1

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Electronic Application of Kentucky ) Power Company for (1) An Order ) Approving the Terms and Conditions ) of the Renewable Energy Purchase ) Agreement for Solar Energy ) ) Case No. Resources Between Kentucky Power ) 2024-00243 Company and Bright Mountain Solar, LLC; (2) Authorization to Enter ) into the Agreement; (3) Recovery ) of Costs Through Tariff P.P.A.; ) (4) Approval of Accounting ) Practices to Establish a ) Regulatory Asset; and (5) All ) Other Required Approvals and ) Relief )

Transcript of January 28, 2025, hearing before Chair Angie C. Hatton at the Kentucky Public Service Commission, 211 Sower Boulevard, Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615.

> LAURA J. KOGUT, RMR, CRR, CRC McLendon-Kogut Reporting Service, LLC 2525 Nelson Miller Parkway, Suite 204 Louisville, Kentucky 40223 (502) 585-5634 lkogut@mclendon-kogut.com www.mclendon-kogut.com

	2	
	2	4
1 C O N T E N T S 2		1 EXHIBITS
3 Appearances	Page 5	2 3 Page
4 Preliminary Matters	7	3 Page Confidential KIUC Exhibit 1 132
5 Testimony of TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM		4 Confidential KIUC Exhibit 2 131
6 Direct Examination by Ms. Glass Cross-Examination by Mr. West	11 13	KIUC 3 131
7 Cross-Examination by Mr. Kurtz Confidential Session (in separate transcript)	27 36	5
8 Continued Cross-Examination by Mr. Kurtz Cross-Examination by Ms. Tussey	36 38	6 7 * * *
9 Examination by Commissioner Stacy Examination by Commissioner Regan	53 60	7 * * * 8
10 Examination By Chair Hatton Confidential Session (in separate transcript)	61 66	9
11 Continued Examination by Chair Hatton Redirect Examination by Ms. Glass	66 69	10
12 Reexamination by Commissioner Stacy 13 Testimony of ZACHARY MICHAEL YETZER	76	11
Direct Examination by Mr. Gish 14 Confidential Session (in separate transcript)	80 82	12
Cross-Examination by Mr. Kurtz 15 Confidential Session (in separate transcript)	82 83	13
Continued Cross-Examination by Mr. Kurtz	84 85	14
16 Cross-Examination by Mr. van Zyl Confidential Session (in separate transcript) 17 Europation by Commissioner Stacy	85 95 95	16
17 Examination by Commissioner Stacy Examination by Commissioner Regan	99	17
18 Confidential Session (in separate transcript) Continued Examination by Commissioner Regan	99 99	18
19 Examination by Chair Hatton Redirect Examination by Mr. Gish	102 105	19
20 Confidential Session (in separate transcript) 21 Testimony of NICOLE MARIE COON	106	20 21
Direct Examination by Mr. Gish 22 Cross-Examination by Mr. West	108 109	22
Cross-Examination by Mr. Kurtz 23 Confidential Session (in separate transcript)	111 113	23
Continued Cross-Examination by Mr. Kurtz 24 Cross-Examination by Mr. van Zyl	114 121	24
Examination by Chair Hatton 25 Redirect Examination by Mr. Gish	126 128	25
	3	5
1 C O N T E N T S		1 APPEARANCES
(Continued)		2 3 FOR KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY:
3	Page	Ms. Katie M. Glass. 4 Stites & Harbison PLLC
Wolffram Confidential Session	132	421 West Main Street
4 (in separate transcript) 5 Testimony of LANE KOLLEN		5 P.O. Box 634 Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0634
Direct Examination by Mr. West	134	6 (502) 223-3477 kglass@stites.com
6 Examination by Commissioner Stacy Examination by Commissioner Regan	135 143	7
7 Examination by Chair Hatton	145	Mr. Kenneth J. Gish, Jr. 8 Stites & Harbison PLLC
Reexamination by Commissioner Stacy	154	250 West Main Street, Suite 2300 9 Lexington, Kentucky 40507-1758
8 Reexamination by Chair Hatton Reexamination by Commissioner Regan	157 159	(859) 226-2300 10 kgish@stites.com
9 Cross-Examination by Mr. Gish	161	11 FOR KENTUCKY INDUSTRIAL UTILITY CUSTOMERS, INC.:
10 Testimony of LEAH WELLBORN Direct Examination by Mr. Kurtz	169	Mr. Michael L. Kurtz 12 Mr. Jody Kyler Cohn
11 Cross-Examination by Mr. Gish	170	Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 13 36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510
Cross-Examination by Mr. Williams 12 Concluding Remarks	171 173	Cincinnati, Ohio 45202 14 (513) 421-2255
12 Concluding Remarks 13	1/3	mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com
14 * * *		<ul><li>15 jkylercohn@bkllawfirm.com</li><li>16 FOR OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:</li></ul>
15 16		Mr. J. Michael West 17 Assistant Attorneys General
17		Office for Rate Intervention 18 700 Capital Avenue, Suite 20
18 19		Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
20		19 (502) 696-5300 michael.west@ky.gov
21 22		20 21
22 23		22 23
24 25		24
		25

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

3 (Pages 6 to 9) McLendon-Kogut Reporting Service, LLC

(502) 585-5634

	10	12
1	Is anybody aware of any public comment	1 first is on page 6 of my direct testimony, and lines
2	request?	2 12. I apparently inserted an extra "I" in the word
3	MR. VAN ZYL: We are not aware of any	3 "analyzing." So it would be just to correct the
4	comments notice.	4 spelling of that.
5	CHAIR HATTON: Okay, then. We'll move to	5 The next one is on page 11, line 12 of my
6	presentation of evidence.	6 direct testimony. The word construction needs an
7	And counsel for the Applicant, you may call	7 "S," so it would just be to correct the spelling of
8	your first.	8 "construction."
9	MS. GLASS: Kentucky Power calls Tanner	9 And then I sponsored a data request. It was
10	Wolffram.	10 Staff's first set, question 5, in the second
11	CHAIR HATTON: Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.	11 paragraph, within the parentheses it said it
12	MR. WOLFFRAM: Good morning.	12 currently reads, (Reading) \$83.26 per megawatt hour.
13	CHAIR HATTON: You've already raised your	13 That should be \$83.68 per megawatt hour.
14	right hand to be sworn.	14 Q. Thank you.
15	Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're	15 Do you have any other corrections?
16	about to give is true and correct under penalty of	16 A. I do not.
17	perjury?	17 Q. And subject to those corrections, if I were
18	MR. WOLFFRAM: I do.	18 to ask you those same questions today, would your
19	CHAIR HATTON: Please be seated. And tell us	19 responses be the same?
20	your full name and address, business address, for	20 A. They would be.
21	the record.	21 MS. GLASS: Thank you. The witness is
22	THE WITNESS: My name is Tanner Scott	22 available for cross-examination.
23	Wolffram. My business address is 1645 Winchester	23 CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. West. 24 * * *
24 25	Avenue, Ashland, Kentucky. CHAIR HATTON: And as far as questioning	25
20	CHAIR HAITON: And as far as questioning	
	11	13
1	11	13
1	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION
2	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 By Mr. West:
2 3	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> </ol>
2 3 4	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> </ol>
2 3 4	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> </ol>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> </ol>
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn,	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass:	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass:	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My position is director of regulatory services.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> <li>about 713 megawatts of capacity in 2028.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My position is director of regulatory services. Q. Thank you.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> <li>about 713 megawatts of capacity in 2028.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. West) Okay. And so is the PPA that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My position is director of regulatory services. Q. Thank you. And did you cause to be filed into the record	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> <li>about 713 megawatts of capacity in 2028.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. West) Okay. And so is the PPA that</li> <li>the Commission is reviewing today a first step in</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My position is director of regulatory services. Q. Thank you. And did you cause to be filed into the record of this case direct and rebuttal testimony and	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> <li>about 713 megawatts of capacity in 2028.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. West) Okay. And so is the PPA that</li> <li>the Commission is reviewing today a first step in</li> <li>addressing that need as to how it's characterized</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My position is director of regulatory services. Q. Thank you. And did you cause to be filed into the record of this case direct and rebuttal testimony and responses to data requests?	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> <li>about 713 megawatts of capacity in 2028.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. West) Okay. And so is the PPA that</li> <li>the Commission is reviewing today a first step in</li> <li>addressing that need as to how it's characterized</li> <li>within your testimony?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My position is director of regulatory services. Q. Thank you. And did you cause to be filed into the record of this case direct and rebuttal testimony and responses to data requests? A. I did.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> <li>about 713 megawatts of capacity in 2028.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. West) Okay. And so is the PPA that</li> <li>the Commission is reviewing today a first step in</li> <li>addressing that need as to how it's characterized</li> <li>within your testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes. The Company's proposal here is part of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My position is director of regulatory services. Q. Thank you. And did you cause to be filed into the record of this case direct and rebuttal testimony and responses to data requests? A. I did. Q. Do you have any updates or corrections to any	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> <li>about 713 megawatts of capacity in 2028.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. West) Okay. And so is the PPA that</li> <li>the Commission is reviewing today a first step in</li> <li>addressing that need as to how it's characterized</li> <li>within your testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes. The Company's proposal here is part of</li> <li>the company's overall generation transformation that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	order today, after Applicant, Attorney General, and then KIUC. Is that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: okay with everybody? And Staff? Okay. MR. VAN ZYL: Yes. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel may ask. MS. GLASS: Thank you. TANNER SCOTT WOLFFRAM, called by Kentucky Power Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Ms. Glass: Q. Mr. Wolffram, can you please state your employer and your position? A. My employer is Kentucky Power Company. My position is director of regulatory services. Q. Thank you. And did you cause to be filed into the record of this case direct and rebuttal testimony and responses to data requests? A. I did.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. West:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Mr. Wolffram. How are you doing?</li> <li>A. Doing well. How are you?</li> <li>Q. So on page 5 of your direct testimony you</li> <li>state that Kentucky Power has a need for 713</li> <li>megawatts of capacity starting in '28; is that</li> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. You said on page 5 of my testimony?</li> <li>Q. Yeah. I believe so.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I believe it's page 4.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>A. Oh, okay. So starting yeah. So my direct</li> <li>testimony there states that the Company's 2022 IRP</li> <li>identified a need for 115 megawatts of capacity</li> <li>beginning in '26, 66 megawatts in '27, and then</li> <li>about 713 megawatts of capacity in 2028.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. West) Okay. And so is the PPA that</li> <li>the Commission is reviewing today a first step in</li> <li>addressing that need as to how it's characterized</li> <li>within your testimony?</li> <li>A. Yes. The Company's proposal here is part of</li> </ol>

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

	14		16
1	plan to use to address our energy and capacity needs	1 happy to take a look at it if there's a specific	
2	moving forward.	2 reference.	
3	Q. So how much of that ener I'm sorry,	3 Q. Subject to check. I don't have a specific	
4	capacity need will this proposal address?	4 reference, but subject to check, if those values	
5	A. So this project's accredited capacity, if we	5 were to decline, how would that affect the 4.8	
6	can turn to page 7 of my direct testimony, on	6 megawatts of value that's assumed here?	
7	line 19, this project represents approximately 4.8	7 A. Assuming that the ELCC accreditation were	to
8	megawatts of accredited capacity.	<sup>8</sup> decline, then the accredited capacity would also	
9	Q. And isn't the facility an 80-megawatt	<sup>9</sup> decline in that PJM planning.	
10	facility?	10 Q. Okay. So the 713 megawatts of need in '28	
11	A. Nameplate it is 80 megawatts, yes.	11 that you mentioned earlier minus 4.8 megawatts	
12	Q. Yeah. So can you explain to me why it's only	12 leaves is it 7 708.2 megawatts remaining,	
13	offering 4.8 megawatts of capacity benefit?	13 correct?	
14	A. Sure. So the 4.8 megawatts of accredited	14 A. Well, not that I am an attorney by trade, but	
15	capacity relates to the ELCC accreditation at PJM.	15 that math does sound sound.	
16	So because of the resource type, one that it's	16 Q. Yeah. Thank you.	
17	solar, and second because it is a fixed-tilt asset,	17 So I'm not going to ask you to go into any	
18	that and it comes online in 2027, that we you	18 specifics, but does Kentucky Power or what are	
19	look at the ELCC accreditation, that gives you a	19 some of the ways Kentucky Power's contemplating to	)
20	percentage of nameplate that goes to the accredited	20 address this remaining 700 megawatts of need?	
21	capacity.	21 A. Sure. So I think, as we've noted throughout	
22	And I think Company Witness Coon provided the	22 this docket, the Company is continuing to evaluat	
23	PJM ELCC accreditation for a similar type of project	23 other resources that were bid into the Company's	
24	in a data request, I believe.	24 <b>RFP</b> , specifically the thermal resources portion of	
25	Q. Okay. So part of that analysis for the ELCC	25 the RFP. So we continue to evaluate options ther	e.
	15		17
1			
1	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively	1 And then, based on our evaluation, we would make	a
		1 And then, based on our evaluation, we would make	a
2	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> </ol>	a
2 3	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then you get diminishing returns because they're they	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then you get diminishing returns because they're they can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then you get diminishing returns because they're they can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that analysis?	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> <li>be generating when when the sun is not shining.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> <li>be generating when when the sun is not shining.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then you get diminishing returns because they're they can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that analysis? <b>A.</b> I'm positive around the diminishing returns part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates the ability of the resource to generate. You know, given the solar type of resource, it would obviously the resource is going to produce while the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation accounts for the fact that that resource would not be generating when when the sun is not shining. Q. Thank you. Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> <li>be generating when when the sun is not shining.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline</li> <li>over the the future?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> <li>something that we would certainly evaluate.</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> <li>be generating when when the sun is not shining.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline</li> <li>over the the future?</li> <li>A. Are you asking specifically related to</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> <li>something that we would certainly evaluate.</li> <li>Q. But it if it's possible, how much</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then you get diminishing returns because they're they can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that analysis? A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates the ability of the resource to generate. You know, given the solar type of resource, it would obviously the resource is going to produce while the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation accounts for the fact that that resource would not be generating when when the sun is not shining. Q. Thank you. Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline over the the future? A. Are you asking specifically related to fixed-tilt	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> <li>something that we would certainly evaluate.</li> <li>Q. But it if it if it's possible, how much</li> <li>of the capacity need would remain as a part</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then you get diminishing returns because they're they can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that analysis? A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates the ability of the resource to generate. You know, given the solar type of resource, it would obviously the resource is going to produce while the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation accounts for the fact that that resource would not be generating when when the sun is not shining. Q. Thank you. Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline over the the future? A. Are you asking specifically related to fixed-tilt Q. Yes.	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> <li>something that we would certainly evaluate.</li> <li>Q. But it if it if it's possible, how much</li> <li>of the capacity need would remain as a part</li> <li>attached to Mitchell provide in addressing the</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then you get diminishing returns because they're they can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that analysis? A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates the ability of the resource to generate. You know, given the solar type of resource, it would obviously the resource is going to produce while the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation accounts for the fact that that resource would not be generating when when the sun is not shining. Q. Thank you. Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline over the the future? A. Are you asking specifically related to fixed-tilt Q. Yes. A solars?	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it if it's possible, how much</li> <li>of the capacity need would remain as a part</li> <li>attached to Mitchell provide in addressing the</li> <li>700-megawatt need?</li> </ol>	a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> <li>be generating when when the sun is not shining.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline</li> <li>over the the future?</li> <li>A. Are you asking specifically related to</li> <li>fixed-tilt</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A solars?</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> <li>something that we would certainly evaluate.</li> <li>Q. But it if it if it's possible, how much</li> <li>of the capacity need would remain as a part</li> <li>attached to Mitchell provide in addressing the</li> <li>700-megawatt need?</li> <li>A. I'd have to do the calculation in terms of,</li> </ul>	a ny
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> <li>be generating when when the sun is not shining.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline</li> <li>over the the future?</li> <li>A. Are you asking specifically related to</li> <li>fixed-tilt</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A solars?</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. I don't know off the top of my head, but I do</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> <li>something that we would certainly evaluate.</li> <li>Q. But it if it if it's possible, how much</li> <li>of the capacity need would remain as a part</li> <li>attached to Mitchell provide in addressing the</li> <li>700-megawatt need?</li> <li>A. I'd have to do the calculation in terms of,</li> <li>you know, what the ELCC accreditation on Mitchel</li> </ol>	a ny
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> <li>be generating when when the sun is not shining.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline</li> <li>over the the future?</li> <li>A. Are you asking specifically related to</li> <li>fixed-tilt</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A solars?</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. I don't know off the top of my head, but I do</li> <li>believe that the data request does provide an</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> <li>something that we would certainly evaluate.</li> <li>Q. But it if it if it's possible, how much</li> <li>of the capacity need would remain as a part</li> <li>attached to Mitchell provide in addressing the</li> <li>700-megawatt need?</li> <li>A. I'd have to do the calculation in terms of,</li> <li>you know, what the ELCC accreditation on Mitchel</li> <li>would be. Again, it's a 790-megawatt nameplate</li> </ul>	a ny
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>and value of 4.8 is that you can only effectively</li> <li>rely on solar resources to a certain extent and then</li> <li>you get diminishing returns because they're they</li> <li>can't serve load 24/7. Is that part of that</li> <li>analysis?</li> <li>A. I'm positive around the diminishing returns</li> <li>part of that question. Again, the ELCC contemplates</li> <li>the ability of the resource to generate. You know,</li> <li>given the solar type of resource, it would</li> <li>obviously the resource is going to produce while</li> <li>the sun is shining, and so the ELCC accreditation</li> <li>accounts for the fact that that resource would not</li> <li>be generating when when the sun is not shining.</li> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>Are ELCC values in PJM projected to decline</li> <li>over the the future?</li> <li>A. Are you asking specifically related to</li> <li>fixed-tilt</li> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A solars?</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A. I don't know off the top of my head, but I do</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>And then, based on our evaluation, we would make</li> <li>recommendation from some grouping of projects to</li> <li>meet the energy and capacity needs that the Compa</li> <li>has.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to take a step back, the 713</li> <li>megawatts of need, a lot of that is driven by losing</li> <li>access to the Mitchell capacity, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, but the so the IRP currently</li> <li>contemplates Mitchell Kentucky Power's interest</li> <li>in Mitchell terminating in 2028.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So, again, not to get into specifics,</li> <li>but is it possible that Kentucky Power retains some</li> <li>interest in Mitchell?</li> <li>A. I don't know, sitting here today, you know,</li> <li>whether or not it it's possible, but it's</li> <li>something that we would certainly evaluate.</li> <li>Q. But it if it if it's possible, how much</li> <li>of the capacity need would remain as a part</li> <li>attached to Mitchell provide in addressing the</li> <li>700-megawatt need?</li> <li>A. I'd have to do the calculation in terms of,</li> <li>you know, what the ELCC accreditation on Mitchel</li> </ol>	a ny

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

	18	20
1	portion of that 790 megawatts would go to serving	1 Q. Okay. So, again, understand that we're not
2	that that 713-megawatt need.	2 math experts here, but 708.2 megawatts of capacity
3	Q. Mitchell's a coal facility, so the ELCC	3 that would be left unaddressed by this proposal
4	values for coal facilities are much higher than	4 divided by 713 megawatts of need is 99.3 percent,
5	those for solar, correct? So we're talking six,	5 roughly.
6	seven hundred megawatts, roughly?	6 So I guess my question is: If the Commission
7	A. Again, I don't have that math off the top of	7 has been provided with no certainty about how
8	my head, but	8 Kentucky Power will address the 99.3 percent of
9	Q. Okay. Is it possible that Kentucky Power	9 capacity need, isn't it possible that this
10	Kentucky Power acquires capacity from other thermal	10 4.8-megawatt project could end up becoming wasteful
11	resources, whether through the PPA or other means?	11 and duplicative?
12	A. The Company is continuing to evaluate the	12 A. Well, I don't I don't view it that way,
13	thermal P PPA bids that were made as part of its	13 and and there's a couple reasons. One, the
14	<b>2023 RFP process</b> , yes.	14 Company had evaluated and Company Witness Yetzer
15	<ul><li>Q. Yes. The answer was yes? Did you say yes?</li><li>A. We'll still evaluating, yes.</li></ul>	<ul> <li>15 can speak on this a little bit more, but at the time</li> <li>16 that it did short list the Bright Mountain facility,</li> </ul>
16 17	<ul><li>A. We'll still evaluating, yes.</li><li>Q. If Kentucky Power ends up acquiring such</li></ul>	<ul> <li>17 it did have other projects that it had planned to</li> </ul>
18	resources, could that provide six, seven, eight	18 or that it did short list that it was going,
19	hundred megawatts of capacity?	19 potentially, to bring forward to this Commission,
20	A. I don't know that I could, you know,	<ul> <li>20 and ultimately two of those projects, you know,</li> </ul>
21	specifically give you a number on the accredited	<ul> <li>21 either had to withdraw from the process or had to</li> </ul>
22	capacity associated with any facility. Again, it	22 reprice, and then those projects weren't ultimately
23	would depend on what facility we ultimately	23 selected.
24	selected.	24 So the Company did attempt to move forward to
25	You know, there there are quite a few	25 address most of the energy and capacity needs that
	19	21
1	thermal resources that were bid into the PPA, or the	1 it had identified, but given some of the uncertainty
2	RFP process that we're evaluating, and so it would	2 around the EPA regulations, specifically the final
3	largely depend on the asset that was selected, the	<sup>3</sup> rule for 111(d), the Company had to take additional
4	type of thermal asset, whether it's a CT or a CC,	4 steps to evaluate those thermal resources beyond the
5	those type of things. So it would largely depend on	5 timing that this project was on.
6	what asset was ultimately selected.	6 And given the timing, there was a risk that
7	Q. So is it fair to sum up that Kentucky	7 the Company could either lose this project or that
8 9	Power how how Kentucky Power will address this	8 the price of this project could potentially increase 9 if it had to wait on the evaluation of the other
10	remaining need is uncertain at this time? A. The Company understands the Commission's	<ul> <li>9 if it had to wait on the evaluation of the other</li> <li>10 thermal resources. And so the Company made the</li> </ul>
11	directive that the Commission expects the Company to	10 decision to move forward with this project on the
12	have owned or contracted for generation to serve its	12 timeline that it did to ensure that it had this
13	load, and so we are taking steps to ensure that we	13 resource to serve customers.
14	can meet that Commission directive and best serve	14I also don't think when you're looking at
15	our customers. This is just the first step in that	15 the Company's total portfolio as it exists now, we
16	overall process, the Bright Mountain project, that	16 are a hundred percent fossil-based. I think my
17	is.	17 understanding from the Commission's Commission's
18	Q. Is one of the tests for the Commission to	18 past orders is that the Commission recognizes the
19	consider here whether this resource is represents	19 benefit of having some resource diversity within a
20	wasteful duplication?	20 utility's generation portfolio, and this asset
21	A. My understanding, as as I described in my	21 allows us to have some resource diversity. It
22	direct testimony, is the Commission does analyze	22 allows us to have potential economic development
23	whether or not this REPA would result in wasteful	23 opportunities.
24	duplication as part of their overall review of the	24 And so I don't believe that, to the extent
24 25	duplication as part of their overall review of the project, yes.	<ul> <li>And so I don't believe that, to the extent</li> <li>the Commission were to approve this project, this</li> </ul>

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

	22		24
1	project goes into service, and then the Company	1	A. Sure. So a a REC is a renewable energy
2	potentially brings forward an additional project		credit. It's, you know, functionally a certificate
3	that this project becomes, quote/unquote, wasteful	3	that, you know, corporations or industrial customers
4	duplication. I think this project stands on its	4	can use to meet environmental sustainability goals
5	own, and I think or we've put the evidence	5	that they may have or, you know, if they have other
6	forward to demonstrate that this project is the	6	green initiatives, for them to use to meet those
7	right the right project to serve customers.	7	those goals.
8	Q. Okay. I want to move on a little bit, but I	8	Q. Okay. Just so I understand and make sure
9	think it relates to something you just said. You	9	we're on the same page, when a REC is sold to a
10	mentioned economic development.	10	business, for instance, it's typically purchased so
11	A. Sure.	11	that they can offset nonclean energy elsewhere,
12	Q. So is a part of the justification for the	12	right, or possibly, in some circumstances?
13	necessity of this project that certain business or	13	A. Yeah. I think it's specific circumstances,
14	industrial ratepayers may demand clean energy?	14	but they it can used to do that.
15	A. My understanding and again, I believe	15	Q. Okay. Part of the analysis here was that the
16	Company Witness Coon can give you some further	16	sale of the RECs associated with this project would
17	details, given her experience across specifically	17	reduce, but not eliminate, the costs associated with
18	the A the other AEP East affiliate companies.		it, correct?
19	But we have had interactions with customers that,		A. Correct. The REPA price is set, and then the
20	you know, are looking for, you know, renewable power	20	<b>REC</b> value that the Company would seek to liquidate
21	to locate within the service territory. I think	21	would then offset the ultimate cost of the REPA to
22	that's not just for Kentucky Power, it's across the,	22	customers.
23	you know, AEP East footprint from my understanding.	23	Q. So I guess my question is: If a REC is being
24	Q. Okay. And does Kentucky Power have a green		sold to offset emissions elsewhere, geographically,
25	tariff?	25	from an emissions' perspective, isn't the seller
	23		25
1	A. We have Tariff RPO.	1	just stepping into the shoes of the generator who
2	Q. Can you explain what that is?	2	generated the nonclean energy?
3	A. Sure. So Tariff RPO is a renewal power	3	A. Sorry. Could you repeat that question?
4	option rider. Under Tariff RPO, there's two	4	Q. Yes. From a an emissions' perspective, if
5	options. Under Option A, functionally, once the	5	a REC is sold to offset emissions elsewhere, isn't
6	Company is subscribed to a certain point, the	6	the seller of the REC stepping into the shoes of the
7	Company would go out and acquire RECs to for		generator from an emissions' perspective?
8 9	participating customers. Then under Option B, the Company can contract	8	A. I I don't know that I can answer that
	for with, let's say, a larger customer, over a	9 10	<b>question sitting here today.</b> Q. Okay. Just to follow up, if RECs are sold,
11	thousand kW, for for purchase of renewable supply	11	and this is allegedly green energy that some of your
12	and renewable energy credits.	12	customers are demanding, it's not actually
13	Q. Okay. So if a specific business or	13	emissions-free if it's offsetting emissions
14	industrial customer wants to contract for renewable	14	elsewhere, is it?
15	energy, they can do that through your existing	15	A. Well, I think this project, again, stands on
16	tariff options, correct?	16	its own in terms of this is the only nonthermal
17	A. They could, but currently like the Bright	17	resource that the Company would would have
18	Mountain facility would give us the option, under	18	access, but you know, access to either owned or
19	Option B, to have a resource located within our	19	contracted for.
20	service territory that we are contracted for to give	20	So I don't think we're using it to offset
21	customers an option to buy that output and the	21	you know, like we've talked about, this is not
22	renewable energy credits associated with that	22	designed to replace Mitchell. It's not designed to
23	facility.	23	replace any potential thermal resource that we may
24	Q. You mentioned RECs. Can you describe what a	24	short list as a result of the continued evaluation
25	REC is?	25	of the RFP. This is a stand-alone resource that we

