

# **Attachment 1**



Ashley Wilmes &lt;ashley@kyrc.org&gt;

---

## EKPC IRP case - Joint Intervenor follow up re. discovery responses

---

**Ashley Wilmes** <ashley@kyrc.org>  
To: Allyson Honaker <allyson@hloky.com>  
Bcc: Cassandra McCrae <cmccrae@earthjustice.org>

Tue, Sep 27, 2022 at 2:33 PM

Hi Allyson,

Our team and experts have been reviewing EKPC's responses to our discovery requests and we have some requests for clarification / more complete responses on a few of them. Please see the attached document more fully detailing these questions. In an effort to simplify the back and forth, I am also writing to see if EKPC would agree to a call between the Joint Intervenor's modeling experts and EKPC's modeling team to sort out a few of the issues pertaining to Supp. Requests 46a and 44d (as detailed in the attached document). Please let me know if you have any questions regarding these requests or would like to schedule a call to discuss.

Thank you!

Ashley

--

**Ashley Wilmes | Director** (*she/her/hers*)



Kentucky Resources Council  
[www.kyrc.org](http://www.kyrc.org) | 502-875-2428

---

 **Joint Intervenor Discovery Follow-Up Questions.pdf**  
61K

**EKPC Integrated Resource Plan Case  
CASE NO. 2022-00098**

Joint Intervenors' Requests for Clarification as to Information Requests:

1. **Initial Request 39** – Joint Intervenors (JIs) asked for the market and fuel commodity prices used by EKPC to evaluate the 2022 IRP, and EKPC provided a single-page pdf file with three visualizations of the requested prices (one for each of market prices, gas, and coal) over the planning period (roughly Jan. 2022 to September 2036).

We understand from this that EKPC used these three visualizations of market prices/commodity costs to evaluate the 2022 IRP. Is that accurate or would EKPC like to supplement this response with the data file used to create those visualizations and more clearly state forecasted prices/costs it relied on?

2. **Initial Request 96** – JIs asked for the currently effective coal supply contracts, and the response provided only lists the requested information for the Spurlock units.

Is that accurate or would EKPC like to correct or supplement this response to include contracts for EKPC's other coal units?

3. **Supplemental Request 54c - Documentation of RTSim outputs.** Is EKPC able to produce (or otherwise document) RTSim output files beyond those applicable to the "Base Case"?

When JIs asked for all the RTSim input and output files via JI Initial Request 40, EKPC provided a single RTSim output file in response: an Excel-based spreadsheet file titled "Request 40 – output.xlsx".

EKPC confirmed via JI Supplemental Request 50a that the "Request 40 – output.xlsx" file "contains information applicable only to the 'Base Case' as noted in cell A4."

From these responses, we understand that EKPC has no other documentation of RTSim outputs. Is that accurate or would EKPC like to correct or supplement its earlier responses to provide documentation of all RTSim outputs?

Documentation supporting (1) the five plans listed in Table 8-5, from the 2,500 Resource Optimizer runs; and (2) the ten plans for which total "system profit" was provided in response to Staff Initial Request 27c.

In response to Staff's Initial Request 27c, EKPC provided "system profit" values "from the Resource Optimizer for the top ten (10) plans" including the lowest five plans listed in Table 8-5.

We are following up to clarify EKPC's response to JI Supplemental Request 54c, where we asked EKPC to "[p]rovide the spreadsheet(s) with all formulas and links intact showing how the values in PSC Response 27c were calculated." In response, EKPC stated: "The values are developed within RTSim, not within a spreadsheet."

If the values were developed in RTSim, why did EKPC not provide those output files in response to JI Initial Request 40?

If values developed within RTSim cannot be output in spreadsheet form (e.g., file type .xlsx), please explain the source for the single output spreadsheet provided in response to JI Initial Request 40 (titled "Request 40 – output.xlsx").

4. **Supplemental Request 52** – JIs asked for the energy market price forecast used in the RTSim modeling, and EKPC stated that information was provided in response to JI's "First Information Request 40 – Inputs."

Could you please clarify where the energy market price forecast was provided and/or confirm that all the intended input files were produced? If it has already been produced, could you please identify the file name(s) containing the energy market price forecast inputs?

5. **Supplemental Request 46a** - In response to JI Supplemental Request 46a, EKPC states that all the modeling inputs have been provided. However, JI's modeling experts have been unable to locate information in the provided input files reflecting various characteristics and parameters generally used in resource optimization modeling. For example, we have been unable to locate the characterization of existing units (variable cost, start cost, loading levels, etc.), capital cost inputs for new generation units, and any build constraints, among other inputs.

