



MAR 9 7 2005

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

F - 8 2955

March 7, 2005

HAND DELIVERED

Ms. Elizabeth O'Donnell Executive Director Public Service Commission 211 Sower Boulevard Frankfort, KY 40602

Re: PSC Case No. 2004-00423

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

Please find enclosed for filing with the Commission in the above-referenced case, an original and ten copies of the Petition for Confidential Treatment of Information regarding the responses of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc., ("EKPC") to the information requests contained in the Commission Staff's Third Data Request in this case dated February 25, 2005. Included with said Petition is a confidential set of all pages in the responses which contain confidential information, along with 10 redacted copies of such responses.

Very truly yours,

Charles A. Lile

Senior Corporate Counsel

had a. Lih

Enclosures

Cc: Service List.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE APPLICATION OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER)
COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF)
PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY, AND A)
SITE COMPATIBILITY CERTIFICATE, FOR THE) CASE NO. 2004-
CONSTRUCTION OF A 278 MW (NOMINAL)) 00423
CIRCULATING FLUIDIZED BED COAL FIRED UNIT)
IN MASON COUNTY, KENTUCKY)

PETITION FOR CONFIDENTIAL TREATMENT OF INFORMATION

Comes now the Petitioner, East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. ("EKPC") and, pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001 Section 7 and KRS §61.870, requests confidential treatment of the designated information in the responses and attached spreadsheets, schedules and support information, which are hereby filed as directed by the Third Staff Data Request of the Kentucky Public Service Commission (the "Commission") in this case dated February 25, 2005. As grounds for this petition, EKPC states as follows:

1. 807 KAR 5:001 Section 7 authorizes confidential treatment of information submitted to the Commission based on grounds provided in KRS §61.870 et seq. EKPC asserts that the information identified in the abovementioned responses, spreadsheets, schedules and support information filed in this case are records generally recognized as proprietary and confidential which, if made public, would permit an unfair commercial advantage to competitors of EKPC, as more fully explained hereinbelow. As such, this information should be granted confidential treatment pursuant to 801 KAR 5:001 Section 7 and KRS §61.878 (1)(c)(1).

- 2. The designated information consists of detailed calculations and other information concerning the evaluation of the most competitive proposals received in response to EKPC's Request for Proposals ("RFP") 2004-01. Disclosure of this information could provide useful pricing information to other utilities, power marketers and other entities which compete with EKPC in the bulk power market, which could put EKPC at an unfair disadvantage in efforts to market surplus power. Furthermore, the disclosure of details of the most competitive proposals to utilities, power marketers and project developers which would be potential bidders in future EKPC RFPs could lead to manipulation of those future proposals, resulting in higher costs for future capacity and related competitive disadvantages for EKPC. The Commission, on February 18, 2005 granted confidentiality protection to the RFP proposals and associated information which were filed in this case on February 14, 2005 and should grant the same protection to this evaluation information.
- 3. EKPC has protected the confidentiality of the subject evaluation information, which contains information known only by RFP bidder EnviroPower L.L.C., EKPC and its consultant, EnerVision, Inc., and has restricted access to this information to only EnerVision representatives and EKPC employees with a need to use it for the purposes of this case. One unredacted copy of the confidential pages of the subject responses, along with 10 redacted copies of the responses, are included with the filing of this Petition, pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001 Section 7.
- 4. The subject information is entitled to confidential treatment pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001 Section 7 and KRS §61.878(1)(c)(1) as information generally recognized as confidential and proprietary which would permit an unfair commercial advantage to competitors of EKPC in the surplus power market if disclosed, as discussed hereinabove. The information is also entitled to confidential treatment

pursuant to KRS §61.878(1)(c)2(c) as confidential information maintained in conjunction with the regulation of a commercial enterprise and disclosed to an agency on a confidential basis.

WHEREFORE, EKPC respectfully requests the Commission to grant confidential treatment to the subject information and deny public disclosure of said information.

Respectfully submitted,

DALE W. HENLEY .

CHARLES A. LILE

P.O. BOX 707

WINCHESTER, KY 40392-0707

(859) 744-4812

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that an original and ten copies of this Petition for Confidential

Treatment of Information in the above-styled case were delivered to the Elizabeth O'Donnell, Executive

Director, Public Service Commission, 211 Sower Boulevard, Frankfort, Kentucky 40602, and copies

were mailed to parties on the service list in this case, this 7th day of March, 2005.

CHARLES A. LILE

Man a. Lik

(423Spur4-DR3-confidtreat)

EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. PSC CASE NO. 2004-00423 INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSE

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DATA REQUEST DATED
FEBRUARY 25, 2005
REQUEST NO. 1 (a)
RESPONDING PERSON: Lynne Travis

Request 1 (a):

Refer to pages 5-7 of the Prepared Direct Testimony of Lynne S. Travis regarding the evaluation of either a self-build proposal or a purchase power option.

a. Provide the calculations, along with any explanation that is needed, which shows, starting with the cost of East Kentucky Power's self-build Spurlock 4 proposal, all the steps taken to derive the average cost per MWh for that proposal as shown on page 3 of 4 of the response to Item 1 of the Commission Staff's December 23 2004 supplemental data request.

Response 1 (a):

The evaluation of the EKPC Spurlock 4 proposal was based on information provided in the bid that EKPC submitted in response to the RFP. EKPC provided EnerVision with a copy of the EKPC Self Build Proposal - Bid #15 at the same time they provided the other proposals. These proposals were submitted in this case in response to the Commission staff data requests dated February 3, 2005. Before the economic analysis began, EKPC and EnerVision discussed assumptions that should be used in the analysis. The following modeling assumptions were agreed upon during initial conference calls between EKPC and EnerVision and did not change over the course of the evaluation:

- Interest Rate: 80%
- Financing Term (build units): 32 years
- Depreciation Methodology: straight line
- Depreciation Period (build units): 32 years
- Escalation Rate: 3% (unless otherwise specified in the proposal)
- Discount Rates: two scenarios of 3% and 6% (The 3% discount rate was used to simulate inflation while a 6% discount rate represents EKPC cost of funds.)
- Capacity Factor: 80%

Specific costs included in the analysis were provided as a part of the EKPC Spurlock 4 Proposal, as supporting documentation, and as updates to the original pricing. EnerVision reviewed the pricing details and included the following quoted costs into the analysis:

- Installed Costs: \$ 1000 in 2008\$ EKPC provided this cost estimate on 9/3/04 via phone conversation. The original quote in the proposal was for \$ 1000 increased steel prices.
- Fixed O&M: \$ KW/Yr in 2004\$ escalated at 3%
- Substation and Transmission: \$ in 2004\$ provided through supporting documentation from EKPC
- Transmission O&M: 5% of the Substation and Transmission investment
- Variable O&M: \$ MWh in 2004\$ escalated at 3%
- Fuel Price: Provided in the EKPC Spurlock 4 proposal and subsequent data requests.
- Heat Rate: 10.4205 MMBTU/MWh—This is an average of the low load heat rate of 11.291 MMBTU/MWh and the full load heat rate of 9.550 MMBTU/MWh

A spreadsheet was developed to evaluate the EKPC Spurlock 4 proposal and is included as Attachment Q1a.1. The supporting calculations for each line item of this spreadsheet are included as Attachment Q1a.2. The spreadsheet analysis included modeling both the total capacity costs (fixed costs) and total energy costs (variable costs) associated with the Spurlock 4 proposal.

