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DAVID CREWS, called as a witness in the aforementioned action, was sworn according to law, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION
BY MR. SCOTT:
Q. Would you state your name, please?
A. My name is Davis Mason Crews.
Q. Mr. Crews, my name is Jeffrey Scott. We met just a minute ago. I'm an attorney and I represent Grayson Rural Electric in this proceeding before the Public Service Commission. The Commission has allowed us to take some depositions in this case, so I'm going to ask you some questions here this morning.

Have you ever given a deposition in a case before?
A. No, sir.
Q. Okay. I will be asking you some questions. And as you can see, to your right, there's a court reporter here and she's taking everything down. If at any time you want to answer a question yes, it's better to say yes than uh-huh or to shake your head. If you want to say no, it's better to say no than huh-uh or to shake
your head.
If at any time $I$ ask a question that you do not understand or if $I$, as is maybe more often the case, ask a question that doesn't make a whole of sense, just ask me to repeat it, okay?
A. Okay.
Q. So, that way, if you do answer a question, can we agree that you understood the question when you answered it?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And another rule that would be quite helpful, since the court reporter is taking this down, and she wants to get an accurate transcript of what's done, is to always give an audible response, whatever it is, rather than shake your head. Just audiblize it so she can hear you.
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is that fair enough?
A. That's fair enough.
Q. Okay. Mr. Crews, where do you work?
A. I work at East Kentucky Power. I'm the senior VP of power supply.
Q. Tell us what the job title of senior vice president of power supply means. What are the
$\qquad$
essential functions of your task?
A. My tasks at East Kentucky Power are to manage the interface of East Kentucky Power with Aces power marketing, to plan the power supply, long-term power supply, for East Kentucky to do the load forecasting for East Kentucky to buy the fuel for the power plants at East Kentucky, to manage the DSM and renewable portfolio of East Kentucky and to -- my job recently has been to work to integrate East Kentucky into PJM.
Q. DSM is Demand Side Management?
A. That's correct.
Q. And PJM is?
A. It's the organized market, Pennsylvania's -- PJM stands for Pennsylvania-Jersey-Maryland. That was the original three states in that organized market.
Q. And that organized market is an entity with which East Kentucky Power has, this summer, I guess, entered into an arrangement?
A. PJM is a regional transmission organization that operates a transmission system, and it operates an organized market for the sale and purchase of electricity.
Q. What is East Kentucky's arrangement with, through, by or for PJM?
A. Well, that's a broad question. We can talk about that for hours.
Q. You said a minute ago that an additional task that you have recently had assigned to you was to manage -- you might have said relationship, but manage something with PJM. So, tell us what it is that you do in that regard.
A. I think -- well, we integrated into PJM, which meant that East Kentucky Power historically has been the stand-alone balancing authority. And a balancing authority is an entity that dispatches generation and balances generation against a load within their footprint.
Q. All right.
A. We also used to operate our transmission system, okay? Today, as a result of joining PJM, East Kentucky turned over its responsibilities as a balancing authority and a transmission operator to PJM. What that means is that we don't do the dispatch of our units. We bid our units into the market now, and PJM dispatches the units in economic order for the benefit -- to lower the
costs across its foot -- or to economically dispatch all the units within its footprint.

The other thing is is that we turned over functional control of our transmission system to PJM as part of joining $P J M$, which means that they -- we take direction from PJM on how to operate 100 KV and above on our transmission system.
Q. So, on a set, predetermined time, do you, let's say East Kentucky, does East Kentucky Power get information to PJM that bids in -- where you bid in $X$ megawatt for ultimate distribution by PJM?
A. Yes.
Q. And then PJM gets that information not just from East Kentucky but its other generators?
A. Yes. There's 185,000 megawatts of generation in PJM. We submit, for each one of our plants, a day-ahead bid of our costs. And then PJM runs the market and decides -- they look at what their load is, they forecast the load of the footprint, and they decide how much generation needs to be run based on a security constrained dispatch, which means that they -- you know, I don't do this for PJM, but $I$ believe that what
they do is they do a straight economic order dispatch of the plants. And then they look if there's any transmission problems that would cause them to re-dispatch the plants to take care of certain transmission problems. And then if there are problems, they re-dispatch and run out of economic order to resolve transmission problems.

And then in the afternoon, after that market clears, they tell us which one of our plants are to be running the next day. And we set them up to run the next day.

We also bid our load in, okay? So, we bid our generation in at noon, and then we find out in the afternoon whether our generation runs. Similarly, we bid our load in a day ahead. So, we forecast what the load of the East Kentucky footprint is. We bid that load in and we find out how much the load is going to cost later in the afternoon.

And then we go into the balancing market, okay, because all the -- you know, all the generation that is bid in, some generators, because generation falls off line from time to time, we get into the balancing the day of,
delivery day. And during delivery day, PJM may call and dispatch additional plants. It's not uncommon for PJM to call and dispatch our Smith plants in realtime because they've either missed the forecast or they've had generation fall off line and they need additional generation to meet the load.

Similarly, our load doesn't come in exactly per load, which means that we are buying in the daily market to balance the differences between our load that was bid in a day ahead and the load that is actually occurring in the realtime. And sometimes we purchase too much, and sometimes we purchase too little. And that gets settled in the day -- pardon me, in the delivery day in the balancing market.
Q. And that settling occurs by selling or buying the difference?
A. Well, the settlement in the delivery day, all right -- sorry, you purchase -- let's take the load, for example. We bid in the day-ahead market. So, we are buying for tomorrow today, all right? So, we forecast on an hourly basis. We forecast hour one through hour 24. And, of
course, there's a load shape related to that. And so there's a different bid for every hour, as far as the load goes. And we buy that at the clearing price in the day-ahead market. And there's a different clearing price for each one of those hours.
Q. Fixed by? PJM tells you what that is?
A. Well, $P$-- yes. I mean, PJM -- it's -the clearing price is based on the generation bids. So, again, we talk about PJM forecasting the load and them doing economic dispatch of the generation.

So, they stack the generation from least cost to highest cost in every hour, and then the clearing price is the highest cost generation in that hour. And that sets the clearing price for that hour. And then the G14.

Load pays the clearing price for that hour. And the day-ahead, once the day-ahead market settles, it's done. You don't make changes to the day-ahead market.

And then you go into delivery day, all right? And you have a position in the delivery day based on having purchased your load during the day-ahead
$\qquad$
market. And then you go in and you'll have differences between what you've purchased to serve your load day ahead and what your load actually is. All right. So, you will settle on an hourly basis between if you were short, if you were -- if your forecast was lower than actual, then you're going to have to buy a little bit at the realtime price. And so you'll settle between your day-ahead purchase for your load and what the realtime price is. And if you -- and every hour you've bought a little bit -- you will have either bought a little bit too much or a little bit too little, and you'll be buying a little bit in that hour. And then that will settle, and you will get a bill that nets all this out.
Q. The generation that East Kentucky Power has on which it relies in part to bid in its load doesn't have the capacity, does it not, to meet everything that you need for your load? Is that accurate?
A. No, I don't think that's accurate.
Q. Does East Kentucky not buy power in excess of its generation on a daily basis?
A. Some days we are net sellers and some
days we're net buyers. There's a capacity market in PJM, all right? And generators that are going to participate in the day-ahead and realtime markets are -- well, if you're a capacity -- if you're a generator in PJM, you typically want to participate in the capacity markets, which is to sell your capacity into the PJM market, because you get a payment back.

But once you sell your capacity into the -or your generation in the capacity market, you're obligated to bid into the day-ahead and realtime markets. Are you with me?
Q. Uh-huh. So, what is the capacity that East Kentucky has to generate from its plants?
A. Well, the capacity is there's formulas that PJM puts out that derives the capacity that is -- they haven't -- you qualify through certain formulas in PJM, and that derives what the capacity is available to be bid into the capacity market. So, we take the rules from $P J M$, we apply them to all the power plants that East Kentucky currently owns, and then we come up with what our available capacity to sell into the PJM market in the capacity market is. And then once we've sold
that capacity into the $P J M$ capacity market, we get paid for that capacity. And then we are obligated to bid it into the market.
Q. I just want to make sure $I$ understand. Whatever megawatts can be produced at Spurlock, plus whatever megawatts can be produced at any other power plant that East Kentucky has --
A. (Interposing) That's correct.
Q. (Continuing) -- it produces whatever is available to produce on a given day at those plants, considering that sometimes there's one down because of repair or maybe there's something else going on at a particular plant. But whatever capacity it has to generate at each of those plants, on a daily basis, is sufficient to meet the load of the 16 -member systems of East Kentucky Power?
A. So, East Kentucky Power --
Q. (Interposing) Is it? That's my question.
A. Not on every day.
Q. And is it some days? On a typical 30-day month, is it there where it needs to be half the time, most of the time, quarter of the time?

What's your best judgment on that?
A. My best judgment is that we have adequate reserves to meet our load. When we were a balancing authority, okay --
Q. (Interposing) When you did it yourself instead of --
A. (Interposing) When we did it ourselves, okay, we -- we needed enough generation to meet our load and have reserves, operating reserves. Now that we're in PJM -- so, we're a winterpeaking utility. PJM is a summer-peaking footprint, all right. And PJM requires us to have enough generation to meet our summer peak, not our winter peak, all right? When we were planning as an independent and not in an organized market, we had to plan to meet our winter peak. Now that we're in PJM --
Q. (Interposing) Have enough for them up there?
A. Beg your pardon?
Q. Have enough for them up there?
A. Well, we have to --
Q. (Interposing) That they can buy it?
A. We have to have enough -- okay. The way
$\qquad$
the market works is that load-serving entities have to buy capacity from the capacity market. Generators sell into the capacity market and load-serving entities buy from the capacity market, okay? And we net out between what our load has to buy and what our generation -- what generation we sell in.