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

	26	28
1	think is part of the overall least-cost reasonable	1 50-percent ownership interest, would the Commission
2	portfolio to serve customers.	2 need to approve that?
3	So I guess I would disagree that this is	3 MS. GLASS: I'll object just to the extent
4	somehow offsetting emissions from some some other	4 that it calls for a legal conclusion.
5	plant. This is, again, part of our portfolio to	5 MR. KURTZ: Let me rephrase.
6	address the energy and capacity needs that the	6 Q. (By Mr. Kurtz) Why does the IRP assume that
7	Company has.	7 Kentucky Power will sell its 50-percent ownership in
8	Q. But you admitted that some businesses buy	8 Mitchell, therefore creating this large capacity
9	RECs for that purpose, to offset emissions	9 need after 2028?
10	elsewhere, correct?	10 A. So I don't know off the top of my head if the
11	A. Sure. But I don't think the my point is,	11 IRP actually assumes that we will sell, it's just
12	I don't think the the company is not entering	12 that it's reflecting our expectation that our
13	into this contract specifically to, you know,	13 entitlement to our 50-percent interest terminates in
14	ultimately sell those RECs to customers. It's just	14 2028 as a result of the order and the Company's CPC
15	a potential option that we have under Tariff RPO to	15 and application for CCR in ELG.
16	sell – or contract those RECs to a customer that is	16 Q. You're aware that there were several orders
17	potentially looking to locate within the Company's	17 issued by the Commission after that indicating an
18	service territory. Otherwise we would use those	18 expectation that if Mitchell were to be sold, it
19	RECs and liquidate those in the markets that Company	19 would be sold at or close to net book value?
20	Witness Coon can elaborate more can provide more	20 A. I'm generally aware that language like that
21	detail on.	21 has appeared in Commission orders, yes.
22	But, again, it's just an option for us, under	22 Q. Let's just be be honest about it. West
23	our current structure, to be able to further	23 Virginia has a different point of view about
24	functionally buy down the cost of the REPA to	24 Kentucky Power's 50-percent ownership interest in
25	customers.	25 Mitchell. They've taken the position that Kentucky
	27	29
1	27	
1	MR. WEST: That's all I have.	1 Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's
2	MR. WEST: That's all I have. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> </ol>
2 3	MR. WEST: That's all I have. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> </ol>
2 3 4	MR. WEST: That's all I have. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	MR. WEST: That's all I have. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz:	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	MR. WEST: That's all I have. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. WEST: That's all I have. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram. A. Good morning.	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company</li> <li>based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company</li> <li>based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> <li>Kentucky Power owns an undivided 50-percent interest</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> <li>now.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. We've had a number of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company</li> <li>based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> <li>Kentucky Power owns an undivided 50-percent interest in in the Mitchell Plant.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> <li>now.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. We've had a number of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company</li> <li>based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> <li>Kentucky Power owns an undivided 50-percent interest in in the Mitchell Plant.</li> <li>Just by way of background, Mitchell is a</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> <li>now.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. We've had a number of</li> <li>days of jackhammering, so today is not a day of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company</li> <li>based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> <li>Kentucky Power owns an undivided 50-percent interest in in the Mitchell Plant.</li> <li>Just by way of background, Mitchell is a two-unit coal facility located in West Virginia?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> <li>now.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. We've had a number of</li> <li>days of jackhammering, so today is not a day of</li> <li>jackhammering, but it's going to be really nice</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company</li> <li>based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> <li>Kentucky Power owns an undivided 50-percent interest in in the Mitchell Plant.</li> <li>Just by way of background, Mitchell is a</li> <li>two-unit coal facility located in West Virginia?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> <li>now.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. We've had a number of</li> <li>days of jackhammering, so today is not a day of</li> <li>jackhammering, but it's going to be really nice</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> <li>Kentucky Power owns an undivided 50-percent interest in in the Mitchell Plant.</li> <li>Just by way of background, Mitchell is a two-unit coal facility located in West Virginia?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. It's 50 percent owned by Kentucky</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> <li>now.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. We've had a number of</li> <li>days of jackhammering, so today is not a day of</li> <li>jackhammering, but it's going to be really nice</li> <li>when it's done.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> <li>Kentucky Power owns an undivided 50-percent interest in in the Mitchell Plant.</li> <li>Just by way of background, Mitchell is a two-unit coal facility located in West Virginia?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. It's 50 percent owned by Kentucky</li> <li>Power and 50 percent owned by your AEP affiliate</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> <li>now.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. We've had a number of</li> <li>days of jackhammering, so today is not a day of</li> <li>jackhammering, but it's going to be really nice</li> <li>when it's done.</li> <li>(Indiscernible conversation.)</li> <li>MR. WEST: Chair, do you know, are these</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>MR. WEST: That's all I have.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Wolffram.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I want to follow up from some of the things</li> <li>Mr. West was talking about.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. On page 4 of your direct testimony, this is</li> <li>where you list the capacity needs of the Company based upon your 2022 IRP.</li> <li>A. Yes, sir.</li> <li>Q. On line 9 you you state, (Reading)</li> <li>Kentucky Power owns an undivided 50-percent interest in in the Mitchell Plant.</li> <li>Just by way of background, Mitchell is a two-unit coal facility located in West Virginia?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. It's 50 percent owned by Kentucky</li> <li>Power and 50 percent owned by your AEP affiliate</li> <li>Wheeling Power?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Power walked away from it, essentially, and it's</li> <li>theirs, and this Commission, in multiple orders, has</li> <li>has indicated that maybe not.</li> <li>MS. BLEND: Commissioner Regan is having</li> <li>trouble hearing.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Oh, I'm sorry.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz, I might just ask</li> <li>you to pause there. I was trying not to interrupt</li> <li>your flow, but we probably need to check on this</li> <li>construction real quick.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Because we we were not</li> <li>under the impression it was going to be like this</li> <li>today. Goodness.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Maybe they're done sawing things</li> <li>now.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. We've had a number of</li> <li>days of jackhammering, so today is not a day of</li> <li>jackhammering, but it's going to be really nice</li> <li>when it's done.</li> <li>(Indiscernible conversation.)</li> <li>MR. WEST: Chair, do you know, are these</li> <li>supposed to be real?</li> </ol>

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

30	32
1 CHAIR HATTON: In this courtroom, they are.	1 A. It was reduced a little bit in our analysis
2 MR. WEST: Okay.	2 in rebuttal with our updated fundamentals. It's
3 CHAIR HATTON: That's a very good question.	<sup>3</sup> roughly 29 cents, but our direct case, it was 34
4 MR. WEST: All right.	4 cents.
5 CHAIR HATTON: That was asked in previous	5 Q. Okay. And and what that is, is that
6 hearings that recorded just fine, so	6 compares the cost of energy under the renewable
7 I'm contemplating taking a break at this	7 energy power agreement versus market, essentially?
8 point.	8 A. It compares so the the analysis that we
9 (Indiscernible conversation.)	<sup>9</sup> did to create the associated rate impacts that was
10 CHAIR HATTON: The other way around.	10 conducted by Company Witness Coon takes the price of
11 Let's go off the record just a minute.	11 the REPA, so our set price, and then it looks at
12 MS. SACRE: We're off, Chairman.	12 what we expect to receive from the project's
13 (Recess from 9:32 a.m. to 9:33 a.m.)	13 participation within the PJM markets, avoided
14 MS. SACRE: Okay.	14 capacity, and then liquidation of RECs.
15 CHAIR HATTON: All right. Commissioner Regan	15 And then once you take those, the revenues
16 has saved the day. We are back on the record in	16 associated with PJM participation, the avoided
17 Kentucky Power's	17 capacity, and the value the assumed value of
18 COMMISSIONER REGAN: They don't like to be	18 <b>RECs</b> , that creates the overall rate impact.
19 touched.	19 Q. And that excuse me. And the energy offset
20 CHAIR HATTON: Case Number 2024-00243.	20 as well, avoided energy
21 Sorry, Mr. Kurtz, could you repeat your last	21 A. Sure.
22 question?	22 Q you forgot that one.
23 MR. KURTZ: Thank you. Thank you, Chair.	23 But but that analysis shows that this
24 Q. (By Mr. Kurtz) Just to sum get off of	24 contract is a net cost to consumers compared to the
25 Mitchell, that that is a big issue that has to be	25 avoided cost of energy capacity and the assumed
31	33
1 resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some	1 value of RECs, correct?
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> <li>associated with the economic development</li> <li>opportunities that Avangrid put forward.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's that's the good news. It is iron</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> <li>associated with the economic development</li> <li>opportunities that Avangrid put forward.</li> <li>It also provides us a physical hedge located</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's that's the good news. It is iron</li> <li>and steel in the ground?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> <li>associated with the economic development</li> <li>opportunities that Avangrid put forward.</li> <li>It also provides us a physical hedge located</li> <li>within our service territory that can help offset</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's that's the good news. It is iron</li> <li>and steel in the ground?</li> <li>A. Yeah. Within our service territory, correct.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> <li>associated with the economic development</li> <li>opportunities that Avangrid put forward.</li> <li>It also provides us a physical hedge located</li> <li>within our service territory that can help offset</li> <li>some of the risks associated with volatile commodity</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's that's the good news. It is iron</li> <li>and steel in the ground?</li> <li>Q. Okay. But now let's get to the the rest</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> <li>associated with the economic development</li> <li>opportunities that Avangrid put forward.</li> <li>It also provides us a physical hedge located</li> <li>within our service territory that can help offset</li> <li>some of the risks associated with volatile commodity</li> <li>prices that we obviously saw as part of our last</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's that's the good news. It is iron</li> <li>and steel in the ground?</li> <li>O. Kay. But now let's get to the the rest</li> <li>of the story. This facility is going to cost your</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> <li>associated with the economic development</li> <li>opportunities that Avangrid put forward.</li> <li>It also provides us a physical hedge located</li> <li>within our service territory that can help offset</li> <li>some of the risks associated with volatile commodity</li> <li>prices that we obviously saw as part of our last</li> <li>two-year FAC proceeding. So there are additional</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's that's the good news. It is iron</li> <li>and steel in the ground?</li> <li>Q. Okay. But now let's get to the the rest</li> <li>of the story. This facility is going to cost your</li> <li>average residential customer in year one 34 cents a</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> <li>associated with the economic development</li> <li>opportunities that Avangrid put forward.</li> <li>It also provides us a physical hedge located</li> <li>within our service territory that can help offset</li> <li>some of the risks associated with volatile commodity</li> <li>prices that we obviously saw as part of our last</li> <li>two-year FAC proceeding. So there are additional</li> <li>benefits beyond what we've quantified.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>resolved between West Virginia and Kentucky at some</li> <li>point in the future?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Start with the good news. How many</li> <li>this this facility will be built in Kentucky</li> <li>Power's service territory?</li> <li>A. Yes, sir. In Perry County.</li> <li>Q. And there will be a fair amount of</li> <li>construction jobs?</li> <li>A. Yes. Again, I will rely on the information</li> <li>provided by Bright Mountain and Avangrid in their</li> <li>application before the Commission, but they they</li> <li>did quantify, and if you want specifics, it's on</li> <li>page 10 of my direct testimony.</li> <li>Q. And there there will be property taxes, I</li> <li>assume, so I should that they'll pay?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's that's the good news. It is iron</li> <li>and steel in the ground?</li> <li>O. Kay. But now let's get to the the rest</li> <li>of the story. This facility is going to cost your</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>value of RECs, correct?</li> <li>A. Based on the benefits that we quantified,</li> <li>this would be a slight cost to customers as a</li> <li>result.</li> <li>Q. Well, it's a like a 14.6 million net</li> <li>present value harm to customers in the direct</li> <li>testimony?</li> <li>A. I would disagree with the characterization</li> <li>that it's a harm to customers. Again, this asset</li> <li>will be available to provide safe, reliable, and</li> <li>adequate service to our customers, and it gives the</li> <li>other benefits that we haven't quantified, which is,</li> <li>again, having a diversity resource within our</li> <li>portfolio, potentially for economic benefits that we</li> <li>didn't quantify. We didn't include the benefits</li> <li>associated with the economic development</li> <li>opportunities that Avangrid put forward.</li> <li>It also provides us a physical hedge located</li> <li>within our service territory that can help offset</li> <li>some of the risks associated with volatile commodity</li> <li>prices that we obviously saw as part of our last</li> <li>two-year FAC proceeding. So there are additional</li> </ol>

9 (Pages 30 to 33)

	34	36
1	value harm to customers. If you don't like the word	1 walking into confidential.
2	"harm," it could be financial loss to customers	2 MR. KURTZ: Okay.
3	based upon that analysis?	3 MR. GISH: If we need to go into confidential
4	A. I I don't agree that it's a financial harm	4 treatment or session, we're happy to. I just
5	or to to customers. Again, customers the	5 want to make sure we don't
6	Company incurs costs to provide service. Those	6 MR. KURTZ: Okay.
7	costs are passed back on to customers to make sure	7 MR. GISH: get too far ahead.
8	that we can provide service in a safe and reliable	8 MR. KURTZ: That would be great. Thanks.
9	manner.	9 MR. GISH: Yeah, and that's I just think
10	I agree with you that this project	10 we need to be careful of that evaluation.
11	ultimately, when you net out all the benefits that	11 CHAIR HATTON: Anything past that, I feel
12	we've quantified, does result in an increase to a	12 like we're getting very we're getting into
13	customer's bill.	13 confidential. Do you want me to go into
14	Q. Let's talk about RECs, renewable energy	14 confidential?
15	certificates. A big revenue stream under this	15 MR. KURTZ: Yes.
16	analysis, under your analysis, is that the company	16 CHAIR HATTON: All right. Candace.
17	will sell the RECs provided under the 15-year	17 MS. SACRE: Yes, ma'am. We are in
18	contract, correct?	18 confidential mode, Chair.
19	A. That's correct.	19 (Confidential session from 9:40 a.m. to 9:42
20	Q. So if you're selling the RECs, you're	20 a.m.)
21	you're not left with green power, you're just left	21 CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Kurtz.
22	with regular power. It's only the entity that	22 MR. KURTZ: Thank you.
23	retires the REC that can claim green energy; isn't	23 CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION
24	that correct?	24 By Mr. Kurtz:
25	A. I don't know that specifically. Again, this	25 Q. Do you know what happens to the bid if the
	35	37
1	resource is - I guess I'm a little confused as to	1 investment tax credit or production tax credit for
2	the – I guess the specifics of that question.	2 solar is eliminated by the current administration?
3	Q. Well, you know what PJM keeps a registry	3 A. You're speaking on the Bright Mountain
4	of all the renewable energy produced in its	4 Q. Yes.
5	footprint, and it keeps a registry of which of those	
6		5 A project specifically?
0	RECs are retired and which are sold.	<ul> <li>5 A project specifically?</li> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> </ul>
7	RECs are retired and which are sold. A. Sure.	
		6 Q. Yes.
7	<ul><li>A. Sure.</li><li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue</li></ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> </ul>
7 8	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Q. Yes.</li> <li>A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring nonthermal resource available through the RFP</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> <li>17 A. I would defer to the Company Witness Yetzer</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring nonthermal resource available through the RFP process to serve customers. We're not this isn't</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> <li>17 A. I would defer to the Company Witness Yetzer</li> <li>18 on that.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring nonthermal resource available through the RFP process to serve customers. We're not this isn't for any other purpose other than this is part of our</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> <li>17 A. I would defer to the Company Witness Yetzer</li> <li>18 on that.</li> <li>19 Q. Okay. The \$14.6 million number from in</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring nonthermal resource available through the RFP process to serve customers. We're not this isn't for any other purpose other than this is part of our overall generation portfolio necessary to serve</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> <li>17 A. I would defer to the Company Witness Yetzer</li> <li>18 on that.</li> <li>19 Q. Okay. The \$14.6 million number from in</li> <li>20 the Company's analysis, do you it's listed as net</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring nonthermal resource available through the RFP process to serve customers. We're not this is n't for any other purpose other than this is part of our overall generation portfolio necessary to serve customers.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> <li>17 A. I would defer to the Company Witness Yetzer</li> <li>18 on that.</li> <li>19 Q. Okay. The \$14.6 million number from in</li> <li>20 the Company's analysis, do you it's listed as net</li> <li>21 benefit cost, and it's so it's a cost,</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring nonthermal resource available through the RFP process to serve customers. We're not this isn't for any other purpose other than this is part of our overall generation portfolio necessary to serve customers.</li> <li>Q. Speaking about the RFP, there were, I think,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> <li>17 A. I would defer to the Company Witness Yetzer</li> <li>18 on that.</li> <li>19 Q. Okay. The \$14.6 million number from in</li> <li>20 the Company's analysis, do you it's listed as net</li> <li>21 benefit cost, and it's so it's a cost,</li> <li>22 14.6 million present value, 23.9 million nominal.</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring nonthermal resource available through the RFP process to serve customers. We're not this is n't for any other purpose other than this is part of our overall generation portfolio necessary to serve customers.</li> <li>Q. Speaking about the RFP, there were, I think, nine thermal projects that scored above this</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> <li>17 A. I would defer to the Company Witness Yetzer</li> <li>18 on that.</li> <li>19 Q. Okay. The \$14.6 million number from in</li> <li>20 the Company's analysis, do you it's listed as net</li> <li>21 benefit cost, and it's so it's a cost,</li> <li>22 14.6 million present value, 23.9 million nominal.</li> <li>23 Could that money be better used could that</li> </ul>
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim green energy you have to retire them, and if you retire them, the revenue stream from selling RECs RECs would would be eliminated; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yeah. I think I'm confused around the characterization of why the Company would be claiming again, we're not claiming any this project for any anything other than this is their at the most the highest scoring nonthermal resource available through the RFP process to serve customers. We're not this isn't for any other purpose other than this is part of our overall generation portfolio necessary to serve customers.</li> <li>Q. Speaking about the RFP, there were, I think,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>6 Q. Yes.</li> <li>7 A. I think I would defer to Company Witness</li> <li>8 Yetzer. He may have some more experience within</li> <li>9 that space in terms of, like, how that may impact</li> <li>10 the pricing. It doesn't from my understanding,</li> <li>11 it would not impact the price, the per-megawatt-hour</li> <li>12 price of the contract from our perspective.</li> <li>13 Q. From your perspective. But do you think that</li> <li>14 the developer factored in the tax benefits under the</li> <li>15 Inflation Reduction Act in pricing out this</li> <li>16 proposal?</li> <li>17 A. I would defer to the Company Witness Yetzer</li> <li>18 on that.</li> <li>19 Q. Okay. The \$14.6 million number from in</li> <li>10 the Company's analysis, do you it's listed as net</li> <li>21 benefit cost, and it's so it's a cost,</li> <li>22 I4.6 million present value, 23.9 million nominal.</li> <li>23 Could that money be better used could that</li> </ul>

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

#### Hearing

38	40
1 A. Again, I don't think so. Again, we evaluated	1 Q. (By Ms. Tussey) And to follow up on that
2 this project. When we're evaluating this project	2 then, so is based on your response, Bright
<sup>3</sup> now, right, we're looking at this because we have an	3 Mountain was considered the best option for solar,
4 energy capacity need in '26 and '27, while Mitchell	4 wind, and those renewable resources?
5 is still part of the system, and this project is	5 A. We didn't evaluate it specifically as it
6 still meeting energy and capacity needs even with	6 relates to that RFP. We ultimately scored all the
7 Mitchell in the system.	7 projects based off of, like, total scoring. So if
8 So I think even if the life of Mitchell	8 you look at the scoring sheet provided by Company
<sup>9</sup> you know, if the Company were, at some point down	<ul> <li>9 Witness Yetzer, all the projects that were bid into</li> </ul>
10 the road, to make a decision to, you know, change	10 all three RFPs are scored against each other.
11 course or if the Commission approved a change of	11 Again, the the reason so the if you
12 course on on on Mitchell, this project is	12 look at the scoring sheet, the Bright Mountain
13 still required from our perspective.	13 project is the highest scoring nonthermal resource.
14 MR. KURTZ: Okay. Chairman, thank you.	14 And so, given the concerns that we had around
15 That's all my questions.	15 potential delay of moving forward with this project
16 THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir.	16 and potential for cost increases and even the
17 MR. KURTZ: Thank you.	17 potential to lose this project if we didn't short
18 CHAIR HATTON: Staff.	18 list it at the time that we did, this project was a
19 MS. TUSSEY: Thank you.	19 no-regrets project to move forward with at the time
20 CROSS-EXAMINATION	20 that we did it.
21 By Ms. Tussey:	21 Q. I wanted to ask a follow-up, but you've
22 Q. Mr. Wolffram, I wanted to follow up, just for	22 almost led into my next question, so I'll get back
23 clarification purposes, on a couple I guess it	23 to my follow-up.
24 was a couple responses in totality to Mr. Kurtz and	24 A. Sorry.
25 Mr. West.	25 Q. That kind of leads me into my next question,
39	41
1 A. Sure.	1 because you mentioned in your direct testimony I
2 Q. Is it my understanding, based on your	2 think it's on page 13, lines 15 and 16, and then
<sup>3</sup> previous responses, that the bids that you-all	3 maybe carrying over into page 14 on line 18. So
4 provided in response to several data requests are	4 you've stated that the project was the least-cost
5 still being evaluated as possible options for the	5 reasonable alternative for a physical resource, but
6 Company?	6 you would agree with me that Kentucky Power won't
7 A. Specific to the thermal resources that were	7 actually own any part of this facility, correct?
8 bid and as part of the RFP, the Company continues to	8 A. We we would have no ownership interest.
9 evaluate those resources.	9 It's just through the the REPA.
10 CHAIR HATTON: I'm sorry. Could could you	10 Q. Okay. Because I think you've provided
11 say that again?	11 information if it wasn't you, I apologize, but
12 THE WITNESS: Sure. The Company continues to	12 that you wouldn't have any maintenance, ongoing
<ul><li>13 evaluate the resources that were bid in as part of</li><li>14 the thermal RFP. The company issued three RFPs, one</li></ul>	13 maintenance, or anything related to that particular
<ul><li>14 the thermal RFP. The company issued three RFPs, one</li><li>15 for standalone storage, one for wind and solar, and</li></ul>	14 facility? 15 A. No. We we are just we're entitled to
15 for standalone storage, one for wind and solar, and 16 one for thermal resources. Those thermal resources	3
16 one for merinal resources. Those merinal resources 17 are still under evaluation.	16 the energy and capacity in the RECs, and then we 17 receive the output.
17 are still under evaluation. 18 CHAIR HATTON: The ones in this same RFP?	18 Q. Okay. And then I I think Mr. Kurtz and
19 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.	19 I I will keep my question general. Mr. Kurtz
20 CHAIR HATTON: Same evaluation?	20 referenced the cost that you-all have estimated and
21 THE WITNESS: Yes.	21 that it would impact ratepayers, correct?
22 CHAIR HATTON: Okay.	22 <b>A.</b> There would be an increase in – in monthly
23 COMMISSIONER STACY: What was the first one?	23 bills, yes.
24 CHAIR HATTON: Standalone storage was the	
	24 O. Okay. And so when you mentioned least cost
25 first RFP.	24 Q. Okay. And so when you mentioned least cost 25 in your direct testimony, can you clarify as to what

McLendon-Kogut Reporting Service, LLC (502) 585-5634

11 (Pages 38 to 41)

	42	4	14
1	you might have been referring to?	1 From this perspective, this project, like	
2	A. Sure. I think, as we mentioned, from our	2 like I talked about, was a no-regrets project	
3	perspective, this is the least-cost reasonable	<sup>3</sup> because we do have an identified energy and capaci	ity
4	nonthermal resource that was identified through the	4 need. This project provides an energy benefit,	-
5	process. We ran an RFP. We we looked at a	5 provides capacity benefits, and allows us the	
6	variety of bids.	6 opportunity to sell RECs to functionally buy down	
7	If you look at our 2022 IRP that's currently	7 the cost to customers.	
8	pending in front of the Commission, one of the in	8 And so and then again, like we talked	
9	our preferred plan, the preferred plan does identify	<sup>9</sup> about, there's the other benefits associated with	
10	the need to diversify our generation portfolio to	10 diversifying the portfolio, having a physical hedge	
11	best serve customers. And so we were, you know,	11 within our service territory, supporting a project	
12	evaluating potential diversification of the	12 that would be located within our service territory	
13	portfolio through the RFP process.	13 that has economic development associated with it.	
14	Once these projects were scored, we	14 And so all those factors played into our	
15	identified this project as the least-cost reasonable	15 decision and made the determination that this was	
16	alternative to address some of that diversity of	16 the right project at the right time for us.	
17	portfolio mix, and we moved forward with it on that	17 Q. And I do appreciate the answer, but I guess	
18	basis.	18 that leads me to: You mentioned the energy and	
19	And, again, at the time we made the decision,	19 capacity, and I think it was Mr. West who mentioned	
20	it was still unclear potentially what other assets	20 that this project does not cover more than 99	
21	that we could move forward with, in terms of whether	21 approximately 99 percent, doesn't cover 99 percent	
22	or not we could get to an agreement on a thermal	22 of your capacity need.	
23	PPA. Again, like I said, we're still evaluating	23 A. It does again, from an in a capacity,	
24	those options.	24 accredited capacity standpoint, the project is	
25	So we had to make a decision at the time that	25 relatively small, but the other benefits associated	
	43	4	15
	43		15
1	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting	1 with it, you know, specifically, like we talked	15
2	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> </ol>	15
2 3	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5 6	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5 6 7	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5 6	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here. Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here. Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here. Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here. Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> </ol>	15
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here. Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here. Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associated</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associated</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are evaluating these projects, right, we're there's</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associate</li> <li>with this project's participation in PJM to reduce</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are evaluating these projects, right, we're there's two components to that equation, right? There's</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associate</li> <li>with this project's participation in PJM to reduce</li> <li>the cost to customers, we and it allows us to</li> </ol>	ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are evaluating these projects, right, we're there's there's least cost and then there's reasonable. So</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associate</li> <li>with this project's participation in PJM to reduce</li> <li>the cost to customers, we and it allows us to</li> <li>avoid at least going to the PJ into PJM and</li> </ul>	ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are evaluating these projects, right, we're there's there's least cost and then there's reasonable. So what is the least-cost reasonable option? So if there was a potential option that was, from a pure cost perspective, lower, but, you know,</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associate</li> <li>with this project's participation in PJM to reduce</li> <li>the cost to customers, we and it allows us to</li> <li>avoid at least going to the PJ into PJM and</li> <li>making short-term market purchases to cover at lease</li> </ol>	ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are evaluating these projects, right, we're there's there's least cost and then there's reasonable. So what is the least-cost reasonable option? So if there was a potential option that was, from a pure cost perspective, lower, but, you know, didn't meet the requirements of our customers or</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associate</li> <li>with this project's participation in PJM to reduce</li> <li>the cost to customers, we and it allows us to</li> <li>avoid at least going to the PJ into PJM and</li> <li>making short-term market purchases to cover at least</li> <li>that 4.8 megawatts of accredited capacity.</li> </ol>	ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are evaluating these projects, right, we're there's two components to that equation, right? There's there's least cost and then there's reasonable. So what is the least-cost reasonable option?</li> <li>So if there was a potential option that was, from a pure cost perspective, lower, but, you know, didn't meet the requirements of our customers or didn't didn't make sense within our overall</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associate</li> <li>with this project's participation in PJM to reduce</li> <li>the cost to customers, we and it allows us to</li> <li>avoid at least going to the PJ into PJM and</li> <li>making short-term market purchases to cover at leas</li> <li>that 4.8 megawatts of accredited capacity.</li> </ol>	ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are evaluating these projects, right, we're there's two components to that equation, right? There's there's least cost and then there's reasonable. So what is the least-cost reasonable option?</li> <li>So if there was a potential option that was, from a pure cost perspective, lower, but, you know, didn't meet the requirements of our customers or didn't didn't make sense within our overall portfolio, then that reasonableness factor on our</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associate</li> <li>with this project's participation in PJM to reduce</li> <li>the cost to customers, we and it allows us to</li> <li>avoid at least going to the PJ into PJM and</li> <li>making short-term market purchases to cover at leas</li> <li>that 4.8 megawatts of accredited capacity.</li> <li>So we do see the benefits across the board</li> <li>there.</li> </ul>	ed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>we made the decision to ensure that we were getting this project at the cost that it was bid in at. And then, ultimately, you know, to the extent that the Company does identify an additional project, say a thermal resource, down the road, we will obviously have to stand it up as on its own merits just like we're doing that here.</li> <li>Q. So, based on some of the acknowledgment that this wasn't the least-cost project bid in, based on your-all's analysis, can you explain if there are circumstances, in Kentucky Power's view, where even if something is not the least cost, it would be the most reasonable alternative?</li> <li>A. So I believe that what when we are evaluating these projects, right, we're there's two components to that equation, right? There's there's least cost and then there's reasonable. So what is the least-cost reasonable option?</li> <li>So if there was a potential option that was, from a pure cost perspective, lower, but, you know, didn't meet the requirements of our customers or didn't didn't make sense within our overall</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>with it, you know, specifically, like we talked</li> <li>about, allowing the Company to have a very small</li> <li>project that provides some diversity within our</li> <li>portfolio, it allows us to potentially attract</li> <li>economic development opportunities for customers</li> <li>that are looking to locate in a service territory</li> <li>that has renewable energy options and provides</li> <li>economic development opportunities.</li> <li>I think from from our perspective I</li> <li>understand the accredited capacity is small, but we</li> <li>do see the benefits associated with our ability to,</li> <li>you know, liquidate RECs to the benefit of</li> <li>customers, to have this resource participate within</li> <li>PJM and allow us to pass back the revenue associate</li> <li>with this project's participation in PJM to reduce</li> <li>the cost to customers, we and it allows us to</li> <li>avoid at least going to the PJ into PJM and</li> <li>making short-term market purchases to cover at least</li> <li>that 4.8 megawatts of accredited capacity.</li> <li>So we do see the benefits across the board</li> <li>there.</li> <li>Q. And I want to talk a little bit about going</li> </ol>	ed