The capacity costs included: the financing of the capital costs – interest costs and depreciation, fixed operations and maintenance costs (O&M), and substation and transmission costs as outlined in the assumptions above. The energy costs included: variable operations and maintenance costs (O&M) and fuel costs. The fuel costs were provided as a part of the EKPC Spurlock 4 proposal and are included in the response to Request 5 of the Commission's data requests in this case dated December 7, 2004.

PSC Request No. 1 (a) Page 3 of 16

The individual costs components for the Spurlock 4 proposal were totaled on an annual basis and each year of costs were present valued to 2004\$. The present value cost for each of the 32 years of the study period was summed to obtain the total cost of each proposal in 2004\$. This total cost was then divided by the total energy (MWh) produced over the 32 years to obtain the average \$/MWh cost for the proposal.

EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. PSC CASE NO. 2004-00423 INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSE

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DATA REQUEST DATED
FEBRUARY 25, 2005
REQUEST NO. 1 (a)
RESPONDING PERSON: David Eames

Supplemental Response 1 (a):

Ms. Travis of EnerVison has responded to Requests 1 (a) and 1 (b) by providing the requested calculations used to determine the average cost per MWh for the Spurlock 4 and EnviroPower proposals. Ms. Travis has also provided an explanation of that process, which addresses topics raised in Mr. Stephen Soble's letter to the Commission on behalf of EnviroPower dated February 24, 2005. Since many of the topics raised by Mr. Soble were not elements of EnerVison's evaluation of the projects, EKPC wishes to provide additional information in response to some of EnviroPower's concerns.

EnviroPower has questioned the source of capital cost estimates that were used for the Spurlock 4 project. The cost estimates for the Spurlock 4 project were developed for EKPC by Stanley Consultants, which was the consulting engineer on the nearly identical Gilbert Unit at Spurlock Station. EKPC provided testimony in Exhibit 11 (pages 2 & 3) of its Certificate Application dated October 28, 2004 concerning Stanley's work and the status of major contracts for Spurlock 4. As Ms. Travis references, the Spurlock 4 cost estimate increased during the evaluation period, largely due to recent increases in steel prices. EKPC believes that such increases in materials costs will impact any project cost estimates which have not been recently updated. Even though EnviroPower has reaffirmed its bid pricing to EKPC, it is not clear to EKPC whether EnviroPower has reaffirmed their project costs with contractors or how firm their project costs are. In addition, at a September 9, 2004 meeting with EKPC, EnviroPower indicated, in response to a question about performance guarantees, that it would provide a performance guarantee, but that it would cost EKPC to get it. EnviroPower indicated that it would

PSC Request No. 1 (a) Page 5 of 16

also ask EKPC to provide a performance guarantee. No costs were added to EnviroPower's proposal in the evaluation process for the costs of providing performance guarantees.

EnviroPower has requested information about fuel cost estimates used in the evaluation of the Spurlock 4 proposal. The fuel cost for Spurlock 4 used in the analysis is based on a fuel study entitled "Updated Fuel, Emission Allowance and Lime/Limestone Projections 2004-2025", dated May 2004. The study was performed by Energy Ventures Analysis, Inc. of Arlington, VA. A discussion of the fuel cost projections was provided to the Commission as Exhibit 12 to EKPC's Certificate Application dated October 28, 2004. The delivered fuel costs for CFB units at Spurlock Station were provided to the Commission on December 15, 2004 (Request 5) in response to its December 7, 2004 data request.

EKPC did not direct EnerVision to add a cost for permit risk to any proposals, including any risk associated with EKPC's ability to obtain an air permit, or EnviroPower's ability to maintain their air permit. Subsequent to the selection of the Spurlock 4 project, EKPC did receive a letter from the Division for Air Quality ("DAQ") regarding the construction permit application for Spurlock 4. The letter has been reviewed and responses are being prepared. Revised modeling is being performed as directed by the DAQ, to incorporate suggested modifications to the modeling procedures. No air quality issues are apparent in this modeling effort. BACT issues raised by the DAQ are being addressed and additional information will be provided to demonstrate that the proper controls and emission levels were selected for the unit. All remaining issues identified in the letter will also be addressed. No issues were found that would prevent the permit issuance. EKPC has no reason to believe that any additional emission controls will be required, or that any comprehensive compliance review will be needed, for Spurlock 4.

EnviroPower has questioned the allocation of risk in the evaluation process based on the status of its Siting Certificate for its proposed project, compared to Spurlock 4. The existence of a Siting Certificate for the EnviroPower project was acknowledged in the evaluation, in that some additional risk could have been assigned to the proposal if such a certificate had not been obtained for the merchant plant proposed by EnviroPower. EKPC's Spurlock 4 project does not require a Siting Certificate, since it is not a merchant generating facility, but does require Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Site Compatibility that are the subject of this case. From EKPC's perspective, the Certificate process in this case for the Spurlock 4 project is not fundamentally different from the process that would be required for EKPC to obtain approval for a power purchase agreement, such as EnviroPower proposed. Since PSC approval of any power supply alternative chosen by EKPC was the relevant risk, the fact that EnviroPower had a Siting Certificate for its project did not provide any relative advantage over the Spurlock 4 project.

PSC Request No. 1 (a) Page 6 of 16

EnviroPower has objected to the fact that the cost of performing an EIS was added to the cost of its proposal. EKPC is not required to have an EIS prepared for Spurlock Station or Smith Station projects, because both of those are already impacted sites with generating facilities already located on them. EKPC did provide Environmental Reports with the Certificate Applications for generation at the Spurlock Station and Smith Station sites. EKPC estimated the cost to perform an EIS at \$2 million, based on EKPC's experience for a number of years in preparing Environmental Reports, including complete Environmental Impact Statements. These reports vary in depth and level of data gathering necessary prior to report generation. The value of \$2 million is an estimate based upon our experience of the level of effort necessary to prepare a report that will meet the requirements of the Rural Utilities Service (7CFRPart 1794). The background reports necessary include, but are not limited to, biological surveys of both plant and animal life, archeology information, background water data, wetlands delineations, waste permitting information, land use, econometric studies, traffic studies, and noise surveys. In many of these studies at least one year's data is necessary to provide a factual report. This cost was added to any proposal for which RUS regulations would require an EIS. The cost of an EIS was added to EnviroPower's proposal on that basis, and was spread over 32 years, the economic life of a baseload plant. EnviroPower's representatives stated they did not believe an EIS was necessary, but provided no support for this assertion. They also stated, during conference call discussions, that they had environmental data for the project available and, if an EIS were required, they would "take care of it". However, EnviroPower never explained exactly what was meant by "taking care of it," and EKPC did not receive any written commitment from EnviroPower to absorb any costs of an EIS.

