

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE APPLICATION)
OF THE FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE OF)
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY FROM) CASE NO. 2017-00003
NOVEMBER 1, 2014 THROUGH OCTOBER)
31, 2016)**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
DELBERT BILLITER
MANAGER – FUELS RISK MANAGEMENT
LG&E AND KU SERVICES COMPANY**

Filed: February 20, 2017

1 **Q. Please state your name, position and business address.**

2 A. My name is Delbert Billiter. I am the Manager, Fuels Risk Management for LG&E
3 and KU Services Company, which provides services to Louisville Gas and Electric
4 Company (“LG&E”) and Kentucky Utilities Company (“KU” or “the Company”)
5 (collectively “the Companies”). My business address is 220 West Main Street,
6 Louisville, Kentucky 40202. A statement of my education and work experience is
7 attached to this testimony as Appendix A.

8 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

9 A. I am submitting this testimony in response to the Order entered in this proceeding by
10 the Commission on February 6, 2017 (“Order”), directing KU to file written direct
11 testimony on a number of issues relating to fuel procurement during the two-year
12 period ended October 31, 2016 (“Review Period”).

13 **Q. Please comment generally on the reasonableness of KU’s fuel procurement
14 practices during the Review Period.**

15 A. KU’s coal procurement practices are sufficiently flexible to allow the Company to
16 respond effectively to changes in market conditions. Although KU typically issues
17 formal, sealed-bid solicitations to meet its coal consumption and inventory needs,
18 under its written fuel procurement policy, it may solicit offers through more informal
19 means, or may respond to unsolicited offers to the extent prices and terms and
20 conditions of such offers are competitive with existing market conditions. These
21 practices, by which KU is able to make optimal use of the market, are memorialized
22 in KU’s written fuel procurement policies and procedures. As noted in response to
23 the Commission’s Order, Item No. 32, the fuel procurement policies and procedures

1 were last changed effective August 1, 2015 and were provided to the Commission in
2 response to Question No. 15 in Case No. 2016-00003.

3 During the Two-Year Review Period, KU conducted five (5) written and one
4 (1) oral coal supply solicitations in the competitive marketplace. The solicitations
5 and associated bid tabulation sheets have been filed in each of the prior six-month
6 review periods. The information for the last six-month period ended October 31,
7 2016, is contained in the response to the Commission's Order, Item No. 25(a) and (b).
8 In addition, each vendor from whom KU purchased coal during the six-month period
9 ended October 31, 2016, and the quantities and nature of each purchase (including
10 whether such purchase was a spot or contract purchase), are identified in response to
11 the Commission's Order, Item No. 27.

12 **Q. Did KU comply with these fuel procurement policies during the Review Period?**

13 A. Yes.

14 **Q. Please describe the coal suppliers' adherence to contract delivery schedules
15 during the Review Period.**

16 A. Generally, performance compared to contract has been very good for KU's suppliers.
17 Some suppliers have experienced operational and/or transportation issues that
18 interrupted deliveries but delivery schedules were adjusted and contract volumes were
19 or will be delivered. A summary of all of KU's long-term fuel contracts is contained
20 in the response to the Commission's Order, Item No. 15 (a) – (k).

21 **Q. What were KU's efforts to ensure the coal suppliers' adherence to contract
22 delivery schedules during the Review Period?**

1 A. KU regularly communicates with its vendors to identify any potential problems in
2 meeting agreed-upon delivery schedules. This includes daily correspondence
3 between logistics personnel and periodic on-site mine visits by KU representatives.
4 When suppliers experience issues meeting the delivery schedule, KU works with
5 suppliers to explore options to meet the contract requirement. These options include
6 adjusting future schedule quantity, allowing deliveries from alternate sources, and/or
7 utilizing alternative transportation options.

8 KU continues to work with its suppliers on deliveries and make-up of force
9 majeure events. This has proven to be an effective strategy over time that results in
10 reasonably priced coal being delivered to our generation stations.

11 **Q. Please describe KU's efforts to maintain the adequacy of its coal supplies in light**
12 **of any coal supplier's inability or unwillingness to make contract coal deliveries.**

13 A. If, after making efforts to mitigate a supplier's inability to make contract deliveries,
14 as described above, a supplier is unable to make contract deliveries or if a supplier is
15 unwilling to make contract deliveries, KU could, as necessary, solicit the coal market
16 to purchase additional coal to offset the delivery deficits. KU could also utilize its
17 on-site inventory to address delivery deficits. In addition, KU would exercise its
18 contractual rights to address any delivery deficits with the supplier.