And today we're long generation in the PJM market. We have more generation than we need to fulfill the load-serving entities' obligation for capacity in the $P J M$ market.
Q. Okay. You said 185,000 --
A. (Interposing) PJM -- the estimates that I've seen from PJM put them at, prior to East Kentucky joining them, was 185,0000 megawatts. So, with East Kentucky joining, it would be somewhere close to 188,000 megawatts. Of course, that's a fluid number because there's generation, plants being brought on, generation plants being retired.
Q. So, East Kentucky's generation capacity is how much?
A. Roughly 3,000 megawatts.
Q. So, is it fair and accurate to say that
whatever generation capacity East Kentucky has and produces is sold in its entirety to PJM on a daily basis?
A. What East Kentucky does, as I pointed out, is that we bid our generation into the RPM market, which obligates us to offer to run that generation for PJM in the day-ahead and balancing markets. And then based on the cost of the -see, PJM takes that whole 185,000 megawatts and dispatches the cheapest units first to try to serve the load within their footprint in the most economic manner. So, on any given day, depending on what the load is, our plants may or may not be dispatched. Our experience so far in PJM is that Spurlock is dispatched almost 100 percent of the time. Cooper is dispatched -- its dispatch has not been a high dispatch because of this cost. And then Dale, similarly, has not been dispatched a great deal. The Smith units have been dispatched more than when we were a stand-alone $B A$ because they run well. They're situated, from a cost standpoint, you know to dispatch.
Q. So, therefore, if Spurlock is dispatched nearly 100 percent and others not 100 percent, and
you have sent in this day-ahead bid --
A. Right.
Q. (Continuing) -- then the price that you pay, East Kentucky pays, for --
A. Energy.
Q. (Continuing) -- energy is, one, fixed by

PJM; two, is based upon what they have come up with in their dispersing to determine the lowest cost first. And East Kentucky then pays what PJM says, based upon how they have determined this dispersal should be? Is that accurate?
A. I'm -- typically -- well, the only reason our Cooper plant is not dispatched is because there are cheaper resources to serve that load.
Q. That there are cheaper resources to serve --
A. PJM is dispatching resources that have a lower cost than Cooper.
Q. For production?
A. For production, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. So, essentially Cooper caps -- Cooper presents a cap of what we would pay in the market. If the market is higher than Cooper, Cooper would
run, and then our cost would be capped at Copper. But we're getting a benefit today from the market because we are able to purchase energy cheaper than what Cooper could generate energy today.
Q. So, therefore, the energy that you're able to purchase that's cheaper than what Cooper can produce is produced where and how? And how does it get -- well, it's produced where? Let's stop there.
A. It's produced within the footprint of PJM.
Q. Which is what? All those states --
A. That 185,000 megawatts that we talked about.
Q. And that's originating from power plants wherever in the east?
A. Wherever -- it could be in --
Q. (Interposing) Midatlantic or whatever that area is?
A. It could be in Ohio; it could be in Pennsylvania, Jersey, Maryland. But it's within the footprint of PJM and --
Q. And -- I'm sorry.
A. Go ahead.
Q. And those plants are owned by some entity other than East Kentucky Power?
A. That's correct.
Q. And how many different generation entities are there that have these plants that produce energy to put into the PJM footprint?
A. I don't know how many. You know it would be all the members within --
Q. (Interposing) Whatever they are?
A. Whatever they are, yes.
Q. And therefore, the -- is it accurate to say that the power that enables me at my house -I'm a member of Grayson Rural Electric -- the power that enables me to turn the light switch on could have originated in Pennsylvania?
A. Could have.
Q. And that's not someplace that's owned by East Kentucky Power, correct?
A. No, sir, it's not.
Q. Could that power have been originated at a plant owned by Duke Energy?
A. It could have been, yes.
Q. And this decision of how this gets dispersed and what East Kentucky actually has to
pay to XYZ generation company in Pennsylvania or ABC generation company in New Jersey, a generation entity similar to East Kentucky, that decision that gets made by PJM, it's kind of like the stock market, isn't it, on how prices are fixed or stock and, you know, what's cheapest, how we can get that here and then try to make sure that there's this balancing going on?
A. I don't know that it's like the stock exchange. Again, the price, the clearing price, is based on the economic dispatch of the plants. So, they look at the bid costs from each one of the plants and they solve to serve the load, the forecasted load, in the cheapest manner and have reliability and not overload the transmission system.
Q. All right. Let me ask you this: You know, you get up every day and you go to East Kentucky Power. And you can't go to work there every day and not know that there's a lawsuit between Grayson and East Kentucky Power, right? It would be hard to escape that?
A. Yeah. I spend a lot of time at East Kentucky Power related to this lawsuit.
Q. Or this case? There's a lawsuit in Mason County, which somehow the lawyers say is related to this. I don't know how it is, but some lawyers for East Kentucky say it is. But there's this matter here, this Public Service Commission proceeding, and you know about it?
A. I do know about it.
Q. You know about it?
A. Of course, I know about it.
Q. And you know what's going on there? You got a view of what's going on. I don't know if your view is the same as mine, but you know what you think is going on. So, let me ask you this: Let's assume for purposes of this question that Grayson Rural Electric has a calculation that probably East Kentucky agrees with, that 15 percent of its load equals 9.3 megawatts. And that Grayson Rural Electric says, "Well, I'm going to buy 9.3 megawatts of power from Duke Energy or ABC Generation Company or one of those entities that we talked about a minute ago that are a part of PJM," would it be accurate, sir, to say that were that to take place, that Grayson, being a member of East Kentucky, and East Kentucky, you
know, going to send out the power, that East Kentucky would just bid in 9.3 megawatts less to PJM, that East Kentucky would not be getting 9.3 megawatts of power, that it would be utilized -that would otherwise have been utilized by Grayson? Is that something that could be done on this daily basis that you've talked about a minute ago?
A. The question -- there's a lot there. So, the question -- let me see if I can restate the question. With proper notice --
Q. (Interposing) Yeah, assuming -- yeah, let's get past all of that. Let's assume that the notice part of the whole Amendment 3 thing met East Kentucky's satisfaction, that we were past that. And that's a good point. I'm leaping forward past all that, for purposes of the question.
A. Okay. So, we've resolved the notice, you know -- the question is: Can East Kentucky separate out 9.3 megawatts of load from Grayson and bid that into -- make a bid short 9.3 megawatts of Grayson's load?
Q. Yes.
A. Yes.
Q. And then there would just be a difference maybe, if this -- would Grayson have to pay a tariff rate for East Kentucky to ABC Generator or Duke Energy, or would there be some kind of --
A. (Interposing) Okay. So, your question now is -- I think your question is: So, once you've given an Amendment 3 Notice, and you're no longer load, okay, that that load is no longer served by East Kentucky, all right, which means it's not served by the wholesale power contract, which is a bundle contract that provides regulation, load following, transmission service, everything you need to serve load, okay? So, you don't -- that relationship for that particular 9.3 megawatts of load is no longer there. So, you have 9.3 megawatts of load that you want to take to some other supplier and serve in the PJM market, right? So, what you have to do is you have to be a member of PJM --
Q. (Interposing) Do you really?
A. Somebody has to be a member of PJM to serve that load. If it's a load within PJ -- my opinion, to the best of my knowledge, is if you're
serving a load in PJM, within their footprint, you're going to need to be a member, or somebody is going to have to, you know, act on your behalf to do it that's a member, all right? So, you're going to have to participate --
Q. (Interposing) Get a declaration of authority or something like that?
A. And my understanding of a declaration of authority is you're asking somebody to act on your behalf --
Q. (Interposing) Power-of-attorney type thing?
A. Right. I mean, you're still responsible but they're doing your work for you. It's more like a consulting arrangement. But that doesn't mean you're not a member. That means somebody else is handling it for you.
Q. Okay. Go ahead.
A. Much the same way that East Kentucky acts for Grayson today in PJM.
Q. Okay.
A. But once you fall outside the contract, somebody has got to act on your behalf. But that person is going to have to participate in the
capacity market; they're going to have to take -they're going to have to apply for transmission access, then they're going to have to participate in the day-ahead and balancing markets on your behalf. So, they're going to have to do everything that East Kentucky currently does in the PJM market to serve your load.
Q. And that's my understanding as well.
A. Right.
Q. But $I$ did not think that that had to be, in this situation, Grayson Rural Electric, or any of the other 16 distribution co-ops.

Let's assume Duke, because that's what we're talking about.
A. Okay.
Q. And Duke is in PJM?
A. Right.
Q. So, Duke would be acting to accomplish those things, because some entity has to in order to meet. --
A. (Interposing) Somebody has got to be a member on your behalf.
Q. All right. So, let's assume that's done.
A. Okay.
Q. Then does East Kentucky -- there's no additional cost to East Kentucky in that situation, is there?
A. Well, it points you to the wholesale power agreement, not Amendment 3 but the wholesale power agreement.
Q. Right.
A. And I'll point you to Section 4-B.
Q. Okay.
A. All right. So, this is the area where -and I guess I would point you to -- the first sentence is a fairly long sentence but it says, you know, "We'll set rates, and East Kentucky will collect from the members in all these different areas." And it goes about through half of the page, right?
Q. Uh-huh.
A. So, you're right, our cost doesn't change but the billing determines that we spread that cost over our members' changes, because there's 9.3 megawatts of demand less than there was prior to Grayson going into PJM. So, the numerator is the same, the denominator is less, the resultant is a higher cost to all members, okay?

And regardless of what the numerator is, the contract says we collect. We're available to collect that. So, for this to be an accretive deal, for this deal to make -- to be good for all members, you need to overcome the increased cost to all members, your cost needs to go down enough to overcome the increased cost to all members.
Q. Has East Kentucky done an analysis of what that would be?
A. What the stranded cost is?
Q. Don't use that word "stranded" yet. We'll talk about that in a minute, unless you're calling that stranded costs.
A. Well, that -- Isaac Scott is going to speak with you later --
Q. Maybe he should. I didn't know he was, but we can depose him later if we have to.
A. I beg your pardon. I'm sorry. He answered the interrogatory. So, it's answered in the interrogatory.
Q. Well, I didn't get answers to interrogatories, so -- I was told they were mailed last Monday but I never got them.

MR. SAMFORD: They were filed.

They should be on the Commission's Website. MR. SCOTT: Pardon?

MR. SAMFORD: They're on the Commission's Website. If you haven't gotten them, you can speak to the postal service.

MR. SCOTT: I think that's
interesting. I get e-mails from you all every day, but $I$ never got the interrogatory answers.
Q. (By Mr. Scott) So, I guess the question -- are you calling that a stranded cost?
A. Well, the -- no, I wouldn't say it's stranded because I get to recover. Because East Kentucky would recover it from the balance of the numbers.
Q. And then my question is: Has there been an analysis that East Kentucky has done to determine what that would be?
A. Yes. And I believe it's in the responses to the interrogatories that have been filed with the Commission.
Q. I was afraid of that.
A. Well, I mean --
Q. (Interposing) That's not your fault. That's not your job to get those to me. All
right.
A. But as far as, you know, the questions today, yes, it's --
Q. (Interposing) Well, do you know what it is? I mean, have you talked to this fellow? Do you know what it is? And $I$ know it wasn't your job to do the analysis, and you just maybe looked at it and trying to remember numbers or something. I can understand that but --

THE WITNESS: Do you want to get -is it -MR. SAMFORD: If you've got it, you can read it to him.
A. I believe it was Question No. 9 in the interrogatories that you filed and that we've answered, and that we answered on time. It says, "Please state what impact, if any, there would be upon the financial picture of East Kentucky Power if Grayson Rural Electric Cooperative is allowed to purchase 9.3 megawatts of power to serve its load in its defined territory from a source other than East Kentucky Power."