Finally, EnviroPower raised questions about the escalation rates used in the evaluation. EKPC discussed escalation rates with EnerVision early in the evaluation process and decided that 3 percent annual escalation was reasonable for a long-term escalation rate based on the Consumer Price Index at the time. Since the primary components of EnviroPower's proposal were fixed demand and energy charges, escalation rates would have little impact on their evaluated price. The primary components of EKPC's proposal subject to escalation were fixed and variable O&M costs. Since these costs are relatively small, a significant change from 3 percent would be required to have much impact on EKPC's evaluated price. Therefore, no escalation rate sensitivities were performed. However, since questions were raised, EKPC checked an alternate source for escalation rates. According to Global Insight's Power Planner (First Quarter 2004) projected escalation rates for Steam Production Plant (Total Operation and Maintenance) from 2008 through 2029 averaged about 2.3 percent. If EKPC changed the escalation rate to 2.3 percent, the evaluated price of Spurlock 4 would be lower.

Q1a.1								
Response to Kentucky PSC Question 1a from 2	estion 1a fron	12_25_05	25_05 Request:					
#15 - EKPC Spurlock Unit 4								
Amount	278 MW	IW						
Term	32 years	ears			and on the state of the state o	To the state of th	AND THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TO TH	- In the state of
Total Installed Cost (less							A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	
Fuel Cost	₩.	\$/MMBTu				THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NAMED IN COLUMN TW		
Fixed O & M	₩	\$/KW/Yr	2004\$			The state of the s		Annual Control of the
Variable O & M	(\$	\$/MWh	2004\$			- The state of the		
Heat Rate	N	MMBTu/MWh	- Constitution			- Andrews	173.5	
Capacity Factor						- AND		
Interest Rate								
Discount Rate							A STATE OF THE STA	T
Escalation Rate		The state of the s				Annual Control of Cont		TO COLUMN TO THE PARTY OF THE P
	And the state of t					- AND	TOTAL CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER	
				The state of the s	The state of the s		Control of the Contro	and any or the state of the sta
80% Capacity Factor				V	ư	G		8
Period		7	5 000	4 60	2043	2013	2014	2015
Line # Capacity Costs	2008	2009	2010	1107	7107	2107		
1 Interest								
2 Depreciation								
3 Fixed O & M (\$/kw yr)								
4 Fixed O & M								
5 Substation and Transmission								
7 Total Fixed Cost								
8 Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month)								
Energy Costs								
9 Energy (MWh)								
10 Variable O & M (\$/MWh)								
11 Variable O & M								
12 Fuel Price								
13 Fuel Cost								
14 Total Variable Cost								
15 Total Variable Cost (\$/MWh)								
16 Total Cost								
17 Total Cost (\$) NPV					A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH			
18 NPV \$/MWh								
19 Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV								
20 Cumulative MWh								
21 Cumulative \$/MWh								

Page 1 of 4

EVI Response to PSC Question 1a.1 3_2_05 BLACKENED spur4spsht.xls

								-
Q1a.1				- Harris Andrews		The state of the s		
Response to Kentucky PSC Qu	3			Serve and distributions of the server of the				
				110000	de contra contrata de la contrata del contrata de la contrata del contrata de la contrata del contrata de la contrata del contrata de la contrata del contrata del contrata del contrata de la contrata del contrata d			
#15 - EKPC Spuriock Unit 4			117771117	- Marian		10.000000000000000000000000000000000000	A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	Land and the second sec
Amount				The second secon				
Term								
Total Installed Cost (less								
substation and transmission				Out to continue				
Fuel Cost				AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF THE			- Daring and and	
Variable O & M								
Valiable O & W Heat Rafe				The second secon			TAXABLE TAXABL	
Capacity Factor	MALES AND THE PROPERTY OF THE	and the state of t	and the same of th				-	
The state of the s	Depreciation per year							
Interest Rate	ansmission Cost (2004\$)		AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT					11000
Discount Rate	ansmission Cost (2008\$)						THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O	
Escalation Rate	- Avenue			- and and another the				A THE PARTY OF THE
90% Canadity Eactor		The state of the s						
Period	6	10		12	13	4	15	16
Line # Capacity Costs	2	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
1 Interest								
2 Depreciation								
3 Fixed O & M (\$/kw yr)								
4 Fixed O & M								
5 Substation and Transmission								
6 Transmission O&M								
7 Total Fixed Cost (\$\K\N\\Month)								
o lotal rixed Cost (Aliverial)								
Energy Costs								
9 Energy (IVIVVI)								
11 Variable O & M								
12 Fuel Price								
13 Fuel Cost								
14 Total Variable Cost								
15 Total Variable Cost (\$/MWh)								
16 Total Cost								
17 Total Cost (\$) NPV								
18 NPV \$/MWh								
19 Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV								
20 Cumulative MWh								
21 Cumulative \$/MWh								Salah da Barah Tukkin

Page 2 of 4

EVI Response to PSC Question 1a.1 3_2_05 BLACKENED spur4spsht.xls

Q1a.1		- Indiana - Indi			- SVATI					
Respon	Response to Kentucky PSC Qu						Address of the second state of the second stat			
	7 7 T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T				- Additional Company of the Company					
#	#15 - EKPC Spuriock Unit 4	The state of the s	A LONG LANGE OF THE PARTY OF TH							
Ā	Amount						To all the second secon	- Constitution of the Cons		
	Term							- ALASTANIA		
F 	Total Installed Cost (less									
รั้ง	substation and transmission		Annual An							- Dominion of the state of the
ű.	Fuel Cost		CAMMAN AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND A					in assistance of the second se		
正	Fixed O & M									
>	Variable O & M	****						THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O		- The second second
I	Heat Rate							NAME OF THE PARTY		
O	Capacity Factor		and the state of t			and the second s				
2	ntorost Dato				et de la companya del companya de la companya del companya de la c		The state of the s			
= C	Discount Rate				The state of the s	The state of the s				
ئنا د	Escalation Rate				100000000000000000000000000000000000000	THE TAXABLE PARTY OF TAXAB				The state of the s
				111111111111111111111111111111111111111		A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR	11.1000			A STATE OF THE STA
		100000000000000000000000000000000000000	110000000000000000000000000000000000000							
æ	80% Capacity Factor		ALIAN MATERIAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PAR				00	C		30
	Period	17	18	19	20	17	77	2020	2034	202
Line # C	Line # Capacity Costs	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	7007
1 In	1 Interest									
2 D	2 Depreciation									
3	3 Fixed O & M (\$/kw yr)									-
4	4 Fixed O & M									
2 S	5 Substation and Transmission									
9	6 Transmission O&M									
7 T	Total Fixed Cost									
8	8 Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month)									
Ш	Energy Costs									
6	9 Energy (MWh)									
10 \	10 Variable O & M (\$/MWh)									
11 \	11 Variable O & M									
12 F	12 Fuel Price									
13 F	13 Fuel Cost									
14 ⊤	14 Total Variable Cost									
15 ⊤	15 Total Variable Cost (\$/MWh)									
16 T	16 Total Cost									
17.	Total Cost (\$) NDV									
18 N	18 NPV \$/MWh									
19 C	19 Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV									
20 C	20 Cumulative MWh					1				
21 C	21 Cumulative \$/MWh								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Page 3 of 4