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

1       it's in your-all's direct testimony, but Kentucky         2       Power is an FRR entity?         3       A. It is.         4       Q. And currently, like as we sit today, how does         5       Kentucky Power satisfy its current requirements with         6       Power stasses. That would be Big Sandy and the 50         9       percent undivided interest in the Mitchell Plant,         11       and then we would make any short-term capacity         12       needs that we need to cover.         13       Q. And generally, when does that occur?         14       A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms         16       process.         17       Q. O. I. m - I'm sory, I. meant like -         18       Pill - et me clarify my question.         18       Pill - let me clarify my question.         19       Kentucky Power; as a winter-peaking utility;         10       is that correct?         20       A. M D/M is a summer-peaking utility;         21       sis that correct?         22       A. I don't know off the top of my head.         2       Q. And P/M is a summer-peaking utility;         2       sis addity, if the Commission were to         2       Q. O. Kay, Well, Tm going to shifl gears a litch bit		46	48
2       Power's an FRR entity?         3       A. It is.         Q. And currently, like as we sit today, how does         5       Kentucky Power satisfy its current requirements with         9       Prector undivided interest in the Mitchell Plant,         10       and then we would make any short-term capacity         11       purchases to cover hattever remainder of or or our         20       A. Stre.         20       A. It don't know off the top of my head in terms         15       of timing, but it occurs during the PLM planning         17       Q. Oh, m - Im sorry. Imean like -         18       II - I elm eakrify my question.         17       Kennoky Power is a winter-peaking utility;         20       A. It fix is a summer-peaking         21       A. It Si a ta corneed;         22       A. It Si a ta corneed;         23       A. RTO, yes.         24       Q. R-yes. So does Kentucky Power generally.         25       make its purchases from the market during the         27       A. Sure.         29       . A It Si a summer-peaking         24       A. RTO, yes.         24       A. RTO, yes.         25       A. Tore.         26       . A sure.	1	it's in your-all's direct testimony, but Kentucky	1 thermal resource RFP and potentially have one of
<ul> <li>4 Q. And currently, like as we sit today, how does 5 Kentucky Power satisfy its current requirements with 6 PfI - PIM?</li> <li>7 A. Sure. So it's a combination of our - our own and sets. That would be Big Sandy.</li> <li>9 percent undivided interest in the Mitchell Plant, and then we would make any short-term capacity and the 50 going to check off some boxes, it would be the 11 unknown box for that particular - 12 eneeds that we need to cover.</li> <li>10 and then we would make any short-term capacity and the 50 going to check off some boxes, it would be the 11 unknown box for that particular - 12 eneeds that we need to cover.</li> <li>11 a. A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms 5 of timing, but it occurs during the PIM planning 16 process.</li> <li>12 (D. Ok, Tm - Tm sory. 1 meant like - 18 III - let me clarify my question.</li> <li>13 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>14 A. I to for Nore?</li> <li>14 A. I to for Nore?</li> <li>14 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>15 oculd.</li> <li>16 A. Sure.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if 15 could.</li> <li>16 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year, hasse on just 12 capacity need in that particular year.</li> <li>16 thermal bid and the torder of your response, yes is the answer to 13 transmission tracking costs that were what mater yeard in sporting the com- the ending year of youre FRP planticular year in the particular yeard in t</li></ul>			
<ul> <li>5 Kentucky Power satisfy its current requirements with PH – PJM?</li> <li>7 A. Sure. So it's a combination of our – our</li> <li>9 owned assets. That would be Big Sandy and the 50</li> <li>9 percent undivided interest in the Mitchell Plant,</li> <li>10 and then we would make any short-term capacity</li> <li>11 purchases to cover whatever remainder of our – our</li> <li>12 neds that we need to over.</li> <li>13 Q. And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>14 A. I toh 't know off the top of my head in terms</li> <li>15 of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning</li> <li>16 process.</li> <li>17 Q. Oh, I'm – I'm sory. I meant like –</li> <li>18 I'll – let me clarify my question.</li> <li>18 I'll – let me clarify my question.</li> <li>19 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. I tas.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. R – yes. So does Kentucky Power?</li> <li>24 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>47 47</li> <li>47 49</li> <li>1 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>24 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>20 Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>21 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if 1</li> <li>22 could.</li> <li>33 and we look forwart to the year, let's – let's say</li> <li>34 approving the con - the – the project?</li> <li>34 A. Sure.</li> <li>35 to or planning process. The project is slated tog</li> <li>36 in service in 12027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>37 encide that paint. We, as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>38 We would sita th as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>30 HR, we would still have the Wig slandy in the mix at</li> <li>31 tat point. We, as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>32 harces of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>33 cortis fir to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>34 tat ked about, the Company is seil – eiker we're</li> <li>35 bare of a Tariff PA yes.</li> <li>36</li></ul>	3	A. It is.	3 our energy and capacity needs.
6       PH - PJM?         7       A. Sure. So it's a combination of our - our         8       owned assets. That would be Big Sandy and the 50         9       percent undivided interest in the Mitchell Plant, and and the would makes any short-term capacity         11       parentaly, when does that occur?         12       owned assets. That would be time to any head in terms         13       Q. And generally, when does that occur?         14       A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms         15       of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning         16       PII - PLM celarity my question.         17       Q. Oh, Fm - Pm sory. I meant like         18       The celarity my question.         19       Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;         20       A. RTo, yes.         20       A. RTo, yes.         21       winter, if it needs to, or do you know?         2       A. I don't know off the top of my head.         3       Q. Okay. Well, Tm going to pull a Charmant         4       A. Sure.         9       Hypothetically for were realwid with facts are right now and us hypothetical, if I         5       could.         4       A. Sure.         9       A. Sure.	4	Q. And currently, like as we sit today, how does	4 Q. So your answer right now is you don't know
<ul> <li>A. Sure. So if's a combination of our - our</li> <li>wored assets. That would be Big Sandy and the 50</li> <li>percent undivided interest in the Mitchell Plant,</li> <li>and then we would make any short-term capacity</li> <li>process. Injust saying that, like, if we were</li> <li>q. And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms</li> <li>for process.</li> <li>M. To, yes.</li> <li>Q. And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>Q. And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>G. A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms</li> <li>d. A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>d. A. Sure.</li> <li>M. Sure. So this project would be included in our planning process. In group as the splication in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forvard to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forvard to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lefs - left say</li> <li>any would, satt che well, regardless of the</li> <li>for eredift is life to 2014. So we would continue to</li> <li>that point. We, as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>We would stil have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>that point. We, as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>We would as the - well, regardless of the</li> <li>any bay Bay (bay (bay (bay (bay (bay (bay (bay (b</li></ul>	5	Kentucky Power satisfy its current requirements with	5 beyond it's possible, it'd have to be purchased from
<ul> <li>8 owned assets. That would be Big Sandy and the 50</li> <li>9 percent undivided interest in the Mitchell Plant, and then we would make any short-term capacity in perchases to cover whatever remainder of our – our needs that we need to cover.</li> <li>10 And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>14 A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning process.</li> <li>17 Q. Oh, Im – Im sory. I meant like – 18 TII – let me clarify my question.</li> <li>18 TII – let me clarify my question.</li> <li>19 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. It is.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking –</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>10 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>24 Winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>24 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>24 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>30. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>447</li> <li>449</li> <li>10 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>477</li> <li>49</li> <li>11 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>24 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>30. Okay. Well, Tim going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>41 A. Sure.</li> <li>42 Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approving the on – he - the project?</li> <li>42 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>31 approving the on – he - the project?</li> <li>43 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>32 approving the on – he - the project?</li> <li>44 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>32 approving the on – the - the project?</li> <li>44 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>32 approving the on – the - the project?</li> <li>44 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>34 proving the on – the - the project?</li> <li>45 A. Bro, we and the - believe Tainff PPA, we'd be</li> <li>45 A. Hore in the Company is sid! eval – alik eval – alik eval – al</li></ul>	6	PH PJM?	6 the market? You obviously are planning
<ul> <li>9 precent undivided interest in the Mitchell Plant, 10 and then we would make any short-term capacity 11 purchases to cover whatever remained or or or or 12 needs that we need to cover.</li> <li>13 Q. And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>14 A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms 15 of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning 16 proces.</li> <li>17 Q. Oh, I'm I'm sory. I meant like -</li> <li>18 Til - let me clarify my question.</li> <li>19 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. I tis.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. R - yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>26 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>27 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>3 Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>4 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I could.</li> <li>47 47</li> <li>49</li> <li>1 Q. Okay. Well, Or any on the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>2028, how would A sith exaits/ji til capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>2028, how would A sith exaits/ji til capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>2028, how would A sith exaits/ji til capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>2028, how would A sith exaits/ji til</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>3 approving the con - the - the project?</li> <li>4 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>5 our planning process. The project is shard to regort?</li> <li>4 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>5 our planning process. The project is shard to regort?</li> <li>4 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>5 our planning process. The project is shard to regort?</li> <li>4 A. Sure. So this pr</li></ul>	7	A. Sure. So it's a combination of our our	7 <b>A. We are.</b>
<ul> <li>and then we would make any short-term capacity</li> <li>purchases to cover whatever remainder of our - our</li> <li>capacity know off the top of my head in terms</li> <li>d. A I don't know off the top of my head in terms</li> <li>for timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning</li> <li>process.</li> <li>TO Q. Oh, I'' - I''' neart like -</li> <li>B TI' - let me clarify my question.</li> <li>B TI' - let me clarify my question.</li> <li>Co And PJM is a summer-peaking -</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>Q. Okay. Number dual ada bort-term market purchases. It is a summer-peaking</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then wet at correct?</li> <li>Q. Can PJM is a</li></ul>	8	owned assets. That would be Big Sandy and the 50	
<ul> <li>purchases to cover whatever remainder of our our</li> <li>needs that we need to cover.</li> <li>Q. And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms</li> <li>of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning</li> <li>process.</li> <li>Q. Oh, Im Im sorry. I meant like</li> <li>B. III let me clarify my question.</li> <li>We must provide the clarify my question.</li> <li>S. Kattoky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>S. Is that correct?</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>could.</li> <li>G. A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>could.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. May Sprotethically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, lets - let's say</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>A. Sure. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>inservice in 2027. So given the</li></ul>	9		
<ul> <li>12 needs that we need to cover.</li> <li>13 Q. And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>14 A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms</li> <li>15 of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning</li> <li>16 process.</li> <li>17 Q. Oh, I'm - I'm sorry. I meant like -</li> <li>18 I'll - let me clarify my question.</li> <li>19 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. It is.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. Ard PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. Ard PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>47 47</li> <li>49</li> <li>1 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>2 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>2 Q. Okay. Well, The Commission were to</li> <li>a prove the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's as filed,</li> <li>a parcy the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>a parcy the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Suis for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>approving the con the well project?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>20 Qokay. Sa, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>21 of the securifization that is pending?</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>33 And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Compan</li></ul>	10		
<ul> <li>13 Q. And generally, when does that occur?</li> <li>14 A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning for the cars of my question.</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. And if the Commission were to</li> <li>16 hypothetically deny the entirety of this particular</li> <li>17 Q. Oh, Tm - Tm sorry. I meant like -</li> <li>18 TII - Iet me clarify my question.</li> <li>19 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. It is.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>47 4. J don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>3 Q. Okay. Well, Tm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>4 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>5 could.</li> <li>47 4. Sure.</li> <li>9 Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>a pprovic med ant praticular year, let's let's say</li> <li>10 2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>11 capacity med in that particular year, let's let's say</li> <li>12 awat the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>13 approving the con the the project?</li> <li>14 A. Sure.</li> <li>14 A. Sure.</li> <li>15 could.</li> <li>16 approving the con the the project?</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the - well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>21 And then the Company is seval like we've</li> <li>22 to the datu the Company is seval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is seval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is seval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is seval like we've</li> </ul>		-	-
14 <b>A. I don't know off the top of my head in terms</b> 15       of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning         16       process.         17       Q. Oh, Pm - Pm sorry. I meant like         18       PII - let me clarify my question.         19       Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;         20       is that correct?         21       A. It is.         2       Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking         23       A. RTO, yes.         24       Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking         23       A. RTO, yes.         24       Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking         25       make its purchases from the market during the         26       Nator t know off the top of my head.         3       Q. Okay. Well, Tm going to pull a Chairman         4       thermal bid and short-term market purchases. It         25       ould.         6       A. Sure.         7       Q. Okay. Well, Tm going to pull a Chairman         3       and we look forward to the year, lefs - lefs say         9       and we look forward to the year, lefs - lefs say         9       and we look forward to the year, lefs - lefs say         9       oulderrecovered is that correct?			
<ul> <li>15 of timing, but it occurs during the PJM planning</li> <li>16 process.</li> <li>17 Q. Oh, Im Im sorry. I meant like -</li> <li>18 I'll - let me clarify my question.</li> <li>16 hypothetically deny the entirety of this particular</li> <li>17 A. It is.</li> <li>20 And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>20 And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>20 And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. R yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>27 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>2 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>3 Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>4 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>5 could.</li> <li>2 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>20 and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>21 d. M. We would, as the - well, regardless of the</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is eval - likk we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is sval - likk we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is sval - likk we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is sval - likk we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is sval - likk we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is sval - likk we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the C</li></ul>			-
<ul> <li>16 process.</li> <li>17 Q. Oh, Im – I'm sorry. I meant like –</li> <li>17 W. Oh, I'm – I'm sorry. I meant like –</li> <li>18 I'll – I the clarify my question.</li> <li>19 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. It is.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking –</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. R – yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>26 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>27 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>21 A. Sure.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM bits a unitue and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>2 could.</li> <li>2 approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>3 approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>3 approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>3 approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>3 approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>3 approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>3 approve the application in the metrically file</li> <li>2 what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>3 approving the con – the project?</li> <li>4 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>3 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>3 We would, as the – well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 RP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>10 that pint. We, as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>3 And then the Company is eval – likk we've</li> <li>2 tarked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>2 tarked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>2 tarked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>3 And then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>4 and the nuclear project so all evaluating</li> <li>4 and then the Company is still evaluating</li> &lt;</ul>			
<ul> <li>17 Q. Oh, I'm I'm sorry. I meant like 18 I'l let me clarify my question.</li> <li>19 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. It is.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking 23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. R yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>40, We would be 4.8 megawatus of accredited</li> <li>20 capacity shorter, and so we would either have to go</li> <li>21 to the market and - and acquire that or meet that</li> <li>22 obligation with, again, some combination of the</li> <li>23 resources that we're currently evaluating in the</li> <li>24 thermal bid and short-term market purchases. It</li> <li>25 just - it would depend.</li> <li>47</li> <li>40</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>40</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>48</li> <li>49</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>41<!--</th--><th></th><th></th><th></th></li></ul>			
<ul> <li>18 I'll let me clarify my question.</li> <li>18 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. It is.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. R - yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>27 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>28 A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>20 Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>41 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I could.</li> <li>20 Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>42 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I could.</li> <li>30 Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>41 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I could.</li> <li>42 O. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>31 approving the conthe project?</li> <li>42 A. Sure. So this project would be included in our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>43 approving the con -the -the project?</li> <li>44 A. Sure. So this project would be included in our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>45 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>46 that point. We, as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>47 We would, as the - well, regardless of the</li> <li>48 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>40 Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>41 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>41 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>42 Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>44 transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>44 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>45 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>44 thermal bio tworkedge, we have had</li> <li>45 underrecovered is that the nost, yes.</li> <li>46 A. Hy experisone of Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>47 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>48 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>49 underrecovered is that the neast, yes.</li> <li>40 Okad</li></ul>		•	
<ul> <li>19 Kentucky Power is a winter-peaking utility;</li> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. It is.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>2 Q. R - yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>477</li> <li>477</li> <li>477</li> <li>477</li> <li>477</li> <li>477</li> <li>49</li> <li>478</li> <li>477</li> <li>49</li> <li>479</li> <li>477</li> <li>477</li> <li>49</li> <li>477</li> <li>477</li> <li>49</li> <li>477</li> <li>477</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>477</li> <li>478</li> <li>478</li> <li>477</li> <li>479</li> <li>471</li> <li>471</li> <li>471</li> <li>471</li> <li>471</li> <li>471</li> <li>471</li> <li>471</li> <li>47</li></ul>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
<ul> <li>20 is that correct?</li> <li>21 A. It is.</li> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. R - yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li></li></ul>			
<ul> <li>A. It is.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. R - yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>47</li> <li>winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>could.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>O2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>A. Sure. So this project is slated to go</li> <li>in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>in k would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>IRP, we would as ill have Big Sandy.</li> <li>An then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>take dabout, the Company is still evaluating</li> </ul>			8
<ul> <li>22 Q. And PJM is a summer-peaking</li> <li>23 A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. R yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>24 thermal bid and short-term market purchases. It</li> <li>25 make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>41</li> <li>49</li> <li>41</li> <li>49</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>43</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>40</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>41</li> <li>42</li> <li>42</li> <li>44</li> <li>45</li> <li>46</li> <li>47</li> <li>40</li> <li>40</li> <li>41</li> <li>41&lt;</li></ul>			
<ul> <li>A. RTO, yes.</li> <li>Q. R-yes. So does Kentucky Power generally</li> <li>make its purchases from the market during the</li> <li>4</li> <li>thermal bid and short-term market purchases. It</li> <li>just - it would depend.</li> <li>just - it would depend.</li> <li>1</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to yull a Chairman</li> <li>Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>could.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say</li> <li>2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>We would, as the - well, regardless of the</li> <li>IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>that point. We, as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>We would, as the - well, regardless of the</li> <li>underrecovery?</li> <li>And then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>And then in the company is still evaluating</li> </ul>			
24       Q. Ryes. So does Kentucky Power generally       24       thermal bid and short-term market purchases. It         25       make its purchases from the market during the       47       49         47       47       49         1       winter, if it needs to, or do you know?       4         2       A. I don't know off the top of my head.       20         3       Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman       4         4       Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I       5         5       could.       A. Sure.       4         7       Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to       3       A. Sure.         9       2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its       5       A. Sure.         10       A. Sure. So this project would be included in       5       A. My experience is that there was a historic         11       underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that –       12       my understanding is that was largely around         13       transmission tracking costs that were run through       14       Tariff PPA.         15       Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the       16         16       in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'l be       15         17       entitle to include that as part of our IRP, did propo			
25       make its purchases from the market during the       25       just - it would depend.         47       47       49         1       winter, if it needs to, or do you know?       4         2       A. I don't know off the top of my head.       1       Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman       4         3       Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman       3       A. Sure.       4       Q. I think you're the main witness for that.         5       chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I       5       A. Sure.       6       Q. And I know that you-all have requested         7       Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to       3       and we look forward to the year, let's - let's say       9       underrecovered, is that correct?         10       2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its       1       0       A. Sure.         11       capacity need in that particular year, based on just       1       underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that -         12       what the facts are right now and us hypothetically       a transmission tracking costs that was largely around         13       transmission tracking costs that was largely around       13         14       Tariff PPA.       15       Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the         16       in service in 2027.		-	
<ul> <li>47</li> <li>49</li> <li>1 winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>A. Idon't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>could.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>entitled to include that as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>have Big Sandy.</li> <li>And then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>4 An then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>4 Chand then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>4 Difference in the company is st</li></ul>			
<ol> <li>winter, if it needs to, or do you know?</li> <li>A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>could.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>RRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>kard then the Company is seval like we've</li> <li>talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>A. d then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ol>			
<ul> <li>A. I don't know off the top of my head.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>could.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>what the facts are right now and us hypothetically approving the con the the project?</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. And I know that you-all have requested</li> <li>recovery through that particular mechanism, but just</li> <li>to confirm, historically, the Tariff PPA has</li> <li>underrecovered; is that correct?</li> <li>A. My experience is that there was a historic</li> <li>underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that my understanding is that was largely around</li> <li>transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>trainiff PPA.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>underrecovery?</li> <li>A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>		47	49
<ul> <li>3 Q. Okay. Well, I'm going to pull a Chairman</li> <li>4 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>5 could.</li> <li>6 A. Sure.</li> <li>7 Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>9 and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>10 2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>11 capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>12 what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>14 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>15 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 P. we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>10 A. Bure.</li> <li>3 A. Sure.</li> <li>4 Q. I think you're the main witness for that.</li> <li>5 A. Sure.</li> <li>6 Q. And I know that you-all have requested</li> <li>7 recovery through that particular mechanism, but just</li> <li>8 to confirm, historically, the Tariff PPA has</li> <li>9 underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that</li> <li>10 A. My experience is that there was a historic</li> <li>11 underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that</li> <li>12 my underrecovery?</li> <li>13 A. Sure.</li> <li>14 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>	1	winter, if it needs to, or do you know?	1 Q. Okay. I'm going to shift gears a little bit
<ul> <li>4 Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I</li> <li>5 could.</li> <li>6 A. Sure.</li> <li>7 Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>8 approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>9 and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>10 2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>11 capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>12 what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>13 approving the con the the project?</li> <li>14 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>15 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>10 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>11 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>12 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>4 Q. I think you're the main witness for that.</li> <li>5 A. Sure.</li> <li>6 Q. And I know that you-all have requested</li> <li>7 recovery through that particular mechanism, but just</li> <li>8 to confirm, historically, the Tariff PPA has</li> <li>9 underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that</li> <li>10 A. My experience is that twere run through</li> <li>11 underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that</li> <li>12 my understanding is that was largely around</li> <li>13 transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>14 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of th</li></ul>	2	A. I don't know off the top of my head.	2 to the Tariff PPA.
5could.5A. Sure.6A. Sure.6Q. And I know that you-all have requested7Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to7recovery through that particular mechanism, but just8approve the application in its entirety as filed,9underrecovered; is that correct?02028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its10A. My experience is that there was a historic11capacity need in that particular year, based on just11underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that12what the facts are right now and us hypothetically12my understanding is that was largely around13approving the con the the project?13transmission tracking costs that were run through14A. Sure. So this project would be included in14Tariff PPA.15our planning process. The project is slated to go15Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the16in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be16context of your response, yes is the answer to17entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.17underrecovery?18Me would, as the well, regardless of the19underrecovery balances in the past, yes.19IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at19underrecovery balances in the past, yes.21that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to20Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part21athen the Company is eval like we've23balances of Tariff PPA, yes. <t< th=""><th>3</th><th></th><th>3 <b>A. Sure.</b></th></t<>	3		3 <b>A. Sure.</b>
<ul> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>muderrecovery?</li> <li>A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>of that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>have Big Sandy.</li> <li>And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>G. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>	4	Chandler for a minute and do a hypothetical, if I	
<ul> <li>7 Q. Hypothetically, if the Commission were to</li> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>4 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>centitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>have Big Sandy.</li> <li>And then the Company is seval like we've</li> <li>talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>recovery through that particular mechanism, but just</li> <li>to confirm, historically, the Tariff PPA has</li> <li>underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that</li> <li>my understanding is that was largely around</li> <li>transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>underrecovery?</li> <li>A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>	5		
<ul> <li>approve the application in its entirety as filed,</li> <li>and we look forward to the year, let's let's say</li> <li>2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>approving the con the the project?</li> <li>4 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>5 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>have Big Sandy.</li> <li>And then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> </ul>	6		
<ul> <li>9 and we look forward to the year, let's s let's say</li> <li>2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>12 capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>13 approving the con the the project?</li> <li>14 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>15 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>9 underrecovered; is that correct?</li> <li>10 A. My experience is that there was a historic</li> <li>11 underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that</li> <li>12 my understanding is that was largely around</li> <li>13 transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>14 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>10 2028, how would Kentucky Power then satisfy its</li> <li>11 capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>12 what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>13 approving the con the the project?</li> <li>14 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>15 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>10 A. My experience is that there was a historic</li> <li>11 underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that</li> <li>12 my understanding is that was largely around</li> <li>13 transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>14 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>11 capacity need in that particular year, based on just</li> <li>12 what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>13 approving the con the the project?</li> <li>14 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>15 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>11 underrecovery associated with Tariff PPA and that</li> <li>12 my understanding is that was largely around</li> <li>13 transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>14 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>12 what the facts are right now and us hypothetically</li> <li>13 approving the con the the project?</li> <li>14 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>15 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>12 my understanding is that was largely around</li> <li>13 transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>14 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>		• •	
<ul> <li>13 approving the con the the project?</li> <li>14 A. Sure. So this project would be included in</li> <li>15 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>13 transmission tracking costs that were run through</li> <li>14 Tariff PPA.</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>			
14A. Sure. So this project would be included in14Tariff PPA.15our planning process. The project is slated to go15Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the16in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be16context of your response, yes is the answer to17entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.17underrecovery?18We would, as the well, regardless of the18A. It's to my knowledge, we have had19IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at19underrecovery balances in the past, yes.20that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to20Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part21extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to21of the securitization that is pending?23And then the Company is eval like we've23balances of Tariff PPA, yes.24talked about, the Company is still evaluating24Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I		• • • •	
<ul> <li>15 our planning process. The project is slated to go</li> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>16 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>15 Q. Okay. So, just for full disclosure, in the</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>16 in service in 2027. So given the REPA, we'd be</li> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>16 context of your response, yes is the answer to</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>17 entitled to include that as part of our FRR plan.</li> <li>18 We would, as the well, regardless of the</li> <li>19 IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at</li> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>17 underrecovery?</li> <li>18 A. It's to my knowledge, we have had</li> <li>19 underrecovery balances in the past, yes.</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>			
18We would, as the well, regardless of the18A.It's to my knowledge, we have had19IRP, we would still have Big Sandy in the mix at19underrecovery balances in the past, yes.20that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to20Q.Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part21extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to21of the securitization that is pending?22have Big Sandy.22A.Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered23And then the Company is still evaluating24Q.And then in the most recent rate case, I	17	-	
<ul> <li>20 that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to</li> <li>21 extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to</li> <li>22 have Big Sandy.</li> <li>23 And then the Company is eval like we've</li> <li>24 talked about, the Company is still evaluating</li> <li>20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part</li> <li>21 of the securitization that is pending?</li> <li>22 A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered</li> <li>23 balances of Tariff PPA, yes.</li> <li>24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I</li> </ul>	18		
21extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to have Big Sandy.21of the securitization that is pending?23And then the Company is eval like we've 2423balances of Tariff PPA, yes.24talked about, the Company is still evaluating24Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I	19		
22have Big Sandy.22A. Portions of the unrecovered underrecovered23And then the Company is eval like we've23balances of Tariff PPA, yes.24talked about, the Company is still evaluating24Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I	20	that point. We, as part of our IRP, did propose to	20 Q. Okay. And then I believe Tariff PPA is part
23And then the Company is eval like we've23balances of Tariff PPA, yes.24talked about, the Company is still evaluating24Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I	21	extend its life to 2041. So we would continue to	21 of the securitization that is pending?
24 talked about, the Company is still evaluating 24 Q. And then in the most recent rate case, I			
			,,,
25 potential thermal resources that were bid into the 25 believe Kentucky Power proposed to shift the LSE			
	25	potential thermal resources that were bid into the	∠⊃ believe Kentucky Power proposed to shift the LSE