And the answer is: "Based upon analysis of the invoices East Kentucky Power issued to Grayson

Rural Electric during the most recent 12 -month period, October '12 through September 2013, a reduction of 9 -- a load of 9.3 megawatts would result in an annual reduction in total revenues of 3.5 million, seven hundred" -- pardon me, "three point five seventy -- two thousand seven hundred and seven dollars. This total reduction is composed of base revenues, demand and energy revenues of three million, sixty-eight thousand and fifty-three dollars. Fuel adjustment cost revenues of six thousand five hundred and seventy-one, and environmental surcharge revenues of four hundred and ninety-eight thousand.

All other things being equal, the impact to East Kentucky's financial picture as a result of this revenue reduction would be lower end total margins" -- sorry -- "which in turn would result in smaller capital credit allowance to all members, including Grayson RECC. It must be remembered that East Kentucky Power rates were designed to recover its revenue requirements as presented in its last base rate case. The reduction in $K W$ demand and corresponding reduction in $K W$ energy sales make it more difficult for East

Kentucky Power to consistently recover its revenue requirement from its members. Even though East Kentucky participates in the PJM market, this participation does not eliminate the need for East Kentucky Power to recover its fixed and variable costs.

East Kentucky Power can only make up the reduction in base revenues through the filing of a base rate case application with the Kentucky Public Service Commission. The reduction in the fuel adjustment cost revenues and environmental surcharge would be made up through the operation of those mechanisms. The 9.3 megawatt reduction in Grayson RECC's load will have two immediate impacts on the members of East Kentucky Power, including Grayson RECC. The 9.3 megawatt reduction in load will result in a corresponding reduction in $K W H$ energy sale. This lowered level of energy sales will have in turn -- will, in turn, have an impact on the monthly fuel adjustment cost factor calculations.

Based on the 12 -month analysis of Grayson RECC bills, East Kentucky has determined the impact could be a reduction in $K W$ energy sales of
three million -- approximately four million KWHs. This would translate into . 0001 dollars per KWH or ten mils per KWH upward adjustment in the monthly fuel costs factor for EKPC's -- fuel cost factor EKPC -- for East Kentucky Power bills to its members." I'm sorry.
Q. Could I see that document that you're reading from?

Are you reading from a document that says that it was East Kentucky's answers to Grayson Rural Electric's interrogatories --
A. (Interposing) I am.
Q. (Continuing) -- that shows a stamp file Public Service Commission date of October 28, 2013?
A. I am. 24 th, $I$ think it says.
Q. October 28th, 2013.
A. I can't see it from here. Yes. MR. SAMFORD: It's not the 28th? MR. SCOTT: Pardon?
Q. Do you see anything on that document that would have any statement of when it was mailed to anybody?
A. The only thing $I$ see on the document is
that the Public Service Commission has shown that it was received by the Public Service Commission.
Q. And doesn't show that it was mailed to anybody, correct?
A. No, it doesn't.

MR. SCOTT: Can we take about a five-minute break?. Is that all right with you guys?

THE WITNESS: Sure.
(A short recess was taken.)
Q. (By Mr. Scott) Okay. Mr. Crews, I'm at a bit of a disadvantage because East Kentucky's lawyers didn't mail me the answers to interrogatories --

MR. SAMFORD: (Interposing) I'm going to object to that.

MR. SCOTT: Well, you didn't mail it. You know you didn't mail it.

MR. SAMFORD: No, that's just not right.

MR. SCOTT: Look, you send me stuff by e-mail every day --

MR. SAMFORD: (Interposing) That's just not right.

MR. SCOTT: You send me stuff by
mail; I get it. I asked you Tuesday where the answers to interrogatories were. You said, "They were put in the mail yesterday," which would have been Monday the 28 th.

MR. SAMFORD: That's correct. MR. SCOTT: Which is the day that they were filed. But those interrogatory answers do not have a Certificate of Service on them. You did not certify that you mailed them to me. We now look at the Website and see that what was filed did not have a Certificate of Service on it, which demonstrates to me that they were, in fact, were not mailed. You know and $I$ know that $I$ would have gotten them, had they been mailed. And you all e-mail me stuff every day, always e-mailing. You all are prolific on that. And to intentionally tell me something that you know is not done is just reprehensible. I just am -- I don't know why I'm shocked by it but $I$ am shocked. But there's no Certificate of Service on that. Every other document that you've filed always has a Certificate of Service, and I'm just -- I just can't believe that that's what happened.
Q. So, I'll have to move on here, sir, because $I$ can't talk to you as much about the answer that you read. Evidently there were -- you signed the interrogatories, too, though, right? I think $I$ saw that.
A. That I signed them?
Q. And a couple of other people, Isaac Scott, you said.
A. Isaac Scott and Don Mosier.
Q. Don Mosier. So --

MR. SAMFORD: For the record, I continue to object to the assertions that you're making, which are just, frankly, not true, Mr. Scott.

MR. SCOTT: Yes, they are. They are. Well, you have no proof that you mailed them. You intentionally did not put a Certificate of Service on those answers to interrogatories. And you're a lawyer that has done this a long time, and you did on every other thing, every other document. And you didn't answer the request for production of documents like you thought none were sent to East Kentucky. And then later, you acknowledge that they were.

Don Prather, interestingly enough, for Shelby responded to the request for production of documents in a couple of instances said, "Obviously, this request is solely for East Kentucky, so Shelby will not answer that." So, you know, Don didn't get the memo. He didn't know he was supposed to be deceptive. So, he spoke truthfully. So, it's just shocking that you guys continue to do that.

MR. SAMFORD: Jeff, you wouldn't know the truth if it slapped you in the face.

MS. FRALEY: Gentlemen, gentlemen.
MR. SCOTT: Yeah, I would. Yeah, I
would. And $I$ know that it hasn't been forthcoming from you folks. And you told me on the phone that those were put in the mail on Monday.

MR. SAMFORD: They were.
MR. SCOTT: And they weren't to Jeffrey Scott.

MR. SAMFORD: They were.
MR. SCOTT: And you have no Certificate of Service showing that they were. And you know that you're supposed to put a Certificate of Service on there, and you didn't.

So, that's just reprehensible.
MS. FRALEY: Let's move on.
Q. (By Mr. Scott) Let's go on here. When you pay for the power that you ultimately have to pay for through PJM, I think you said a few minutes ago that that power in some extent is generated by a source other than Smith or Spurlock or Cooper? It could be generated by some plant somewhere else? Correct?
A. I said --
Q. (Interposing) Not an East Kentucky entity?
A. I said that we use power from generation that is not generation to meet our load. And we have used power from generation that is non-native to East Kentucky for probably 15,20 years. We've sought to lower the cost to our members by participating in the market all the time. That's one of the things -- one of the services that we have historically and will continue to do for our members is try to reduce the cost of their ultimate power supply by participating in markets. Prior to $P J M$, prior to joining $P J M$, we had a 400 megawatt transmission path from PJM to East

Kentucky to be assured that we could purchase energy from PJM to optimize our generation against the PJM market. So, I guess I'm not -- that's something that has occurred since the -- you know, it has occurred even before the organization of markets. Utilities used to trade for differences, so I -- I don't understand the point, but --
Q. Don't understand the point?
A. I don't understand the significance that East Kentucky serves load with non-native generation in the attempt to lower its cost to its members.
Q. I don't know that that was the point that I was making. I just asked you if you did it.
A. Okay. Yes, we do it.
Q. Okay. Is there any fee or are there fees or costs that East Kentucky pays when there is transmission to serve its members that might pass through lines of another entity, like AEP, KU?
A. Today?
Q. Uh-huh.
A. Okay. In the -- when we joined PJM -prior to joining PJM, I told you that we had a transmission request from $P J M$ to be able to
purchase from PJM. One of the business case points for joining PJM was that when we joined PJM, we would no longer have to pay that, all right?

East Kentucky currently pays, as a member of PJM, network integrated transmission service, which you will typically hear or see referred to as NITS. All right? And we pay NITS to PJM based on the East Kentucky load, and that's all we pay. So, we do not see pancaking of transmission. We pay one NITS rate and that's the reason for going into regional transmission organizations, or that's one of the reasons to be inside a regional transmission organization.
Q. So, East Kentucky does not pay an AEP rate to PJM for physical delivery of power?
A. We pay NITS.
Q. And that's it?
A. Yes. If you become, if you serve your load, the 9.3 megawatts that you asked about, you will pay NITS.
Q. Or somebody will for that 9.3?
A. Right.
Q. That don't have to be determined who it
would be, but somebody would have to pay it?
A. You can't serve that 9.3 megawatts without network integrated transmission service.
Q. So, were this situation to -- assuming you're past all the notice stuff and all that Amendment 3 stuff, would East Kentucky just simply put less on the grid and then PJM would clear that at the market price? That's really all that would happen, right?
A. We're talking about East Kentucky's load?
Q. Yeah.
A. What you're saying is if you had a contract with Duke and that contract -- describe the Duke contract. Are they going to -- is it a load following contract or block contract? I mean, tell me --
Q. Let's say block.
A. Okay. So, you're going to take a 7 by 24 contract from Duke?
Q. Let's say that. Let's just use that as an example.
A. And you have your load -- I don't understand, because your load is not a block load.
Q. Well, let's talk about that, then,
because I get that a lot in the things that your lawyers do decide to send me about load. And I think there's even a letter that you wrote to Carol Fraley a couple or three weeks ago about load and that this 9.3 megawatts must designate a particular load. Do you know if there's any specific load that Grayson Rural Electric has that is -- you know, must utilize 9.3 megawatts? I mean, do they have anything that -- or could that just be part of what's put on their system?
A. I guess let's talk about what Amendment 3 says. Have you got a copy?
Q. Uh-huh.
A. Okay.
Q. With respect to any load or loads?
A. Right. And load, your load at Grayson is typically about a 51 percent load factor, which means between the peak and the average energy, it's about 51 percent of the peak. So, you have a load shape that varies in every hour, all right? But you're talking about bringing a block like this that doesn't vary in every hour. So, as your load shape actually occurs, you're picking 9.3 megawatts, which is the peak, all right? And in a
lot of days, you're not going to even come close to that peak, all right? So, I don't know what you would do with all the energy that you're not going to be using to serve load. Are you going to settle that in the market or -- you know, it's not going to come to East Kentucky because it's not East Kentucky's load anymore.

So, I guess I would point you to that there's a difference between bringing a power supply of a 7 by 24 at 9.3 megawatts and wanting that credited to -- essentially $I$ think what you're looking for is somebody to credit your bill. But we're just not going to bill you for the 9.3 megawatts and you're going to have to serve it.
Q. And pay?
A. And pay PJM. But if you're buying a block, I don't know what you're going to do with that. But the difference between -- this was one of the issues that we tried to resolve in the MOU because it doesn't work well to bring this to try to serve load.

