SULLIVAN, MOUNTJOY, STAINBACK & MILLER PSC

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ronald M. Sullivan
Jesse T. Mountjoy
Frank Stainback
James M. Miller
Michael A. Fiorella
Allen W. Holbrook
R. Michael Sullivan
Bryan R. Reynolds
Tyson A. Kamuf

Mark W. Starnes

C Ellsworth Mountjoy

Mary L. Moorhouse

May 10, 2012

Federal Express

Jeff DeRouen
Executive Director
Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615

RECEIVED

MAY 1 1 2012

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

RE: In the Matter of: Application of Big Rivers Electric Corporation for Approval to Issue Evidences of Indebtedness P.S.C. Case No. 2012-00119

Dear Mr. DeRouen:

Enclosed for filing on behalf of Big Rivers Electric Corporation are an original and ten copies of Big Rivers' responses to the Public Service Commission's Second Information Request dated May 2, 2012, and Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, Inc.'s Second Set of Data Requests dated May 3, 2012. I certify that a copy of this letter, a copy of Big Rivers' responses to the Commission Staff's Second Information Request and the KIUC's Second Set of Data Requests, have been served on each of the persons shown on the attached service list.

Sincerely,

Tyson Kamuf

TAK/ej Enclosures

cc: Mark A. Hite Albert Yockey

Telephone (270) 926-4000 Telecopier (270) 683-6694

> 100 St. Ann Building PO Box 727 Owensboro, Kentucky 42302-0727

SERVICE LIST BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION PSC CASE NO. 2012-00119

Michael L. Kurtz, Esq. Kurt J. Boehm, Esq. Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street Suite 1510 Cincinnati, OH 45202

Counsel for Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, Inc.

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

VERIFICATION

I, Mark A. Hite, verify, state, and affirm that I prepared or supervised the preparation of
the data responses filed with this Verification, and that those data responses are true and accurate
to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	contact with water with the contact and with the
	Mark A. Hite
COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY COUNTY OF HENDERSON)
SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO May, 2012.	before me by Mark A. Hite on this the 9th day of
	Paula Mitchell Notary Public, Ky. State at Large My Commission Expires_/-/2-/3

ORIGINAL



Your Touchstone Energy® Cooperative

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF KENTUCKY

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC)
CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE)
EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS)

Case No. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

FILED: May 11, 2012

ORIGINAL

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

1	Item 1) Refer to Big Rivers' response to Item 3.b. of Commission Staff's
2	First Information Request ("Staff's First Request") which states that "Big
3	Rivers generally uses 5.75% as a discount rate when evaluating economic
4	options involving cash because that has historically been Big Rivers'
5	opportunity cost given that Big Rivers has the option to use excess cash to
6	prepay the RUS Series A Note." Also, refer to Big Rivers' response to Items
7	24.a. and b. of Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, Inc.'s ("KIUC") First
8	Set of Data Requests ("KIUC's First Request"). The response to Item 24.a.
9	shows the imputed interest rate on the 5.75 percent RUS Series A Note at
10	December 31, 2010 was 5.84 percent and at December 31, 2011 was 5.85
11	percent. The response to Item 24.b. shows that, for 2012, the imputed
12	interest rate is expected to be 5.85 percent. Explain why Big Rivers would
13	not use 5.84 or 5.85 percent as its discount rate when evaluating economic
14	options involving cash.
15	
16	Response) Big Rivers used the RUS Series A Note stated interest rate of 5.75%
17	to evaluate the proposed borrowing because the analysis was performed on a net
18	present value cash flow basis. The 5.75% stated interest rate reflects Big Rivers'
19	true opportunity cost of cash while the 5.85% imputed interest rate is for financial
20	reporting purposes in accordance with the RUS Uniform System of Accounts and
21	GAAP accounting standards.
22	If Big Rivers were to use the higher 5.85% imputed interest rate as
23	the discount rate in this evaluation, the result would be an even higher net
24	present value benefit. Table A contained in Hite Direct Exhibit E shows a net