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

	100.2024-00243 01/20	/2025 nealing
	5.0	50
	50	52
1	O OATT expense that you mentioned into base rates	1 continues to underrecover, even if it's a smaller
2	and take it out of the Tariff PPA calculation,	2 amount. Did Kentucky Power consider a different way
3	correct?	3 to recover the expenses as it relates to this
4	A. We are only recovering PJM OATT expense	4 application?
5	through base rates right now, yes.	5 A. So I think from a from our standpoint,
6	Q. Okay. So there has been a small shift in	6 right, because this is a fixed-cost asset, we, to a
7	the what is part of the calculation of the	7 larger degree of certainty, will know the cost of
8	Tariff PPA	8 the the pro the project as it relates to what
9	A. Sure.	<sup>9</sup> we're paying from a we're paying in the the
10	Q correct? Okay.	10 contract price at every hour that the facility is
11	But the general, like I don't want to	11 generating. So it is a fixed cost.
12	simplify I will simplify it, just because the	12 The offsetting costs so we we would
13	calculation that's included within the tariff has	13 have the REC revenues that flow through. Those
14	not fundamentally changed, but maybe the items that	14 would be variable, but that would functionally be to
15	go into that calculation has changed, correct?	15 buy down the ultimate price of that project.
16	A. As as we sit here today, yes. I know that	16 So I think, as I sit here today, I have less
17	we currently have a per we are currently on	17 of a concern in terms of the mechanism itself
18	rehearing on one of our Tariff PPA updates, that	18 resulting in a significant underrecovered balance as
19	there's been some discussion around the	<ul> <li>19 a result of this project specifically.</li> </ul>
20	over/underrecovery mechanism. But from a	20 Q. Okay. Did you-all and I kind of asked
21	fundamental level, I agree that the calculation	21 this, but did you-all consider any rider mechanism
22	hasn't hasn't changed yet.	-
23	Q. Okay. And I believe that those aren't part	23 this project?
24	of this case?	24 <b>A.</b> Not specifically for this project, no.
25	A. They are not.	25 MS. TUSSEY: I believe I believe that's
	F 1	50
	51	53
1	Q. However, I know that you provided some	
1 2		1 all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.
	Q. However, I know that you provided some	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> </ol>
2	Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul><li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li><li>A. Yes, we have.</li></ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today,</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> </ol>
2 3 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have us projecting what the overall cost to PPA is, but</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> <li>to cost your ratepayers a little bit more? Is that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have us projecting what the overall cost to PPA is, but there still is an over/under mechanism within that</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have us projecting what the overall cost to PPA is, but there still is an over/under mechanism within that rider.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> <li>to cost your ratepayers a little bit more? Is that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have us projecting what the overall cost to PPA is, but there still is an over/under mechanism within that rider.</li> <li>So, to the extent that the Company is either underrecovered or overrecovered, that mechanism</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> <li>to cost your ratepayers a little bit more? Is that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have us projecting what the overall cost to PPA is, but there still is an over/under mechanism within that rider.</li> <li>So, to the extent that the Company is either underrecovered or overrecovered, that mechanism would either, you know, pass back to customers any</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> <li>to cost your ratepayers a little bit more? Is that</li> <li>wrong?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA.</li> <li>I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have us projecting what the overall cost to PPA is, but there still is an over/under mechanism within that rider.</li> <li>So, to the extent that the Company is either underrecovered or overrecovered, that mechanism would either, you know, pass back to customers any overrecovery or it would be designed to collect any</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> <li>to cost your ratepayers a little bit more? Is that</li> <li>wrong?</li> <li>A. On a total-bill basis, customers would our</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA. I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have us projecting what the overall cost to PPA is, but there still is an over/under mechanism within that rider.</li> <li>So, to the extent that the Company is either underrecovered or overrecovered, that mechanism would either, you know, pass back to customers any overrecovery or it would be designed to collect any underrecovery.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> <li>to cost your ratepayers a little bit more? Is that</li> <li>wrong?</li> <li>A. On a total-bill basis, customers would our</li> <li>current forecast indicates that it would be a slight</li> <li>23 cost.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. However, I know that you provided some information as to those calculations as well; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, we have.</li> <li>Q. And based on your recollection, the Tariff PPA still appears to, as it we sit here today, underrecover going forward?</li> <li>A. So I think the my response would be that I don't know that the underrecovered position will be the same given the removal of the PJM OATT expense tracking that was removed from Tariff PPA.</li> <li>I think, based on our our feedback and and the direction from this Commission in those PPA orders, we are moving to our last calculation included forward-looking billing determinants that would, you know, allow that would basically have us projecting what the overall cost to PPA is, but there still is an over/under mechanism within that rider.</li> <li>So, to the extent that the Company is either underrecovered or overrecovered, that mechanism would either, you know, pass back to customers any overrecovery or it would be designed to collect any</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>all I have. I appreciate it. Thank you.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Of course.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Did you say something?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. Can I just call you Tanner? Is that okay?</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Tanner, you testified through tough</li> <li>questioning from Moriah, she's pretty tough, and you</li> <li>testified through a jackhammer or a Sawzall or</li> <li>something, so I'm just going to make it pretty easy.</li> <li>I tell me when I'm wrong about this.</li> <li>Okay? When I say something that you don't agree</li> <li>with, just tell me. And we're going to it's</li> <li>going to be we're going to have a little</li> <li>conversation, not questioning.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Is it wrong to understand that this is going</li> <li>to cost your ratepayers a little bit more? Is that</li> <li>wrong?</li> <li>A. On a total-bill basis, customers would our</li> <li>current forecast indicates that it would be a slight</li> <li>cost.</li> <li>Q. There would be a slight cost?</li> </ol>

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

	54	5	6
1	Q. And then is it wrong to say that this doesn't	1 Q. Let's go on to the next what's the next	
2	help you with your generation capacity but about	2 thing?	
3	three or four percent? Is that wrong?	3 A. So I think the next thing is this project	
4	A. It is not a sig a large accredited	4 does provide us with energy benefits. So I know	
5	capacity component.	5 we've talked about, you know, the limitation the	
6	Q. Well, help me just a little bit. You've	6 limited capacity value from an ELCC accreditation.	
7	hinted at a few times that there's other	7 But from an energy perspective, this is a low-cost	
8	considerations here that make this worthwhile. Can	8 resource that will get bid into PJM and and most	
9	you just speak more than just in vague kind of	9 likely get picked up by the PJM market, and every	
10	generalities	10 hour that it's generating, which is, you know,	
11	A. Sure.	11 generally when when the sun is shining. And so	
12	Q what those considerations are that make	12 in every hour that that project is generating, it	
13	this a worthwhile project otherwise?	13 creates revenue that the Company receives from PJN	1.
14	A. Yeah. So I think I'll start with the	14 and then that revenue we would pass back to	-,
15	maybe I'll say the most front of mind from from	15 customers to ultimately reduce their costs that are	
16	my perspective. Obviously, we just got out of our	16 flowing – that flow through the Company's current	
17	two-year fuel adjustment clause proceeding, and	<sup>17</sup> fuel adjustment clause. So there is an energy	
18	during that proceeding that covered years 2020	18 benefit associated as well.	
19	through 2022. And during that time period, right,	19 Q. Can I ask a question about that?	
20	we did see spikes in the commodity market, so, you	20 <b>A.</b> Sure.	
21	know, increased natural gas price prices, and	21 Q. You're basically saying that this is going to	
22	then we had some challenges with procuring and, you	22 be a cost increase to your customers. So even	
23	know, securing coal given the scarcity of coal	23 though you're passing that back, you're still going	
24	through that time period. And so currently our	24 to have a cost increase to customers, correct?	
25	generation portfolio is a hundred percent reliant on	25 <b>A.</b> Based on our current assumptions, but, you	
20	generation portiono is a nunarea per cent remain on		
	55	5	_
	JJ	5	/
1			/
1 2	these commodities, other than any market purchases	1 know, there is the	/
	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.	1 know, there is the	/
2	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ol>	/
2 3	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> </ol>	/
2 3 4	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> </ol>	/
2 3 4 5	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us – this is the first – would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility –	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>5 are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> </ol>	/
2 3 4 5 6	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> </ol>	/
2 3 4 5 6 7	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> </ol>	/
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> </ol>	/
2 3 6 7 8 9	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal. Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right,	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> </ol>	/
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal. Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> </ol>	/
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal. Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> </ol>	1
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM. And so what this resource does is it gives us – this is the first – would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility – that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal. Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity. A. Sure.	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> </ol>	1
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases</li> <li>that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives</li> <li>us this is the first would be the first</li> <li>contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power</li> <li>that would not be subject to those volatility</li> <li>that volatility within the commodity markets for gas</li> <li>and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right,</li> <li>but I was looking for something other than your</li> <li>generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> </ol>	1
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> </ol>	1
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> </ol>	1
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I think, obviously, having the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> <li>within our service territory. We have seen, in</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I think, obviously, having the investment from this developer within our service</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> <li>within our service territory. We have seen, in</li> <li>other AEP East operating companies, the customer</li> </ol>	rs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I think, obviously, having the investment from this developer within our service territory we view as a huge success for us. The</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> <li>within our service territory. We have seen, in</li> <li>other AEP East operating companies, the customer</li> </ol>	rs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives</li> <li>us - this is the first would be the first</li> <li>contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power</li> <li>that would not be subject to those volatility</li> <li>that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I think, obviously, having the investment from this developer within our service territory we view as a huge success for us. The developers provided information around the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> <li>within our service territory. We have seen, in</li> <li>other AEP East operating companies, the customer</li> <li>are looking to, you know, have at least a portion of</li> </ol>	rs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I think, obviously, having the investment from this developer within our service territory we view as a huge success for us. The developers provided information around the construction jobs, the full-time job the the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> <li>within our service territory. We have seen, in</li> <li>other AEP East operating companies, the customer</li> <li>their supply or all of their supply provided via a</li> </ol>	rs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I think, obviously, having the investment from this developer within our service territory we view as a huge success for us. The developers provided information around the construction jobs, the full-time job the the FTEs that will be required within Perry County. So</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> <li>within our service territory. We have seen, in</li> <li>other AEP East operating companies, the customer</li> <li>are looking to, you know, have at least a portion of</li> <li>their supply or all of their supply provided via a</li> <li>corporate sustainability goals or, you know, that's</li> </ol>	rs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I think, obviously, having the investment from this developer within our service territory we view as a huge success for us. The developers provided information around the construction jobs, the full-time job the the FTEs that will be required within Perry County. So anytime that we can support economic development</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> <li>within our service territory. We have seen, in</li> <li>other AEP East operating companies, the customer</li> <li>are looking to, you know, have at least a portion of</li> <li>their supply or all of their supply provided via a</li> <li>corporate sustainability goals or, you know, that's</li> <li>just something they believe in.</li> </ol>	rs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>these commodities, other than any market purchases that we're making from PJM.</li> <li>And so what this resource does is it gives us this is the first would be the first contracted-for or owned resource for Kentucky Power that would not be subject to those volatility that volatility within the commodity markets for gas and coal.</li> <li>Q. Well, maybe I didn't state my question right, but I was looking for something other than your generating capacity or the source of that capacity.</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q. Are there other considerations, other than that, that make this project a great project in some way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I think, obviously, having the investment from this developer within our service territory we view as a huge success for us. The developers provided information around the construction jobs, the full-time job the the FTEs that will be required within Perry County. So anytime that we can support economic development opportunities within</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>know, there is the</li> <li>Q. So tell me</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q tell me what other considerations there</li> <li>are besides that that make this a good project. Is</li> <li>there something that we don't know, that we don't</li> <li>see that that is there anything else?</li> <li>A. I think I've covered, you know, the benefits</li> <li>that I've been able to identify.</li> <li>Q. Well, you touched on some economic</li> <li>development</li> <li>A. Sure.</li> <li>Q benefits. Do you want to talk about that?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think I can reference back to our</li> <li>our Rider RPO Option B option. So to the extent</li> <li>that we did have let's say there was an</li> <li>industrial-size customer that was looking to locate</li> <li>within our service territory. We have seen, in</li> <li>other AEP East operating companies, the customer</li> <li>are looking to, you know, have at least a portion of</li> <li>their supply or all of their supply provided via a</li> <li>corporate sustainability goals or, you know, that's</li> </ol>	rs

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

	58		60
1	to either dedicate a portion of the output to	1 that a little bit?	
2	that to serve that customer and hopefully have	2 A. I Company Witness Coon can obvious	v talk
3	them locate within our service territory. So we	<sup>3</sup> around again, we were talking a little bit ar	-
4	would have the option.	4 the economics and the benefits associated with	
5	Currently we don't have a facility that we	5 having a facility available for for customers	
6	can do that with because we don't have any renewable	6 under	
7	generation in the portfolio, but this would give us	7 Q. Who could do that?	
8	that option.	8 A. Company Witness Coon.	
9	Q. Is there anything other than just crossing	9 COMMISSIONER STACY: Okay. All right	t
10	your fingers and hoping that somebody's going to	10 Thanks, Tanner. I appreciate it.	
11	come and I mean, do you have is there more to	11 THE WITNESS: Of course.	
12	it than that? Do you have just it's kind of a	12 CHAIR HATTON: Commissioner Regan.	
13	hope and a hoping that that will happen?	13 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Yeah.	
14	A. I can speak – our economic development team	14 EXAMINATION	
15	is in constant conversations with a variety of	15 By Commissioner Regan:	
16	businesses and potential customers all the time. I	16 Q. So most of the questions that I had ready to	
17	know how hard they work, and they are always – it	17 go have been asked, so I won't go through that, b	ut
18	is not just more than a hope and a wish.	18 I have a more general question. Do you know, o	
19	We are actively engaged in communicating with	19 does anyone could or is there someone else	
20	customers, identifying their needs, and potentially	20 can answer this question: Is there any part of yo	
21	what it would take to have them locate within our	21 compensation for Kentucky Power or AEP that p	
22	service territory because ultimately, from my	22 bonus or is based on the percentage of	aysa
23	perspective, you know, my goal is to position us in	23 diversification in energy that the company has?	
24	the best way possible so that we can attract	24 <b>A.</b> I don't know that sitting here today, but	WO
25	businesses to our service territory, because I do	25 could certainly get that information.	wc
20	businesses to our service territory, because r do	2.5 Could certainly get that mormation.	
	59		61
1		1 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay, Thank	
1	59 think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.	1 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank 2 That's it.	
	think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.		
2	think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers. So we are actively and vehemently engaged in	2 That's it.	
2 3	think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers. So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> </ul>	
2 3 4	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5	think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers. So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.	<ol> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> </ol>	you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>That's it.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> </ol>	you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>That's it.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> </ol>	you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> </ul>	you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> </ul>	you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> </ul>	you. you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> </ul>	you. you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> </ul>	you. you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the commonwealth and it's good</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> </ul>	you. you as of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company,</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> </ul>	you. you as of to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company, if this company does good.</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> <li>Q. And we'd just like to find a way to make all</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> <li>18 confidential, please say so, in order to answer this</li> </ul>	you. you as of to s
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company, if this company does good.</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> </ul>	you. you as of to s
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company, if this company does good.</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> <li>Q. And we'd just like to find a way to make all</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> <li>18 confidential, please say so, in order to answer this</li> </ul>	you. you as of to s
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the e it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company, if this company does good.</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> <li>Q. And we'd just like to find a way to make all these things happen if we can.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> <li>18 confidential, please say so, in order to answer thi</li> <li>19 question. But why is this one a rush? Why did to</li> </ul>	you. you as of to s his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the e it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company, if this company does good.</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> <li>Q. And we'd just like to find a way to make all these things happen if we can.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> <li>18 confidential, please say so, in order to answer thi</li> <li>19 question. But why is this one a rush? Why did to</li> <li>20 one need to happen now?</li> <li>21 A. So I don't think this is this opportunity</li> </ul>	you. you as of to s his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company, if this company does good.</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> <li>Q. And we'd just like to find a way to make all these things happen if we can.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Anything else that you can share with me?</li> <li>A. Not that I can think of off the top of my head, but</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> <li>18 confidential, please say so, in order to answer thi</li> <li>19 question. But why is this one a rush? Why did to</li> <li>20 one need to happen now?</li> <li>21 A. So I don't think this is this opportunity.</li> </ul>	you. you as of to s his
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company, if this company does good.</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> <li>Q. And we'd just like to find a way to make all these things happen if we can.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Anything else that you can share with me?</li> <li>A. Not that I can think of off the top of my head, but</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> <li>18 confidential, please say so, in order to answer thi</li> <li>19 question. But why is this one a rush? Why did to</li> <li>20 one need to happen now?</li> <li>21 A. So I don't think this is this opportunity</li> <li>22 was rushed. It just had to be on a different</li> <li>23 timeline. It couldn't be delayed the way that</li> <li>24 had to take additional time to evaluate the the</li> </ul>	you. you as of to s his <b>we</b> <b>rmal</b>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>think that will provide some much-needed rate relief to our customers.</li> <li>So we are actively and vehemently engaged in economic development opportunities.</li> <li>Q. I get that, Tanner, and I'm you seem like a fella that really does want to do a good job, and I and I can appreciate that, and but I I'm just I'm just looking for something else, because the way it looks just on the face of it, it's it's difficult, it looks like, and I'm just hoping there's more to it that that maybe somebody can shed a light on something else that that helps us make it possible, because it's it's good for the commonwealth and it's good for your customers and it's good for your company, if this company does good.</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> <li>Q. And we'd just like to find a way to make all these things happen if we can.</li> <li>A. Absolutely.</li> <li>Q. Anything else that you can share with me?</li> <li>A. Not that I can think of off the top of my head, but</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 That's it.</li> <li>3 CHAIR HATTON: That's it?</li> <li>4 EXAMINATION</li> <li>5 By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>6 Q. Okay. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>7 A. Good morning.</li> <li>8 Q. So in your testimony you talked about how</li> <li>9 felt that this was the right resource at the right</li> <li>10 time.</li> <li>11 A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>12 Q. I know that the Intervenor's witness,</li> <li>13 Mr. Kollen, has said the exact opposite, that it w</li> <li>14 the wrong resource at the wrong time. And part</li> <li>15 your explanation for why you would choose this</li> <li>16 particular choice from the RFP was based on wo</li> <li>17 about losing the opportunity. If we need to go in</li> <li>18 confidential, please say so, in order to answer thi</li> <li>19 question. But why is this one a rush? Why did the one need to happen now?</li> <li>21 A. So I don't think this is this opportunity,</li> <li>22 was rushed. It just had to be on a different</li> <li>23 timeline. It couldn't be delayed the way that</li> </ul>	you. you as of to s his <b>we</b> <b>rmal</b>

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

	62		64
1	back and potentially look at their pricing given	1	administration change.
2	some of the changes via the EPA's 111(d) rule.	2	Q. Is this project already in the queue for PJM?
3	So they had potentially new compliance costs	3	A. I believe so, but I would ask Company Witness
4	that, you know, weren't originally contemplated in	4	Yetzer to confirm me on that.
5	their original bids, and so if the those	5	Q. Yes, sir.
6	resources needed time to potentially reprice to	6	A. Yes.
7	factor in the passage of the the EPA's 111(d)	7	Q. Okay. If the evaluation by the expert
8	rule and then give us updated pricing that we could	8	witnesses of the Intervenors is correct I'm being
9	evaluate.	9	careful because I I don't want to I don't want
10	So while that was pending, we decided to move	10	to accidentally go into confidential, and please
11	forward on the original timeline, what what I	11	catch me if I'm about to.
12	would consider the original timeline to move forward	12	If this this doesn't doesn't make money
13	with Bright Mountain. We just needed additional	13	and is noneconomic, if the Commission is unable to
14	time on the thermal resources, if that makes sense.	14	approve it, is there any salvaging this deal? Is
15	Q. So I misunderstood you that there was	15	there a renegotiation of price per megawatt hour, is
16	possibility that you would lose out on this	16	there or do you believe there are others waiting
17	opportunity?	17	that I mean, do you know if there's if that
18	A. No. I think if we had waited to move forward	18	possibility is off the table?
19	with the Bright Mountain project, to put them on a	19	A. I don't know whether the developer would
20	similar timeline as the thermal resources, like if	20	continue to engage with us beyond that. I guess I
21	we were to say in that scenario, right, when we	21	would defer to Company Witness Yetzer just and he
22	decided to move forward, if we would have said we're	22 23	may have some more information around, like, what the market for this kind of resource would be if we
23 24	just going to wait until we get the reprice of the thermal resources and then make a decision in	24	weren't the offtaker.
24	connection with all the the thermal resources as	25	But there is the potential that, you know,
2.5	connection with an the the thermal resources as	2.5	but there is the potential that, you know,
	63		65
1	well, then there's the potential either that the	1	somebody else could pick up that project or that
2	developer, you know, could have repriced this REPA	2	that project doesn't come to fruition.
3	or their costs could have increased that would have	3	Q. Okay. So as far as choosing this one first,
4	reflected in an increased price or they could have	4	there were the 111(d) concerns that would cause the
5	taken that project elsewhere.	5	others to take longer
6	Q. So the developer, if you had not accepted it	6	A. Yes.
7	when you did, may have opted to get a better price	7	Q to evaluate, and this one was evaluated
8	somewhere else?	8	and ready to go?
9	A. They could have.	9	A. Yes.
10 11	Q. Okay. Part of the reason that or maybe the entire reason that they feel your company		Q. This one does not probably well, we know. It results in additional costs to your customers?
12	feels this is economical is because of those	11 12	A. Yes.
13	renewable energy credits and your estimation of	13	A. Yes.         Q. In combination with others, as a total
14	being able to offset the costs with selling those	14	package, it might not
15	credits?	15	A. Correct.
16	A. That's a component of it, yes.	16	Q have that? Others are still being
17	Q. At the time they were evaluated, we were in a	17	reevaluated?
18	different position as far as federal administration.	18	A. Yes, Your Honor.
19	Does anyone believe these credits are worth less now	19	Q. We have to evaluate them on a
20	under the current administration?	20	project-by-project basis as they're brought forward
21	A. I would defer that to Company Witness Coon.	21	to us for to make sure that the least-cost
22	She is a little bit more familiar	22	reasonable alternative is being considered.
23	Q. Okay.	23	Again, being careful not to go go into
24	A with the the REC market and whether or	24	anything that's confidential. Actually, let's just
25	not we've seen any impact as a result of the	25	go into confidential, just just to be safe for a

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

	66	68
1	minute.	1 that isn't.
2	(Confidential session from 10:18 a.m. to	2 CHAIR HATTON: Okay.
3	10:22 a.m.)	3 Q. (By Chair Hatton) Thirty-four cents has now
4	MS. SACRE: We're on public record, Chair.	4 been revised to 29 cents per month?
5	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you.	5 A. Yes, Your Honor.
6	MS. SACRE: You're welcome.	6 Q. And the information I have was that that was
7	CONTINUED EXAMINATION	7 in the first year?
8	By Chair Hatton:	8 A. Yes, Your Honor.
9	Q. So the jobs total was different for Perry	9 Q. Do we expect it to be different in subsequent
10	County and then a statewide or a service areawide?	10 years?
11	Let me let me get to that real quick.	11 A. I don't work it changes year to year, but
12	A. I believe their first number was on a total	12 I don't off the top of my head, I don't know what
13	commonwealth perspective.	13 the change is. Company Witness Coon may be able to
14	Q. Okay. So why is that? They they just	14 provide you some additional information on that.
15	don't think they could get all those positions	15 Q. Company Witness Coon?
16	filled locally?	16 A. Yes, ma'am.
17	A. I don't know, off the top of my head, the	17 Q. Okay. Bear with me just a moment here.
18	the different numbers. It was just the information	18 CHAIR HATTON: All right. I think that's all
19	that was provided in their certificate filing.	19 the questions I have. Let me check one more thing.
20	Q. Okay. And in and specifically, there	20 All right. That's all the questions I have.
21	there was an expected 280 jobs for construction, but	21 Do we have redirect?
22	only 36 of those would be from Perry County. There	22 MS. GLASS: Yes, Your Honor, I do have some
23	would be 12 jobs ongoing thereafter to for	23 redirect.
24	operation and maintenance of the facility, but that	24 CHAIR HATTON: Proceed.
25	would be only four jobs locally for operation and	25 MS. GLASS: Thank you.
	67	69
1	maintenance of the facility?	1 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
2	A. Those are their estimates, yes.	2 By Ms. Glass:
3	Q. Okay. And those would not be hired by	3 Q. Mr. Wolffram, I'll start with asking you some
4	Kentucky Power? That's that's not your decision,	4 redirect questions on Mr. West's cross-examination
5	how many to hire locally?	5 of you earlier.
6	A. That's correct.	6 You were talking about RECs, renewable energy
7	Q. But that does impact the the overall	7 credits, and you had said that RECs can be used to
8	desirability, I assume, if I mean, we don't know	8 offset emissions. And do you believe that Ms. Coon
9	that those are in your service area, the remainder,	9 may be able to provide additional information on
10	either, right? They're just somewhere in Kentucky?	10 RECs and what they're used for?
11		
12	A. We we obviously one of the reasons that	11 A. Yes.
13	A. We we obviously one of the reasons that we were attracted to this project is because of the	11 <b>A. Yes.</b> 12 Q. Thank you.
	-	
14	we were attracted to this project is because of the	12 Q. Thank you.
	we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically	<ol> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>Would you also agree that customer interest</li> </ol>
14	we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry	<ul> <li>12 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>13 Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>14 in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> </ul>
14 15	we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry County. So, you know, we obviously viewed that as a positive when we were evaluating this project. Q. And you said the the total impact per	<ul> <li>Q. Thank you.</li> <li>Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> <li>the the Company has made this application in this</li> </ul>
14 15 16	we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry County. So, you know, we obviously viewed that as a positive when we were evaluating this project. Q. And you said the the total impact per customer in that first year has now been revised?	<ul> <li>12 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>13 Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>14 in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> <li>15 the the Company has made this application in this</li> <li>16 case?</li> <li>17 A. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think we've</li> <li>18 laid out the the other reasons the Company</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry</li> <li>County. So, you know, we obviously viewed that as a positive when we were evaluating this project.</li> <li>Q. And you said the the total impact per customer in that first year has now been revised?</li> <li>A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>12 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>13 Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>14 in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> <li>15 the the Company has made this application in this</li> <li>16 case?</li> <li>17 A. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think we've</li> <li>18 laid out the the other reasons the Company</li> <li>19 selected this project.</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry</li> <li>County. So, you know, we obviously viewed that as a positive when we were evaluating this project.</li> <li>Q. And you said the the total impact per customer in that first year has now been revised?</li> <li>A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>Q. Not confidential?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>12 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>13 Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>14 in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> <li>15 the the Company has made this application in this</li> <li>16 case?</li> <li>17 A. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think we've</li> <li>18 laid out the the other reasons the Company</li> <li>19 selected this project.</li> <li>20 Q. So I also want to talk about and kind of give</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry</li> <li>County. So, you know, we obviously viewed that as a positive when we were evaluating this project.</li> <li>Q. And you said the the total impact per customer in that first year has now been revised?</li> <li>A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>Q. Not confidential?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>12 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>13 Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>14 in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> <li>15 the the Company has made this application in this</li> <li>16 case?</li> <li>17 A. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think we've</li> <li>18 laid out the the other reasons the Company</li> <li>19 selected this project.</li> <li>20 Q. So I also want to talk about and kind of give</li> <li>21 some background on the way that the Company pays for</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry</li> <li>County. So, you know, we obviously viewed that as a positive when we were evaluating this project.</li> <li>Q. And you said the the total impact per customer in that first year has now been revised?</li> <li>A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>Q. Not confidential?</li> <li>A. No. CHAIR HATTON: Is confidential?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>12 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>13 Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>14 in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> <li>15 the the Company has made this application in this</li> <li>16 case?</li> <li>17 A. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think we've</li> <li>18 laid out the the other reasons the Company</li> <li>19 selected this project.</li> <li>20 Q. So I also want to talk about and kind of give</li> <li>21 some background on the way that the Company pays for</li> <li>22 the benefits received under the contract and the way</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry</li> <li>County. So, you know, we obviously viewed that as a positive when we were evaluating this project.</li> <li>Q. And you said the the total impact per customer in that first year has now been revised?</li> <li>A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>Q. Not confidential?</li> <li>A. No. <ul> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Is confidential?</li> <li>MR. GISH: The it's the jobs, right?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>12 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>13 Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>14 in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> <li>15 the the Company has made this application in this</li> <li>16 case?</li> <li>17 A. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think we've</li> <li>18 laid out the the other reasons the Company</li> <li>19 selected this project.</li> <li>20 Q. So I also want to talk about and kind of give</li> <li>21 some background on the way that the Company pays for</li> <li>22 the benefits received under the contract and the way</li> <li>23 that revenues are recovered.</li> </ul>
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>we were attracted to this project is because of the economic development opportunities, specifically the the FTEs and the ongoing FTEs for Perry</li> <li>County. So, you know, we obviously viewed that as a positive when we were evaluating this project.</li> <li>Q. And you said the the total impact per customer in that first year has now been revised?</li> <li>A. Yes, Your Honor.</li> <li>Q. Not confidential?</li> <li>A. No. CHAIR HATTON: Is confidential?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>12 Q. Thank you.</li> <li>13 Would you also agree that customer interest</li> <li>14 in renewable energy is not the only purpose that</li> <li>15 the the Company has made this application in this</li> <li>16 case?</li> <li>17 A. Yeah, I would agree with that. I think we've</li> <li>18 laid out the the other reasons the Company</li> <li>19 selected this project.</li> <li>20 Q. So I also want to talk about and kind of give</li> <li>21 some background on the way that the Company pays for</li> <li>22 the benefits received under the contract and the way</li> </ul>