MR. SAMFORD: I guess you referred to --

THE WITNESS: (Interposing) A
block.
A. Pardon me, a block power supply or a standard energy produce to serve load, you know. But we torpedoed the MOU and said, "We're not going to do that," which carries us back to Amendment 3. And Amendment 3 is clear about serving load, not brining a power supply to be enveloped into the wholesale power agreement, all right? Because what Amendment 3 says is that you step out from under the wholesale power agreement and you go take that particular load to somebody else, all right? And it talks about how to calculate the load.

And even in Section 1.A, it says, "During any calendar year, the member may make or cancel such an election, giving 90 days' notice to the seller, with respect to any load or loads with an average peak coincident demand." And it says, "calculated in the same manner" -- and it's got a parenthetical that says, "calculated in the same manner," which means that you have to figure out what that load previous three-year peaks were to figure out -- so, it's clear that it's talking about load, not bringing this to be enveloped into
the power supply agreement.
Q. So, how does Amendment 3 get implemented?
A. Well --
Q. (Interposing) How does Grayson Rural

Electric purchase 9.3 megawatts of power within the framework of Amendment 3?
A. Well, you step out from under the wholesale power contract. And then you file for transmission service. And then you purchase 9.3 megawatts and serve that load. You act as a market participant for 9.3 megawatts.
Q. Like we talked about an hour ago?
A. Yeah. But if you try to serve your load with a block power supply --
Q. We have wasted --
A. (Interposing) Well, you will have -- you will have charges and penalties for bringing the wrong type of -- for having purchased too much. If you try to buy 9.3 megawatts of 7 by 24 to serve your 9.3 megawatts of load, you're going to have too much energy a lot of the time and there will be, you know, penalties associated with that.
Q. How does Jackson or Owen or Fleming-Mason or Bluegrass or Cumberland or any other entity
operate under Amendment 3 by going outside the wholesale power contract and purchasing up to 15 percent of their load and do so in a way that East Kentucky does not impose --
A. (Interposing) First of all, East Kentucky would not be imposing any penalties, because we don't manage --
Q. (Interposing) Costs, fees, stranded costs, the three million and some odd dollars that you talked about a while ago.
A. Okay. With regard to -- you know, I guess we can take -- the only person that you mentioned that actually has Amendment 3 power supply is Jackson.
Q. Jackson.
A. The rest of the people don't have any Amendment 3 power supplies. And Jackson has two currently -- one currently, wellhead. And they're bringing on a landfill gas plant. Those are behind the meter, all right? And this has always -- we're not trying to be obstructive to bring -and we haven't said no to Grayson, that you can't do what you're asking to do.
Q. I read where somebody said that you
haven't said no. It might have been you, I don't know. It might have been in that letter. But I beg to differ on that, but we'll let that one slide for now. But go ahead.
A. But we haven't said no. We've said, "Give us appropriate notice, and we'll move forward."

You know, when the Magnum deal was done, that was not held up by East Kentucky.
Q. Yeah, you weren't on the speaker phone conference call with Tony Campbell when he said no, that's right. You weren't there, that's right. He said no about four times. But go ahead.
A. But we have a number of -- and it's in the response to the interrogatories. We've listed all of the Amendment 3 notices and what they have been and where they're at. With regard to --
Q. Jackson.
A. (Continuing) -- Jackson, we had -- I had a high expectation that the MOU was going to move forward, because we -- at one time, we had an agreement amongst all the CEOs and we actually had a letter from Grayson asking us to move forward
with the MOU. And we my have jumped the gun -Q. (Interposing) Well, we don't have an MOU .
A. No, we don't have an MOU.
Q. And Grayson is not the only co-op that hasn't voted to accept it. So, you know, that -just tell me why it is that what Jackson does --
A. (Interposing) Well, Jackson is behind the meter, okay? And they, by virtue of the circuit that they're on, it identifies which load is being served to buy that particular generator, all right? And because it's behind the meter, it's not subject to those rules, all right? The problems of serving load -- you know, the complications of serving load from the transmission system are imposed by FEREC and PJM not so much East Kentucky, all right? The fact that Jackson has got a unit operating, the wellhead unit, it's displacing load on their circuit. And we worked with them on that. The complications of serving load the way that you're wanting to do it are imposed by entities other than East Kentucky.
Q. Well, I understood you a minute ago, when
you read the answers to interrogatories that I haven't been sent, is that there would be fees imposed --

MR. SAMFORD: Same objection.
That's an untrue statement.
Q. (Continuing) -- by East Kentucky Power.

Did I hear you wrong?
A. That there -- the interrogatory asked, "Are there increased costs?" Did you give that back to me?
Q. Yeah. I wasn't authorized to hang on to it.
A. I don't know that -- it was mine, and I would be happy to give it to you.
Q. Well, that would be swell. Whatever those costs and fees were, the difference in costs, would those be things that East Kentucky would be saying, "Okay, Grayson. You have to go do your deal but you've got to pay this"?
A. The question in the interrogatory was: "Are there additional costs?" Let me see here. It's Question 9.

MR. CRAWFORD: Question 9.
A. It says, "Please state what impact would
be to the financial picture."
And we stated that we would see increased -or we would have less revenues, okay? We didn't say that there would be stranded costs.
Q. Would East Kentucky be seeking to have Grayson Rural Electric, "Okay. You're past all the notice stuff, but, yeah, you can do that, but here's the lost revenue. So, you have to pay us this difference"?
A. I'd point you to -- you know, I think that's something that the board would have to resolve. But I'll point you to -- in Amendment 3, it says that -- in Section 1, the last paragraph of Section 1, where it says, "Members shall be solely responsible for all additional costs associated with the exercise of elections under the above paragraphs, including but not limited to administrative scheduling and transmission tariff, any penalties, charges and costs imposed by MISO or other authorities."

I can't speak entirely for East Kentucky because the board has to make a decision on that. I will point out that when we were looking at Amendment 5, we were talking about assessing
stranded costs to people that took load off the system. Under Amendment -- pardon me, under the MOU, behind the meter, was -- pardon me, to be treated without stranded costs, and if it was a transmission -- or a supply that was delivered across the transmission system, the transit cost was, I belive, to be applied.
Q. But under Amendment 3 that you just read, that paragraph that you just read, there would not be, would there, any additional cost associated with the exercise of elections including but not limited to administrative scheduling, transmission tariff and any penalties, charges and costs? There wouldn't be any of those, would there?
A. So, you're saying --
Q. (Interposing) Under the scenario that I gave you a minute ago.
A. The question of additional costs? I guess that would be something -- there are additional costs. I think in our response to 9 , we pointed out there would be a reduction in revenue.
Q. Revenue.
A. And as a result, there would be costs
that were not recovered under the rate design that we are currently under.
Q. Sure.
A. And no doubt that we will -- this is -okay. So, ultimately --
Q. (Interposing) However, let's -- the question --
A. (Interposing) However, when we go back and go to the next rate case and get beyond the regulatory lag, those costs will be picked up in the next rate case.
Q. Okay. Well, let's take that, then. Is it fair, accurate and complete to say that the only difference to East Kentucky Power, under what Grayson has proposed to do, would be a reduction in revenue? Is it also fair, accurate and complete to say that there would not be, under the proposal that Grayson has, these additional costs incurred by East Kentucky; that East Kentucky would, in fact, not incur these costs?
A. Not incur what costs?
Q. Administrative, scheduling, transmission, tariff and any penalties, charges and costs imposed by MISO or other authorities? None of
$\qquad$
that would be incurred by East Kentucky, would it?
A. No. You would incur those costs as a participant in PJM.
Q. And that would be between Grayson and Duke, correct?
A. It would be between Grayson and PJM. I mean, you're going to get a bill --
Q. (Interposing) Duke acting for Grayson with PJM?
A. If Duke is going to do it all for you, then it would be between you and Duke.
Q. Correct.
A. All right.
Q. So, East Kentucky is out nothing except lost revenue, correct?
A. Which implies a stranded cost.
Q. Okay. So, the only thing that East Kentucky will not get is the revenue that it otherwise would get by Grayson paying for the 9.3 megawatts? Is that accurate, fair and complete to say that?
A. East Kentucky will not -- I agree that damage to East Kentucky is the loss of revenue --
Q. Solely?
A. (No response.)
Q. Is it fair and accurate and complete to say the only loss to East Kentucky is the revenue that Grayson would pay for the 9.3 megawatts?
A. Right.
Q. Okay.
A. It's always been -- there's two issues here. One is, you know, whether it's five or 15 percent; and the other issue is the lost revenue that is picked up by the balance of the members.
Q. But let me ask you this: You don't know me. You've never met me, $I$ don't think. You don't know me.
A. No.
Q. And I'm not the sorry son-of-a-bitch that I have been portrayed to be. But let me just ask you this question, sir: Is that not the deal that East Kentucky Power made with the member systems when they signed Amendment 3, that, "Yes, if we're doing this, we could lose revenue," we, East Kentucky Power; that East Kentucky Power could lose revenue? "But we made a deal. We had lawyers and you all had lawyers and we made an amendment to a contract." And isn't that the deal
$\qquad$
that was made, that, "Yeah, we could lose revenue, but, you know, we're thinking this is a good deal for all our members, because, hey, after all, we are -- yesterday, we ended cooperative month, but we are a cooperative, and if we lose revenue for 9.3 megawatts for Grayson or lose revenue for the other 15 percent of these other distribution costs, then so be it." I mean, that's the deal we made?
A. First, I don't -- I disagree with the position you're taking, all right? Amendment 3 was agreed to by all the members, all right, and East Kentucky. There has never been any question about Amendment 3, all right? With regard to the revenue question, East Kentucky doesn't -- you know, at the point in time when the revenue requirement is not being met, we go to the Commission and file for a new revenue requirement. We file for a new rate.
Q. Which is another question, I think.
A. So, it's not a point of whether or not East Kentucky loses revenue. East Kentucky's revenue requirement, per the contract, you've already agreed that you're going to pay our
revenue requirement. You know, you own East Kentucky, all right? The members own East Kentucky. And when we went out and built power plants and created our company, electively, you know, your obligation to purchase from East Kentucky allowed the credit to be able to go borrow the money to build the power plants and transmission system.

So, when you go and take 9.3 megawatts off East Kentucky's system, it just reduces the -- as you point -- as we pointed out, the revenue that we collect. At some point in time, when the revenue -- if we've got enough --
Q. (Interposing) Could be to a point where, "Gollee, Grayson has done that and so-and-so has done this, and the revenue -- hey, we're not getting the revenue because of these co-ops doing what this agreement amendment says they can do. Well, we better go to the Commission and seek relief." Is that what you're saying?
A. Yeah. I mean at some point when the revenue requirement -- but when we don't get adequate collections to cover all our debts, we'll have to go to the commission.
Q. Now, at this point in time, East Kentucky doesn't believe that it needs to go to the Commission for revenue relief, correct? It did that a year or two ago, and right now they don't think they have to?
A. That's a question better asked of someone in --
Q. (Interposing) Well, to your knowledge -and you don't get to make those decisions, I know. But to your knowledge, you don't think they've --
A. (Interposing) That's a question better asked of someone the financial organization.
Q. We know -- and I don't know if you've seen the answers that your lawyers who represent other distribution co-ops, too, and the other distribution co-ops who aren't represented by your lawyers have given to the interrogatories, but every one of them, trust me, every one of them says -- I know you don't want to trust me, but for purposes of the question, just trust me.
A. I don't have to -- my job is just to answer your questions.
Q. I do know the truth if it hits me in the face -- or slaps me in the face. But if you
assume for purposes of this question that every distribution co-op that has answered this question, "Have you sought to purchase power from a source other than East Kentucky within the framework of Amendment 3," every distribution co-op has said, "No, we haven't."