Would EKPC agree to a call between JI's modeling experts and EKPC's modeling team to sort out where that and other information can be independently reviewed in the provided input files? For our part, we'd be glad to include or exclude attorneys according to EKPC's preference.

6. **Supplemental Request 44d** - JI's Supplemental Request 44d asked EKPC's team to explain how an external reviewer could review constraints used in the modeling, e.g., reserve margin requirements, new build constraints, etc. In response, EKPC stated only that "these inputs are not direct drivers for the constraints referenced," presumably referring to the three categories of input files that were provided: fuel, load, and value. But Request 44d did not ask for the drivers of the previously provided inputs, and the question asked has not been answered.

Are we to understand from this that there were no constraints supplied to the model? Meaning, for example, that the model was not required to meet a reserve margin in any given year or at any time in the planning period modeled? If agreeable to EKPC, this response may be easiest to clarify in a call directly between JI's experts and EKPC's modeling staff. Would it be possible to set that up?

## **Attachment 2**



Ashley Wilmes &lt;ashley@kyrc.org&gt;

---

**EKPC IRP case - Joint Intervenor follow up re. discovery responses**

---

**Allyson Honaker** <allyson@hloky.com>  
To: Ashley Wilmes <ashley@kyrc.org>

Mon, Oct 3, 2022 at 3:54 PM

Ashley,

Thank you for your email on September 27, 2022 in which you requested my client, East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.'s ("EKPC") to supplement its responses to certain data requests and for a possible telephone conference between EKPC and the Joint Intervenors.

After reviewing the information attached to your email and discussing with my client, EKPC believes that the information it originally provided is responsive to the questions asked and does not wish to supplement its responses at this time. EKPC believes it has provided all of the requested information within the filings made in this proceeding. In addition, EKPC is also not agreeable to a telephone conference with the Joint Intervenors' modeling witnesses.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns.

[Quoted text hidden]

# **Attachment 3**





Ashley Wilmes &lt;ashley@kyrc.org&gt;

---

**EKPC IRP case - updated confidentiality agreement attached**

---

Ashley Wilmes <ashley@kyrc.org>  
To: Allyson Honaker <allyson@hloky.com>  
Bcc: Cassandra McCrae <cmccrae@earthjustice.org>

Thu, Oct 20, 2022 at 4:21 PM

Allyson:

Attached is an updated Confidentiality Agreement, adding the signature of Shannon Fisk, who is now part of our legal team on this IRP case. He agrees to be bound to the terms of the confidentiality agreement, as indicated by his signature on page 5.

Also, I received your response to my September 27, 2022 email that had requested clarification and more detailed responses to a few of the data requests posed to EKPC by the Joint Intervenors. I wanted to follow up, so that you may share our response with your client. In my email, I had also inquired whether EKPC would agree to a call between the EKPC modeling team and the modeling experts retained by Joint Intervenors, in order to work through a few very specific technical issues pertaining to Supplemental requests 46a and 44d.

Your response indicated that EKPC had declined to supplement the responses and was not agreeable to a telephone conference among the modeling witnesses.

While we respect that decision, it is disappointing that EKPC has declined these opportunities to further the dialogue and to provide additional detail in order to further inform our comments on the proposed IRP. In the 2021 LGE/KU IRP, we found that a brief conversation between the modeling team for the companies and those of our experts to be very helpful in clarifying certain matters not readily apparent from the filed plan and supporting workpapers. We had hoped that in furtherance of our shared interest in assuring the full and fair consideration of all issues and considerations needed to produce a plan to adequately meet the electricity needs of the ratepayers at the lowest possible cost, EKPC would be willing to engage in that conversation and in the minimal effort needed to provide important clarifications prior to our comment deadline.

Joint Intervenors will pursue other avenues, including the scheduled hearing and as needed, post-hearing data requests, to obtain the clarifications that EKPC declined to provide. In all honesty, however, I must convey our disappointment with a simple request for clarification of a few discrete points declined, and a collaborative opportunity missed.

Thanks,

Ashley

--

Ashley Wilmes | Director (*she/her/hers*)

Kentucky Resources Council  
[www.kyrc.org](http://www.kyrc.org) | 502-875-2428



---

**Confidentiality Agreement - Mountain Association - executed (updated 2022-08-18 and 2022-10-17) - Fisk****Signed.pdf**

903K