EVI Response to PSC Question 1a.1 3_2_05 BLACKENED spur4spsht.xls

Q1a.1	_		STANDARD TO THE STANDARD TO TH						The state of the s
Resp	Response to Kentucky PSC Qu		The second secon						
-	#15 - EKPC Spurlock Unit 4					1011	The state of the s		
	Amount								
	Term			The state of the s					
	Total Installed Cost (less								
	substation and transmission				a de la companya de l				
	Fuel Cost		a policinal excession		- He all distance		•		
	Fixed O & M				1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Tringville (ATTENDED TO THE PARTY OF THE PA
	Variable O & M							- STATE OF THE STA	
	Heat Rate							- Committee of the comm	
	Capacity Factor								
					MANAGE SECOND SE	. La constitución de la constitu			A STATE OF THE STA
	Interest Rate			- Contraction of the Contraction					AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER
	Discount Rate			- Annual Property Control of the Con	au autore de la companya de la compa				
	Escalation Rate								
			**************************************	And the second s		A THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TO THE			
					and and the same of the same o				
	80% Capacity Factor						70	CC	
	Period	26	27	28	29	30	3.1	35	1-7-1
Line #	Line # Capacity Costs	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	lotai
7	1 Interest								
2	2 Depreciation								
6	3 Fixed O & M (\$/kw yr)								
4	4 Fixed O & M								
S.	5 Substation and Transmission								
9	6 Transmission O&M								
7	7 Total Fixed Cost								
8	8 Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month)								
	Energy Costs								
တ	9 Energy (MWh)								
10	10 Variable O & M (\$/MWh)								
11	11 Variable O & M								
12	12 Fuel Price								
13	13 Fuel Cost								
14	14 Total Variable Cost								
15	15 Total Variable Cost (\$/MWh)								
16	16 Total Cost								
17	17 Total Cost (\$) NPV								
18	18 NPV \$/MWh								
15	19 Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV								
20	20 Cumulative MWh								
21	21 Cumulative \$/MWh	題語為法院							

Page 4 of 4

EVI Response to PSC Question 1a.1 3_2_05 BLACKENED spur4spsht.xls

Q1a.2

Supporting Calculations for Spurlock 4 Evaluation In Response to Kentucky PSC Question 1a from 2_25_05 Request

(Note: Item #'s correspond to Line Items in spreadsheet Q1a.1: Response to PSC Question 1a.1 2_25_05)

1. Loan Interest Calculation

$$I_n = B - C_n$$

$$I_1 = 0$$
where:

B = periodic total payment

C = principal portion

I = interest payment

n = period under consideration (period 1 is 2008)

Periodic Total Payment

$$B = \frac{(i \times A)}{1 - (1 + i)^{-N}} = \frac{(1 + i)^{-32}}{1 - (1 + i)^{-32}} = \frac{(1 + i)^{-32}}{1 - (1 + i)^{-32$$

where:

A = amount of loan

N = total number of periods in the loan

i = interest rate

Principal Portion

$$C_n = B \times (1+i)^{-(1+N-n)}$$
 $C_1 = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{-(1+32-1)} = \frac{1}{2}$

2. Depreciation Calculation

$$D = \frac{A}{N} = \frac{1}{N}$$

3. Fixed Operations and Maintenance Cost Escalation

$$FOM_n = \times (1+e)^{(Y-2004)}$$

 $FOM_1 = \times (1+e)^{(2008-2004)} \approx 0$
where:

FOM = cost of fixed operations and maintenance (Dollars per kilowatt per year) e = escalation rate

Y = year under consideration

= fixed operations and maintenance cost in year 2004 per EKPC proposal (Dollars per kilowatt per year)

4. Fixed Operations and Maintenance per Year

$$FY_n = MW \times 1000 \times FOM_n =$$
 where:

FY = fixed operations and maintenance per year 1000 = factor to convert capacity amount into kilowatts

5. Substation and Transmission Interest Calculation

$$ST_n = TB - TC_n =$$

where:

ST = substation and transmission interest payment

TB = substation and transmission loan payment

TC = substation and transmission principal portion

Substation and Transmission Total Loan Payment

$$TB = \frac{(i \times TA)^{-1}}{1 - (1 + i)^{-N}} = \frac{(1 \times TA)^{-1}}{1 - (1 + i)^{-32}} = \frac{(1 \times TA)^{-1}}{1 - (1 + i)^{-32}} = \frac{(1 \times TA)^{-1}}{1 - (1 + i)^{-1}} = \frac{$$

where:

TA = substation and transmission loan amount

Principal Portion

$$TC_n = TB \times (1+i)^{-(1+N-n)} = (1+i)^{-(1+32-1)} \approx (1+i)^{-(1+32-1)}$$

6. Substation and Transmission Operations and Maintenance per Year

$$STY = \times TA =$$

where:

STY = substation and transmission operations and maintenance per year = percentage constant

7. Total Fixed Cost per Year

where:

TFC = total fixed cost per year

8. Total Fixed Cost per Kilowatt per Month

$$FC_n = \frac{TFC_n}{(MW \times 1000) \times 12}$$

$$FC_1 = \frac{TFC_n}{(MW \times 1000) \times 12} \approx \frac{TFC_n}{(MW \times 1000) \times 12}$$

where:

FC = total fixed cost per kilowatt per month 1000 = factor to convert capacity amount into kilowatts 12 = number of months in one year

9. Energy per Year

$$E_n = \times CF \times MW =$$

where:

E = energy per year (Megawatt hours)

CF = capacity factor

MW = capacity amount (Megawatts)

8760 = number of hours in one year

10. Variable Operations and Maintenance Cost Escalation

$$VOM_n = \times (1 + e)^{(Y-2004)}$$

 $VOM_1 = \times (1 + e)^{(2008-2004)} \approx 0$
where:

VOM = cost of variable operations and maintenance (Dollars per Megawatt hour) = variable operations and maintenance cost in year 2004 per EKPC proposal (Dollars per Megawatt hour)

11. Variable Operations and Maintenance per Year

$$VY_n = E_n \times VOM_n$$

$$VY_1 = \{ \{ \} \}$$

where:

VY = variable operations and maintenance per year

12. Fuel Price

 FP_n

where:

FP = fuel price per EKPC proposal (Dollars per million British Thermal Units)

13. Fuel Expense Calculation per Year

$$FE_n = FP_n \times HR \times E_n$$

$$FE_1 = \blacksquare$$

where:

FE = fuel expense per year

HR = heat rate (million British Thermal Units per Megawatt hour)

14. Total Variable Cost per Year

$$TVC_n = VY_n + FE_n$$

$$TVC_1 =$$

15. Total Variable Cost per Megawatt Hour

$$VC_{n} = \frac{TVC_{n}}{E_{n}}$$

$$VC_{1} = \frac{1}{E_{n}}$$

where:

VC = total variable cost per megawatt hour

16. Total Cost per Year

$$TC_n = TFC_n + TVC_n$$
 $TC_1 =$
where:

TC = total cost per year

17. Net Present Value of Total Cost per Year

$$NPV_{n} = \frac{TC_{n}}{(1 + DR)^{(Y-2004)}}$$

$$NPV_{1} = \frac{1}{(1 + DR)^{(2008-2004)}} \approx 1$$

where:

NPV = net present value of total cost per year DR = discount rate

18. Net Present Value Cost per Megawatt Hour

$$NPVC_{n} = \frac{NPV_{n}}{E_{n}}$$

$$NPVC_{1} = \frac{1}{E_{n}} \approx \frac{1}{E_{n}}$$

where:

NPVC = nominal cost per megawatt hour

19. Cumulative Net Present Value of Total Cost

$$CTC_n = \sum_{1}^{n} NPV_n$$

$$CTC_2 = \sum_{1}^{2} NPV_n =$$

where:

where:

CTC = cumulative net present value of total cost

20. Cumulative Megawatt hours

$$CMWh_{n} = \sum_{1}^{n} E_{n}$$

$$CMWh_{2} = \sum_{1}^{2} E_{n} =$$

CMWh = cumulative megawatt hours

21. Cumulative Net Present Value Cost per Megawatt Hour

$$CC_{n} = \frac{CTC_{n}}{CMWh_{n}}$$

$$CC_{32} = \frac{CTC_{n}}{CMWh_{n}} = \frac{CCC_{32}}{CC}$$

where:

CC = cumulative cost per megawatt hour

EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. PSC CASE NO. 2004-00423 INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSE

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DATA REQUEST DATED
FEBRUARY 25, 2005
REQUEST NO. 1 (b)
RESPONDING PERSON: Lynne Travis

Request No. 1 (b):

Provide a side-by-side comparison, for each year of the 32-year study period, of the PVRR revenue requirements and the cost per MWh for both East Kentucky Power's self-build Spurlock 4 proposal and the bid submitted by EnviroPower. Provide all supporting calculations.

Response No. 1 (b):

A side-by-side comparison of the Present Value Revenue Requirements (PVRR) and the cost per MWh for both the EKPC Spurlock 4 proposal and the EnviroPower proposal is included as Attachment Q1b.1. The annual values for EKPC are a result of the evaluation of the EKPC Spurlock 4 proposal, as outlined in the response to Question 1a. These values and the supporting calculations are found in the EKPC Spurlock 4 spreadsheet analysis, Attachment Q1a.1.

The evaluation of the EnviroPower proposal is based on information provided in the bid that EnviroPower submitted in response to the RFP. EnerVision reviewed the pricing details and included the following quoted costs into the analysis:

• Capacity Costs: \$\\$/k\W/\text{Month in 2008 and escalating to \$\\$/k\W/\text{Month in 2037} - Actual annual capacity charges for the remaining years are stated in the EnviroPower proposal, page 5 of 24: \$TABLE OF BASELOAD POWER PRICES\$. Based on this table of prices, the average

PSC Request No. 1 (b) Page 2 of 15

• Energy Costs: \$/MWh in 2008 and escalating to \$/MWh in 2037 – Actual annual energy charges for the remaining years are stated in the EnviroPower proposal, page 5 of 24: TABLE OF BASELOAD POWER PRICES. Based on this table of prices, the average annual escalation rate for the energy charges over the 30 year period is approximately %.

(Fixed and variable O&M costs were embedded in the Capacity and Energy Costs of EnviroPower's proposal and not independently specified.)

In addition to the above quoted costs, EnerVision reviewed the EnviroPower proposal to determine if there were additional costs that should be included in the analysis that EnviroPower had not identified as a cost component of either the capacity charge or the energy charge. An estimate for the following cost components was developed and included in the analysis:

- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS): \$2,000,000 in 2008\$ financed over a 32 year period based on a % interest rate. Based on RUS regulations, it is EnerVision's and EKPC's belief that RUS will require an EIS to be completed for the EnviroPower site. From EnviroPower's letter dated 8/13/04, they respond to the EIS question stating: "As described in the EnviroPower proposal, KMP has successfully completed all existing environmental review and certification requirements for its construction. To the extent further RUS environmental review is required, EnviroPower is confident that existing completed work will provide an exceptional database for such review." However, EnviroPower did not state that the cost to complete the EIS is included in their capacity charge provided in the proposal. Therefore, the cost to complete the EIS has been included in the analysis.
- Transmission Investment: \$\ \text{in 2008\$ financed over 32 years based on a \$\ \text{with interest rate.} The EnviroPower proposal on page 13 of 24 states that some additional transmission costs would be "reimbursed to KMP through transmission service credits structured through the PPA". Therefore, this estimate of transmission costs was included in the analysis.
- Transmission O&M: 5% of the Transmission investment
- Synchronous Condensers: \$ 10000 in 2008\$ financed over a 32 year period based on a 10000 interest rate. The synchronous condensers are needed to provide VAR and voltage support throughout the central region

PSC Request No. 1 (b) Page 3 of 15

- of EKPC's territory which the EnviroPower project could not provide. The cost was based on an estimate provided by an outside vendor.
- Availability Bonus: Originally the annual energy was calculated based on an 80% capacity factor. An 88% capacity factor was introduced when EnviroPower provided a draft Purchase Power Agreement in late September 2004 that included a seasonal availability bonus. The seasonal availability bonus was calculated based on the formulas in the draft contract and included in the analysis.

A spreadsheet was developed to evaluate the EnviroPower proposal and is included as Attachment Q1b.2. The supporting calculations for each line item of this spreadsheet are included as Attachment Q1b.3. The spreadsheet analysis included modeling both the total capacity costs (fixed costs) and total energy costs (variable costs) associated with the EnviroPower proposal.

The capacity costs included: the capacity charges as outlined in the EnviroPower proposal, EIS expense, transmission costs, synchronous condensers and the availability bonus. The energy costs included the contracted energy charge (\$/MWh), as outlined in the proposal, was applied to the annual energy (MWh) based on an 88% capacity factor.

Just as with the EKPC Spurlock 4 proposal, the individual cost components for the EnviroPower proposal were totaled on an annual basis, and each year of costs were present-valued to 2004\$. The present value cost for each of the 32 years was summed to obtain the total cost of each proposal in 2004\$. This total cost was then divided by the total energy (MWh) produced over the 30 years of the EnviroPower proposal to obtain the average \$/MWh cost of the proposal.

			Q1b	.1	,						
Response	to Kentucky P	SC Question 1b	from	2_22_05	Request:						
		EKPC Spurlock					1 (*/88) 8 (* 1				
	Annual PVRR	(Present Value	Rev	enue Req	uirements	s) and	3 \$/MWH				<u> </u>
									ļ		
		20/ 5	licaci	ınt Rate							
		3/62	1500		I PVRR		Cumulative PVRR				
	Annual P\	/RR (2004\$)		1	/IWh)		(\$/MWh)				
Year	Spur 4 (1)	Enviro (4)		Spur 4 (2)	Enviro (5)		Spur 4 (3) Enviro (6	5)			
2008											
2009 2010											
2010											
2012											
2013											
2014											
2015 2016								II	-		-
2017											
2018											
2019											-
2020 2021											
2022											
2023								4			<u> </u>
2024											
2025 2026											
2027											
2028											
2029											
2030 2031											
2032	-										
2033											
2034 2035	_										-
2036											
2037											
2038											
2039	_								_		-
Total											
	ırlock 4 Calculati										
1		neet (Q1a.1) provide	ed in r	esponse to	PSC Questi	ion 1a	dated February 25, 2	005 for supp	porting calcul	ations for t	he EKPC
Spurlock 4	Proposal.		T	1		1	T			T	1
(1) Spurlos	k 4 Appual DV/DD	 line 17 of O1a 1 -	Snur	lock Total (Cost in each	vearr	resent valued to 200	1 4 \$ bv 3% d	iscount rate		
							ach year present value			ount rate ar	nd divided b
the MWh c	of Spurlock 4 in ea	ich year									
(3) Spurloo	ck 4 Cumulative P	VRR in \$/MWh - lin	e 21 c	f Q1a.1 - S	purlock cum	ulative	Total Cost in each y	ear present	valued to 20	04\$ by 3%	discount
		ulative MWh of Spu									
	Land Calandad's		-			-					
	wer Calculations		d in r	esnonse to	PSC Queeti	ion 1h	dated February 25, 2	1005 for sup	norting calcu	lations for t	he
	er to the spreadsi ier Proposal.	iedi (QTD.Z) piuvide	JU III I	caponae io	, oo Questi	מו ווטו	actour oblidary 20, 2	.coo ioi sup	roming calcu		.,.5
nvirol	Power Annual PVI	RR - line 13 of Q1b.	2 - Er	viroPower	Total Cost in	n each	year present valued	to 2004 \$ by	y 3% discoun	t rate	
1		RR in \$/MWh - line roPower in each vea		Q1b.2 - Env	viroPower To	otal Co	st in each year prese	ent valued to	2004\$ by 39	% discount	rate and