Now, if you assume --
MR. CRAWFORD: (Interposing) Wait a minute. That's not correct. My set of interrogatories and we said we were exploring that possibility but could not do so --
Q. (Interposing) Well, let me modify it to say that every co-op has said that they at this point have not sought to purchase power from a source other than East Kentucky and Owen. And two or three others said, "We've talked about it and we've explored it and we've looked into it." But if you assume for purposes of the question that not one distribution co-op today has sought to purchase power under Amendment 3 other than Grayson, would that three million and some odd dollars, or whatever the total is, of your answer have any negative financial impact upon East Kentucky Power?
A. I guess, you know, I'd have to point you to the answers to the interrogatories. And in the answers to the interrogatory, we've listed all the people that have given notice. So, there are any number of co-ops -- first of all, Jackson --
Q. (Interposing) Do those answers say that the premise of my question is wrong? Because each of the distribution co-ops answered, I promise you, just like I said. So --
A. (Interposing) I haven't seen it, but there have been -- I mean, Farmers has gotten notice right now that they're planning to work to purchase from a landfill gas right now. So, I don't know how they would answer anything other than that they're planning to purchase from a landfill gas plant. We have other notices historically where people have purchased from other utilities.

You had a New Frank notice --
MR. CRAWFORD: (Interposing) We had a New Frank notice but it fell through.

THE WITNESS: Right. New Erank didn't perform. We counselled Mark that he should withdraw the notice, and he did.
A. So, I guess, at this point in time, I'm not sure what -- other than your notice and the notice from -- we have a notice from Jackson for a landfill gas plant that is coming on line. And we have -- let's see. Your notice, Farmers' notice and then Jackson, which is coming on line, there are at least three folks that are --
Q. (Interposing) What's Farmers giving you notice for?
A. The landfill gas plant.
Q. Which is how much?
A. One megawatt. And it's on their distribution system.
Q. So, when do they plan on doing that?
A. They plan to have it on by June of '15.
Q. Of what year?

MS. ERALEY: June of '15.
A. June of '15.
Q. Oh, I thought you said June 15th. So, June of --
A. (Interposing) June of 2015. I'm sorry. I was not -- I didn't give you a good accurate answer.
Q. So, will they be assessed any fees, costs
or any remuneration requests for loss of revenue?
A. You know, I can't answer that today.
Q. Why?
A. Well, because the board hasn't told me.
Q. What about Jackson --
A. (Interposing) To date, Jeff, nobody has been assessed a stranded cost for leaving.
Q. Let's cut through notice. Are we, then -- I'm not sure you answered my question. Wait a minute, I guess you did.
A. You can ask me, and I'll answer you again.
Q. Pardon me?
A. I said, you can ask me and I'll answer you again.
Q. Is it not, then, sir -- and you're a big, grown-up man, you've done this for a long time. Are we, then, not talking about simply a deal that was made that if it's going to hurt East Kentucky revenue-wise, then so be it? If it's going to help East Kentucky -- if it's going to help Grayson, then so be it? If it's going to help Jackson, so be it, or Owen and hurt East Kentucky revenue, so be it, so long as, so long as it
doesn't get to the point where that loss of revenue causes East Kentucky to seek rate relief? Isn't that -- you can boil it all down to a deal is a deal?
A. Well, first, East Kentucky hasn't said no, right? The issue has -- the issue has been and continues to be whether it's five or fifteen percent in allocation, all right? And the Amendment 3 --
Q. Well, it's fifteen, isn't it? It's your all's five and our fifteen, isn't it?
A. Well, I guess I would point you to -- and there's a fine point as far as I'm concerned that no member shall receive no more than fifteen percent.
Q. Right.
A. And as $I$ pointed out in my letter to Carol Ann Fraley, that we see that as a limit.
Q. Right.
A. That doesn't mean that it's guaranteed. And, you know --
Q. (Interposing) Yeah, why do you not think it's a guarantee? If it says that --
A. (Interposing) Why didn't it say that any
member may receive 15 percent, and the first pig to the trough eats first?
Q. Isn't that a reasonable inference to draw from that, that it is first come first serve?
A. No. I don't believe it's reasonable to draw that inference or not, because this document -- Amendment 3 was dated October 2003. And Board Policy 305 was dated March of 2004, which is almost concurrent with the signing of Amendment 3 . So, I wasn't there. I've only been at East Kentucky for three years. But it's persuasive to me that the same people that were responsible for drafting Amendment 3 were responsible for drafting Policy 305. And Policy 305 gives the details on how to allocate the benefits of Amendment 3 to the members.
Q. Do you think that the Board Policy can modify Amendment 3?
A. I do not. But I don't see that the Board Policy is out of alignment with Amendment 3. And so given that it's not out of alignment with Amendment 3, I don't see that it is in any negative way impacting the rights and benefits of Amendment 3.
Q. I've seen things in filings here from your lawyers in this case that include statements such as, you know, the claimed notice that Grayson Rural Electric has sent or its desire to enter into this deal with Duke based upon how they look at things here on behalf of East Kentucky that may not be fair to the members of Grayson Rural Electric or an equitable thing to the members of Grayson Rural Electric. Have you seen any documents with language such as that?
A. Do you have one with you?
Q. Yeah, it's in here. I can dig it out. If you do, or if you don't, fine --
A. (Interposing) I don't recall seeing anything about documents filed saying anything was unfair to Grayson Electric Rural's members. I haven't drafted anything related to that.
Q. Do you think that it's in any way the business of or some contractural obligation on or legal obligation on East Kentucky Power to decide for itself what's in the best interest of Grayson Rural Electric's members?
A. No. I mean, I think it's Grayson's board to decide what's in the best interest of Grayson's
members. And I'd like to see the document -- can you produce the document --
Q. (Interposing) Well, if it exists, it's there; if it's not, it's not. The point was I wanted to asked you what you thought.

MR. SAMFORD: Wait, wait, wait. Now, you're saying that a document exists that says something that you give a characterization, and now you're saying that it doesn't exist?

MR. SCOTT: Let's take a minute here, sir, and I'll find it, because $I$ don't want anybody saying that the truth slapped me in the face and I didn't know it, so --

THE WITNESS: I would like to see where we said that something that you're doing is not in the best interest of your members or however you characterized it.

MR. SCOTT: All right. Well, we'll
find it here.
Q. September 24 th objection that was filed kind of mirrors something that you said there a minute ago near the conclusion of that document, talking about the MOU and so on. "In contrast to the load designation and filing requirement of

Amendment 3, the MOU included a provision which East Kentucky effectively agreed to waive the requirement for all future Amendment 3 transactions; thereby opening the door for the type of block power purchases now contemplated by Grayson." Is that what you were referring to a while ago?
A. Uh-huh. But that's not the reference that you made.
Q. No, no, no.
A. That's the reference $I$ made?
Q. I'll find it. I'll find it. And here's what I'll do, before we leave here today, I will -- and we may go on with the rest of this deposition, but before we leave here today, I will either state on the record that it doesn't exist or, "Here it is and I'Il read it," okay?

Well, I'll keep looking here in a minute.
A. Well, you're going to do that before I leave, right? Since it was during my deposition, and I'm the one --
Q. (Interposing) Yeah. And I'm about through, and we can just wait and Jeff will go through it here. And I'll say, "Boy, I made a
statement that $I$ thought was referencing East Kentucky's lawyers saying that we need to look out for -- we, East Kentucky, need to look out for Grayson," or words to that effect and that Grayson -- and that East Kentucky has a need to make sure that it looks out for the best interest of Grayson and its member," or I will say, "Well, you know, that wasn't said. I thought it was, but it wasn't said." So, I'll tell you one way or the other, how's that?
A. That's good.
Q. Is that fair enough?
A. That's fair.
Q. All right. Go back to OATT a minute.
A. Open Access Transmission Tariff?
Q. Yeah. And that's nothing that would change under this, as far as any -- unless Grayson would have to pay that; is that correct?
A. If you -- I mean, I haven't seen your contract with Duke, or $I$ don't know what it looks like. But when you give Amendment 3 notice that you're going to deal with someone other -- serve your power, serve load with anything other than East Kentucky Power contract, which is a bundle
contract that supplies you capacity and energy, transmission service, balancing and all the bells and whistles associated with serving load, then you have to go and file for -- you or your agent has to go and file for transmission service for that 9.3 megawatts. And you have to follow the OATT, which is not an East Kentucky OATT now, it's a PJM OATT. So, you won't even be dealing with East Kentucky on that; you'll be dealing with PJM. You or your agent will be dealing with PJM. And you'll get the same treatment that East Kentucky gets when we deal with PJM.
Q. Is there any other acceptance by East Kentucky for off-system power at this point besides the Jackson? Is there Salt River? Is there a one -- is there a hydro --
A. (Interposing) It's Lock 7.
Q. Is there anything else?
A. No.
Q. Jackson and that --
A. Jackson doesn't -- all of Jackson's are behind the meter. Anything that --
Q. (Interposing) And Salt River's is a one megawatt --
A. (Interposing) Salt River's was -- Salt River gave notice for Lock 7 back in 2004. There was any number of -- there were a number of -- you know, that was done at the early beginning. And Salt River was not paying for transmission for a number of years on Lock 7. And one of my jobs has been to work with Salt River and put them -- and have them pay for transmission. And this year, just recently, Salt River is paying for transmission associated with Lock 7.

Now, when we integrated into $P J M$, we carved Lock 7 out and enveloped it within East Kentucky's load because it was historical and made exceptions for that, and PJM accepted that as part of our entry into PJM. But going forward, you know, things are -- I don't see things being enveloped within East Kentucky's load like the Salt River project is.
Q. Is there anything else that was done like that?
A. No. Done like?
Q. Like Salt River's one --
A. (Interposing) Thre's no other Amendment 3 generation that is being delivered across the
transmission system.
Q. So, they are paying or they are not?
A. They are paying.
Q. Okay.
A. They're paying East --
Q. (Interposing) What do they pay?
A. They pay us the cost of NITS service on the LG\&E and KU transmission system for that.
Q. Do you have documents evidencing that that you could obtain and send us and show what they actually pay?
A. I can show you what they pay, yes, sir.
Q. Would you do that? You might have to ask your lawyers if that's okay. But maybe at some point in the future, provide that?
A. We'll provide that. But, that, as I stated before, that was something that we have been working to resolve for the better part of two and three-quarter years. And it has been resolved. And it was -- you know, with regard to PJM, it was agreed to by PJM. And we don't anticipate doing that in the future.
Q. Sir, as fate would have it, which is probably why you insisted that I keep looking, I
$\qquad$
find in a letter of October 2, 2013, that has your name on it, to Carol Fraley that, in summary, without knowing the amount of power to be acquired from the non-EKPC resource, the date upon which this will happen or the load or loads to be served by the non-EKPC resource, it is impossible for EKPC to assure that Grayson's customers are reliably and adequately supplied with power. And that was the reference that $I$ was making a while ago.