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

	70	72
1	the Company will flow back energy benefits and other	1 A. Yes. That was my reference to the some of
2	benefits received to customers from this project?	2 the things that impacted the Company's last two-year
3	A. Sure. So as currently proposed, the	<sup>3</sup> FAC proceeding.
4	dollar-per-megawatt-hour price that is part of the	4 Q. Exactly. Thank you.
5	<b>REPA</b> would be recovered through Tariff PPA. So that	5 This would also protect the Company against
6	cost the Company pays that cost for every hour	6 the failure of natural gas pipelines, correct?
7	that that facility is generating. That is the cost	7 A. This is a nongas-related resource, so that
8	that will run through Tariff PPA.	8 those would have no impacts to this facility.
9	To the extent that the Company liquidates	9 Q. Okay. It would also protect the Company and
10	RECs that it receives as a result of the project,	10 its customers from increased coal prices or failure
11	those RECs would credit the amount that runs through	11 of coal suppliers to deliver or coal scarcity in the
12	Tariff PPA, functionally reducing the amount	12 market, correct?
13	recovered through Tariff PPA.	13 A. Again, that was my reference to the 2020
14	And then, once the project has bid within	14 to or 2020 to 2022 two-year FAC proceeding, yes.
15	PJM, any revenues the Company receives, those	15 Q. Thank you.
16	revenues would be a credit to the customers through	16 This also represents a physical hedge against
17	the Company's fuel adjustment clause.	17 market energy prices, correct?
18	Q. Okay. Great. Thank you.	18 A. Agreed.
19	So the 83.68 per megawatt hour that the	19 Q. And because this is a 15-year renewable
20	Company pays is a fixed price that's determined or	20 energy purchase agreement, this provides the Company
21	set by the contract, correct?	21 with a fixed price for 15 years, correct?
22	A. Correct.	22 A. That's correct.
23	Q. So any energy revenues that the Company	23 Q. Okay. So it also provides price certainty
24	receives and any revenues that the Company received	24 for customers, right?
25	from the liquidation of RECs essentially have the	25 <b>A. It does.</b>
	71	73
1	effect of buying down that fixed contract	1 Q. Thank you.
2	contract price, correct?	2 So would you agree that this project, or
3	A. Correct.	3 the what the Company will receive from this
4	Q. So the liquidation of RECs is another benefit	4 renewable energy purchase agreement and what
5	of this contract in that it can have the effect of	
6		5 customers receive are generally part of the
	buying down the contract price, therefore reducing	<ul><li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li><li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li></ul>
7	cost to customers as well?	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> </ul>
7 8	cost to customers as well? A. I would agree.	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> </ul>
8 9	<ul><li>cost to customers as well?</li><li>A. I would agree.</li><li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about,</li></ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> </ul>
8 9 10	<ul><li>cost to customers as well?</li><li>A. I would agree.</li><li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits</li></ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with diversity of resources, different fuel sources. It</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	cost to customers as well? A. I would agree. Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with diversity of resources, different fuel sources. It won't the Company will not just have resources	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> <li>16 was approximately three percent.</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	cost to customers as well? A. I would agree. Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with diversity of resources, different fuel sources. It won't the Company will not just have resources solely that come from fossil fuels, correct?	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> <li>16 was approximately three percent.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay. And is that three percent in the</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with diversity of resources, different fuel sources. It won't the Company will not just have resources solely that come from fossil fuels, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> <li>16 was approximately three percent.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay. And is that three percent in the</li> <li>18 summer</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with diversity of resources, different fuel sources. It won't the Company will not just have resources solely that come from fossil fuels, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And because of that, that means that the Company will the Bright Mountain project represents a fuel-independent resource, right?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> <li>16 was approximately three percent.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay. And is that three percent in the</li> <li>18 summer</li> <li>19 A. It was total.</li> <li>20 Q or is that annually?</li> <li>21 A. It's total.</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with diversity of resources, different fuel sources. It won't the Company will not just have resources solely that come from fossil fuels, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And because of that, that means that the Company will the Bright Mountain project represents a fuel-independent resource, right?</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> <li>16 was approximately three percent.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay. And is that three percent in the</li> <li>18 summer</li> <li>19 A. It was total.</li> <li>20 Q or is that annually?</li> <li>21 A. It's total.</li> <li>22 Q. Okay. Great. So three percent annually.</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with diversity of resources, different fuel sources. It won't the Company will not just have resources solely that come from fossil fuels, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And because of that, that means that the Company will the Bright Mountain project represents a fuel-independent resource, right?</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> <li>Q. And so that means that the Company would be</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> <li>16 was approximately three percent.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay. And is that three percent in the</li> <li>18 summer</li> <li>19 A. It was total.</li> <li>20 Q or is that annually?</li> <li>21 A. It's total.</li> <li>22 Q. Okay. Great. So three percent annually.</li> <li>23 And I heard you also testify earlier that</li> </ul>
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>cost to customers as well?</li> <li>A. I would agree.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, I've heard you talk about, throughout your testimony, just the various benefits of this project. And Commissioner Stacy was asking about all the benefits of this project. And if I can summarize those for you, and I'll see if you agree with me, this will provide the Company with diversity of resources, different fuel sources. It won't the Company will not just have resources solely that come from fossil fuels, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. And because of that, that means that the Company will the Bright Mountain project represents a fuel-independent resource, right?</li> <li>A. Agreed.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>5 customers receive are generally part of the</li> <li>6 Company's cost of service, correct?</li> <li>7 A. I would agree.</li> <li>8 Q. So this is the Company, as I've heard you say</li> <li>9 before, fulfilling its responsibility to provide</li> <li>10 adequate reliable service to customers, correct?</li> <li>11 A. That's the way I view it, yes.</li> <li>12 Q. Okay. And so can you tell me what percent of</li> <li>13 the Company's annual energy needs that this project</li> <li>14 will satisfy?</li> <li>15 A. Based on our quantification and testimony, it</li> <li>16 was approximately three percent.</li> <li>17 Q. Okay. And is that three percent in the</li> <li>18 summer</li> <li>19 A. It was total.</li> <li>20 Q or is that annually?</li> <li>21 A. It's total.</li> <li>22 Q. Okay. Great. So three percent annually.</li> </ul>

19 (Pages 70 to 73)

	74		76
1	A. Based on our updated fundamentals, it's about	1	confidential. I'm not asking you specific questions
2	29 cents for an average customer on a monthly basis.	2	about that and I don't mean to get into any
3	Q. Okay. So about a quarter per month, correct?	3	confidential information. But does that information
4	A. That's correct.	4	on that exhibit take into account both price and
5	Q. And subject to check on the math on this I	5	nonprice factors?
6	don't expect you to do math on the stand but that	6	A. Yes.
7	basically means that this is going to provide about	7	Q. Okay. And could Company Witness Yetzer
8	three percent of the Company's energy needs for less	8	elaborate on that or any information contained in
9	than 0.2 percent of a bill price increase. Does	9	that exhibit?
10	that sound about correct to you?	10	A. He absolutely can.
11	A. That math seems about right, yes.	11	MS. GLASS: Those are all the questions I
12	Q. Would you agree that if the Company does	12	have. Thank you.
13	bring forward an application to approve a thermal	13	COMMISSIONER STACY: Can I ask a question?
14	PPA or some other resource in the future, that will	14	CHAIR HATTON: Sure.
15	also be part of the cost of the Company's cost of	15	REEXAMINATION
16	service and that could also result in you know,	16	By Commissioner Stacy:
17	add cost to customers' bill, result in bill	17	Q. Tanner, she just asked you about I just
18	increases, correct?	18	want to follow up on something she asked. She said
19	A. There there could be associated there	19	that if you did this deal that it would it would
20	will be associated bill impacts associated with any	20	protect you against the price fluctuations in the
21	other facility that the Company brings forward, yes.	21	price of oil, gas, and and pipeline problems
22	Q. Ms. Tussey was asking you questions about the		A. Can.
23	1 5	23	Q because of you have, what, three percent
24 25	with this contract through Tariff PPA. Do you remember those?	24	of your energy being produced by this, but, in fact,
25	Temember mose?	25	you're going to purchase energy from the PJM,
	75		77
1	75	1	
1	A. I do.	1	correct?
2	<ul><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there</li></ul>	2	correct? A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM,
2 3	<ul><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of</li></ul>	2 3	correct? A. We – we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.
2 3 4	<ul><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the</li></ul>	2 3 4	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of</li> </ul>
2 3	<ul><li>A. I do.</li><li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of</li></ul>	2 3	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	<ul><li>correct?</li><li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li><li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	<ul><li>correct?</li><li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li><li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li></ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That - that certainly was a one of the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That – that certainly was a – one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That - that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think the the Company is aware,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount of market purchase that you have to make from the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That - that certainly was a - one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think the the Company is aware, you know, that adding riders and line items to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount of market purchase that you have to make from the other PJM resources.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That - that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think the the Company is aware, you know, that adding riders and line items to bills, you know, can present challenges to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount of market purchase that you have to make from the other PJM resources.</li> <li>Q. I like I like that answer, but that's not</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That - that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think the the Company is aware, you know, that adding riders and line items to bills, you know, can present challenges to customers, but to the extent that one the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount of market purchase that you have to make from the other PJM resources.</li> <li>Q. I like I like that answer, but that's not the real answer. The real answer is that you're</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think the the Company is aware, you know, that adding riders and line items to bills, you know, can present challenges to customers, but to the extent that one the Commission would determine that a separate rider for this specific project would be appropriate, then the Company has no objection to that. It's simply that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount of market purchase that you have to make from the other PJM resources.</li> <li>Q. I like I like that answer, but that's not the real answer. The real answer is that you're still going to be reliant on price fluctuations in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That - that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think the the Company is aware, you know, that adding riders and line items to bills, you know, can present challenges to customers, but to the extent that one the Commission would determine that a separate rider for this specific project would be appropriate, then the Company has no objection to that. It's simply that we were trying to apply it to a currently existing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount of market purchase that you have to make from the other PJM resources.</li> <li>Q. I like I like that answer, but that's not the real answer. The real answer is that you're still going to be reliant on price fluctuations in the market of oil and gas, and you're still going to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That - that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think the the Company is aware, you know, that adding riders and line items to bills, you know, can present challenges to customers, but to the extent that one the Commission would determine that a separate rider for this specific project would be appropriate, then the Company has no objection to that. It's simply that we were trying to apply it to a currently existing billing line item to avoid customer confusion.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount of market purchase that you have to make from the other PJM resources.</li> <li>Q. I like I like that answer, but that's not the real answer. The real answer is that you're still going to be reliant on price fluctuations in the market of oil and gas, and you're still going to be subject to some kind of a a pipeline</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And is it your recollection that there already is a specific line or a specific function of Tariff PPA that allows the Company to recover the costs of purchased power agreements through the PPA?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And is that essentially the reason that the Company indicated it would recover the cost of this REPA through Tariff PPA?</li> <li>A. That - that certainly was a one of the determinate factors, yes.</li> <li>Q. Would the Company consider creating a new rider to recover these costs through if the Commission were would approve it?</li> <li>A. Sure. I think the the Company is aware, you know, that adding riders and line items to bills, you know, can present challenges to customers, but to the extent that one the Commission would determine that a separate rider for this specific project would be appropriate, then the Company has no objection to that. It's simply that we were trying to apply it to a currently existing</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>correct?</li> <li>A. We we purchase all our energy from PJM, yes.</li> <li>Q. So can you estimate the the amount of coal, gas that is produced by that energy that you purchase?</li> <li>A. Oh, I</li> <li>Q. So if you think about that and if some of that certainly is, then you're really not protected from that, you're just protected from it, maybe, you know, to a lesser extent.</li> <li>A. Well, I think the the point there is that we would be less reliant on you know, we would have the offsetting revenues associated with the project being built in, and so therefore you're functionally buying down or reducing the amount of market purchase that you have to make from the other PJM resources.</li> <li>Q. I like I like that answer, but that's not the real answer. The real answer is that you're still going to be reliant on price fluctuations in the market of oil and gas, and you're still going to</li> </ul>

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

	78		80
1	reliant on, you know, adequate supply	1	ZACHARY MICHAEL YETZER, called by Kentucky
2	Q. Yeah.		Power Company, having been first duly sworn,
3	A which we have.	3	testified as follows:
4	Q. That's all I want that's all I wanted to	4	DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	make clear.	5	By Mr. Gish:
6	A. Yeah.	6	Q. Mr. Yetzer, can you state your employer and
7	CHAIR HATTON: Mr. West?	7	position, please, for the record?
8	Mr. Kurtz?	8	A. I'm employed by American Electric Power
9	MR. KURTZ: No, Your Honor.	9	Service Corporation, and I am a regulated
10	CHAIR HATTON: Staff?	10	infrastructure development manager.
11	MS. TUSSEY: No.	11	Q. Thank you.
12	CHAIR HATTON: All right. For this	12	And did you file direct testimony and
13	particular witness, I won't excuse just because	13	responses to data requests in this proceeding?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.	14	A. I did.
15	CHAIR HATTON: you know how that goes.	15	Q. Do you have any corrections to your testimony
16	THE WITNESS: No problem.	16	or responses to data requests?
17	CHAIR HATTON: But you can step down from the	17	A. I do not.
18	stand.	18	Q. And if I were to ask you the same questions
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.	19	that are in your testimony and in your data
20	CHAIR HATTON: Let's take a break before we	20	requests, would you give the same responses?
21	take our next witness. Let's say 15 minutes.	21	A. I would.
22	(Recess from 10:37 a.m. to 11:04 a.m.)	22	MR. GISH: And before I turn Mr. Yetzer over
23	MS. SACRE: You're on, Chair.	23	for cross-examination, there were a couple of very
24	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the	24	specific questions in the testimony of Mr. Wolffram
25	record in Case Number 2024-243, Kentucky Power's	25	that I think we could kind of get out of the way.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	application for approving the terms and conditions of a renewable energy purchase agreement. Leave it at that. It's a very long title. All right. Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Zachary Yetzer. Mr. Gish will be presenting Mr. Yetzer. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true and correct to the best of your knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: All right. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address. THE WITNESS: Zachary Michael Yetzer. My business address is One Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio 43215.	4 5 7 8 9	It might be more efficient to to do now. Q. (By Mr. Gish) The first question was, Mr. Wolffram was asked regarding the status of the Bright Mountain project and the PJM interconnection process. Can you let the Commissioners know what the what the status of that project is in the PJM interconnection process? <b>A. Yeah. That that project actually has</b> <b>it's a full-blown interconnection agreement with PJM</b> <b>now. I think they executed that agreement in Q3 of</b> <b>last year. So it is it is ready ready to</b> <b>break ground and start building the project.</b> MR. GISH: And the other question that I think was was asked, and I think we want to make sure the Commissioners asked, requires us to go into confidential session briefly. Is that can we can we do that? CHAIR HATTON: I don't mind. MR. GISH: Okay. CHAIR HATTON: I don't want a protract a
21 22 23 24 25	CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. GISH: Thank you, ma'am. * * *	21 22 23 24 25	protracted direct for things that are already on the record, but MR. GISH: Yeah. CHAIR HATTON: this sounds MR. GISH: Yeah.

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

	82	84
1	MS. SACRE: So go on private?	1 MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
2	CHAIR HATTON: Yes, please.	2 CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION
3	(Confidential session from 11:07 a.m. to	3 By Mr. Kurtz:
4	11:10 a.m.)	4 Q. So 80-megawatt nameplate?
5	MS. SACRE: We're on public, Chair.	5 A. That is correct. Yes, nameplate is 80
6	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you, Candace.	6 megawatts.
7	MS. SACRE: You're welcome.	7 Q. Okay. 4.8-megawatt ELCC accredited capacity,
8	MR. GISH: Thank you.	8 you've heard that?
9	Mr. Yetzer is available for cross-examination.	9 A. Yes, I I have heard that. That is my
10	CHAIR HATTON: Gotcha. Just in time,	10 understanding.
11	Mr. West. Your turn.	11 Q. Okay. The first year this solar is expected
12	MR. WEST: No cross of this witness.	12 to produce 150,000 megawatt hours, approximately?
13	CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz.	13 A. Approximately, yes.
14	MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.	14 Q. So the first-year price from Kentucky Power
15	CROSS-EXAMINATION	15 to to the developer is estimated to be
16	By Mr. Kurtz:	16 12.5 million?
17	Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.	17 A. I don't have a calculator or able to to do
18	A. Good morning.	18 that math, but that that subject to check,
19	Q. The investment tax credit, was it 50 percent	19 that would sound right.
20	for this project?	20 Q. Okay.
21	A. I I actually do not know what the ITC	21 A. Contract rate times the
22	project for this or what the ITC was for this	22 Q. And
23	project. The the developer, his they proposed	23 <b>A 150,000.</b>
24	a contract rate into this RFP but did not stipulate	2.4 Q. And the the Company has assumed a
25	what percentage of the ITC the project was eligible	25 degradation in the output from the solar facility of
	83	85
1		
1	for, only that it was an ITC project.	1 half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?
2	<ul><li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li><li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30</li></ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> </ol>
2 3	<b>for, only that it was an ITC project.</b> Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<b>for, only that it was an ITC project.</b> Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> </ol>
2 3	<b>for, only that it was an ITC project.</b> Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	<b>for, only that it was an ITC project.</b> Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 5	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Yeah. I think we</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Yeah. I think we better.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I'm Jurgens van Zyl. I'm one of the Staff</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Yeah. I think we better.</li> <li>Candace, whenever you're ready. This might</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>Q. I'm Jurgens van Zyl. I'm one of the Staff</li> <li>attorneys here. I think we've covered a lot of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Yeah. I think we better.</li> <li>Candace, whenever you're ready. This might happen a lot Candace.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>M. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I'm Jurgens van Zyl. I'm one of the Staff</li> <li>attorneys here. I think we've covered a lot of</li> <li>ground, actually, of, what, you know, we had</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Yeah. I think we better.</li> <li>Candace, whenever you're ready. This might happen a lot Candace. MS. SACRE: Evidently.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I'm Jurgens van Zyl. I'm one of the Staff</li> <li>attorneys here. I think we've covered a lot of</li> <li>ground, actually, of, what, you know, we had</li> <li>intended to ask.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Yeah. I think we better.</li> <li>Candace, whenever you're ready. This might happen a lot Candace. MS. SACRE: Evidently. (Confidential session from 11:12 a.m. to</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I'm Jurgens van Zyl. I'm one of the Staff</li> <li>attorneys here. I think we've covered a lot of</li> <li>ground, actually, of, what, you know, we had</li> <li>intended to ask.</li> <li>I just want to kind of briefly understand</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Yeah. I think we better.</li> <li>Candace, whenever you're ready. This might happen a lot Candace. MS. SACRE: Evidently. (Confidential session from 11:12 a.m. to 11:14 a.m.)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I'm Jurgens van Zyl. I'm one of the Staff</li> <li>attorneys here. I think we've covered a lot of</li> <li>ground, actually, of, what, you know, we had</li> <li>intended to ask.</li> <li>I just want to kind of briefly understand</li> <li>your role for RFPs before we get into other</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>for, only that it was an ITC project.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So the investment tax credit was 30 percent, 40 percent, 50 percent. Is essentially that a reduction in the capital cost of the project by the amount of the ITC?</li> <li>A. That is my understanding, yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if the ITC goes away or is reduced under the current administration, that will trigger a renegotiation if that's a change in law?</li> <li>A. I think I would need to MR. GISH: Ma'am ma'am, this is this section of the REPA is covered under this is confidential and was discussed earlier. CHAIR HATTON: Oh. Do you agree that MR. KURTZ: Yeah. Well, we can go on confidential. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Yeah. I think we better.</li> <li>Candace, whenever you're ready. This might happen a lot Candace. MS. SACRE: Evidently. (Confidential session from 11:12 a.m. to</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>half a percent per year. Are you aware of that?</li> <li>A. I'd have to rely on Witness Coon to to do</li> <li>that, but that is that's typical. That's</li> <li>that's typically what we see for degradation.</li> <li>Q. And over the 15-year contract period,</li> <li>Kentucky Power is projected to pay the developer</li> <li>\$179 million nominal?</li> <li>A. I sub I subject to check. I</li> <li>don't I don't have those numbers. Witness Coon</li> <li>might have an annual payment there in her analysis.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Good morning, Mr. Yetzer.</li> <li>A. Good morning.</li> <li>Q. I'm Jurgens van Zyl. I'm one of the Staff</li> <li>attorneys here. I think we've covered a lot of</li> <li>ground, actually, of, what, you know, we had</li> <li>intended to ask.</li> <li>I just want to kind of briefly understand</li> </ul>

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

	86	8	38
1	AEP?	1 Q. Not the planning process, but you said that	
2	A. Uh-huh.	2 you evaluate it, right? So Kentucky Power comes and	
3	Q. You help draft them, I understand, and then	<sup>3</sup> they say, "Okay. You know, we think that you	
4	you help shepherd sort of them through the process.	4 know, we think these things are important to us."	
5	What does that include?	5 Who develops who develops the rubric by	
6	A. Yeah. So my my role with Service	6 which you measure all these proposals against one	
7	Corporation is to – is to work on and issue RFPs on	7 another?	
8	behalf of our various operating companies, including	8 A. Yeah. So I develop that rubric.	
9	Kentucky Power.	9 Q. Okay.	
10	So when Kentucky Power approached our group	10 A. And it's RFP-specific based off of the	
11	saying, "Hey, we'd like to issue an RFP," I I was	11 feedback that we got from Kentucky Power. So, y	ou
12	assigned.	12 know, I you know, we've got a whole list of	
13	And, you know, I met weekly with Kentucky	13 things that we look at typically in in RFPs and	
14	Power leadership. I virtually go through a list of	14 we say, "Hey" you know, at the time it was	
15	questions that I ask them. "Hey, what do you want	15 Brian West that I would who was the the form	er
16	included in your RFP? What are what are your	16 VP of regulatory and finance at Kentucky Power.	
17	goals for this RFP?" You know, "What are your	17 But I I basically asked him, "Hey, here's	
18	long-term goals that we that we want to state in	18 a list of the things that we typically look at for	
19	the RFP?"	19 each proposal. Are any of these things you know	v,
20	So I take guidance from Kentucky Power and	20 do any of these things hit home? Are any of these	
21	and the other operating companies when I draft RFPs	21 things that that you might want to remove, or is	
22	on their behalf and incorporate that to the RFP. We	22 there anything else that you'd like to add to the	
23	go live with that RFP and issue it.	23 to the list that we can look at for each of these	
24	And then I also collect the you know, on	24 proposals?"	
25	proposal due date, we collect the proposals. I'm in	25 And and, you know, he provided feedback	
	87	8	39
1	87 charge of parsing those proposals out to the various	۶ ۱ on on what you know, what items, both price	39
1 2			
-	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various	1 on on what you know, what items, both price	
2	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Power</li> </ol>	
2 3	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So the</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals.	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So the</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get.	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with.	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>And and those give combine to to</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what they hope to get out of the RFP and and what they	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>And and those give combine to to</li> <li>become the total score, which ultimately feeds</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what they hope to get out of the RFP and and what they would hope to achieve in their long-term planning	<ul> <li>1 on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>2 and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>3 and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>4 each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>5 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>6 is the score sheet?</li> <li>7 THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>8 for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>9 would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>10 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>11 THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>12 sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>13 which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>14 sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>15 nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>16 total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>17 And and those give combine to to</li> <li>18 become the total score, which ultimately feeds</li> <li>19 the the total ranking of the proposals.</li> </ul>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what they hope to get out of the RFP and and what they would hope to achieve in their long-term planning process.	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>And and those give combine to to</li> <li>become the total score, which ultimately feeds</li> <li>the the total ranking of the proposals.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. van Zyl) Okay. So I just want to</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what they hope to get out of the RFP and and what they would hope to achieve in their long-term planning process. Q. So that rubric that you sort of use, that	<ul> <li>1 on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>2 and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>3 and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>4 each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>5 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>6 is the score sheet?</li> <li>7 THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>8 for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>9 would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>10 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>11 THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>12 sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>13 which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>14 sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>15 nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>16 total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>17 And and those give combine to to</li> <li>18 become the total score, which ultimately feeds</li> <li>19 the the total ranking of the proposals.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. van Zyl) Okay. So I just want to</li> <li>21 make sure that I understand both your answer and</li> </ul>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what they hope to get out of the RFP and and what they would hope to achieve in their long-term planning process. Q. So that rubric that you sort of use, that sort of measuring stick that you use, who develops	<ol> <li>on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>is the score sheet?</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>And and those give combine to to</li> <li>become the total score, which ultimately feeds</li> <li>the the total ranking of the proposals.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. van Zyl) Okay. So I just want to</li> <li>make sure that I understand both your answer and</li> <li>then I the score sheet, the Z so ZMY-3</li> </ol>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what they hope to get out of the RFP and and what they would hope to achieve in their long-term planning process. Q. So that rubric that you sort of use, that sort of measuring stick that you use, who develops that? Is that a Kentucky Power development, or is	<ul> <li>1 on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>2 and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>3 and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>4 each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>5 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>6 is the score sheet?</li> <li>7 THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>8 for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>9 would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>10 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>11 THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>12 sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>13 which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>14 sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>15 nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>16 total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>17 And and those give combine to to</li> <li>18 become the total score, which ultimately feeds</li> <li>19 the the total ranking of the proposals.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. van Zyl) Okay. So I just want to</li> <li>21 make sure that I understand both your answer and</li> <li>22 then I the score sheet, the Z so ZMY-3</li> <li>23 we're not in confidential. We don't need to get</li> </ul>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what they hope to get out of the RFP and and what they would hope to achieve in their long-term planning process. Q. So that rubric that you sort of use, that sort of measuring stick that you use, who develops that? Is that a Kentucky Power development, or is that something sort of AEP does?	<ul> <li>1 on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>2 and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>3 and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>4 each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>5 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>6 is the score sheet?</li> <li>7 THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>8 for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>9 would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>10 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>11 THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>12 sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>13 which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>14 sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>15 nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>16 total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>17 And and those give combine to to</li> <li>18 become the total score, which ultimately feeds</li> <li>19 the the total ranking of the proposals.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. van Zyl) Okay. So I just want to</li> <li>21 make sure that I understand both your answer and</li> <li>22 then I the score sheet, the Z so ZMY-3</li> <li>23 we're not in confidential. We don't need to get</li> <li>24 into that. But the that represents so</li> </ul>	er,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	charge of parsing those proposals out to the various SMEs and the various groups between Kentucky Power and Service Corporation that are going to basically perform analysis on those proposals. I then collect that analysis. You know, and in parallel, the Integrated Resource Planning Group is doing the financial analysis on these. We bring all that analysis together to basically come up with a ranking of of all the various proposals that we get. And then I I make a recommendation to Kentucky Power on on what to move forward with. And sometimes it's multiple recommendations. And they make a decision based off of on what to short list and what to move forward with in into the negotiation phase based off of, you know, their very specific goals and and what they what they hope to get out of the RFP and and what they would hope to achieve in their long-term planning process. Q. So that rubric that you sort of use, that sort of measuring stick that you use, who develops that? Is that a Kentucky Power development, or is	<ul> <li>1 on on what you know, what items, both price</li> <li>2 and nonprice, that are important to Kentucky Powe</li> <li>3 and that's what we ultimately used to to score</li> <li>4 each individual proposal off of.</li> <li>5 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Can I just ask: So th</li> <li>6 is the score sheet?</li> <li>7 THE WITNESS: So the score sheet that you see</li> <li>8 for ZMY Exhibit 3 is the that's what I would</li> <li>9 would refer to as the total score sheet.</li> <li>10 COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.</li> <li>11 THE WITNESS: So we've got and we've got a</li> <li>12 sheet that comes out for the economic analysis,</li> <li>13 which would be the price scoring on my total score</li> <li>14 sheet. And then we also have a spreadsheet of of</li> <li>15 nonprice scoring that is the nonprice column on my</li> <li>16 total score sheet that you see in Exhibit 3.</li> <li>17 And and those give combine to to</li> <li>18 become the total score, which ultimately feeds</li> <li>19 the the total ranking of the proposals.</li> <li>20 Q. (By Mr. van Zyl) Okay. So I just want to</li> <li>21 make sure that I understand both your answer and</li> <li>22 then I the score sheet, the Z so ZMY-3</li> <li>23 we're not in confidential. We don't need to get</li> </ul>	er,