(6) EnviroPower Cun	nulative PVRR in \$/	MWh - line 17	of Q1b.2 - I	EnviroPowe	er cumu	lative Total	Cost in ear	ch year pres	sent valued	to 2004\$ by	/ 3%
discount rate and div	ided by the cumulat	tive MWh of Er	viroPower	in each yea	ar						
(7) The EnviroPowe	r proposal is for a 30	0 year PPA, the	erefore the	re are no M	WHs to	divide cos	ts by in yea	irs 2038 and	d 2039 to ca	alculate a \$/	MWh rate.
The minimal costs as	sociated with the E	nviroPower pro	posal in ye	ears 2038 th	nrough	2040 are d	ue to the co	sts of Sync	hronous Co	ndensers,	
Transmission, and E	IS expenses that are	e financed ove	r 32 years.								
									1		

Q1b.2									
Response to Kentucky PSC Question 1b from 2.			st:				TATALAN TATALA		
#28 EnviroPower, LLC & Khanjee Holdings, Inc.	dings, Inc.								
Amount:	267	267 MW	A CANADA						
Capacity Factor:						Depr	Depreciation per year		
Discount Rate:		- MARTINIA							
EIS and Transmission						- Address - Addr			
SynchCond		(2004\$)							
Finance lerm		years		70.000					
Period n		2	3		5	9		1 8	5 0
Period m	A DAMPANE	1	2		4	5		, 2700	
Line # Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
1 6 Month Peak Season Bonus									
2 EIS and Transmission carrying cost									
3 SynchCond carrying cost									
4 Transmission O&M									
5 Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month)									
6 Capacity Charge									
7 Total Fixed Costs									
8 Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month)									
o Energy (M)//h)									
10 Energy Charge (\$/MWh)									
11 Energy Charge									
12 Total Cost									
13 Total Cost (\$) NPV									
14 NPV \$/MWh									
15 Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV									
16 Cumulative MWh									
17 Cumulative \$/MWh									
APSA =									
PSBC = PSBF = PSBF =									age
PSB									

0.450					1							
20.0	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	-				- Annual Contract of the Contr						
Response to Kentucky PSC Question		-										
#28 EnviroPower, LLC & Khanjee Hol			**************************************									
Amount:												
Capacity Factor:						and the state of t						
Discount Rate:												
Interest Rate												
EIS and Transmission						***************************************						
SynchCond												
Finance Term			- Additional Control of the Control									
r Corred		10	-	-	12		13	14	15		16	17
T POLICE OF THE		0.0	10	C	11		12	13	14		15	16
	2017)	2018	2019	1	2020	2021		2022	2023		2024
4 6 Month Deak Season Boniis												
o I Mortini Can Octaball Control												
2 Octob Cond correction conditions												
s syncholin carrying cost												
4 Transmission O&IVI												
5 Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month)												
6 Capacity Charge												
7 Total Fixed Costs												
8 Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month)												
0 Energy (MM/h)												
9 Elieigy (ivivii)												
10 Energy Charge (\$/NIVVn) 11 Energy Charge												
12 Total Cost												
13 Total Cost (\$) NPV												
14 NPV \$/MWh												
15 Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV												
16 Cumulative MWh												
17 Cumulative \$/MWh												
# TASA												
= APSA =												
II OBSd												
II Hasa												

Q1b.2										-
Respo	Response to Kentucky PSC Question								A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	
	#28 EnviroPower, LLC & Khanjee Hol		The state of the s	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1						
	Amount:		A CONSTRUCTION OF THE PROPERTY							
	Capacity Factor:									1
	Discount Rate:									
	Interest Rate						And the second s			T
	EIS and Transmission									_
	SynchCond						100000	The second secon		$\overline{\top}$
	Finance Term						STATE OF THE PARTY			
	Period n	18	19	6	20	21	22	23		24
	Period m	17	18	8	19	20				[23
Line #		2025	2026	2027	2028	83	2029	2030	2031	
٢	1 6 Month Peak Season Bonus									
2	2 EIS and Transmission carrying cost									
3	3 SynchCond carrying cost									
4	4 Transmission O&M									
5	5 Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month)									
9	6 Capacity Charge									
7	Total Fixed Costs									
8	8 Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month)									÷.
6	9 Energy (MWVh)									
10	10 Energy Charge (\$/MWh)									
11	11 Energy Charge									
12	12 Total Cost									
*	1000									
13	13 Total Cost (\$) NPV									
14	14 NPV \$/MWh									7
15	15 Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV									
16	16 Cumulative MWh									
17	Cumulative \$/MWh									
	= PSAT									
	= APSA =									
	= DSBC =					1				
	= PSBF									
	= BSB	東京の子では 高いない								Π

		ANALYSIS STATE OF THE STATE OF	and the state of t									2038																							
						- ALVANDARIA				30	29	2037																							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	1,								interest that is a second of the second of t	29		2036																							
				The state of the s					-	28		2035	4																						
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1								27	26	2034																							
				The state of the s					- Indianasia	26	25	2033																							
	And the second s		***************************************	AAAA AAAA AAAA AAAA AAAA AAAA AAAA AAAA AAAA			The state of the s			25	24	2032																							
	Response to Kentucky PSC Question	#28 EnviroPower, LLC & Khanjee Hol	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Alliouni.	Discount Rate:	Interest Rate	EIS and Transmission	SynchCond	Finance Term	Period n	Period m	Year	1 6 Month Peak Season Bonus	2 EIS and Transmission carrying cost	3 SynchCond carrying cost	4 Transmission O&M	5 Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month)	6 Capacity Charge	7 Total Fixed Costs	Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month)	/ W A A / L- \	9 Energy (IVIVVn)	10 Energy Charge (#/WWII)	ly charge	Cost	13 Total Cost (\$) NPV	\$/MWh	Lating Total Coat (\$) NDV	15 Curriulative Total Cost (4) INFV	17 Cumulative \$/MWh	PSAT =	= APSA =	PSBC =	PSBF =	PSB =
Q1b.2	Response to	#28 EI										Line #	1 6 Mont	2 EIS an	3 Synch	4 Transn	5 Capac	6 Capac	7 Total F	8 Total F	L	9 Energy	10 Energy	11 Energy Charge	12 Total Cost	13 Total C	14 NPV \$/MWh	7 P	15 Curnul	17 Cumul					