So, is it your belief, then, that East Kentucky must be assure then that Grayson's members are supplied with reliable power; that it's not Grayson's responsibility, that it's East Kentucky's?
A. Well, before you leave the contract, you have to give notice as conforms to the Amendment 3. Once you've given notice that conforms to Amendment 3, it's your responsibility to assure that your customers are served. But it's my responsibility to assure that -- because $I$ have to adhere to Amendment 3 and. Board Policies, so that was my way of saying that $I$ have to assure that the Amendment 3 policy is being -- has been
followed or I have not fulfilled my responsibility to assure that you're adequately served.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Samford, the document does exist.

MR. SAMFORD: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: I don't know that I
agree --
MR. CRAWFORD: Jeff, can we have a copy of that, please?

MR. SCOTT: I'll talk to Carol Ann about that.

MR. SAMFORD: The letter was actually attached --

MR. SCOTT: (Interposing) Yeah, it was attached to their objection to the request for the amendment.

THE WITNESS: But I don't know that I agree that that was being parental on the part of East Kentucky to Grayson.

MR. SCOTT: Well, that's where you and I differ, I guess.

THE WITNESS: It may be, at least one of the points where you and I differ.

MR. SCOTT: I don't know. I think
we're agreeing on a lot of stuff.
Q. (By Mr. Scott) Let me ask you this:
"You haven't done the notice right, Grayson."
This is your letter. "You haven't done the notice right and, you know, here's why you haven't done the notice right."
A. And I offered to help you. I'll be happy to write the notice for you if you'd like.
Q. Well, gollee, that might be swell. That's my question. You know, I'm not agreeing on the load part of your analysis, and maybe it's because $I$ don't know enough about what you do or how you do it or what has to be accomplished to do your job as you do -- well, I know I don't. But looking at this contract and thinking how Grayson gets its power, I have a little bit of difference in your opinion on that. But --
A. (Interposing) Well, Jeff, once --
Q. (Interposing) Explain to me that again, though, because $I$ ain't getting it. You know, the load, the -- if it's 9.3 megawatts, Grayson uses -- what did you say, 50, or what --
A. (Interposing) Your load factor, which is a percentage of --
Q. (Interposing) Of your demand?
A. It's how much energy is supplied of that 9.3 megawatts.
Q. Yeah.
A. But we don't have to agree, okay? Because when we take that 9.3 megawatts out and you take the load to PJM, that's between you and Duke. That's not between you and --
Q. (Interposing) That's what I thought.
A. Yeah. So, I don't --
Q. (Interposing) That's what I thought. But I'm hearing you say something different.
A. No, no. I'm pointing out to you that when you try to take this type of power supply to serve something that looks like this, it doesn't work well. But that's up to you to deal with in the future, not with me. Because when you take that load out, you and Duke or you and whoever are going to serve that, all right? We're not going to bid it; we're not going to serve it. That's between you and your new power supplier about how you all serve that. But, you know, that's going to be yours.
Q. So, why do you care?
A. I don't. I mean, I care but that's -you know, that's up to you to handle going forward.
Q. Getting to the point at which I thought you and $I$ were in.--
A. (Interposing) Violent agreement?
Q. Wondrous agreement, and happily agreement.

Are we not talking, Grayson Rural Electric and East Kentucky, are we not talking about policy differences rather than implementation of Amendment 3 differences? Because you agree that Amendment 3 is there and is a contract that controls the purchase of outside power. You've told me that. You agree that if Grayson"makes a deal with somebody, it's their deal and they've got to live with it. That once -- you don't have those, as you termed, those parental duties. I didn't say that but you did. But those wouldn't even exist once the deal is done, so --
A. (Interposing) Where the problem -- you know, your question: Where is the problem?
Q. Where is the rub?
A. First of all, you know, if you give a
conforming notice --
Q. (Interposing) Which you're going to help us do.
A. (Continuing) -- then the problem gets to be how it's implemented, all right? And today, because we don't have the MOU, right? When we had the MOU, all right, it was agreed in the MOU that up to 2.5 percent, you had --
Q. (Interposing) You go that far?
A. You could go that far. And each member, first member --
Q. (Interposing) But at that point --
A. (Continuing) -- go to 15 percent would go. But now we're back to -- since that got cratered, we're back to Amendment 3 and Policy 305. So, what I have to do, as an employee of East Kentucky, is follow the policy --
Q. (Interposing) You still have to -you've got your margin order --
A. (Interposing) I've got the --
Q. (Continuing) -- you've got to do that?
A. Right. So, you've got to give me a notice that conforms, all right?
Q. With Policy 305 or --
A. (Interposing) The notice has to comply with --
Q. (Interposing) You're saying that it still doesn't comply with Amendment 3 ?
A. It's got to comply with Amendment 3. And once we get a notice that conforms to Amendment 3, then we -- because it's greater than five percent, we go into Policy 305.
Q. And you stand by your words that you put in this letter to Carol Ann that the June 2012 notice of five or less and the August 2012 notice of five or less and the January 13 notice of less than five and then -- that none of those are compliant with Amendment 3 because it didn't designate the load and didn't designate the date on which this was to occur?
A. Well, Jeff, how -- yes, I do.

First, let me answer your question. Yes. And then let me say, there's a lot of work that has to go on both for you and for us to bring effect to that --
Q. (Interposing) Well, can't you see that June of 2012 to November 1, all saints' day, 2013, that Grayson would think, "Gollee, there's been a
lot of time to get work done, and that East Kentucky ought to have said, 'Hey, Grayson. Okay. We've got this June something letter. Gee, what's going on there, folks? How can we help you do that'"? And that that was never done. Do you see that that might be their position?
A. No.
Q. You don't?
A. No. I'm sorry. You know, we didn't -we're not the party that has entered into the legal area here. We didn't drag this to the Commission and file lawsuits.
Q. Well, we filed a Commission Complaint concerning Amendment 3. That's the only thing that is involved with the Public Service Commission, you know. And I don't know what a lawsuit has got to do with Amendment 3, other than what your lawyers say.
A. Your point is well taken. But, you know, for us to bring effect to a notice, okay -- and the reason that we have notice is to give us adequate time to get the metering and other things set up and to adjust our power supply plans as we go forward, because --
Q. (Interposing) But -- I'm sorry. I interrupted you. That was bad on my part. Go ahead.
A. And the other thing is is $I$ have to comply with Amendment -- you know, I have to follow Amendment 3. And if you give me notice, then -- you know, and $I$ was going to put metering in place for the Magnum deal, then, okay, we go down that path. But $I$ don't know that the notice for the Duke, until you tell me what you're going to do with Duke, what the load is. I don't know where to go put the meter to be able to know that you're serving -- to be able to take that load out of my power supply to you. So, there's things that I've got to do to bring effect to what you want to do, all right?

And the other thing I've got to do is start adjusting the plans of East Kentucky as to whether or not we're going to serve your load.
Q. Well, I guess we thought that by telling you that in June, to the extent of June 2012, that 9.3 megawatts, that you could have come back and said, "Okay. Here's how you need to do that."

And I also understood you to say a minute ago
that, "You don't have to worry about metering on this 9.3" --

MR. CRAWFORD: Jeff, let me note an objection. You know, I outlined all of this last night again, because $I$ didn't want to go by memory. I'm looking at your June 22nd, 2012 notice, and it references the 10.7 megawatt load with Magnum. And then your second, August 9th, you talk about a 5 megawatt.

THE WITNESS: And then you talk about a 4.4 megawatt purchase.
Q. Yeah. And, you know, try to get 5 or under for a calendar year, under Amendment 3. That it was error, I think, to say, "We want to use 10 point whatever." First of all, the math was wrong. But we can't say we want to use 10.7 -- let's say 9.3 because 9.3 is the maximum. We can't say we want 9.3 for the calendar year of 2012, because we'd have to give you 18 months' notice. Whatever anybody's interpretation of Amendment 3, if it's over 5, you know you've got to give 18 months' notice. So, we could not have properly have said, "During the year 2012 , we want 9.3." That would be wrong. So, we had to break
it down 5 or less for 2012 and then 5 or less for 2013. And then in the aggregate, you've got your 15 percent, which is 9.3. That's why those were done that way.
A. But that -- and -- so --
Q. So, I don't think an 18 -month period runs until January or something at the earliest, you know.
A. But that was for a particular -- where you -- and the Magnum deal was partially behind the meter and partially going to be in front of the meter, because my recollection of the feeder that you're going to put it on, that it was going to attach to -- you didn't have enough load on that feeder, right?
Q. Uh-huh.
A. So, it was going to be a kind of hybrid type of deal. But $I$ don't know where -- is that the feeder that you're going to want to -- which feeders are you going to take off of East Kentucky with your Duke deal?
Q. Well, why does that matter, under the scenario that we went through a while ago, the way I understood it?
A. Well, because you're going to serve that load. That's going to be your load; not going to be East Kentucky's load anymore. So, you know, we're going to have to carve that out. And I need to know how much -- you know, you're going to need to know how much load you have on that feeder every day so that you can bid it in to PJM. You're going to need meters on it and we're going to need meters on it so that we know how much you're serving. I mean, you're going to have to know how much you're serving, because you're going to -- every day, you or your agent is going to do a load forecast for it, and you're going to bid it in to $P J M$, all right?

And there's an accounting process that says that it's going to go out and look at that substation and it's going to say, "This much was served by East Kentucky, and this much was served by Grayson."
Q. Isn't it just a financial transaction?
A. In what sense?
Q. I mean, it's just -- the way $I$ understood your explanation of how, you know, this gets bid in and then how you get your clearing and all
that, it seems to me like with all of these megawatts going through here, it's just a financial transaction. And it's 9.3 megawatts less.
A. But you're going to be paying Duke for your 9.3 megawatts, and you're going to be paying us for the balance, all right?
Q. Correct.
A. And what you're -- Jeff, you're taking your 9.3 and you're separating it out from the contract. You're not going to get a credit on your bill from East Kentucky for 9.3 megawatts. You're going to get a bill from Duke for 9.3 megawatts and you're going to get a bill from us for the balance. And for us to be able to segregate that, there's a lot of work that has to be done. We've got to know where you're going to -- what the load is for the 9.3 that you're going to serve from Duke.
Q. Why can't people sit down with you -you're the guy in charge of this -- assuming everything else being -- well, let me start all over.