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

	90		92
1	ultimate sort of final score on that, that	1	myself.
2	represents nonprice factors? So all the	2	Q. Okay. So we'll we'll go on from those.
3	considerations that were important to Kentucky Power	3	Under the terms of the contract, you are
4	from not just like a value perspective, right, a	4	obligated to pay Kentucky Power is obligated to
5	(indiscernible) perspective as well as, you know,	5	pay for all of those resources for every hour of
6	your expected costs and your expected revenues and	6	generation regardless of whether something is sold
7	everything else?	7	into whether regardless of whether PJM calls
8	A. That is correct. And and, you know, just	8	up that resource, correct?
9	a just a high level there that, you know, those	9	So if it's producing energy but the cost of
10	columns would be the the pricing and the and	10	it is higher than whatever the call price is of the
11	the nonpricing. The nonpricing would be what we	11	market, right, you still owe Bright Mountain the
12	consider the the nonprice factors and and the	12	\$83.68 for for that hour?
13	scoring associated with those.	13	A. That is correct, yes. Kentucky Power will
14	Q. Okay.	14	purchase the full output of the facility for the 15
15	A. Yep.	15	years.
16	Q. So let's look at just a little bit of and	16	Q. What happens to the energy that doesn't get
17	I know Witness Coon may ultimately be who we ask	17	called into PJM? So what happens to that revenue?
18	these questions to, but I have you here and I just	18	I mean, it's not revenue, but what what
19	want to see if you can give us some information	19	what do you do with that energy?
20	here.	20	A. So Kentucky Power actually, you know, this
21	Are you familiar with how the renewable	21	facility will get bid in to both the day-ahead
22	energy credit works and functions?	22	market and the real-time market. So, you know, on a
23	A. It I'm I'm familiar that a renewable	23	day-ahead basis, we'll create a forecast for this
24	energy certificate or renewable energy credit gets	24	facility
25	generated with with each megawatt hour that is	25	Q. Uh-huh.
	91		93
1	that is produced from the from a renewable	1	A which gets submitted to PJM. A day-ahead
2	facility, yes.	2	award will be given to that facility to to
3	Q. And so within the the terms of the	3	generate for whatever that forecast was for the next
4	contract, every hour that Kentucky Power or every	4	day.
5	hour that Bright Mountain generates energy, you pay	5	And then in the in the real-time,
6	for that REC, the value of the REC, you pay for the		regardless of what LMPs are showing, that facility
7	value of the capacity, and you pay for the value of	7	will generate at whatever it you know, whatever
8	the energy?	8	the irradiance is O. Right.
9 10	A. Yes. For every megawatt hour that Bright		A dictates for for the solar facility,
10	Mountain produces, we would we would purchase a bundled product, which would which is encompassed	11	
11 12	by that contract rate.		into into the market. It just gets sold into the
13	Q. And how I'm trying to think of how to ask	13	market at whatever the LMP is that
14	this without going into are you generally aware	14	Q. Okay.
15	of the price that energy is currently being bid on	15	A. – it's generating at.
16	into PJM, solar energy is currently being bid on in	16	Q. Okay. And so you just kind of lose the
17	PJM?	17	difference over
18	A. I have no knowledge of	18	A. Yeah. There's a
19	Q. No knowledge of that?	19	Q (indiscernible)?
20	A of that personally.	20	A lot of other stuff that goes into it
21	<ul><li>Q. Do you think Ms. Coon would have, or do you</li></ul>	21	because you've got the day-ahead award, you've got
22	have anybody here today who could speak to sort of	22	the
23	the more specifics?	23	Q. Yeah.
24	A. I don't know if Witness Coon knows exactly,	24	A real-time
25	but she'd be a better person to ask than than	25	
	<b>I I I I I I I I I I</b>		

24 (Pages 90 to 93)

	94	96
1	A the end-balance charges. But yes, you	1 studies, the cultural resource studies. They've
2	you pay \$83.68 and you get the output of the	<ul> <li>2 they've got all the permitting that's required for</li> </ul>
3	facility, and then Kentucky Power and AEP commercial	<ul> <li>the facility. They have a signed interconnection</li> </ul>
4	operations will decide on the bidding strategy and	4 agreement like we were talking about earlier.
5	how to optimize the the the output of that	5 What they have not started yet, it would be
6	facility.	<ul> <li>6 actually building the the the project, right?</li> </ul>
7	Q. Okay. Witness Wolffram discussed some of the	<ul> <li>7 So it's always in a continuous state of, you know,</li> </ul>
8	nonprice factors and involved in sort of the	<ul> <li>8 construction, but, you know, they haven't actually</li> </ul>
9	evaluation of that, and one of those was, like,	<ul> <li>9 started, you know, building roads. There are some</li> </ul>
10	potential for an EDR customer to come in.	10 roads that are already on on-site because this is
11	And, again, if I'm getting close to anything	11 a reclaimed coal mine that they're building this
12	confidential, let us know.	12 site on.
13	But just generally speaking, one of the sort	13 But, you know, they haven't started building
14	of stated benefits is that customers seem to want	14 the interconnection yet. They haven't started
15	renewable energy, and you think that there's an	15 putting panels, invertors, transformers on-site.
16	opportunity for an EDR con like, for an EDR	16 None of that has has commenced yet.
17	contract to materialize out of that.	17 And they won't they won't start that until
18	Are you in like, is are you aware of	18 Kentucky Power is given has given the the
19	any negotiations that Kentucky Power has through the	19 developer notice to proceed, which would require a
20	RFP process that has indicated that an industrial	20 final nonappealable order.
21	customer is likely or that a large commercial	21 Q. Have they acquired the property?
22	customer is likely to enter the territory that have	22 A. The property is under is under lease.
23	made stipulations or made, you know, any kind of	23 They don't own the property. They've they've
24	entreaty there?	24 leased the project property, and it's my
25	A. I am not aware of any of those. My role as	25 understanding there's a there's a few lease
		07
1	95	97
1	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the	1 owners, but there there's one lease one one
2	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract.	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> </ol>
2 3	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> </ol>
2 3 4	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> </ol>
2 3	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that.	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that.	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure.	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace.	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.)	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman.	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> <li>of lease option that they make that they're</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman. CHAIR HATTON: Okay.	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> <li>of lease option that they make that they 're</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> <li>of lease option that they make that they're</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION By Commissioner Stacy:	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> <li>of lease option that they make that they're</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> <li>construction, and then they would start making</li> <li>some some sort of higher lease payment is what I</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION By Commissioner Stacy: Q. With your working with the developer, what	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> <li>of lease option that they make that they're</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> <li>construction, and then they would start making</li> <li>some some sort of higher lease payment is what I</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<pre>the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract.    Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that.    MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions    CHAIR HATTON: Sure.    MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch.    CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace.    (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.)    MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman.    CHAIR HATTON: Okay.     EXAMINATION By Commissioner Stacy: Q. With your working with the developer, what stage is this project in development? What what</pre>	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> <li>construction, and then they would start making</li> <li>some some sort of higher lease payment is what I</li> <li>assume is happening, but that's just based on my</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<pre>the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract.    Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that.    MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions    CHAIR HATTON: Sure.    MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch.    CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace.    (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.)    MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman.    CHAIR HATTON: Okay.         EXAMINATION By Commissioner Stacy: Q. With your working with the developer, what stage is this project in development? What what currently what things have they actually done?</pre>	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> <li>construction, and then they would start making</li> <li>some some sort of higher lease payment is what I</li> <li>assume is happening, but that's just based on my</li> <li>experience.</li> <li>Q. So the general description of the progress on</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION By Commissioner Stacy: Q. With your working with the developer, what stage is this project in development? What what currently what things have they actually done? A. So I'd consider this this facility, you</pre>	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> <li>of lease option that they make that they're</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> <li>construction, and then they would start making</li> <li>some some sort of higher lease payment is what I</li> <li>assume is happening, but that's just based on my</li> <li>experience.</li> <li>Q. So the general description of the progress on</li> <li>this project so far is they they haven't bought</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<pre>the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION By Commissioner Stacy: Q. With your working with the developer, what stage is this project in development? What what currently what things have they actually done? A. So I'd consider this this facility, you know, later stage in the in the</pre>	<ul> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> <li>of lease option that they make that they're</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> <li>construction, and then they would start making</li> <li>some some sort of higher lease payment is what I</li> <li>assume is happening, but that's just based on my</li> <li>experience.</li> <li>Q. So the general description of the progress on</li> <li>this project so far is they they haven't bought</li> <li>any equipment, they haven't installed any equipment,</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<pre>the RFP manager is specifically just the RFP and the negotiation of the actual contract. Witness Wolffram would have to answer any of those sorts of questions. I don't have any visibility into what Kentucky Power is doing with with that. MR. VAN ZYL: Chair, I do think I have just a few confidential questions CHAIR HATTON: Sure. MR. VAN ZYL: if we could just switch. CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Let us know when you're ready, Candace. (Confidential session from 11:25 a.m. to 11:37 a.m.) MS. SACRE: We're in public, Chairman. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION By Commissioner Stacy: Q. With your working with the developer, what stage is this project in development? What what currently what things have they actually done? A. So I'd consider this this facility, you</pre>	<ol> <li>owners, but there there's one lease one one</li> <li>of the leases is significantly bigger than the</li> <li>than the rest.</li> <li>Q. Do you know the general terms of that, just</li> <li>that one big one?</li> <li>A. I do not. The that is not something that</li> <li>we that the a developer would supply to us.</li> <li>Q. You don't know if they paid a significant</li> <li>amount toward the acquisition of that of that</li> <li>property through a lease or not?</li> <li>A. No. I I know that from my discussions</li> <li>with the developer that they have ongoing costs. So</li> <li>I assume that there is and this is just based on</li> <li>my experience, but I assume that there is some sort</li> <li>of lease option that they make that they're</li> <li>making continuous payments on until they start</li> <li>construction, and then they would start making</li> <li>some some sort of higher lease payment is what I</li> <li>assume is happening, but that's just based on my</li> <li>experience.</li> <li>Q. So the general description of the progress on</li> <li>this project so far is they they haven't bought</li> </ol>

25 (Pages 94 to 97)

	98		100
1	done is just make that an option on the land?	1	Q. Okay. And and I'm assuming you look at
2	A. No, I would I would say that they've I	2	projects in other states for other companies?
3	classify the property as under control, because one	3	A. That is correct, yes.
4	of it's my understanding that one of the one	4	Q. Can you talk about, maybe, the number of
5	of the things that PJM requires for you to apply for	5	projects that have made it into the queue or not
6	interconnection is land control. So they they		made it through the queue and have had to pull out,
7	would not		just in your experience?
8	Q. Can I stop you just a second? Just a moment		A. You're talking about the PJM queue?
9	earlier you said that they have an option on that	9	Q. Yeah. Sorry.
10	one big tract.		A. I don't have any any any specific data
11	A. And I I'd classify that as land control		here here today, but there are a large percentage
12	because there's there's, you know		of projects that apply to the PJM queue and never
13	Q. But it is a it is an option. That's		actually sign an interconnection agreement.
14	that's the	14	You've got developers that are you know,
15	A. I-	15	it's their job to to build projects. That's how
16	Q. That's the legal term of what for what		they make money. And so they go out and they
17	the of how they hold control of that, correct?		they secure land for all sorts of projects, all
18	A. I'd classify that as an option for the		all over the country, they apply for
19	developer.		interconnection, and then a lot of the times those
20	COMMISSIONER STACY: That's all I'm that's	20	projects just fall out of the queue because of
21	all I want to know. Thank you.	21	results, the results that they get in the PJM
22	THE WITNESS: Thank you.		interconnection queue via interconnection costs.
23	CHAIR HATTON: Commissioner Regan.	23	If if this project, where they want to
24	* * *	24	want this project to interconnect to the to the
25			grid, if it requires a large amount of upgrades or
	99		101
1	EXAMINATION	1	millions of dollars of of changes to the
2	By Commissioner Regan:		transmission system or upgrades to the transmission
3	Q. Just to follow up on the worksheet and the	3	system, that might make that project uneconomic for
4	the worksheet's pricing and nonpricing, are those	4	the developer. And and that is a very common
5	all weighted evenly?	5	reason for projects to to fall out of the out
6	A. I think we'd need to go back into	6	of the queue.
7	confidential session to because that ZMY-3 is	7	Q. Okay. And if there was a change of of law
8	is a fully we're confidential exhibit, for me		or or whatever reason, and Bright Mountain pulled
9	to		out of the project, would the would that would
10	CHAIR HATTON: Back in confidential		the process restart maybe with another developer and
11	COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay.		they'd have to go back into the PJM queue?
12	CHAIR HATTON: please, Candace.		A. No. So for if for whatever reason,
13	(Confidential session from 11:41 a.m. to		if if Kentucky if Kentucky Power did not move
14	11:46 a.m.)		forward with this Bright Mountain project and they
15	MS. SACRE: We're in public mode.		had to find another buyer or another offtake for the
16	CONTINUED EXAMINATION		output of this facility, that facility will retain
17	By Commissioner Regan:		its interconnection agreement. It's it's good to
18	Q. And Bright Mountain is owned by Avangrid?		go. It's got its interconnection agreement.
19	A. Avangrid Renewables, yes. That is correct.	19	Now they just need to comply with whatever
20	Q. Okay. And they and they operate across 22		timing that PJM has has given them in that
21	states?		interconnection agreement via, "Hey, you need to be
22	A. That's it's something like that, yes. I		commercial by X date." And I don't know I don't
23	don't have the exact number in front of me. I think		know if it's three years or two years. I don't know
24	I I think I put it in in testimony, but	24	the timing on that, but PJM tells you you have to

25 you have to be online before a specific date,

26 (Pages 98 to 101)

McLendon-Kogut Reporting Service, LLC (502) 585-5634

25 it's -- yeah, they're -- they're a large developer.

	102	104
1	because PJM's planning	1 mean, I think we need to go back into confidential
2	Q. Right.	2 session to to to talk about, you know,
3	A any future agreements, and they're	<sup>3</sup> Kentucky Power's plans throughout the process.
4	planning their grid based off of projects that	4 But packaging projects does not necessarily
5	they've given interconnection agreements to. So	5 mean you're going to you're going to get
6	they've they've gotta be online by a specific	<ul> <li>6 something more or less economic. It's – each</li> </ul>
7	time for PJM to plan.	<ul> <li>7 project is stands on you know, stands on on</li> </ul>
8	COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.	8 its own there.
9	CHAIR HATTON: We're still on public?	9 And being that I think I can say that this
10	MS. SACRE: Yes, ma'am.	10 was the only project that this developer bid into
11	CHAIR HATTON: Okay.	10 was the only project that this developer but into 11 this RFP, so we would Kentucky Power would not
12	EXAMINATION	-
		12 have even been able to take advantage of, you know,
13	By Chair Hatton:	13 "Can you give us a you know, a discount for doing
14	Q. I don't have a lot more to follow up. It	14 multiple deals with you," or, you know, kind of
15	seems that all of the noncost factors, most	15 economies of scale type stuff. So I I can't say.
16	everyone's estimation would matter, but maybe that	16 I can't say one way or the other.
17	the price negotiated per megawatt hour in this	17 Q. Yeah. And the queue really wasn't a factor
18	contract negates all of those good benefits if it's	18 because all of the top scorers are already in the
19	just not in the not economic.	19 queue?
20	A. Uh-huh.	20 A. They yeah, they've already the the
21	Q. So how did Kentucky Power decide that and	21 top projects all already were in operation.
22	if we need to go in confidential, we can. But how	22 Q. Gotcha. Okay.
23	did how did you decide that this price was I	23 CHAIR HATTON: Redirect?
24	don't even know how to how to ask this	24 MR. GISH: Just a couple.
25	nonconfidentially. But why did you find that price	25 CHAIR HATTON: Sorry, Mr. Gish.
	103	105
1		
	point acceptable?	1 MR. GISH: Oh, no.
2	point acceptable? A. That that would be a question for	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> </ol>
2 3	point acceptable? A. That that would be a question for Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> </ol>
2 3 4	point acceptable? A. That that would be a question for Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	point acceptable? A. That that would be a question for Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	point acceptable? A. That that would be a question for Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that Q. That's fair.	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>7 By Mr. Gish:</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis,</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I I can go in general, but, you know, if in my</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with the with the economic rankings, compiling those</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I I can go in general, but, you know, if in my</li> <li>experience, which has only been with AEP, I think</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with the with the economic rankings, compiling those together and then making a recommendation to to</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I I can go in general, but, you know, if in my</li> <li>experience, which has only been with AEP, I think</li> <li>I'd be divulging our offer strategy.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with the with the economic rankings, compiling those together and then making a recommendation to to</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I I can go in general, but, you know, if in my</li> <li>experience, which has only been with AEP, I think</li> <li>I'd be divulging our offer strategy.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Back into</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with the with the economic rankings, compiling those together and then making a recommendation to to Kentucky Power for them to ultimately decide what to short list.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the AEP, I think</li> <li>I'd be divulging our offer strategy.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Back into</li> <li>confidential</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with the with the economic rankings, compiling those together and then making a recommendation to to Kentucky Power for them to ultimately decide what to short list.</li> <li>Q. Ideally, would it have been would this</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the AEP, I think</li> <li>I'd be divulging our offer strategy.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Back into</li> <li>confidential</li> <li>MR. GISH: Yeah.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with the with the economic rankings, compiling those together and then making a recommendation to to Kentucky Power for them to ultimately decide what to short list.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I can go in general, but, you know, if in my</li> <li>experience, which has only been with AEP, I think</li> <li>I'd be divulging our offer strategy.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Back into</li> <li>confidential</li> <li>MR. GISH: Yeah.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: please, Candace.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely</li> <li>economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with the with the economic rankings, compiling those together and then making a recommendation to to Kentucky Power for them to ultimately decide what to short list.</li> <li>Q. Ideally, would it have been would this</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I can go in general, but, you know, if in my</li> <li>experience, which has only been with AEP, I think</li> <li>I'd be divulging our offer strategy.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Back into</li> <li>confidential</li> <li>MR. GISH: Yeah.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: please, Candace.</li> <li>MR. GISH: Sorry.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>point acceptable?</li> <li>A. That that would be a question for</li> <li>Witness Coon. I I did none of the economic analysis, so I I don't know, on a on a purely economic basis, how that</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A how that shook out in the ranking</li> <li>Q. That's fair.</li> <li>A so I'd ask her.</li> <li>Q. You were involved in the just the rubric in choosing the projects but not</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q the economic analysis?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So I I was I was in charge of driving the process forward, making sure that all the SMEs were providing their their analysis, compiling that analysis into and and then with the with the economic rankings, compiling those together and then making a recommendation to to Kentucky Power for them to ultimately decide what to short list.</li> <li>Q. Ideally, would it have been would this project have been packaged with another one at the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>MR. GISH: Oh, no.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I was looking at the wrong</li> <li>one.</li> <li>MR. GISH: He's far enough away</li> <li>(indiscernible).</li> <li>REDIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. Just a just a couple questions. There</li> <li>was Mr. van Zyl asked some questions about the</li> <li>bidding of the Bright Mountain project into the</li> <li>into PJM and what happens if it's not picked. In</li> <li>your experience, what are solar projects typically</li> <li>bid into the market? What price are they typically</li> <li>bid into at?</li> <li>A. Are we allowed to go confidential? I I</li> <li>I think I'd be sharing some of the just it</li> <li>I can go in general, but, you know, if in my</li> <li>experience, which has only been with AEP, I think</li> <li>I'd be divulging our offer strategy.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Back into</li> <li>confidential</li> <li>MR. GISH: Yeah.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: please, Candace.</li> </ol>

# 27 (Pages 102 to 105)

	106	108
1	(Confidential session from 11:53 a.m. to	1 NICOLE MARIE COON, called by Kentucky Power
2	11:57 a.m.)	2 Company, having been first duly sworn, testified as
3	MS. SACRE: We are on normal.	3 follows:
4	CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Does that conclude your	4 DIRECT EXAMINATION
5	questions?	5 By Mr. Gish:
6	MR. GISH: That concludes my redirect.	6 Q. Ms. Coon, can you please state your employer
7	CHAIR HATTON: Mr. West, do you have further	7 and position?
8	questions?	8 A. My employer is American Electric Power
9	MR. WEST: No.	9 Service Corporation, and my position is regulatory
10	CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz?	10 consultant principal.
11	MR. KURTZ: No questions, Your Honor.	11 Q. And did you have excuse me. Did you file
12	CHAIR HATTON: Mr. van Zyl?	12 direct testimony and rebuttal testimony and response
13	MR. VAN ZYL: No questions.	13 to data requests in this proceeding?
14	CHAIR HATTON: Okay. You may be excused.	14 A. I did.
15	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	15 Q. And do you have any corrections to your
16	CHAIR HATTON: Unless anybody knows of a good	16 testimonies or responses to data requests?
17	reason. Speak now or forever hold your peace.	17 A. I do have some minor corrections. The first
18	All right.	18 one is my rebuttal testimony. On page 3, line 15,
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you much.	19 the word "values" should be "valued."
20	CHAIR HATTON: All right. We are at a pretty	20 And then the next one is in a data response
21	good stopping point for lunch, and so we would take	21 to AG-KIUC 2-7, Part B. Yes. The third line,
22	one hour and then come back with your final witness.	22 starting at the "and," it says, "and the Tier 1 REC
23	MS. GLASS: Great.	23 price in the previous year." It should state, "and
24	MR. GISH: That would be great. Thank you.	24 the Tier 1 REC price in 2022."
25	CHAIR HATTON: Let's go off the record.	25 And then similarly, in the next sentence it
	107	109
1	(Recess from 12:01 p.m. to 1:04 p.m	1 says, "The product of those numbers is then added to
2	· · ·	
	MS. SACRE: You are on. Chair.	
3	MS. SACRE: You are on, Chair. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you.	2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The
3 4	MS. SACRE: You are on, Chair. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> </ul>
	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> </ul>
4	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> </ul>
4 5	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> </ul>
4 5 6	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7	<ul><li>CHAIR HATTON: Thank you.</li><li>We are back on the record in Case Number</li><li>2024-243.</li><li>And, Counsel, you may call your next witness.</li><li>MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls</li></ul>	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury?	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> <li>17 Your Honor, the witness is available for</li> </ul>
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address. THE WITNESS: My name is Nicole Marie Coon.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> <li>17 Your Honor, the witness is available for</li> <li>18 cross-examination.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address. THE WITNESS: My name is Nicole Marie Coon. My business address is One Riverside Plaza,	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> <li>17 Your Honor, the witness is available for</li> <li>18 cross-examination.</li> <li>19 CHAIR HATTON: Mr. West?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address. THE WITNESS: My name is Nicole Marie Coon. My business address is One Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio 43215.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> <li>17 Your Honor, the witness is available for</li> <li>18 cross-examination.</li> <li>19 CHAIR HATTON: Mr. West?</li> <li>20 MR. WEST: Yeah, just a few questions.</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address. THE WITNESS: My name is Nicole Marie Coon. My business address is One Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio 43215. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> <li>17 Your Honor, the witness is available for</li> <li>18 cross-examination.</li> <li>19 CHAIR HATTON: Mr. West?</li> <li>20 MR. WEST: Yeah, just a few questions.</li> <li>21 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address. THE WITNESS: My name is Nicole Marie Coon. My business address is One Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio 43215.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> <li>17 Your Honor, the witness is available for</li> <li>18 cross-examination.</li> <li>19 CHAIR HATTON: Mr. West?</li> <li>20 MR. WEST: Yeah, just a few questions.</li> <li>21 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>22 By Mr. West:</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address. THE WITNESS: My name is Nicole Marie Coon. My business address is One Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio 43215. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. GISH: Thank you, Your Honor.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> <li>17 Your Honor, the witness is available for</li> <li>18 cross-examination.</li> <li>19 CHAIR HATTON: Mr. West?</li> <li>20 MR. WEST: Yeah, just a few questions.</li> <li>21 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>22 By Mr. West:</li> <li>23 Q. How are you doing?</li> </ul>
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. We are back on the record in Case Number 2024-243. And, Counsel, you may call your next witness. MS. GLASS: Thank you. Kentucky Power calls Nicole Coon. CHAIR HATTON: Please raise your right hand to be sworn. Do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to give is true to the best of you knowledge under penalty of perjury? THE WITNESS: I do. CHAIR HATTON: Thank you. Please have a seat. Tell us your full name and your business address. THE WITNESS: My name is Nicole Marie Coon. My business address is One Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio 43215. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. GISH: Thank you, Your Honor.	<ul> <li>2 the previous year's price." It should say, "The</li> <li>3 product of those numbers is then added to the 2022</li> <li>4 price."</li> <li>5 Q. Ms. Coon, does does that change impact the</li> <li>6 values that were in the exhibit referenced in this</li> <li>7 request?</li> <li>8 A. It does not change any values. It's just an</li> <li>9 update to the description.</li> <li>10 Q. Okay. With those excuse me. With those</li> <li>11 corrections and updates, if I were to ask you the</li> <li>12 same questions that are in your direct testimony,</li> <li>13 rebuttal testimony, and in the data requests, would</li> <li>14 you give the same responses?</li> <li>15 A. I would.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: Thank you.</li> <li>17 Your Honor, the witness is available for</li> <li>18 cross-examination.</li> <li>19 CHAIR HATTON: Mr. West?</li> <li>20 MR. WEST: Yeah, just a few questions.</li> <li>21 CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>22 By Mr. West:</li> </ul>

28 (Pages 106 to 109)

#### Hearing

	110	112
1	In your direct testimony on page 3, you state	1 Q. Okay. So in your direct case or direct
2	that net present value benefits to your project are	2 testimony, you calculated that the first-year rate
3	87.202 million; is that correct?	3 impact to the average residential customer would be
4	A. That's correct.	4 34 cents a month?
5	Q. Okay. And did you provide an update to that	5 A. That's correct.
6	in your rebuttal or at sometime later? Has that	6 Q. Or about \$4 a year?
7	value changed at all?	7 A. Roughly, yes.
8	A. Yes. In rebuttal we updated the analysis.	8 Q. Okay. And there are 131,000 residential
9	Q. Okay. So what is the updated value for your	9 customers served by Kentucky Power?
10	estimate of benefits of the projects?	10 A. I don't have that exact number. Witness
11	A. So I provided the work paper for that	11 Wolffram would know that.
12	analysis to my rebuttal, and in there the net	12 Q. Okay. And following up from what Mr. West
13	present value of the total benefits is	13 just said, the the in your direct testimony
14 15	97.051 million.	<ul><li>14 you calculated that the costs of the REPA would</li><li>15 exceed the benefits on a net-present-value basis by</li></ul>
15 16	MR. GISH: Mr. West, can you identify what work paper that is?	<ul><li>15 exceed the benefits on a net-present-value basis by</li><li>16 14.6 million?</li></ul>
10	THE WITNESS: Oh, yes. That's Confidential	17 <b>A. That's correct.</b>
18	Work Paper NMC-4.	18 Q. In your rebuttal testimony you calculated
19	Q. (By Mr. West) Okay. Both those amounts are	19 that the first year you calculated that the costs
20	gross amounts, correct? They're not net of costs,	20 would exceed the benefits on a net-present-value
21	they're just they just represent the benefits?	21 basis by 4.7 million?
22	A. Yes, those are just benefits.	22 A. Yes. I did a sensitivity analysis with
23	Q. Okay. Did you identify the gross amount of	23 updated fundamentals.
24	costs in your testimony?	24 Q. And using the base the base forecast that
25	A. Not directly in my direct testimony.	25 the \$4.7 million costs exceed benefits on a
	111	113
1	However, we show that it's a cost to customers with	1 net-present-value basis?
	However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> </ol>
	However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> </ol>
2 3 4	However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis. Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis. Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis. Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn? A. Yes.	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the benefits, you agree that the costs exceed the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the benefits, you agree that the costs exceed the benefits, correct?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the benefits, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the benefits, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. MR. WEST: Thank you. That's all I have.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Your Honor, I have two</li> <li>confidential exhibits I'd like to discuss with the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the benefits, you agree that the costs exceed the benefits, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Thank you. That's all I have. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Your Honor, I have two</li> <li>confidential exhibits I'd like to discuss with the</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yes. Candace.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the benefits, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Thank you. That's all I have. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Your Honor, I have two</li> <li>confidential exhibits I'd like to discuss with the</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yes. Candace.</li> <li>(Confidential session from 1:11 p.m. to 1:26</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the benefits, you agree that the costs exceed the benefits, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct. <ul> <li>MR. WEST: Thank you. That's all I have.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul> </li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon, Ms. Coon.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Your Honor, I have two</li> <li>confidential exhibits I'd like to discuss with the</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yes. Candace.</li> <li>(Confidential session from 1:11 p.m. to 1:26</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>However, we show that it's a cost to customers with the rate impact and then provided the work papers behind supporting all the analysis.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you are you familiar with the testimony of Mr. Kollen and Ms. Wellborn?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So do you agree with their calculation of the costs was 179 million nominal basis and 101.8 million net present value?</li> <li>A. I haven't done it on the nominal basis, but the net-present-value basis is that sounds correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So if you agree with the 101.8 million net present value of the costs and your updated value for the benefits is 97.051 million for the benefits, correct?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>MR. WEST: Thank you. That's all I have. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kurtz. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>net-present-value basis?</li> <li>A. Yes, I believe that's</li> <li>Q. And that that results in a first-year rate</li> <li>impact to the average residential customer of</li> <li>29 cents a month, or about three and a half dollars</li> <li>a year?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And the the big change in your</li> <li>direct versus rebuttal was a I guess a higher</li> <li>base case energy forecast based upon the AEP</li> <li>fundamentals versus your direct case?</li> <li>A. Yes. That was the largest difference change</li> <li>was the energy.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Capacity pricing was pretty constant</li> <li>and your REC pricing in the base case and in your</li> <li>direct was about the same as well?</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let me</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Your Honor, I have two</li> <li>confidential exhibits I'd like to discuss with the</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yes. Candace.</li> <li>(Confidential session from 1:11 p.m. to 1:26</li> </ol>