#28 EnviroPower, LLC & Khanjee Hol	Q1b.2					
Amount: Amount: City Factor: Count Rate:	Resno	onse to Kentucky PSC Question	The state of the s			
#28 EnvirorPower, LLC & Mangle Hol Capacity Factor: Discount Rate: Discount Rate: Interest Rate EIS and Transmission 31 32 33 Period m 31 32 33 Finance Term SynchCond carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost Period m 2039 2040 ElS and Transmission Carrying cost Transmission Carrying cost Transmission Carrying cost Capacity Charge (\$MWM) Capacity Charge (\$MWM) Energy Charge (\$MWM) Energy Charge (\$MWM) Energy Charge (\$MWM) Energy Charge (\$MWM) Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative MWh Cumulative S/MWh Cumulative S/MWh PSBC = PSBC = PSBC = PSBF =	2001					
Capacity Factor: Discount Rate: Discount Rate: Discount Rate: Discount Rate: ElS and Transmission SynchCond		#28 EnviroPower, LLC & Khanjee Hol				
Capacity Factor: Discount Rate: Discount Rate: Interest Rate ElS and Transmission SynchCond Finance Term Period manage Strong SynchCond carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost Transmission carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost Transmission carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost Transmission carrying cost Transmission carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost Transmission carrying cost SynchCond carrying cast SynchCond carrying		Amount:				A CONTRACTOR OF THE PERSON OF
Discount Rate: Interest Rate		Capacity Factor:				autoversident in
Interest Rate		Discount Rate:				
EIS and I ransmission		Interest Rate				
SynonCond Finance Term Finance Term Finance Term Finance Term Finance Term Period m 31 32 33 Period m Year 2039 2040 32 ElS and Transmission Bonus ElS and Transmission carrying cost SynonCond Teams ElS and Transmission O&M Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month) Energy C		EIS and Transmission	AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PERSON OF THE P			
Period m		SynchCond		The state of the s		
Period n 32 33 Period m		rinance lerm				
Period m 31 32 Year		Period n	32		33	
Year Year 2039 2040 6 Month Peak Season Bonus EIS and Transmission carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost SynchCond carrying cost Transmission O&M Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month) Capacity Charge Total Fixed Cost Energy Charge Total Fixed Cost (\$/MWh) Energy Charge Total Cost Energy Charge Total Cost Energy Charge Total Cost Energy Charge Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative MWh Cumulative \$/MWh PSBC = PSBC = PSBF = PSBF =		Period m				
6 Month Peak Season Bonus EIS and Transmission carrying SynchCond carrying cost Transmission O&M Capacity Charge (\$/KVV/Month) Capacity Charge Total Fixed Costs Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month) Energy (MWh) Energy Charge Total Cost (\$/MWh) Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative \$/MWh	Line #	Year	2039	2040		Total
EIS and Transmission carrying SynchCond carrying cost Transmission O&M Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month) Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month) Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month) Energy (MWh) Energy Charge (\$/MWh) Energy Charge (\$/MWh) Cotal Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative MWh Cumulative \$/MWh		6 Month Peak Season Bonus				
SynchCond carrying cost Transmission O&M Capacity Charge (\$/KW/Month) Capacity Charge Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month) Energy (MWh) Energy Charge (\$/MWh) Energy Charge Total Cost Total Cost Total Cost Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative MWh Cumulative \$/MWh	2	EIS and Transmission carrying cost				
Transmission O&M Capacity Charge (\$/KVV/Month) Capacity Charge Total Fixed Cost (\$/KVV/Month) Energy (MVVh) Energy Charge (\$/MVVh) Energy Charge Total Cost Total Cost Total Cost Total Cost Total Cost Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative \$/MWh Cumulative \$/MWh	က					
Capacity Charge (\$/KVV/Month) Capacity Charge Total Fixed Cost (\$/KVV/Month) Energy (MVVh) Energy Charge (\$/MVVh) Energy Charge Total Cost Total Cost Total Cost (\$) NPV NPV \$/MWN Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV	4					
Capacity Charge Total Fixed Costs Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month) Energy (MWh) Energy Charge (\$/MWh) Energy Charge Total Cost Total Cost Total Cost (\$) NPV NPV \$/MWh Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative #/WWh Cumulative \$/MWh	2					
Total Fixed Costs Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month) Energy (MWh) Energy Charge Total Cost Total Cost Total Cost (\$) NPV NPV \$/MWh Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative AWWh Cumulative \$/MWh	9					
Total Fixed Cost (\$/KW/Month) Energy (MWh) Energy Charge Total Cost Total Cost NPV NPV \$\text{NMWh} Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative \$\text{MWh} Cumulative \$\text{MWh}	7					
Energy (MWh) Energy Charge (\$/MWh) Energy Charge Total Cost NPV NPV \$/MWh Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative \$/MWh Cumulative \$/MWh	8					
Energy Charge (\$/MWh) Energy Charge Total Cost Total Cost (\$) NPV NPV \$/MWh Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative \$/MWh Cumulative \$/MWh	6	Energy (MWh)				
Energy Charge Total Cost Total Cost (\$) NPV NPV \$/MWh Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative MWh Cumulative \$/MWh	10	Energy Charge (\$/MWh)				
Total Cost (\$) NPV NPV \$/MWh Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative \$/MWh	1	Energy Charge				
Total Cost (\$) NPV NPV \$/MW/h Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative \$/MW/h	12	Total Cost				
NPV \$/MWh Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative MWh Cumulative \$/MWh	13	Total Cost (\$) NPV				
Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV Cumulative MWh Cumulative \$/MWh	14	NPV \$/MWh				
Cumulative \$/MWh Cumulative \$/MWh	15	Cumulative Total Cost (\$) NPV				
Cumulative \$/MWh	16	Cumulative MWh				
PSAT = APSA = APSA = PSBC = PSBF = PS	17					
APSA = PSBC = PSBF = PSBF = PSBF = PSBF = PSBF = PSBF = PSB	-	PSAT =				
PSBC = PSBF = PSB =		= APSA =				
PSBF = PSB =		PSBC =				
		PSBF =				
		PSB				

Q1b.3

Supporting Calculations for EnviroPower Evaluation In Response to Kentucky PSC Question 1b from 2_25_05 Request

1. Peak Season Availability Bonus

 $PSB_n = PSBC \times PSBF \times CRR_n \times 1000 \times 6$

 $PSB_1 =$

where:

PSB = peak season bonus

PSBC = peak season bonus capacity

PSBF = peak season bonus factor (= 1.5 per EnviroPower proposal)

CRR = capacity reservation rate (per EnviroPower proposal)

n = period under consideration (period 1 is 2008)

1000 = factor to convert PSBC into kilowatts

6 = number of months in peak season

Peak Season Bonus Capacity

PSBC = APSA - PSAT

PSBC =

where:

APSA = actual peak season availability

PSAT = peak season availability target

Actual Peak Season Availability

 $APSA = 0.97 \times CC$

APSA =

where:

CC = contract capacity (= 267 MW per EnviroPower proposal)

0.97 = factor corresponding to a 97% availability factor

Peak Season Availability Target

 $PSAT = CC \times 0.93$

PSAT =

where:

0.93 = factor corresponding to a 93% availability factor (per EnviroPower proposal)