Nobody, no distribution co-op, so far,
seemingly wants to admit that if they pay less for power that it is in the best interest of their members. But let's assume that it was. Let's assume that whatever money any distribution co-op pays for its wholesale power rate is less in the aggregate of what they pay East Kentucky Power, and that, therefore, that could be a reduced rate that their members have to pay.

And all these answers that people have given,
say, "Well, not necessarily. You have to take into account this. You have to take into account that. You have to take into account stranded costs," and all the nuanced answers. But if you get to just the premise that grown people ought to be able to agree upon, that if you pay less for something, that it's a good deal. Can you and I agree on that?

MR. CRAWFORD: Now, let me note an objection. Jeff, you're an interesting fellow. You threw in there, you drug the rest of the co-ops in, including Owen. And since I just answered their interrogatories, I know how they answered that. They answered it that, "We, like Grayson, are endeavored to figure out exactly what
it would cost us to purchase off-line. And we can't do that until the interpretation of Amendment 3 is either done by PSC or we agree in the MOU that we all worked on. Then we can run the numbers, utilizing the proper expertise to ensure that it's in the best interest of our consumers." That's the way I answered the interrogatory. And two managers of the two co-ops I represent said that that was the honest truth. There was no other way to answer at this point.

So, I don't know about these nuances that you're talking about, but we want the same thing apparently that Grayson wants, which is to understand how to do this. But there's an interpretation problem with Amendment 3. MR. SCOTT: Well, let me finish. It's still nuanced. And it's the -- it's not answering the question.
Q. But my question for you is: If we're talking about this little package of Sweet Tarts that we're going to go to a convenient store and buy, and we love Sweet Tarts, and we can go pay a nickle at Junior Food Mart or pay a dime down at Speedway next door, we would probably rather go to

Junior Food Mart and pay the nickle.
Now, if we can pay for power less, considering the costs, all those things, we're leaping forward, we're leaping forward to notices being met and tariffs and everything, assuming there is a way to pay less for power, why is that not a good thing? Wouldn't you agree with me that that's a good thing?
A. To answer the question about Sweet Tarts. If there's a dime difference -- if there's a nickle difference between here and there, this is a very simple -- but even that has complications, because the difference would be, "Where are you?" Because with the price of gas today, it may be -if you're at the Speedway, it's cheaper to buy it at Speedway than it is to drive down there and pick it up. So, even with your example, there's complications, okay? So, it's not a simple answer. And $I$ think that's what you're saying is is you've got to know all the details to come up with the answer.
Q. All right. Well, I'm asking you to -MR. SAMFORD: (Interposing) Let the record reflect he just motioned down to Mr.

Crawford.
THE WITNESS: Mr. Crawford.
Q. Well, what I'm asking you to do is --
A. (Interposing) You're asking me to --
Q. (Continuing) -- to know all the details. And once you know all the details --
A. Well, I'm sorry. You're asking me right now to make an ascertation about what is good for Grayson. And just a moment ago, you were very emphatic that $I$ didn't have any play in deciding what's good for Grayson.
Q. No, I'm not asking you to tell me what you think is good for Grayson. I'm just trying to get to a point where if you and I can agree, you for the position that you hold with East Kentucky, can agree, considering this unique thing where Grayson is an owner of East Kentucky --
A. (Interposing) They are.
Q. (Continuing) -- that if what Grayson and the other distribution co-ops pay for power can be reduced, once all the details are known --
A. All right.
Q. (Continuing) -- once all the implementation of the scenarios are done and
known, isn't it not a good thing for Mrs. Jones, sitting in her mobile home, to pay less for power every month? Can't we agree on that?
A. Jeff, I think that we can agree that what needs to happen is through collaboration between Grayson and all the other members is trying to get Mrs. Jones the least cost power supply, all right? But as we pointed out, you know, the underlying issue here has always been fairness and cost shifting amongst members.
Q. There you go again, trying --
A. I'm not trying to do anything. East Kentucky -- here's the point, and we've said this a number of times.
Q. So somebody doesn't jump in there and get more than they should? Is that why you say that?
A. The fairness issues is -- and the fairness issue was addressed in Policy 305. There has been a knowledge fairness issue from the beginning about how do you allocate a constrained resource amongst the members, okay?

Now, the other thing that needs to be considered is that when you -- when we're in an era where a load is increasing all the time,
losing load to an external power supply doesn't increase cost.
Q. Thank you.
A. When your load is going like this, (indicting).

Currently load is flat. So, when you go out, when anyone goes out and brings additional power supply to a power supply that has already got enough to serve, you're creating costs, unrecovered costs that increases the cost to everyone. And that's -- and, you know, the question being is -- the question should be -well --
Q. Tell me how I've said it wrong. Go ahead. You know, tell me what --
A. (Interposing) No, no, no. I'm not saying --
Q. (Interposing) Tell me why you think the question was not correct, or the analogy that $I$ was trying to make.
A. Yeah. If you're trying to buy -- you know, if your rate, through purchasing additional power supply, increases the aggregate cost to everyone, you haven't helped the lady at the end
of the line.
Q. But the way I understood you is that it hasn't and won't unless you keep on going to a point where your then revenues are not sufficient to meet what the wholesale power contract says it can meet, correct?
A. You mean -- your point is -- I'm sorry. I'm trying to understand what your point is. I think the point you're saying is that you, in isolation, are not driving that.
Q. Right.
A. But if many people do that --
Q. (Interposing) You're saying it could?
A. (Continuing) -- it will.

All right. I'm saying that -- I'm saying that every one of them contributes. And then you reach a tipping point where you have to do something.
Q. But we're not there, even with 9.3 megawatts, we're not there, right?
A. I'm not the person that does that kind of calculation.
Q. Well, what's your opinion? I mean, you're an educated man. What is your educational
background?
A. I'm a civil engineer.
Q. Okay.
A. I've worked in this industry for over 30 years.
Q. Well, then, you can answer that question to know whether or not we would be there at 9.3 megawatts.
A. Let me answer that with one of my -- with what one of my mentors has told me about deals. You know, I brought a deal to one of my mentors a while back when $I$ was a much younger man. And I told him, I said, "Kyle, you know, I know this isn't quite covering our costs but it's only 9.3 megawatts."

And he said, "David, if one is good is five better?"

And the answer is no. So, you know, if one is good -- one is not good; five is not good.
Q. Because it would be --
A. Because --
Q. (Continuing) -- an increased amount of revenue lost to East Kentucky Power?
A. Yeah, I mean, you're increasing -- at
some point, you set precedences, you attorneys would say, or you set things up, and, you know, you do things that are not productive. You do enough things that are not productive, you end up with things that don't turn out well.
Q. What I'm hearing you say, the inference that I'm drawing from what you're saying by that statement is that the purchase of outside power, under Amendment 3, just should not be done.
A. Well, Jeff, today we do that for all the members.
Q. Yep, you do, don't you? To the extent of several megawatts a day, right?
A. Probably multiple --
Q. Hundreds?
A. Hundreds of megawatts --
Q. (Interposing) 300 or whatever the number is per day.
A. It varies every day. But some days, it's -- some days, it may be 1,000 .
Q. And this would just be 9.3 less, right?
A. But the difference is is that when we purchase it for the aggregate, everybody benefits equally. When you do it as an individual, or as
an individual co-op, the rest of them don't benefit from it.
Q. And you think that's East Kentucky's province to make sure that that doesn't happen?
A. No. I'm saying that's a fact. Amendment 3 --
Q. (Interposing) Is that good or bad?
A. I don't -- it's not my job to -- my job, Jeff, is to implement Amendment 3.
Q. And I get you, and you've said that two or three times. But have you been given those marching orders from your superiors to make sure that when you do analyze that, you make sure that the slant that you've put on it is to make sure that you continue to say that it's not in the best interest of everyone? If Grayson gets to do it, it might be good for Grayson, but it's not in the best interest of everyone; so, therefore, East Kentucky, as the parent, East Kentucky, as the entity that should look out for the best interest of the members should not allow it to happen?
A. East Kentucky --
Q. (Interposing) Have you been given that kind of marching order?
A. No.
Q. By words or by substance?
A. First of all, I don't need to be given marching orders to do my job. I read the Amendment 3, and we implement. And I'm not saying I'm the only one that does it, but I've read it. I understand -- I believe I understand it. As an employee of East Kentucky, I have to implement the Board Policy 305. You know, the Board directs me on what to do. I've got Amendment 3 and they have Board Policy 305.
Q. Somebody directed you to write this letter, didn't they?
A. I believe I wrote that letter to give you insight into what it would require --
Q. (Interposing) Well, you start off by referring to --
A. (Interposing) I think our response to one of your letters, a letter from Carol Ann there.
Q. "Please accept this in response to your letter dated September 26 , purporting to give notice on behalf of Grayson Rural Electric."

That September 26 th letter was not addressed
to you, was it?
A. No. That September 26 th letter, I believe, was addressed to Tony Campbell.
Q. Right. So, therefore, Mr. Campbell had to give you direction to respond to it, correct?
A. No. Mr. Campbell sent me the letter.
Q. Without comment?
A. Said probably -- I don't recall any comments on the letter. I just got the letter. I knew that it was my responsibility, within my purview, to answer the letter.
Q. And so you put this letter together?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Without comment from Tony Campbell?
A. Mr. Campbell is aware of what's in that letter.
Q. Did he assist you in its preparation?
A. Not to my recollection.

MR. SAMFORD: I'm going to object, too, because, obviously, this is all tied into the litigation. And so the company's methods and correspondence is tied to the litigation, and it's close to privilege could be work product --

MR. SCOTT: Well, it wasn't from a
lawyer or to a lawyer. I mean, this was from President Carol Ann Fraley to President Tony Campbell. And then you sent a letter back to Carol Fraley, October 2, 2013. You know, this document later got attached to a pleading filed in this case. But it certainly wasn't done as a part of this case.
Q. My question is: Did Mr. Campbell assist you in the preparation of this letter?
A. I mean, $I$ forwarded that letter, in draft form, to Tony Campbell for his comments.
Q. And did you forward it to anybody else for their comments?
A. I forwarded it -- I don't recall -- Mr. Samford was also forwarded the letter for comment. But those are my thoughts.
Q. Do you see anything that's bad policy, anything that is in any way deemed by you to be inappropriate for Grayson Rural Electric to try to purchase power at a cost that is less than what it pays to the extent of 15 percent of its load in an effort to benefit its members?
A. Grayson is allowed, under Amendment 3, to go purchase power from entities other than East

Kentucky. And, you know, whether that's good or bad, whether the price is something that is good for Grayson's members is for Grayson's board and the Public Service Commission to determine.
Q. So, would there be any reason for East Kentucky Power to even be involved in that process?