29 (Pages 110 to 113)

114	116
<ol> <li>Chair.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. This will be KIUC 3?</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Yes, ma'am.</li> <li>CONTINUED CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Okay. So</li> <li>MR. GISH: Before before we start, there's</li> <li>yellow highlighted information in this.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Oh.</li> <li>MR. GISH: I don't know if that's just</li> <li>highlighting or</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: No, I did the highlighting.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: I don't think this is</li> <li>confidential, but please check.</li> <li>MR. GISH: And it doesn't it doesn't look</li> <li>like it's confidential information, it just</li> <li>THE WITNESS: No, this is information pulled</li> <li>PJM GATS.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>1 A. Yes. Just note that 2024 wouldn't be a full</li> <li>year based on when I pulled the information.</li> <li>3 Q. Oh, okay. So the actual RECs sold in</li> <li>Kentucky started out in 2018 at \$14.96 a megawatt</li> <li>hour?</li> <li>A. That's the average price.</li> <li>7 Q. Yeah. Let's just look at the average. And</li> <li>then the average in 2019 was \$22.10 a megawatt hour?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. That's a 47.7 percent increase?</li> <li>A. I mean, I have not done the math, but that</li> <li>seems about correct.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then the next year, 2020, the</li> <li>price dropped by 43.7 percent to \$12.44 a megawatt</li> <li>hour?</li> <li>A. Yes. That's what the numbers say.</li> <li>Q. Then the next year it increased by 54 percent</li> <li>to \$19.17 a megawatt hour; is that correct?</li> <li>A. I can confirm that it's \$19.17.</li> <li>Q. Then in the next year it dromed by 12.4</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>20 MR. GISH: Yeah.</li> <li>21 CHAIR HATTON: We may have develop a policy</li> <li>22 using different color highlighting when we highlight</li> <li>23 things.</li> <li>24 MR. KURTZ: Sorry.</li> <li>25 CHAIR HATTON: No, it's</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>20 Q. Then in the next year it dropped by 12.4</li> <li>21 percent to \$16.78 a megawatt hour, correct?</li> <li>22 A. Yes. Yes.</li> <li>23 Q. Then it doubled by went up by 50 percent</li> <li>24 to \$25.33 a megawatt hour. And then I'll say the</li> <li>25 last one. Then in the last partial year it went</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>MR. KURTZ: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Kurtz) On page 2 of your response you</li> <li>did a November 25 supplemental update?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And after your testimony was filed, you went</li> <li>on to the PJM GATS system. That's where they track</li> <li>renewable energy generated in PJM versus the RECs</li> <li>that are retired?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And to claim the environmental</li> <li>benefit, you have to actually retire the REC, not</li> <li>sell it, correct?</li> <li>A. Right. You take title to the renewable</li> <li>energy claim when you are it's retired on your</li> <li>behalf.</li> <li>Q. And that's the way it becomes green. If it's</li> <li>just if you just sell if you just buy the</li> <li>solar power and then sell the RECs, it's not really</li> <li>green energy?</li> <li>A. Right. The entitlement goes to the person</li> <li>that it's retired upon.</li> <li>Q. So in in the third page of this document,</li> <li>which is a lot of my yellow highlighting, you show</li> <li>actual Kentucky transactions for the years 2018 to</li> <li>2024; is that correct?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>from \$25.33 a megawatt hour to \$30.34, an increase</li> <li>of 19.7 percent; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Again, I can't confirm the percentage, but</li> <li>the number is \$30.34.</li> <li>Q. So over this six full year and one partial</li> <li>year, the average REC sales price in Kentucky in</li> <li>Kentucky was \$19.78 a megawatt hour, correct?</li> <li>A. For Kentucky-sited solar projects, not</li> <li>necessarily that they were sold within Kentucky.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Now, if you go down to the bottom,</li> <li>these are the number of it says sum of traded in</li> <li>the in the month. This is the amount of RECs</li> <li>from Kentucky solar projects that were sold that</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Do you know how many megawatt hours</li> <li>Bright Mountain is expected to produce? 150,000</li> <li>megawatt hours in year one?</li> <li>MS. GLASS: It is in public record.</li> <li>MR. GISH: It's in public record.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Kurtz) So that would basically</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: I'm sorry. Could you speak up</li> <li>just a bit?</li> </ol>

# 30 (Pages 114 to 117)

	118	120
1	THE WITNESS: Yes. It's 150,000 megawatt	1 A. So I'm not 100 percent sure on everything
2	hours in the first year.	2 that's included in here, but there is also, you have
3	Q. (By Mr. Kurtz) Okay. So that would basically	3 to remember, people that might have net metering on
4	double the supply of RECs in Kentucky available for	4 their houses that are selling their RECs, and they
5	sale?	5 might not have someone such as AEPSC has that their
6	A. I mean, this is only shows what's traded,	6 full-time job is to work in the REC market, work
7	not necessarily what's fully available in Kentucky.	7 with the brokers and sell the and market these
8	There could be more and people just aren't marketing	8 <b>RECs and get the highest available price.</b>
9	them for sale, they're keeping them for their for	9 Q. I'm sure, actually, AEP would maximize the
10	themselves. So it's hard to say if it would more	10 value if this is approved. I'm sure of that.
11	than double the amount available.	11 There's no reason not to, would there? 12 A. No.
12	Q. Well, Kentucky Power tends to sell all of its RECs, does it not?	
14	A. To my knowledge, Kentucky Power has not had	<ul> <li>13 Q. No. Okay. But the the at the bottom</li> <li>14 on the far right, this is the sum of retired RECs.</li> </ul>
15	RECs yet to sell, considering the generation fleet	15 This is what we're talking about on the PJM GATS
16	is not renewable generation.	16 system. These are RECs that were produced and
17	Q. No, no. I mean, if this contract is	17 retired so that people could take a credit for the
18	approved, the intent is to sell all the RECs	18 green energy?
19	received, which would be 150,000 in year one?	19 A. That's correct.
20	A. Yes, the the intent is to liquidate the	20 Q. Okay. And conversely, if they're sold, you
21	RECs in order to buy down the price of the REPA.	21 could not take credit as green energy, the guy who
22	Q. If you double the supply of something, what	22 bought it and retired it would; is that correct?
23	do you think that might do to the price?	23 A. Yes. They take entitlement to the renewable
24	A. So I think what the issue here is that you're	24 energy claim.
25	looking at it on a Kentucky basis when it needs to	25 MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Ms. Coon.
	119	121
1	119	1 Chain Lhous no further questions
1	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our	1 Chair, I have no further questions.
2	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> </ol>
2 3	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however,	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ol>
2	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> </ol>
2 3 4	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high.	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue.	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue. Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue. Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them. So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue. Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to sell, why would they not want to maximize the value	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> <li>on there.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them.</li> <li>So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue.</li> <li>Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to sell, why would they not want to maximize the value and do what you said?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> <li>on there.</li> <li>And I just wanted to verify, in your rebuttal</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them.</li> <li>So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue.</li> <li>Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to sell, why would they not want to maximize the value and do what you said?</li> <li>A. That that is what we're planning to do.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> <li>on there.</li> <li>And I just wanted to verify, in your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, when you took a second look at the energy</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them.</li> <li>So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue.</li> <li>Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to sell, why would they not want to maximize the value and do what you said?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> <li>on there.</li> <li>And I just wanted to verify, in your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, when you took a second look at the energy</li> <li>sale value, you started doing a peak and off-peak</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them.</li> <li>So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high.</li> <li>As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue.</li> <li>Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to sell, why would they not want to maximize the value and do what you said?</li> <li>A. That that is what we're planning to do.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> <li>on there.</li> <li>And I just wanted to verify, in your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, when you took a second look at the energy</li> <li>sale value, you started doing a peak and off-peak</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them.</li> <li>So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue.</li> <li>Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to sell, why would they not want to maximize the value and do what you said?</li> <li>A. That that is what we're planning to do.</li> <li>We're planning to sell the RECs into the PJM market and</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> <li>on there.</li> <li>And I just wanted to verify, in your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, when you took a second look at the energy</li> <li>sale value, you started doing a peak and off-peak</li> <li>system. How does that analysis change what you</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them.</li> <li>So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue.</li> <li>Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to sell, why would they not want to maximize the value and do what you said?</li> <li>A. That that is what we're planning to do.</li> <li>We're planning to sell the RECs into the PJM market and</li> <li>Q. Well, the the solar in Kentucky has averaged \$19.78 for their sales. Why would they not be selling into the same market that you intend to</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> <li>on there.</li> <li>And I just wanted to verify, in your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, when you took a second look at the energy</li> <li>sale value, you started doing a peak and off-peak</li> <li>system. How does that analysis change what you</li> <li>produced in the worksheet for for the the</li> <li>energy values?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>be looked on a PJM-wide basis, which is what our forecast takes into account, because Kentucky does not have a renewable portfolio standard; however, there are multiple states within PJM that do. And these RECs are able to comply with those states' RPS requirements, and therefore they those would be the states that are buying them.</li> <li>So it's adding to the demand that's within PJM, and the demand within PJM is relatively high. As I've pointed out in my rebuttal testimony, not only are utilities needing these RECs, but there's also the corporate buyers that need these RECs as well to meet their sustainability goals. So there's a supply and demand issue.</li> <li>Q. Well, why would the owners of the RECs in Kentucky not want to maximum if you're going to sell, why would they not want to maximize the value and do what you said?</li> <li>A. That that is what we're planning to do.</li> <li>We're planning to sell the RECs into the PJM market and</li> <li>Q. Well, the the solar in Kentucky has averaged \$19.78 for their sales. Why would they not</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>Chair, I have no further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. van Zyl:</li> <li>Q. Hi, Ms. Coon. My name is Jurgens van Zyl.</li> <li>I will be honest, I think 99 percent of the</li> <li>questions I had for you were asked</li> <li>A. Okay.</li> <li>Q at this point or or removed. So I</li> <li>really just wanted to take a quick look just to</li> <li>understand and this this is no need to be</li> <li>confidential.</li> <li>But your answer to, I believe it is the</li> <li>exhibit to Staff's question 7 or the first</li> <li>Staff's first request, item 7, where you talk about</li> <li>the sort of cost of service, total cost of service</li> <li>on there.</li> <li>And I just wanted to verify, in your rebuttal</li> <li>testimony, when you took a second look at the energy</li> <li>sale value, you started doing a peak and off-peak</li> <li>system. How does that analysis change what you</li> <li>produced in the worksheet for for the the</li> <li>energy values?</li> </ol>

# 31 (Pages 118 to 121)

1 guess is the question?

124

So the next set of questions, again, which is

very fast, and it's just to -- to just verify some 2 A. I believe in rebuttal testimony I quantified 2 3 how much that change in net present --3 things. We talked earlier -- I believe Mr. West 4 Q. Yeah, 700 --4 asked Mr. Wolffram some questions about the ELCC --5 A. -- value was. 5 A. Uh-huh. Q. -- and 65,000, something like that? Q. -- for this. Again, I think if we go back to 6 6 7 A. Yes. But I -- I also provided the full work 7 your re -- to Kentucky Power's response to Staff's paper that has the on-peak and off-peak analysis --8 first questions, item 3, there is an attachment 8 there, if I can find it, where you show PJM's 9 Q. Oh, okay. 9 -- if you're looking just for the energy -expected ELCC values. 10 **A**. 10 A. Yeah. There's a multitude of attachments. 11 O. Okav. 11 12 A. -- portion. And that's one of the work 12 Q. There's a multitude --13 papers in my rebuttal. Let me --13 A. Yep. 14 Q. The only reason I ask this, I just want to 14 Q. -- of those. 15 understand. So, like, net present value, that 15 So for fixed-tilt solar --16 number is lower. Because we've used that sheet a 16 A. Uh-huh. 17 Q. -- we have -- and what, it's a little 25-ish 17 lot. We've used that initial worksheet quite a few 18 times. It's just you're just expecting net present percent value now for the upcoming year, but then 18 19 value to be lower in the energy sales than it would there's a steep drop-off, right? 19 A. Yes. For the planning year 2024-2025, which 20 have been? 20 21 A. Yes. If you used on- and off-peak pricing, 21 we're currently in, to my knowledge, it's --22 yes, it's a -- it's a difference of less than 22 Q. Yep. 23 \$765,000. 23 A. -- solar-fixed panel is 33 percent. And then 24 Q. Can I ask why you didn't use the on/off peak 24 if you look at the next attachment for that one for 25 sort of weighted values in the original analysis? 25 2025-2026, fixed-tilt solar goes to nine percent. 123 125 1 And to my knowledge, that's based off of 1 A. Just based off my experience in having done 2 this for other AEP operating companies, it doesn't 2 methodology -- methodology change at PJM for ELCC. Q. So to the extent that there is a capacity 3 make a large amount of difference over the net 3 4 present value, and even on a yearly basis it's even, 4 value, right, the 4.8 megawatts of -- of capacity value here, that number -- did you calculate that 5 like, smaller. 5 6 So it's just kind of just the norm of what we that number is going to go less and less and less 6 7 do based off of our knowledge and the fact that 70 for PJM? Or when you did your initial analysis, did 7 percent of it is on-peak pricing. you not have the updated methodology from PJM? 8 8 9 So really the only difference is if it's a 9 A. No. If you look in my confidential 10 holiday or, like, the weekend, because most of the 10 attachment on the capacity page, it has the first 11 time solar is producing when the sun is shining and 11 year -- it's actually later than the -- these years 12 it's on-peak hours. 12 we're talking about. 13 Q. On-peak hours. Well, how does that work for Q. Uh-huh. Right. Because it's '27 that's 13 14 Kentucky Power customers specifically? Because 14 going to be the first year? you-all are a winter-peaking utility. So when is 15 15 A. Yeah. So I have that price in there, and your -- when is your utility's peak hours? 16 then we have the following ones from the next 16 17 A. Well, on-peak hours are still defined the 17 attachment in this discovery response that 18 same as PJM, from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. 18 forecasted out. And then I believe we keep it 19 Q. Okay. But for Kentucky Power, does that 19 constant from there, so it goes down to 3 percent --20 change at all? Like does -- when is -- when is 20 Q. Right. 21 Kentucky Power's winter-peaking hours? Do you have A. -- through the forecasted period. 21 22 an idea of when that is? 22 O. Through the forecasted period. 23 A. I believe it's in the morning time; however, 23 And -- and that's, I think -- like I said, I

122

1

- 24 I don't know that for sure.
- 25 Q. Okay. The only -- I asked that.

### 32 (Pages 122 to 125)

think most of these questions -- I'll ask you as

well, but I expect we'll have to ask Mr. Wolffram

McLendon-Kogut Reporting Service, LLC (502) 585-5634

24

25

	126	128
1	this.	1 price than it's one way to look at this REPA.
2	When you did this analysis for for AEP,	2 What would you say to that?
3	were you aware of any large industrial or commercial	3 A. I would say that we get the revenues back
4	customer that was looking to come in specifically	4 from this REPA as well. So anytime so it's a
5	for EDR or some sort of other renewable project or	5 it's a it's a hedge against those market prices.
6	wanted some sort of renewable energy as a condition	6 So if the prices, like last week when it was
7	of landing in the service area?	7 really cold, are up to 150, 200 dollars, we get that
8	A. I was not personally aware of any, but I'm	8 revenue back, and then, obviously, we are in the
9	not working with the economic development team in	9 money then.
10	Kentucky on a daily basis and and talked with	10 So it's still it's providing a hedge
11	them as Witness Wolffram might be.	11 against those those swings, and it's just that
12	Q. That's fine. I just wanted to make sure that	12 fixed price certainty of amounts. And with all the
13	I ask everybody that to just have an idea.	13 large load that's coming on in the PJM market, or is
14	MR. VAN ZYL: I think, actually, that might	14 expected to, I mean, there is uncertainty around
15	be my questions, Chair.	15 what the energy market will do as well. And so I
16	CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Commissioner Stacy?	16 just think having that fixed price, knowing
17	COMMISSIONER STACY: No.	17 customers have price certainty around what they're
18	CHAIR HATTON: Commissioner Regan?	18 paying for.
19	COMMISSIONER REGAN: No.	19 CHAIR HATTON: Redirect?
20	EXAMINATION	20 MR. GISH: Yes. Thank you.
21	By Chair Hatton:	21 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
22	Q. Okay. Someone tossed a question to you, I	22 By Mr. Gish:
23	think it was Witness Wolffram, earlier, when I asked	23 Q. A couple questions here. There was a
24	whether the change in federal administration might	24 discussion from Mr. van Zyl about on-peak hours and
25	cause us to suspect that the value of renewable	25 off-peak hours, and he asked the question that
	127	129
1	127 energy credits would have gone down since this	129 1 just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus
1		
	energy credits would have gone down since this	1 just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus
2	<ul><li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li><li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li></ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> </ol>
2 3	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> </ol>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that? A. I don't have any way of predicting that. However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that? A. I don't have any way of predicting that. However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that? A. I don't have any way of predicting that. However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government. So, for instance, Virginia's government is	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that? A. I don't have any way of predicting that. However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government. So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>10 coincident peak</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that? A. I don't have any way of predicting that. However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government. So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a page number, but if not, I'll give you a general</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So it's a completely separate thing.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a page number, but if not, I'll give you a general concept and ask you how you would respond to that.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So it's a completely separate thing.</li> <li>PJM has a pricing construct for on- and off-peak and</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a page number, but if not, I'll give you a general concept and ask you how you would respond to that. Witness Kollen opined that this contract,</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So it's a completely separate thing.</li> <li>PJM has a pricing construct for on- and off-peak and</li> <li>the the on the on-peak load, or the on-peak</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a page number, but if not, I'll give you a general concept and ask you how you would respond to that. Witness Kollen opined that this contract, this REPA, does not provide incremental capacity or</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So it's a completely separate thing.</li> <li>PJM has a pricing construct for on- and off-peak and</li> <li>the the on the on-peak load, or the on-peak</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a page number, but if not, I'll give you a general concept and ask you how you would respond to that. Witness Kollen opined that this contract,</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So it's a completely separate thing.</li> <li>PJM has a pricing construct for on- and off-peak and</li> <li>the the on the on-peak load, or the on-peak</li> <li>demand for Kentucky Power is a separate construct?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a page number, but if not, I'll give you a general concept and ask you how you would respond to that. Witness Kollen opined that this contract, this REPA, does not provide incremental capacity or energy and merely substitutes and displaces other</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So it's a completely separate thing.</li> <li>PJM has a pricing construct for on- and off-peak and</li> <li>the the on the on-peak load, or the on-peak</li> <li>demand for Kentucky Power is a separate construct?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a page number, but if not, I'll give you a general concept and ask you how you would respond to that. Witness Kollen opined that this contract, this REPA, does not provide incremental capacity or energy and merely substitutes and displaces other capacity and energy purchases but at a higher price.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So it's a completely separate thing.</li> <li>PJM has a pricing construct for on- and off-peak and</li> <li>the the on the on-peak load, or the on-peak</li> <li>demand for Kentucky Power is a separate construct?</li> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. You talked a little bit about the energy</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>energy credits would have gone down since this calculation was done. Do you have any way of predicting that or know anything about that?</li> <li>A. I don't have any way of predicting that.</li> <li>However, I will point out that most of the RPS actually, all of the RPS standards are set by the state, state government and not the federal government.</li> <li>So, for instance, Virginia's government is the one that set up their Virginia Clean Economy Act. It's not a federal mandate.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. Kentucky doesn't have one of those.</li> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay. In the Intervenors', Witness Kollen's testimony I can hopefully cite to you a page, a page number, but if not, I'll give you a general concept and ask you how you would respond to that. Witness Kollen opined that this contract, this REPA, does not provide incremental capacity or energy and merely substitutes and displaces other capacity and energy purchases but at a higher price. What would you what would you say to that?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>just so we're on we understand, on-peak versus</li> <li>off-peak, as far as energy pricing, that is set by</li> <li>PJM, correct, the timing?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. Then he asked a question about</li> <li>when Kentucky Power's energy peak was, and that's a</li> <li>different thing altogether; is that correct?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. That's set during the Company's 1-CP,</li> <li>coincident peak</li> <li>A. Right.</li> <li>Q is that right?</li> <li>And that's used in Kentucky Power's</li> <li>generation planning, correct?</li> <li>A. To my knowledge, yes.</li> <li>Q. Yeah. So it's a completely separate thing.</li> <li>PJM has a pricing construct for on- and off-peak and</li> <li>the the on the on-peak load, or the on-peak</li> <li>demand for Kentucky Power is a separate construct?</li> <li>A. Uh-huh.</li> <li>Q. You talked a little bit about the energy</li> <li>if there was just the energy-only cost, and the</li> </ol>

33 (Pages 126 to 129)

#### Hearing

1.20	100
<ul> <li>If there were no capacity benefit to this</li> <li>project and if there were no REC benefit to this</li> <li>project, the only thing we would get back from it</li> <li>would be the energy value, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Correct. And that energy value, based on the</li> <li>base case and I will apologize for doing some</li> <li>on-the-fly ener or lawyer math, but it looks</li> <li>like, on average, is abut 44 or 45 dollars over the</li> <li>course is that</li> <li>MR. BLAND: You're talking about Exhibit 3?</li> <li>MR. GISH: Yes, I'm talking about KIUC</li> <li>Exhibit 2.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) The base case energy is, looks</li> <li>like somewhere between the 42.50, let's say, is</li> <li>the average. Does that make sense?</li> <li>A. In the updated 2024 fundamentals?</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>So the price that you're actually going to</li> <li>pay for this energy is slightly higher than that.</li> <li>It's about \$50, but that with that comes the</li> <li>price certainty of never it never being higher</li> <li>than 86; is that right?</li> </ul>	1(Confidential KIUC Exhibit 1, Confidential2KIUC Exhibit 2, and KIUC 3 admitted.)3CHAIR HATTON: You're still under oath.4MR. WOLFFRAM: Yes, Your Honor.5CHAIR HATTON: Do we do we just want to do6Staff, or does is that that's okay with7everybody to start in that order?8MS. BLEND: We are on confidential session,9though, Your Honor.10CHAIR HATTON: Oh.11MS. SACRE: No, we're still on normal on12normal.13CHAIR HATTON: We need to be in confidential14session. Thank you.15MR. GISH: Yes. Sorry.16CHAIR HATTON: Please put us in confidential17session.18MS. BLEND: Thank you.19(Confidential session from 1:48 p.m. to 1:5620p.m.)21MS. SACRE: Okay. We're on the public22record, Chairman.23CHAIR HATTON: Are you notating the24confidential?
24 than 80; is that right? 25 <b>A. Correct.</b>	24 confidential? 25 MS. SACRE: Yes, ma'am.
	2.5 MIS. SACKE: 1 es, ma am.
<ol> <li>MR. GISH: I have no I have no further</li> <li>questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. West?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>(Indiscernible conversation.)</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Intervenors ready to call your</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Mr. Kurtz?</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: No further questions, Your Honor.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. van Zyl?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: No.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Any reason why this</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>4 first witness?</li> <li>5 MR. WEST: Yes. Your Honor, I'll introduce</li> <li>6 Lane Kollen.</li> <li>7 CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>8 MR. WEST: Call Lane Kollen to the stand.</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>9 witness couldn't be excused?</li> <li>10 You may step down, Ms. Coon.</li> <li>11 You would like to recall Mr. Wolffram?</li> <li>12 MS. GLASS: Yes. Kentucky Power will recall</li> <li>13 Mr. Wolffram for the purpose of answering</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>9 CHAIR HATTON: Mr. Kollen, would you raise</li> <li>10 your right hand, please, for me.</li> <li>11 Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are</li> <li>12 about to give is true and correct under penalty of</li> <li>13 perjury?</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>14 Mr. van Zyl's confidential questions.</li> <li>15 CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>16 MR. GISH: And might do a bit of</li> <li>17 housekeeping. Mr. Kurtz proposed these exhibits.</li> <li>18 We have no objection to them being added as</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>14 THE WITNESS: I do.</li> <li>15 CHAIR HATTON: Please have a seat. Tell us</li> <li>16 your full name and business address.</li> <li>17 THE WITNESS: My name is Lane Kollen. My</li> <li>18 business address is J. Kennedy and Associates,</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>exhibits.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> <li>MR. GISH: They're already in the record,</li> <li>but so</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Okay.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>19 Incorporated, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305,</li> <li>20 Roswell, Georgia 30075.</li> <li>21 CHAIR HATTON: Welcome back to the Kentucky</li> <li>22 PSC.</li> <li>23 THE WITNESS: Well, thank you.</li> </ol>
<ul> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Mr. Gish.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: They're admitted.</li> </ul>	24 CHAIR HATTON: Different courtroom than 25 usual.