2. EIS and Transmission Carrying Cost

$$ET_n = ETB - ETC_n$$

$$ET_1 = \begin{bmatrix} ETB & ETC & ETC$$

where:

ET = EIS and transmission interest payment

ETB = EIS and transmission loan payment

ETC = EIS and transmission principal portion

EIS and Transmission Total Loan Payment

$$ETB = \frac{(i \times ETA)}{1 - (1 + i)^{-N}} = \frac{1 - (1 + i)^{-32}}{1 - (1 + i)^{-32}} = \frac{1 - (1 + i)^{-32}}{1 - (1 + i$$

where:

ETA = EIS and transmission loan amount

Principal Portion

$$ETC_{n} = ETB \times (1+i)^{-(1+N-n)}$$

$$ETC_{1} = (1+(1+3)^{-(1+32-1)})^{-(1+32-1)} \approx (1+(1+3)^{-(1+32-1)})^{-(1+32-1)}$$

3. Synchronous Condenser Carrying Cost

$$SC_m = SCB - SCC_m$$

 $SC_1 =$

where:

SC = synchronous condenser interest payment

SCB = synchronous condenser loan payment

SCC = synchronous condenser principal portion

m = period under consideration (period 1 is 2009)

Synchronous Condenser Total Loan Payment

$$SCB = \frac{(i \times SCA)}{1 - (1 + i)^{-N}} = \frac{(1 + i)^{-N}}{1 - (1 +$$

where:

SCA = synchronous condenser loan amount

Principal Portion

$$SCC_m = SCB \times (1+i)^{-(1+N-m)}$$

 $SCC_1 = (1+(1+i)^{-(1+32-1)}) \approx (1+(1+32-1)^{-(1+32-1)})$

4. Transmission Operations and Maintenance per Year

 $TY = \times TA =$

where:

1

TY = transmission operations and maintenance per year = percentage constant

5. Capacity Reservation Rate

 CRR_n

where:

CRR = capacity reservation rate per EnviroPower proposal (dollars per kilowatt per month)

6. Capacity Expense per Year

$$CE_n = CRR_n \times CC \times 1000 \times 12$$

$$CE_1 =$$

where:

1000 = factor used to convert CC into kilowatts 12 = number of months in one year

7. Total Fixed Cost per Year

$$TFC_{n,m} = PSB_n + ET_n + SC_m + TY + CE_n$$

$$TFC_{n=2,m=1} =$$

8. Total Fixed Cost per Kilowatt per Month

$$FC_{n,m} = \frac{TFC_{n,m}}{(CC \times 1000) \times 12}$$

$$FC_{n=2,m=1} =$$

where:

FC = total fixed cost per kilowatt per month

1000 = factor to convert capacity amount into kilowatts

12 = number of months in one year

9. Energy per Year

$$E_n = 8760 \times CF \times CC =$$

where:

E = energy per year (Megawatt hours)

CF = capacity factor 8760 = number of hours in one year

10. Energy Charge

 EC_n

where:

EC = energy charge per EnviroPower proposal (dollars per megawatt hour)

11. Energy Expense per Year

$$EE_n = EC_n \times E_n$$

$$EE_1 =$$

12. Total Cost per Year

$$TC_{n,m} = TFC_{n,m} + EE_n$$

$$TC_{n=2,m=1} =$$

13. Net Present Value of Total Cost per Year

$$NPV_{n,m} = \frac{TC_{n,m}}{(1+DR)^{(Y-2004)}}$$

$$NPV_{n=2,m=1} = \frac{1}{(1+CR)^{(2009-2004)}} \approx 1$$

where:

NPV = net present value of total cost per year DR = discount rate

14. Net Present Value Cost per Megawatt Hour

$$NPVC_{n,m} = \frac{NPV_{n,m}}{E_n}$$

$$NPVC_{n=2,m=1} = \frac{1}{E_n} \approx 1$$

where:

NPVC = nominal cost per megawatt hour

15. Cumulative Net Present Value of Total Cost

$$CTC_{n,m} = \sum_{1}^{n} \sum_{0}^{m} NPV_{n,m}$$

$$CTC_{n=2,m=1} = \sum_{1}^{2} \sum_{0}^{1} NPV_{n,m} = 0$$

where:

CTC = cumulative net present value of total cost

16. Cumulative Megawatt hours

$$CMWh_n = \sum_{1}^{n} E_n$$

$$CMWh_2 = \sum_{1}^{2} E_n = \sum_{1}^{n} E_n$$

where:

Cow = cumulative megawatt hours

17. Cumulative Net Present Value Cost per Megawatt Hour

$$CC_{n,m} = \frac{CTC_{n,m}}{CMWh_n}$$

$$CC_{n=33,m=32} = \frac{CCC_{n,m}}{CCC_{n=33,m=32}} = \frac{CCC_{n,m}}{CCC_{n=33,m}} = \frac{CCC_{n,m}}{CCC_{n,m}} = \frac{CCC_{n,m}}{CCC_{n,m}} = \frac{CCC_{n,m}}{CCC_{n,m}} = \frac{CCC_{n,m}}{CCC_{n,m}} = \frac{CCC_{n,m}}{CCC_{n,m}} = \frac{CCC_{n,m}}$$

where:

CC = cumulative cost per megawatt hour

EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. PSC CASE NO. 2004-00423 INFORMATION REQUEST RESPONSE

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DATA REQUEST DATED
FEBRUARY 25, 2005
REQUEST NO. 2
RESPONDING PERSON: Lynne Travis

Request No. 2:

Provide East Kentucky Power's estimated cost of the Spurlock 4 proposal expressed in \$/KW/Month and \$/MWH for each year 2008 through 2037. Explain in detail how it was derived and provide all supporting calculations.

Response No. 2:

The requested cost schedule is attached hereto as Attachment Q 2. The process for deriving these costs is described in the response to Request No. 1 (a).

		Q2						
esponse to	Kentucky PSC Ques	stion 2 fro	m 2_22_05	Request:				
	EKPC Spurlock	4 Evalu	ation	J				
Canacity C	osts (\$/KW/Month)	and Enc	ray Costs (¢/8/8/8/6\				
Oapacity C	OSIS (WILLANDINIII)	anu Lne	agy costs (Φ/1414411)				

	Spurlock 4							
	Capacity Costs		Spurlock 4					
	(1)		rgy Costs (2)					
Year			\$/MWh					
2008								
2009								
2010								
2011								
2012						l		
2013								
2014								
2015								<u> </u>
2016								
2017								
2018								
2019	1							
2020								
2021					***************************************			
2022								l
2023								
2024								
2025								
2026							:	
2027								
2028								
2029								
2030								
2031								
2032								
2033								
2034								
2035						,		
2036					·			
2037								
2038								
2039								
KPC Spuriosi	4 Calculations:							

Note: Refer to the spreadsheet (Q1a.1) provided in response to PSC Question 1a dated February 25, 2005 for supporting calculations for the EKPC Spurlock 4 Proposal.

⁽¹⁾ Spurlock 4 Annual Capacity Costs (\$/KW/Month) - line 8 of Q1a.1 - Spurlock Total Fixed Cost in each year divided by 278,000 KW divided by 12 months per year

⁽²⁾ Spurlock 4 Annual Energy Costs (\$/MWh) - line 15 of Q1a.1 - Spurlock Total Variable Costs in each year divided by energy in each year