19 To mitigate delivery issues with any one supplier, KU maintains, when
20 operational possible and economically practical, a diversity of suppliers. This
21 diversity assists in maintaining an adequate supply by limiting the impact of a
22 delivery shortfall from an individual supplier.

1 These efforts, coupled with ongoing procurement pursuant to the Company's
2 policies, produced adequate coal supplies through the end of the Review Period.

3 **Q. Were there any changes in coal market conditions that occurred during the**
4 **Review Period, or that KU expects to occur within the next two years that have**
5 **significantly affected or will significantly affect the Company's coal procurement**
6 **practices?**

7 A. The coal market has experienced and continues to undergo substantial changes.
8 Although these changes can affect KU's bargaining power with suppliers, they did
9 not alter, nor are they expected to alter, the Company's coal procurement practices.
10 KU's fuel procurement practices allow the Company to respond effectively to
11 changes in market conditions.

12 The market conditions in the U.S. coal industry continue to be very difficult.
13 The coal market has undergone significant changes due to ever-tightening federal
14 regulations and the growing availability of natural gas at very reasonable prices and
15 in significant volumes. U.S. coal production has declined from over a billion tons in
16 2012 to 739 million tons in 2016 as the industry continues to "right size" to meet
17 lower demand. Coal production is expected to rebound slightly in 2017 as the demand
18 for coal increases marginally in the electric power sector. This change however is not
19 expected to continue for the long term.

20 The U.S. Energy Information Administration's ("EIA") *Short -Term Energy*
21 *Outlook*, released January 10, 2017 effectively confirms the 2016 drop in production
22 and the changes expected in the coal market over the next couple of years in the
23 following:

1 U. S. Coal Supply “EIA estimates that coal production declined by
2 158 million short tons (MMst) (18%) in 2016, to 739 MMst, which
3 would be the lowest level of coal produced since 1978. The
4 decline in coal production in 2016 would be the largest annual
5 decline in terms of both tons and percentage based on data going
6 back to 1949. In 2017, growth in coal-fired electricity generation
7 is expected to lead to an increase of 51 MMst (7%) in total U. S.
8 coal production, with the majority of the increase coming from the
9 Western and Interior regions. Total coal production in 2018 is
10 expected to increase only slightly, with coal production growth in
11 the Western region mostly offset by declines in the Interior region
12 and Appalachia region.”
13

14 U. S. Coal Consumption “Coal consumption in the electric power
15 sector, which accounts for more than 90% of total U. S. coal
16 consumption is estimated to have declined by 60 MMst (8%) in
17 2016. The decline is a result of competition with low-priced
18 natural gas and the relatively mild temperatures in the first half of
19 2016 that reduced overall electricity demand. Coal consumption in
20 the electric power sector is forecast to increase by 41 MMst (6%)
21 in 2017, mostly because of rising natural gas prices and increasing
22 electricity generation. However, a reverse of these trends in 2018
23 is expected to lead to an 11 MMst (1%) decline in power sector
24 coal consumption.”
25

26
27 **Q. Were KU’s costs of fuel for the Review Period reasonable?**

28 A. Yes. The prices KU is paying for coal is very comparable to other utilities in the
29 region as identified in response to the Commission’s Order, Item No. 18. KU
30 continues to follow the same sound coal procurement practices previously reviewed
31 by the Commission. The schedule indicates that demand and prices in the coal market
32 impacted all utilities and that the prices KU is paying for fuel are reasonable based on
33 market conditions.

34 **Q. Were KU’s fuel purchases and practices during the Review Period reasonable?**

1 A. Yes. In my opinion, KU's fuel purchases and practices were reasonable during the
2 Review Period.

3 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

4 A. Yes.

Appendix A

Delbert Billiter

Manager, Fuels Risk Management
LG&E and KU Energy LLC
220 W. Main Street
Louisville, KY 40202
Telephone: (502) 627-4668

Work Experience

LG&E and KU

Manager, Fuels Risk Management	2011 – Present
Manager, Fuels Technical Services	2005 – 2011
Lead Mining Engineer	1996 – 2005

Arch Coal

Manager, Engineering and Preparation	1995 – 1996
Various engineering positions in IL, KY and WV	1988 – 1995

Education

Bachelor of Science – Mining Engineering
University of Kentucky, 1988

Professional

Registered Professional Engineer in KY