MR. SAMFORD: Other than the fact you see us.
A. Yes. Because you have to give us -- you have to conform to Amendment 3 and give us notice, and then we have to put the technical things in place to be able to do the accounting to segregate the load that you're serving with a third-party supply and the load that we're serving under the wholesale power contract. Aside from that, I don't need to be involved at all.
Q. Assuming there was a notice given to whoever East Kentucky said the appropriate person was to receive notice today, all saints day, that Grayson was going to, under Amendment 3, purchase 9.3 megawatts of power from Duke Energy, and this number of megawatts would just be place on its system for distribution as it deemed fit, and the
notice would contain whatever other requirements you said it should have, and that you sat down with Carol Fraley and assisted her in the preparation of the notice, and the notice said everything that East Kentucky thought it ought to say, would it be 18 months from today before could actually occur?
A. Jeff, you know, as -- I can't change Amendment 3.
Q. Well, so, is the answer yes or no?
A. You know I have to administer Amendment 3 per what it says in Amendment 3. Amendment 3 says that if it's greater than 5 megawatts, it's 18 months.
Q. That would be yes, now, wouldn't it?
A. I'm just quoting you -- as I said, I don't have the authority to change Amendment 3. So, yes, as far as I'm concerned, I would -- as far as the way $I$ would pursue it, I would look at Amendment 3, and it would be greater than 5 megawatts --
Q. (Interposing) And that question was kind of asked of you by Carol Ann on the phone or something a few months --
A. (Interposing) It was, correct.
Q. And that was your answer? "You know, all I can do is tell you what Amendment 3 says. And as far as I'm concerned, Amendment 3 is 18 months," right?
A. That's right.
Q. You told her that?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. So, 18 months from now would be the date upon which this 9.3 megawatts could first be purchased, according to you and --
A. (Interposing) Well, it's really according to Amendment 3.
Q. (Continuing) -- and in behalf of what East Kentucky says Amendment 3 says. So, is it possible -- let's assume that the cost to Grayson for that 9.3 megawatts, 18 months from today, would be the same as Grayson thinks it would be today, and that the overall costs would be less than what it would otherwise have to pay East Kentucky Power, could East Kentucky Power do the things that you're sayingreast Kentucky Power would have to do to make sure that that happens 18 months from today?
A. If you give a conforming notice today, all right, we would take the notice, because it's greater than five percent, all right, because we don't have the MOU in place, which would have allowed you to do what you're asking for, all right, and then we would take it to the board, and they would go through Board Policy 305, because that's what is currently in effect. And they would decide whether or not to allocate in excess of five percent to Grayson, okay? If that went into effect, yeah, $I$ can -- we can do all the technical stuff. But it has to go through -because we don't have the MOU, it has to go through Board and Policy 305.
Q. So, in theory, irrespective of the language of Amendment 3, East Kentucky could, by board action, you believe, block that occurrence from happening 18 months from today, by concluding that under Board Policy, exceeding 5 megawatts; and, therefore, it might interfere with Jackson or Owen wanting to do something that -- or any other distribution co-op; "And, therefore, we decline to" --
A. (Interposing) That would be speculation
Q. (Interposing) In theory.
A. It would be speculation on my part what the board would do, okay?
Q. Well, it would be speculation on anybody's part. But, in theory, it could happen, wouldn't you agree?
A. Jeff, you know, of course, it could happen.
Q. Sure.
A. Of course, in theory, it could happen that they could approve it. So, what we're talking about is speculation. So, me opining on it one way or the other doesn't really move the ball.
Q. And you understand, do you not, that Grayson Rural Electric and maybe even some of these other distribution co-ops don't think that under Amendment 3 that board approval is even allowed or necessary or something that accepting or rejecting is what the board could do? Do you understand that?
A. I understand that. But Board Policy 305 is there. It's approved, I guess, until -- and,
you know, I'd have to ask counsel, but until somebody is -- I guess you would have to go through and somebody would have to be rejected, and then they would have to cause a lawsuit to be effected to decide whether or not that has standing or not. And $I$ guess before you can have a lawsuit -- or my understanding, before you can have a lawsuit, you've got to be aggrieved, so --
Q. And could it be 18 months before anybody would know if they were aggrieved?
A. No. I guess you would know if you were aggrieved at the point in time that you went through the 305 -- ran the 305 traps and got denied. It seems to me $I$ would know if $I$ were aggrieved --
Q. (Interposing) I don't remember what the time limit on that policy -- but --
A. But you're asking me to give you information that's outside my area of expertise as far a legal and as far as $I$ can tell you. I've got Policy 305 here with me today.
Q. I've got it here.
A. But, you know, I --

MR. SCOTT: I might be through,

Mr. Crews. Let me ask Carol Ann a question. Let's take a couple of minutes. I might be through.
(A short recess was taken.)
Q. (By Mr. Scott) Is not the only thing that East Kentucky would lose by not selling 9.3 megawatts to Grayson just its margins on what it would have received from the sale of 9.3 megawatts?
A. No. Because we have a debt -- we have debt to cover. So, it's not just margins. The revenue -- my opinion, and it's probably a better question to be asked of our financial folks. But the margins and the debt coverage would be the things that $I$ see, as an engineer as opposed to a financial person. But $I$ don't think it's just the margins.

MR. SCOTT: Well, except what I might have to ask you after I review the answers to interrogatories, I have no further questions. And I reserve the right to do that, because I haven't received the interrogatories.

MR. CRAWFORD: No questions.
MR. OSWALD: No questions.

## EXAMINATION

BY MR. SAMFORD:
Q. I just have one question, $I$ think, just to clarify. Earlier we were talking about the process for adopting the MOU. And you made the statement that we torpedoed the MOU. Could you clarify what you mean by that?
A. Well, when we were working on the MOU, the process that we went through was -- the first thing that we did was work really hard to get an agreement amongst our CEOs. And the CEOs were a part of pulling the MOU together. And we made a lot of progress on many of the issues related to what we've discussed today. And we drafted the document, and we got concurrence from all of the CEOs on the MOU. And it was going through Board approval at all of the member boards. And that was progressing well up until the time that we got a letter back from Carol Ann that you had withdrawn your support; that your board chose not to ratify the MOU.

At that point in time, there were other boards that chose either not to act on it, mostly not to act on it at that point in time.

So, as far as East Kentucky, East Kentucky did not withdraw its support for the MOU.
Q. And as you sit here today, has East Kentucky's board approved the MOU conditionally?
A. Yes.
Q. What's that condition?
A. That all members have to approve it. And, you know, as a -- I don't understand the type of thing the -- the MOU resolves some of the things -- the whole reason we went and worked -East Kentucky and the member CEOs worked was to take a lot of the complications around serving load and fix that and make it so that we could administer and resolve the five and fifteen percent and have something that we could work through and get agreement on how to implement.

And I'm, I guess just as a statement, not as a question, I'm perplexed that Grayson withdrew your support of the MOU, because the MOU would pave the way as opposed to be an obstruction to do what you want to do. So, that is a statement. So, I'm just perplexed.

MR. SAMFORD: I have no further
questions.

## RE-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SCOTT:
Q. Do you know why East Kentucky Power did not take before its board the adoption or rejection of the MOU before it did? I think it was September 10 th or so that it did that. Do you know why it didn't do that earlier?
A. If you're asking why September 10th?
Q. Why not earlier than that?
A. East Kentucky -- until all the member boards have approved it, it could not go into effect. And the original -- and it was communicated to all the CEOs that the process would be for all the member boards to approve, and then we would take it to the East Kentucky Board to approve.

The East Kentucky Board decided to approve the MOU to show that it supported the MOU.
Q. Why did it do that if it -- if it had said that it was not going to do it until all of the distribution co-op boards had approved it, then why did it go ahead and do it before all the distribution co-ops had approved it?
A. I think to make it clear that it was not
being obstructive to the MOU.
Q. And you realize that there are other distribution co-ops that have not approved the MOU besides Grayson?
A. I do recognize. I think I stated that there were other --
Q. Yeah.
A. I believe I stated that. In fact, I know I stated that.
Q. And there are other distribution co-ops who have not intervened in this proceeding? You know that, too, don't you?
A. I know that there are co-ops, other member co-ops, that did not intervene.
Q. Does that tell you anything?
A. It tells me that they didn't want to have the legal fees associated with intervening in this proceeding.
Q. Well, East Kentucky pays a bunch of the legal fees. I mean, do you know why they didn't --

MR. CRAWFORD: (Interposing) Let
me object. East Kentucky is not paying Owen Electric or Fleming-Mason's, and I so answered --
$\qquad$

MR. SCOTT: (Interposing) And I didn't say they did. I said a bunch. And you know which ones they're paying.

MR. CRAWFORD: Well, once again --
MR. SCOTT: (Interposing) So, don't act like you don't know.

MR. CRAWFORD: Wait a minute. Now, I'm going to tell you right now, I'm not going to take the lip out of you that I've been hearing here today. When I speak, then you let me speak like a professional, and then you can pick up.

MR. SCOTT: Well, don't act like you don't know that East Kentucky is paying the legal fees --

MR. CRAWFORD: (Interposing) East Kentucky may be paying legal fees pertaining to one or more of these, $I$ don't know. I can't speak for anybody else. But I'm here for two co-ops. And they're not paying our legal fees.

MR. SCOTT: I didn't suggest that they were --

MR. CRAWFORD: (Interposing) Well, I believe you did.

> MR. SCOTT: No, I didn't. I said a
bunch of the legal fees. You know what $I$ said. MR. SAMFORD: Let me just also say again, you do not know what you're talking about. MR. SCOTT: Well, I don't know the truth if it slaps me in the face.
Q. (By Mr. Scott) So, you think that's the only reason that the other distribution co-ops did not get in this proceeding is they didn't want to incur the legal fees?
A. That's what I think.
Q. okay.
A. You asked me to have an opinion, and that's my opinion.

MR. SAMFORD: Are you done, Jeff?
Q. I guess my question was --
A. (Interposing) You didn't ask me what East Kentucky thinks; you asked me what David Crews thinks. And what $I$ answered is what David Crews --
Q. "What do you take from that," I think, was my question. And you said, "I guess they didn't want to incur the legal fees."
A. Right.

MR. SCOTT: Okay. Fair enough. I
just want an answer.
THE WITNESS: Question asked;
question answered.
MR. SCOTT: Okay. I don't have any
further questions.
RE-EXAMINATION
BY MR. SAMFORD:
Q. Let me just ask one. What is the score card right now? How many co-ops have approved the MOU and how many have not?
A. The question was -- to my recollection, there are 14 co-ops that have approved the MOU, and two that have not; Grayson being one of them. That's my recollection.

MR. SAMFORD: Done? We're done.
(The deposition of David Crews was

```
concluded at 12:50 p.m.)
```

$\qquad$
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