Case No. 2012-00119 Response to PSC 2-1 Witness: Mark A. Hite Page 1 of 2

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

Ţ	presem vanu	e of \$28,559,298 for the proposed RUS Series A Note refinancing
2	amount of \$4	442,000,000 using a discount rate of 5.75%. If a discount rate of $5.85%$
3	were used, t	he net present value would be \$30,458,413.
4		
5		
6	Witness)	Mark A. Hite

7

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

1	Item 2) Re	efer to Big Rivers' response to Item 4 of Staff's First Request
2	which states t	hat "[t]he total increase in Big Rivers' liabilities as of the
3	closing will b	e \$139,381,389." Also, refer to Big Rivers' response to Item 21
4	of KIUC's Firs	st Request which states that "the long-term debt outstanding
5	only increases	s \$138,155.800."
6		
7	a.	State which of the two amounts is the increased liability
8		amount.
9	b.	The difference between these two amounts, \$1,225,589, is
10		labeled as "RUS Series A Note Difference (GAAP vs.
11		Stated)" in the response to Item 4 of Staff's First Request.
12		Explain what is meant by this statement and provide the
13		$calculation\ for\ the\ \$1,225,589.$
14		
15	Response)	
16	a.	The increased liability amount is \$139,381,389. (Big Rivers'
17		response to Item 21 of KIUC's First Request stating that long-
18		term debt will increase \$138,155,800 was referring to the stated
19		amount of the long-term debt. The stated amount of debt would
20		be used in calculating Big Rivers Balance of Bondable additions, a
21		measure of Big Rivers' capacity to secure new debt under its
22		indenture.)
23	b.	The statement refers to the fact that GAAP and RUS reporting
24		require Big Rivers to use an "imputed" or "effective" rate of

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

24

rate).

interest for the RUS Series A Note. This rate differs by definition from the "stated" interest rate, as explained below. At the consummation of Big Rivers' bankruptcy plan of reorganization on July 17, 1998, Big Rivers issued a note to the RUS (the "1998 RUS Note") in the amount of \$1,022,583,000, bearing a stated interest rate of 5.75%. In accordance with Statement of Position (SOP) 90-7, "Financial Reporting by Entities in Reorganization Under the Bankruptcy Code," Big Rivers was required to record its liabilities at "fair value." To determine and record the fair value of Big Rivers' liabilities, Big Rivers was required to record its long-term debt by applying a discount rate commensurate with the market rate to the future debt service payments under the 1998 RUS Note, regardless of the stated principal and coupon rates of the obligation. At that time, Big Rivers determined that the market rate associated with the 1998 RUS Note was 5.81%. In accordance with GAAP, this rate must be used for financial statement purposes (oftentimes referred to as the "imputed" interest rate or the "effective" interest

The cash flows associated with the note at the stated rate (the "Stated Note") must equal the cash flows associated with the note at the imputed or effective rate (the "GAAP Note"). The \$6,302,501 initial principal balance difference — i.e. the excess of the Stated Note vs. the GAAP Note -- results in the GAAP Note

Case No. 2012-00119 Response to PSC 2-2 Witness: Mark A. Hite Page 2 of 4

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

2223

recording \$6,302,501 more interest and \$6,302,501 less principal over the life of the 1998 RUS Note than the Stated Note. Again, identical cash flows, both in amount and timing, retire both notes at the same point in time; the difference here simply reflects the manner in which the principal and interest balances are reported over the life of the 1998 RUS Note in order to adhere to GAAP accounting requirements.

