 22-26

1.11.5 Please list the respective capacities in MWs of the proposed projects at this point.

RESPONSE:

Bidders were not required to identify the bid capacity for the descriptions of proposed generation facilities submitted to BC Hydro at this point in the process.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.11.6 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

11.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 22-26

1.11.6 What is BC Hydro's understanding of the reason(s) why two of the pre-qualified bidders did not provide detailed project descriptions?

RESPONSE:

BC Hydro does not know.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.12.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

12.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 28-34, p.9, lines 1-2

1.12.1 What is BC Hydro's understanding of the reason(s) why three of the pre-qualified bidders which had provided detailed project descriptions did not submit tenders on August 13, 2004?

RESPONSE:

Two of the pre-qualified bidders who provided detailed project descriptions did not notify BC Hydro of the reasons for not submitting tenders. The third pre-qualified bidder, a VIGP-type project who provided a detailed project description but did not submit a tender, said that the terms and conditions of the EPA were too onerous.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.12.2 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

12.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 28-34, p.9, lines 1-2

1.12.2 Of the ten proposed projects for which BC Hydro received tenders on August 13, 2004, how many were natural gas based?

RESPONSE:

Nine.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.12.3 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

12.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 28-34, p.9, lines 1-2

1.12.3 After two bidders proposing three projects were rejected due to non-compliance, how many of the proposed projects for which tenders were received were natural gas based?

RESPONSE:

Six.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.12.4 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

12.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 28-34, p.9, lines 1-2

1.12.4 Please confirm that at this point there were four tenders from four bidders proposing a total of seven projects.

RESPONSE:

Four bidders with a total of six projects were passed to the Submission Evaluation Committee for evaluation. A non-VIGP Tender containing two gas-fired projects had one project disqualified.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.12.5 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

12.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 28-34, p.9, lines 1-2

1.12.5 Of these seven projects, how many were natural gas based?

RESPONSE:

Please see BC Hydro's responses to GSXCCC IR 1.12.4 and BCUC IR 2.69.6.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.12.6 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

12.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 28-34, p.9, lines 1-2

1.12.6 Of these seven projects, how many were VIGP projects?

RESPONSE:

Please see BC Hydro's response to BCUC IR 2.69.6.

Four.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.12.7 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

12.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.8, lines 28-34, p.9, lines 1-2

1.12.7 How many bidders accounted for the VIGP projects at this point?

RESPONSE:

Two.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.13.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

13.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.9, lines 3-10

1.13.1 Please reconcile the reference to “all four tenders comprising 6 projects” with the previous paragraph which refers to ten projects of which the bidders of three were disqualified (apparently leaving seven projects).

RESPONSE:

Please see BC Hydro’s responses to BCUC IR 2.69.6 and GSXCCC IR 1.12.4.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.13.2 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

13.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.9, lines 3-10

1.13.2 If one project did not pass the Submission Evaluation Committee (SEC) assessment, please provide the reason why it did not pass.

RESPONSE:

All projects passed the SEC assessment.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.13.3 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

13.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.9, lines 3-10

1.13.3 Of the six projects which passed the SEC assessment, how many were natural gas based?

RESPONSE:

Five.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.13.4 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

13.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.9, lines 3-10

1.13.4 Of the six projects which passed the SEC assessment, how many were VIGP projects?

RESPONSE:

Four.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.13.5 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

13.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.9, lines 3-10

1.13.5 Of the six projects which passed the SEC assessment, how many were proposed by Duke Point Power (or corporate affiliates)?

RESPONSE:

Two.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.14.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

14.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.9, lines 24-27

1.14.1 Does BC Hydro consider that the Quantitative Evaluation Methodology has met the Commission's request that it "use assessment models which can be made public so that the various components and assumptions can be assessed and tested by intervenors"?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

15.0 Reference: CFT Report, pp.9-10, Appendix H, QEM, CFT Report, p.13, lines 1-2

1.15.1 Please clarify BC Hydro's use of the term "tender." The CFT Main Report appears to use "tender" in the sense that one bidder submits one tender that may include more than one proposed project. The QEM Appendix appears to use "tender" in the sense that one tender corresponds to one proposed project.

RESPONSE:

A tender may include one or more projects (provided that in aggregate the Bid Capacity is within the 25 MW to 300 MW range). On the face of the Tender Form section 3 includes instructions regarding the listing of multiple projects and states "This Tender is submitted in respect of the following project(s)." A table with numerous lines on which to list projects then follows.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.16.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

16.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.11, lines 23-25; p.12, lines 1-8; and p.13, lines 1-9

1.16.1 How many separate Portfolios were assembled and assessed?

RESPONSE:

Five.

16.2 Reference: CFT Report, p. 11, lines 23-25; p.12, lines1-8; and –p.13, lines 1-9

1.16.2 For each Portfolio for which a Portfolio Spreadsheet was run, please provide the number of included projects and the portfolio capacity.

RESPONSE:

Portfolio	Number of Projects	Portfolio Capacity
1	1	252 MW
2	1	280 MW
3	1	255 MW
4	1	285 MW
5	2	299 MW

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.16.3 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

16.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.11, lines 23-25; p.12, lines 1-8; and p.13, lines 1-9

1.16.3 How many of the Portfolios for which a Portfolio Spreadsheet was run contained VIGP projects?

RESPONSE:

Five.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.17.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

17.0 Reference: CFT Appendix H QEM, p.8

1.17.1 In one of the two electricity price forecast methods, the Quantitative Evaluation Methodology sets out the defining characteristics of “the most economical resource addition, currently a natural-gas fired, F-series combined cycle gas turbine (CCGT).” Please provide a table showing the values for the Duke Point Power plant in comparison with those of the hypothetical plant described in Appendix H.

RESPONSE:

This Information Request is out of scope.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.18.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

18.0 Reference: CFT Report, p. 12, lines 18-29

1.18.1 Please confirm that BC Hydro's active management of natural gas and electricity price exposure at best allows BC Hydro to mitigate risk due to price fluctuations but does not eliminate BC Hydro's exposure to long-term rising natural gas prices.

RESPONSE:

Confirmed.

19.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.13, lines 29-32, p.14, lines 1-2

1.19.1 What is BC Hydro's explanation of how the Duke Point Power project could be approximately \$50-million less expensive than the VIGP Benchmark?

RESPONSE:

The primary reason is that the tendered O&M Charge and Energy Charge for the Duke Point Power project were less than those assumed for the VIGP benchmark.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.20.1 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

20.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.14, line 15

1.20.1 Please confirm that the “two smaller projects totaling 122 MW” were among the six proposed projects for which Net Tender Cost was determined using the Tender Spreadsheet. If not, please explain.

RESPONSE:

A total of six tenders were received by BC Hydro in response to the CFT; however two of these were not evaluated by the QEM because they failed the pre-QEM review process. Hence, only four projects were evaluated using the Tender Spreadsheet. The “two smaller projects totalling 122 MW” were among the four projects that were evaluated using the Tender Spreadsheet.

GSXCCC Information Request No. 1.20.2 Dated: 08 December 2004 BC Hydro Response issued 20 December 2004	Page 1
British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Call for Tenders for Capacity on Vancouver Island Review of Electricity Purchase Agreement	

20.0 Reference: CFT Report, p.14, line 15

1.20.2 What are the fuel sources for each of the two smaller projects comprising Tier 2?

RESPONSE:

One was a biomass-fired project; the other was a gas-fired peaking capacity project.