

Jeff C. Greer

From: Terri Combs <terri.combs@ekpc.coop>
Sent: Friday, December 29, 2017 3:32 PM
To: A L Rosenberger ; Alan Ahrman - Owen; Barry Myers -- Taylor County; Bill Prather -- Farmers; Bobby Sexton--Big Sandy; Boris Haynes; Carol Fraley -- Grayson; Carol Wright - Jackson Energy; Chris Brewer - Clark Energy; Debbie Martin -- Shelby; Dennis Holt; Elbert Hampton; Jerry Carter; Jim Jacobus -- Inter-County; Jimmy Longmire -- Salt River; Jody Hughes; Joe Spalding, Inter-County Energy; Joni Hazelrigg; Kelly Shepherd; Ken Arrington -- Grayson; Kerry Howard -- Licking Valley; Landis Cornett; Mark Stallons -- Owen; Mickey Miller -- Nolin; Mike Williams -- Blue Grass; Paul Hawkins -- Farmers; Raymond Rucker; Ted Hampton; Ted Holbrook; Tim Eldridge; Tim Sharp - Salt River Electric; Wayne Stratton -- Shelby; William Shearer -- Clark
Cc: Tony Campbell; Mike McNalley; Don Mosier; David Smart
Subject: From Tony Campbell re: Amendment 3 Memo
Attachments: A3 Load Loss Mitigation Discussion Final.docx

Sending on behalf of Tony Campbell

All:

Since South Kentucky gave us notice to exercise their rights under the MOU, we have had a number of CEO's contact us. Many have asked questions about the financial impacts to the remaining Owner Members. Mike McNalley and his team have been working on the potential cost implications of losing this 58 MW baseload block of power. Please remember this was done somewhat quickly, and we will continue to refine the data. In addition, please note that we will do everything possible to totally mitigate this loss of load, and will protect our Owner Members should it return at an inopportune time.

*Regards,
Anthony "Tony" Campbell*

*President and CEO
Phone: 859-745-9313
Fax: 859-744-7053*



PRIVILEGED OR CONFIDENTIAL NOTICE: This electronic mail transmission is for the use of the named individual or entity to which it is directed and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. It is not to be transmitted to or received by anyone other than the named addressee (or a person authorized to deliver it to the named addressee). It is not to be copied or forwarded to any unauthorized persons. If you have received this electronic mail transmission in error, delete it from your system without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error by replying via email or by calling East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. at 859-744-4812 (collect), so that our address record can be corrected.

East Kentucky Power Cooperative
Mitigation of Amendment 3 Load Loss

December 27, 2017

For this analysis I am using the SK Amendment 3 notice and their actual billings for the 12 months ending November 2017. The notice was for 58MW of load to be removed from the EKPC system, at an effective load factor of 100%.

South Kentucky Billing

EKPC billing differential to SK for the 12 months would have been a reduction of 508,000 MWh and \$30.4 million over the 12 months. This includes a reduction of \$28.5 million from Base Rates, an increase of \$2.5 million from the FAC, and a reduction of \$4.4 million in the ES. The base rate and FAC impacts should be taken together, for a net billing reduction of \$26.0 million.

For SK, we calculate a reduced load factor on the EKPC system because they are removing 100% load factor MWs. SK's load factor in the 12 months of 2017 would have dropped from the actual 56.3% to only 43.5%; this would have resulted in an increased cost per MWh billed by EKPC of \$6.07/MWh (from \$68.95/MWh to \$75.02/MWh). Because we do not have their new contract details it is impossible for us to calculate the net impact of their new contract on SK members.

Cost Shift and Mitigation

The load loss as a result of an Amendment 3 election will shift costs. EKPC will act promptly to mitigate that cost shift.

The cost shift consists of the fixed costs EKPC would no longer recover in base rates from SK, and the ES which would be "automatically" reallocated based on revenue to all members (including SK).

We estimate that the ES amount that would remain with SK is about \$0.3 million, so approximately \$4.1million would be reallocated to the other 15 owner-members.

EKPC's system is approximately half fixed cost and half variable cost (fuel, purchased power, etc). So of the base revenue loss (\$26.0 million), about \$13 million would be fixed and need to be recovered.

Thus, the total cost shift, without any mitigation, is approximately \$17.1 million to the 15 owner members for the 12 month period ending November 2017.

Amendment3 (and SK) provides for a long notice period, which is necessary for EKPC to achieve the best mitigation of the load loss for its owner-members. This is important because it gives EKPC the time to develop and execute numerous options. Without the time to act, EKPC would have only two options: sales of the energy into PJM in the day-ahead and real-time market, and a base rate increase. For 2017,

the energy market would have provided approximately \$5/MWh of margin, or \$2.3 million, leaving an unmitigated balance of \$14.8 million. Given EKPC's low margins this year, this might be large enough to tip us into a base rate increase, especially if we had no further mitigation options.

However, with time, more options unfold. These include participating in the PJM Intermediate Capacity Auctions (IA), the PJM Base (May) Capacity Auction (BRA), natural load growth, economic development, and special contracted loads. In the IA we might expect from \$800k to \$1.6 million of revenue in the first year, growing as the market firms and better prices are realized (three years out) in the BRA.

Load growth in our budget for 2018, which includes a bounce back to weather-normal as well as some real load growth, is projected at 1,388 MW and 974,217 MWh. If this is achieved, it is sufficient to absorb the loss of the SK load, although our EKPC results would be lower than projected (because we have their entire load in our budget). Because the notice period extends beyond the 2018 budget year, it is reasonable to conclude that EKPC can grow load sufficiently to offset the SK loss by the time their load actually leaves. Any load growth on SK's system also will directly benefit the EKPC system and all owner-members because their notice is for a fixed block of power which cannot grow – thus all load growth must be served under the wholesale power agreement.

A significant new load developed through economic development efforts could further mitigate the SK load loss. However to be valuable in this context that new load should be at tariffed rates and not heavily discounted so that it makes a full contribution to the fixed costs. A load such as the expansion of Gallatin, which is interruptible and does not contribute substantially to fixed costs, will not provide a material benefit in this context (it is obviously valuable in other ways).

Special load contracts (bi-lateral agreements) could possibly be negotiated. However the MW size (58) is odd, and it is likely we would have difficulty finding a good match at the size needed.

Finally, the SK notice is for a 20 year contract. We will mitigate the load loss for that period, and this strictly means that we will not have those resources immediately available to serve SK should they desire to return early – again a key reason for the long notice periods in Amendment 3.

Additional Load Loss (more Amendment 3 Notices)

Under Amendment 3, after SK's election, there are approximately 69.2 MW of potential load to be noticed across all owner-members. If some or all of these MWs are noticed soon, EKPC will follow similar mitigation plans. However, our "natural" load growth scenario will be insufficient to absorb all of the load loss by the time the notices are effective, so there likely would be some margin depression for a year or so. Other mitigation efforts might make up some of the shortfall, but we should expect some cost shifting in base rates, at least for a year or two.

All figures are estimates and we are continuing to refine these analyses.