As noted above, the 1998 stated interest rate on the 1998 RUS Note was 5.75%, which translated at that time to an interest rate of 5.81% on the GAAP Note in accordance with the "fair value"

RUS Note was 5.75%, which translated at that time to an interest rate of 5.81% on the GAAP Note in accordance with the "fair value requirements" of GAAP. Over the years Big Rivers has prepaid and "clawed back" principal on the 1998 RUS Note and its successor, the current RUS Series A Note. Principal on the RUS Series A Note is currently prepaid by \$35 million, as has been discussed in the financing application and several other data request responses. Prepayment of principal on the Stated Note upsets the equilibrium in the cash flow (debt service) between the Stated Note and the GAAP Note, so GAAP requires that the interest rate on the GAAP Note be increased to bring those cash flows back into equilibrium. Accordingly, and as a result of that accounting adjustment, the interest rate on the GAAP Note as of December 31, 2011, was 5.85%, as discussed in Big Rivers' response to the KIUC First Request Item 24a.

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's **Second Request for Information** Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

1		Another way to view this is to consider the stated and
2		GAAP values of the note. Under the proposed financing, Big
3		Rivers' liabilities will increase \$139,381,389 for financial
4		reporting purposes (GAAP). Big Rivers will use \$442 million of
5		the borrowed funds to pay down the RUS Series A Note. The
6		stated value of the note will decrease \$442 million while the
7		GAAP value of the note will only decrease \$440,774,441. The
8		difference, \$1,225,589, will be placed in account 189, Unamortized
9		Loss on Reacquired Debt, and amortized in equal monthly
10		amounts over the life of the new debt, 20 years. Please see the
11		electronic version of Exhibit I provided in the response to Item 14
12		of Staff's First Request for Information on the RUS Series A Note
13		amortization schedule.
14		
15		
16	Witness)	Mark A. Hite
17		

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

1	Item 3) Refer to Big Rivers' response to Item 6 of Staff's First Request.	ı
2	The response to Item 6.e. states that "[t]he decrease in annualized all-in	
3	interest expense is \$1,421,349." The response goes on to state that the	
4	reduction in interest expense does not reflect the increase in the	
5	$amortization\ of\ the\ \$1,225,589\ loss\ associated\ with\ the\ refinancing.$	
6	Provide a schedule showing the amortization period and the annual	
7	amount of the amortization expense associated with the loss on the	
8	refinancing.	
9		
10	Response) As stated in the response to Item 6.e. of Staff's First Request for	
11	Information, the all-in effective interest rate does not include the straight line	
12	amortization of the refinancing loss associated with the RUS and GAAP	
13	accounting for the RUS Series A Note, nor the cost of Big Rivers' counsel. The	
14	refinancing loss of \$1,225,589 will be amortized over the life of the new financing	_
15	20 years, as shown in the table on the following page.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

Case No. 2012-00119 Response to PSC 2-3 Witness: Mark A. Hite Page 1 of 2

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

	A
	Amortization of
$\underline{\operatorname{Period}}$	Refinancing Loss
1	(61,279)
2	(61,279)
3	(61,279)
4	(61,279)
5	(61,279)
6	(61,279)
7	(61,279)
. 8	(61,279)
9	(61,279)
10	(61,279)
11	(61,279)
12	(61,279)
13	(61,279)
14	(61,279)
15	(61,279)
16	(61,279)
17	(61,279)
18	(61,279)
19	(61,279)
20	(61,288)
	(1,225,589)

2

4 Witness) Mark A. Hite

5

APPLICATION OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO ISSUE EVIDENCES OF INDEBTEDNESS CASE NO. 2012-00119

Response to Commission Staff's Second Request for Information Dated May 2, 2012

May 11, 2012

1	Item 4) Confirm that Big Rivers is requesting authority to borrow
2	\$235,000,000 from CoBank and \$345,155,800 (\$302,000,000 + \$43,155,800
3	from the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation for
4	total borrowing of \$580,155,800, which will result in a reduction in annua
5	interest expense of $\$1,421,349^{1}$ compared to current outstanding long-term
6	debt.
7	
8	Response) The foregoing restatement of Big Rivers' request for relief is accurate
9	with respect to the proposed CFC and CoBank term loans.
10	
11	
12	Witness) Mark A. Hite
13	

¹ See response to Staff 's First Request, Item 6. e.