# 34 (Pages 130 to 133)

134	136
1 THE WITNESS: Very glad to be here.	1 A. Yes. One of the things that I address in my
2 CHAIR HATTON: Sure.	2 testimony is, in the event that the Company first
3 Mr. West.	<sup>3</sup> of all, that you would approve this contract, the
	4 Company is also asking for approval of the
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
5 General, having been first duly sworn, testified as	5 ratemaking recovery of the costs of the contract
6 follows:	6 through Tariff PPA. There's also a related effect
7 DIRECT EXAMINATION	7 in the Tariff FAC, the fuel adjustment clause. And
8 By Mr. West:	8 there's also another related tariff called Tariff or
9 Q. Mr. Kollen, can you just tell us your	9 Rider, RPO, and that's renewables resource option.
10 occupation and your involvement in this case?	10 And essentially, under that proposal, the
11 A. Yes. I am an economic and planning	11 Company can either sell the RECs under the
12 consultant and ratemaking consultant. My	12 Company's proposal, it can either sell the RECs into
13 involvement in this case was to review the proposed	13 some market or it can utilize the RECs to serve the
14 resource, the Bright Mountain REPA, and also to	14 requirements of Rider RPO. That I think I
15 address the ratemaking effects.	15 misspoke previously, but that's a renewable power
16 There are certain ratemaking effects that	16 option.
17 were not addressed in the Company's testimony that	17 And that tariff gives customers the option to
18 would need to be addressed if, indeed, the	18 pay extra for their service, under Option A, by
19 Commission adopts and approves this contract.	19 paying \$5 per megawatt hour. And there is an
	20 <b>Option B where the Company can directly negotiate</b>
	21 with, let's say, an industrial customer and then
22 <b>A.</b> Yes.	22 provide either directly assigned renewable power or
23 Q. Do you have any additions or corrections to	23 provide RECs to that industrial customer at a
24 that testimony?	24 negotiated price.
25 <b>A. No.</b>	25 And so the Company, as part of its proposal
105	100
135	137
1 Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data	137 1 in this case, said that not only would it intend to
1 Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data	1 in this case, said that not only would it intend to
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> </ol>	1in this case, said that not only would it intend to2monetize the RECs in in these various markets of3Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could4also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under5Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing6considerations associated with that.7In any event, if the Company uses any of the8RECs to provide or meet its obligations under9Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.10And one of the proposals that I have is that those11revenues from that tariff should be used to offset12the cost of the REPA contract purchases in13Tariff PPA.14And I don't believe that any of the Company's15witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness, actually.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness, actually.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Stacy?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> <li>consideration. So if the Company utilizes the RECs</li> <li>to supply, you know, their customers under either</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness, actually.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Stacy?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> <li>consideration. So if the Company utilizes the RECs</li> <li>to supply, you know, their customers under either</li> <li>Option A or Option B of Tariff RPO, then whatever</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness, actually.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Stacy?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> <li>consideration. So if the Company utilizes the RECs</li> <li>to supply, you know, their customers under either</li> <li>Option A or Option B of Tariff RPO, then whatever</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness, actually.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Stacy?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that there were some things</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> <li>consideration. So if the Company utilizes the RECs</li> <li>to supply, you know, their customers under either</li> <li>Option A or Option B of Tariff RPO, then whatever</li> <li>the revenues are should be used to reduce the cost</li> <li>of the contract recovered through Tariff PPA.</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness, actually.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Stacy?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that there were some things</li> <li>that weren't addressed in in this.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> <li>consideration. So if the Company utilizes the RECs</li> <li>to supply, you know, their customers under either</li> <li>Option A or Option B of Tariff RPO, then whatever</li> <li>the contract recovered through Tariff PPA.</li> <li>Q. So one of the things I think you're saying is</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness, actually.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Stacy?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that there were some things</li> <li>that weren't addressed in in this.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> <li>consideration. So if the Company utilizes the RECs</li> <li>to supply, you know, their customers under either</li> <li>Option A or Option B of Tariff RPO, then whatever</li> <li>the revenues are should be used to reduce the cost</li> <li>of the contract recovered through Tariff PPA.</li> <li>Q. So one of the things I think you're saying is</li> <li>that they could assign this energy directly to an</li> </ul>
<ol> <li>Q. Did you sponsor any responses to data</li> <li>request data requests?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. If you were asked those same questions today,</li> <li>would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Is it your intention intention to adopt</li> <li>the direct testimony and those answers as your</li> <li>testimony in this matter?</li> <li>A. Yes, it is.</li> <li>MR. WEST: The witness is available for</li> <li>cross.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And</li> <li>MS. GLASS: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: No questions. Staff?</li> <li>MR. VAN ZYL: We have no questions for this</li> <li>witness, actually.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Stacy?</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Stacy:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned that there were some things</li> <li>that weren't addressed in in this.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>in this case, said that not only would it intend to</li> <li>monetize the RECs in in these various markets of</li> <li>Virginia and the Pennsylvania markets, but it could</li> <li>also use the RECs to fulfill its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO. And so there are different pricing</li> <li>considerations associated with that.</li> <li>In any event, if the Company uses any of the</li> <li>RECs to provide or meet its obligations under</li> <li>Tariff RPO, it will get revenues from that tariff.</li> <li>And one of the proposals that I have is that those</li> <li>revenues from that tariff should be used to offset</li> <li>the cost of the REPA contract purchases in</li> <li>Tariff PPA.</li> <li>And I don't believe that any of the Company's</li> <li>witnesses addressed that particular aspect of my</li> <li>direct testimony.</li> <li>So that's a that's an important</li> <li>consideration. So if the Company utilizes the RECs</li> <li>to supply, you know, their customers under either</li> <li>Option A or Option B of Tariff RPO, then whatever</li> <li>the contract recovered through Tariff PPA.</li> <li>Q. So one of the things I think you're saying is</li> </ul>

35 (Pages 134 to 137)

	138	140	
1	A. Yes, that's correct.	1 Q. Okay. Would there be a greater benefit to a	
2	Q (indiscernible).	2 company if they had this direct assignment	
3	A. That's correct.	3 A. It would depend on	
4	Q. And then what else would that industry get?	4 Q versus	
5	A. Well, that industry would then be directly	5 <b>A. Yeah.</b>	
6	assigned the renewable power, and I don't know what	6 Q going out in the market and buying it	
7	type of contract would be entered into with the	7 somewhere?	
8	industrial customer.	8 A. Yeah. I don't know. Presumably they would	
9	But the other thing that could happen, in	<sup>9</sup> pick the highest of the two options. You know, if	
10	in addition to a direct assignment and there are	10 they had an option of selling to a customer and,	
11	various forms that that takes that I've seen	11 you know, selling RECs to a residential customer for	
12	throughout the country in different jurisdictions.	12 \$5 per megawatt hour is pretty low. If you could	
13	But another form that could take is where the RECs	13 sell it for \$25 in Virginia or Pennsylvania, of	
14	are just simply sold to the industrial customer.	14 course you would do that.	
15	So in that	15 And there is a caveat in Tariff in that	
16	Q. You call that a direct assignment? Is that	16 Rider RPO for Option A that says if they're	
17	what you call it?	17 available. So I don't know that the Company would	
18	A. Yes. Yes. So the renewable power would be	18 buy RECs, you know, in some market like Virginia or	
19	used to serve a particular industrial customer. And	19 Pennsylvania for \$20 and then sell them to	
20	I'm just using "industrial customer" as an example,	20 residential customers for \$5.	
21	because those are the customers that qualify under	21 Q. In your opinion, would there be a would	
22	Option B of Tariff RPO.	22 there be some kind of a benefit to a potential	
23	And the revenues that would be received from	23 company that would locate in the service area?	
24	that and and that's why it's a tariff, because	24 Would there be an incentive to investors in that	
25	the customer under either Option A or Option B would	25 company that was going to locate in the region for	
	139	141	_
1	pay the Company directly for these RECs. And in a	1 them to locate there and take that and take that	
2	sense, it's very similar to monetizing the RECs	<ul><li>2 energy directly from from the source?</li></ul>	
3	either in Virginia or Pennsylvania.	<sup>3</sup> A. It could be a the the advantage would	
4	And the Company's proposal with respect to	4 be in the structure of the contract and the pricing.	
5	monetizing the RECs with these third parties is to	5 For example, in Louisiana, they have various	
6	put that as a a reduction or an offset against	6 green tariffs, and an industrial customer can	
7	the cost of the the REPA that is recovered	7 acquire certain amounts of power, green power, by	
8	through the PPA.	8 paying a premium over the standard rate. And	
9	And as I point out in my testimony, if the	9 included in that, then, would be the RECs, the	
10	RECs are sold to customers, those revenues should go	10 environmental attributes of that power. And then	
11	in as an offset in the Tariff PPA, similar to if	11 the industrial customer could retire that REC and	
12	they were sold to third parties.	12 get credit for that environmental product.	
13	Q. And in your preparation of your testimony	13 And, you know, it it basically depends on	
14	and did you did you look at the Company and	14 a cost-benefit analysis performed by that industrial	
15	all of its assets and to see if they had ever	15 customer as to whether or not that makes sense.	
16	done that before, made a direct assignment to	16 Q. But you don't know of any necessarily any	
17	A. I don't believe they have, because they don't	17 incentive for an investor to take this energy, this	
18	have renewable resources at this time.	18 green energy, and use it for this versus just going	
19	And under Option A of Tariff RPO, the Company	19 on the market and buying it?	
20	can acquire RECs independently of whatever it might	20 A. Yeah. I think if you could arbitrage it, buy	
21	generate or be assigned through a REPA in order to	21 it low, sell it higher, you know, there would be an	
22	supply any customer demand for RECs.	22 incentive to do that. Or if you could use it to	
23	Q. Would there be would there be	23 in lieu of another option to acquire your	
24	A. I don't know if they've done anything of that	24 environmental attributes.	
	nature yet.	25 Q. What does what does that mean?	

36 (Pages 138 to 141)

142	144
1 A. Well, you know, the different ESG goals that	1 calculation of the the value of selling the
2 corporations have, you know, for example, that	2 energy into the PJM energy markets, they've under
3 they'll be net zero by 2030 in terms of carbon	3 they've overstated that value by using only on-peak
4 emissions. Yeah.	4 prices.
5 So many of these companies are focused in on	5 If you have a constant on the megawatt hours
6 reducing their so-called carbon footprint, and they	6 but use on-peak energy prices, you get a higher
7 have corporate goals to achieve that, and so they,	7 energy value than you would actually experience by
8 systemwide, would need to acquire environmental	8 selling that power into the PJM energy markets, both
<sup>9</sup> attributes, whether they have power renewable	<sup>9</sup> on-peak and off-peak.
10 power directly assigned to them, whether they	10 Q. Okay.
11 generate it themselves and have a direct contract	11 A. And so basically what that does by using
12 with a third party, or whether they buy RECs in	12 on-peak price is that it overstates the energy value
13 in some other form.	13 and and then understates AEP's estimates of the
14 Q. Would you think that a potential investor	14 losses. Because if you just look at what they're
15 would think this is more of a a more direct or	15 paying, they're paying 83.68 for every meg every
16 straightforward or honest way to to buy this	16 kilowatt hour, every megawatt hour that they're
17 to buy this energy or just buy the credit?	17 buying, and it's a it's a must-take contract.
18 A. I don't know. Each each corporation and	18 Whatever that facility produces, they have to take
19 maybe each facility has its own goals, and we'd have	19 it, and they have to pay that price. And then
20 to look at the package packages available to	20 they're selling it into PJM, let's say at \$40 a
21 them.	21 megawatt hour. There's an inherent loss in there.
22 Q. Right. 23 A. So	22 So you're buying high, selling low, and 23 then then the capacity value is very little. So
23 A. S0 24 COMMISSIONER STACY: Okay. Thank you.	<ul> <li>24 there's very little offset or savings there.</li> </ul>
25 CHAIR HATTON: Commissioner Regan.	25 So the whole economics of this really swings
	20 So the whole economics of this really swings
143	145
113	145
1 EXAMINATION	
1 EXAMINATION	1 on the margin on the value of the RECs.
1 EXAMINATION	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> </ol>
1 EXAMINATION 2 By Commissioner Regan:	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>G. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>G. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>G. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And that if you look at the bottom of page 6,</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> <li>What do you mean by that?</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And that if you look at the bottom of page 6,</li> <li>I refer to Ms. Wellborn's testimony</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> <li>What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, it's too small to really</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And that if you look at the bottom of page 6,</li> <li>I refer to Ms. Wellborn's testimony</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> <li>What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, it's too small to really</li> <li>make any difference in the in the capacity</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And that if you look at the bottom of page 6,</li> <li>I refer to Ms. Wellborn's testimony</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A (Reading) failed to consider a range of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> <li>What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, it's too small to really</li> <li>make any difference in the in the capacity</li> <li>Q. And I</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And that if you look at the bottom of page 6,</li> <li>I refer to Ms. Wellborn's testimony</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A (Reading) failed to consider a range of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> <li>What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, it's too small to really</li> <li>make any difference in the in the capacity</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And that if you look at the bottom of page 6,</li> <li>I refer to Ms. Wellborn's testimony</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A (Reading) failed to consider a range of</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> <li>What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, it's too small to really</li> <li>make any difference in the in the capacity</li> <li>Q. And I</li> <li>A (indiscernible).</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And that if you look at the bottom of page 6,</li> <li>I refer to Ms. Wellborn's testimony</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A (Reading) failed to consider a range of</li> <li>energy prices or to differentiate the energy prices</li> </ol>	<ol> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> <li>What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, it's too small to really</li> <li>make any difference in the in the capacity</li> <li>Q. And I</li> <li>A (indiscernible).</li> <li>Q I was going to go ahead and answer that</li> </ol>
<ol> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Commissioner Regan:</li> <li>Q. Good afternoon.</li> <li>A. Good afternoon.</li> <li>Q. I am looking at your testimony and wonder if</li> <li>you can give me just a general overview. And I'm on</li> <li>page 7, lines 1 through 3, where you talk about</li> <li>AEP's methodology inherently overstates estimates of</li> <li>energy revenues and understates the estimates of the</li> <li>losses each year of the 15-year contract.</li> <li>Is that just based on the net present value,</li> <li>or are there other factors that that, you know,</li> <li>you you testified that way?</li> <li>A. Yeah. What I was referring there to</li> <li>specifically there was the on-peak/off-peak pricing.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And that if you look at the bottom of page 6,</li> <li>I refer to Ms. Wellborn's testimony</li> <li>Q. Uh-huh.</li> <li>A (Reading) failed to consider a range of</li> <li>energy prices or to differentiate the energy prices</li> <li>on an hourly basis, instead using only AEP's</li> <li>fundamental forecast of fundamental forecast of</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>on the margin on the value of the RECs.</li> <li>But, you know, to circle back to your</li> <li>specific question, that's why the the losses on</li> <li>these sales every hour they're losing money.</li> <li>Q. Right.</li> <li>A. Buying high, selling low. And then the</li> <li>question is whether it's made up in the the value</li> <li>of the RECs, which is very uncertain in our</li> <li>assessment.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER REGAN: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Chair Hatton:</li> <li>Q. All right. Mr. Kollen, you have stated your</li> <li>opinion in your testimony that the PSC should reject</li> <li>this contract, that it's not in the public interest</li> <li>and that it's the wrong resource at the wrong time.</li> <li>What do you mean by that?</li> <li>A. Well, first of all, it's too small to really</li> <li>make any difference in the in the capacity</li> <li>Q. And I</li> <li>Q I was going to go ahead and answer that</li> <li>question.</li> </ul>

37 (Pages 142 to 145)

	146	148
1	preemptively trying to and making the argument that	1 isn't economic? It just doesn't make sense.
2	this is necessary to meet some kind of capacity need	2 Address the big picture first and then see,
3	and energy need, whereas they haven't resolved the	<b>3</b> once if there's still a need for the smaller
4	bigger issue of how do you fill the capacity hole,	4 issue.
5	particularly in the absence of Mitchell, if that	5 Q. So they said that they're still analyzing
6	actually happens, and the energy coming out of	6 other projects in this RF in this RFP. The
7	Mitchell and other sources.	7 that sounds like they intend to do others. Does it
8	And this this seems to be, you know, the	8 matter which one they do first?
9	tail wagging the dog. You know, you start out with	9 A. Yes, I think it does, because it's the larger
10	something that should be a follow-on, because you	10 asset, the larger resource that's going to overwhelm
11	really have to view this in the perspective of the	11 and determine the need as to whether or not a
12	bigger picture. They need more capacity, a lot of	12 smaller resource is is necessary.
13	it, if they don't have Mitchell, starting in 2028,	13 So, since it doesn't really affect much the
14	and this doesn't really get them there, and it's a	14 Company's capacity situation, why would you start
15	very high cost, and we think of uncertain value. We	15 out with that and then add, under my hypothetical
16	think it's a negative value based upon the Company's	16 example, a thousand megawatts, and now you have a
17	base economic analysis.	17 thousand and 4.8 megawatts when you really don't
18	So why would you enter into this contract,	18 need the 4.8 megawatts? Why would you lead with
19	particularly at this time, with this resource?	19 that? Why wouldn't you just first take care of the
20	And, you know, the Company argues, "Well,	20 big picture and then determine whether or not it
21		21 made sense to move forward with a smaller resource?
22	as well. But we we think that economics should	22 Q. So to the to the best of your ability to
23	lead the issue. But you have to look at it in terms	23 predict, you feel like these purchases would be sold
24	of the broader picture. How do you fill the	24 into the PJM spot market at a loss?
25	capacity hole?	25 A. Yeah. Well, that's the Company's forecast
	147	149
1	Q. So they'll they'll be capacity short by	1 under every stretch of the imagine every
2	every everyone's estimate by next year, by 2026?	2 sensitivity, it's sold at a loss.
3	A. That's according to their forecast. I think	3 Q. I was going to say: Is it is it possible
4	'27, or maybe '26, yes. Somewhat in '26 and then	4 that we're wrong about that or are we certain that
5	more in '27	5 they'd be sold at a loss?
6	Q. Right.	6 A. Well, unless the PJM spot markets, the energy
7	A and more in '28 if, in fact, Mitchell	7 markets, go up over \$83.68, you know, then it's
8	isn't resolved.	8 going to be sold at a loss.
9	Q. All right. But if this is too small to make	9 Q. Okay. And and so the 83.68 fixed price
10	any difference, why not just go ahead and have at	10 A. Yes.
11	least a little bit of	11 Q doesn't change over 15 years?
12	A. Yeah.	12 A. It doesn't, right.
13	Q diversified resource that would be a bit	13 Q. In general we want long-term contracts at
14 15	of a hedge? Like why does it hurt to do it?	14 fixed prices
15 16	A. Well, let's use for example, let's just	15 <b>A.</b> Uh-huh.
16 17	say a hypothetical unit, thermal unit, might be, let's say, a thousand megawatts, right? That's more	16 Q because we expect that they'll go up.
18	than what the Company needs by 2028, but that's the	17 A. Right. Right.
19	resource available, and it's being offered to the	18 Q. We don't think that it's likely they'll go up
		<ol> <li>above 83.68 in 15 years?</li> <li>A. Well, AEP has their forecasters, and they</li> </ol>
		20 A. Well, AEP has their forecasters, and they
20	Company. Again, hypothetically. So if if you only need 800 but now you've	
20 21	So if if you only need 800 but now you've	21 have this fundamental forecast and they show the
20	So if if you only need 800 but now you've got a 1,000-megawatt resource because that's what's	<ul><li>21 have this fundamental forecast and they show the</li><li>22 trajectory of what they think the average hourly PJM</li></ul>
20 21 22	So if if you only need 800 but now you've got a 1,000-megawatt resource because that's what's available and that's what you're negotiating on,	<ul> <li>21 have this fundamental forecast and they show the</li> <li>22 trajectory of what they think the average hourly PJM</li> <li>23 market prices will be on-peak and I think we have</li> </ul>
20 21 22 23	So if if you only need 800 but now you've got a 1,000-megawatt resource because that's what's	<ul><li>21 have this fundamental forecast and they show the</li><li>22 trajectory of what they think the average hourly PJM</li></ul>

38 (Pages 146 to 149)

	150		152
1	not provide the off-peak.	1	spent developing and executing this contract 'cause
2	But in any event, we have these the AEP		I don't remember whether that's confidential, but
3	fundamentals forecast, and it does not go over	3	there was there was some money spent developing
4	83.68, I don't believe, in any year, so –	4	this.
5	Q. Did you do any analysis of what like if	5	A. Right.
6	83.68 too high, what would be the break-even rate?	6	Q. I'm trying to figure out if this could be
7	Do you have an idea?	7	salvaged, if there's a way that this could work.
8	A. I well, we can back-calculate that. We	8	A. Well, I think if AEP is willing to guarantee
9	can also back-calculate the value of the RECs that	9	it, you know, that it's economic. And there's two
10	would be required to, you know, break even on the	10	ways of doing it. You know, you can either do it
11	contract.	11	through the RECs or you can do it through the energy
12	And one of the things that we had thought	12	pricing, but the energy pricing is controlled by the
13	about, well, if AEP is so certain about their REC	13	market.
14	forecast, then how about they put their mouth where	14	The RECs, there's a lot of vagaries there,
15	their money is [sic] and just stand up and say,	15	very uncertain. We think that the value will
16	"Okay. We'll value the RECs at this level." And	16	decline over time as more and more renewable
17	then that way, you know, the contract will break	17	resources enter the market and there's less and less
18	even, and then it makes sense to move forward with.	18	demand for those RECs. I mean, that's just based
19	Q. How much effort would it take for you to do	19	upon the history, the allowance history.
20	that math to see what you think the break-even cost	20	And but if AEP is so certain about their
20	per megawatt hour should be?	21	forecast, put their money where their mouth is and
21	A. Yeah. I haven't done it, but I don't think	21	it could be salvaged to break even
23	it would be difficult to do it. You know, we could	23	Q. How would you
24	do it on a break-even energy price and we could do	24	A at least break even.
25	it on a break-even REC price, but	25	Q. How would a guaran what would a guarantee
20	n on a break-even KEC price, but	2.5	Q. How would a guarant what would a guarantee
	151		153
1	151	1	153
1	Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of	1	look like?
2	Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then	2	look like? A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right
2 3	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> </ul>	2 3	<ul><li>look like?</li><li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract</li></ul>
2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like</li> </ul>	2 3 4	look like? A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5	look like? A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6	look like? A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7	look like? A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	look like? A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	look like? A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were organized, and then they declined over time, and</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the testimony of Witness Coon. But basically, that</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were organized, and then they declined over time, and essentially now they're worth very little.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the</li> <li>Commission or, you know, our firm or or the</li> <li>Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the testimony of Witness Coon. But basically, that to the extent that capacity costs are recovered</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were organized, and then they declined over time, and essentially now they're worth very little. And we would expect the same thing to happen</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the</li> <li>Commission or, you know, our firm or or the</li> <li>Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the testimony of Witness Coon. But basically, that to the extent that capacity costs are recovered right now through Tariff PPA and the capacity costs</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were organized, and then they declined over time, and essentially now they're worth very little. And we would expect the same thing to happen with RECs. I I can't prove that because it's</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the testimony of Witness Coon. But basically, that to the extent that capacity costs are recovered right now through Tariff PPA and the capacity costs that are being incurred right now would be displaced</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were organized, and then they declined over time, and essentially now they're worth very little. And we would expect the same thing to happen with RECs. I I can't prove that because it's it's an assumption about the future, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the testimony of Witness Coon. But basically, that to the extent that capacity costs are recovered right now through Tariff PPA and the capacity costs that are being incurred right now would be displaced by the the you know, the capacity value of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were organized, and then they declined over time, and essentially now they're worth very little.</li> <li>And we would expect the same thing to happen with RECs. I I can't prove that because it's it's an assumption about the future, but it's based upon, you know, informed analysis of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the testimony of Witness Coon. But basically, that to the extent that capacity costs are recovered right now through Tariff PPA and the capacity costs that are being incurred right now would be displaced by the the you know, the capacity value of this contract, that could be addressed in</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were organized, and then they declined over time, and essentially now they're worth very little. And we would expect the same thing to happen with RECs. I I can't prove that because it's it's an assumption about the future, but</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the testimony of Witness Coon. But basically, that to the extent that capacity costs are recovered right now through Tariff PPA and the capacity costs that are being incurred right now would be displaced by the the you know, the capacity value of this contract, that could be addressed in Tariff PPA.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. It wouldn't cost your client a whole lot of money, then</li> <li>A. No, I don't I don't think so.</li> <li>Q if we ask you to provide something like that?</li> <li>A. I don't think so.</li> <li>Q. All right.</li> <li>A. But, yeah, the REC price, I think, is the most uncertain component of the entire analysis. The energy price, you know, it's got a longer term trajectory of increasing. Okay. That's fair enough. But the REC prices, as Ms. Wellborn points out in her testimony and this happened with the SO2 and the nit the NOx allowances. They were high cost, had a high market value in the early years when they began when the markets were organized, and then they declined over time, and essentially now they're worth very little.</li> <li>And we would expect the same thing to happen with RECs. I I can't prove that because it's it's an assumption about the future, but it's based upon, you know, informed analysis of history with what happened with the valuation of</li> </ul>	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>look like?</li> <li>A. Well, there's a there's a deficiency right now that results in a cost, and to this contract over the 15-year term. And, you know, the Commission or, you know, our firm or or the Company could figure out what the break-even point is on on the RECs. And if AEP is willing to stand behind that, then, you know, it would be a break-even proposition.</li> <li>Q. Okay. And then let's see. I think it was around page 11 of your testimony. You were talking about the proposed method for how to deal with the avoided capacity cost through the tariffs. What do you think is the proper method for that?</li> <li>A. Well, I think that the Company responded to that to some extent in its testimony, I believe the testimony of Witness Coon. But basically, that to the extent that capacity costs are recovered right now through Tariff PPA and the capacity costs that are being incurred right now would be displaced by the the you know, the capacity value of this contract, that could be addressed in</li> </ul>

39 (Pages 150 to 153)

154	156
1 captured then in Tariff PPA, that was avoided, then	1 from a third party, they could you know, they
<ul> <li>that should be picked up in Tariff PPA.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 could acquire RECs or whatever they wanted to do and</li> </ul>
3 So and I I don't think they disagree	<ul> <li>could acquire released whitever endy whited to do and</li> <li>then price that accordingly. They have a lot of</li> </ul>
4 with that, but I think they just simply said there	<ul> <li>4 pricing flexibility already under that tariff.</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>was nothing in base rates, if I recall correctly.</li> </ul>	5 Q. Is there is there not some way that they
6 Q. Okay. Okay.	<ul> <li>6 could they could acquire or create some some</li> </ul>
7 CHAIR HATTON: All right. I think that's all	<ul> <li>other energy in the gas or coal in in the</li> </ul>
8 the questions I have.	8 region and fill that in their their shortage?
9 COMMISSIONER STACY: I have one.	<ul> <li>9 A. I – I hadn't really thought about that,</li> </ul>
10 CHAIR HATTON: Yeah, Mr. Stacy.	10 quite frankly. I don't know the answer.
11 REEXAMINATION	11 Q. But it's maybe possible?
12 By Commissioner Stacy:	12 A. I think it's possible, yes.
<ol> <li>Dy commissioner stacy.</li> <li>Q. Let's assume that just for some reason,</li> </ol>	13 Q. So then they could do this project,
14 that Kentucky Power just wants to create some green	14 basically, and then add a source of energy that
	15 would address their capacity issues and do both of
16 through the mechanism that they that we're	16 these things, maybe? 17 A. Well
<ul><li>17 talking about here.</li><li>18 A. Right.</li></ul>	17 <b>A. Well</b> 18 O. Is that true or
5	
19 Q. And then you're saying that the real big	,
20 problem is, is they really haven't addressed their	
<ul> <li>21 capacity issue moving forward, correct?</li> <li>22 A. That's right. Yeah. The big picture.</li> </ul>	21 economics are such that the project breaks even, at
	<ul> <li>least you know, in other words, it's at least not</li> <li>harmful to the all of the customers of the</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>24 you were running Kentucky Power for about 45 seconds</li> <li>25 here</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Company, then maybe that's a path forward.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER STACY: Okay.</li> </ul>
2.5 Here	25 COMMISSIONER STACT. Okay.
155	157
1 A. Okay. All right.	1 CHAIR HATTON: I have a follow-up, actually.
2 Q and you wanted to sell some green energy,	2 Are you done?
<sup>3</sup> or if you had a if you had a a company that	3 COMMISSIONER STACY: Go ahead.
4 wanted to locate in in their region and you	4 REEXAMINATION
5 wanted that for this economic development project,	5 By Chair Hatton:
6 what would you do to what would you do to	6 Q. Are you familiar enough with the customer
7 without scrapping what has been proposed here, to	7 customers of Kentucky Power's service region to know
<sup>8</sup> address that energy capacity issue that you've	8 whether they have the type of customers who would be
9 described?	9 likely to want to do one of those green energy
<b>10 A. Well, one thing that could be done is that</b>	10 subscription services?
11 you could offer, you know, a subscription program	11 A. Well, I understand
12 basically to customers whereby they pay a premium to	12 Q. I mean, this isn't Louisville.
13 the normal rate to get the green energy. In other	13 A. Yeah.
14 words, they could essentially take this green energy	14 Q. There
15 and allocate it to those customers who raised their	15 A. Yeah.
16 hand and said, "I'll pay more."	16 Q. There aren't a lot of huge clients
17 And if there's actually a market for it,	17 A. Right. Right.
18 then, you know, that that would be an appropriate	18 Q currently.
19 way to address the green energy issue.	19 A. I understand that Kentucky Power's service
20 Q. Can I say what else now?	20 territory is very heavily residential and not a lot
21 A. Yes, you can. Of course. But but, you	21 of heavy industry and that you know, I don't know
22 know, they have an Option B under Tariff RPO where	22 what the demand for green energy is. I think we
23 they can negotiate with industrial customers	23 asked for that information in discovery, but they
24 already, and if there are industrial customers that	24 didn't provide it to us.
25 want green energy and the Company could source that	25 You know, because you would know that by the

40 (Pages 154 to 157)

	158	160
1	number of customers who wanted to purchase RECs	1 A. A high industrial demand
2	under Option A, Tariff RPO, or any industrials that	2 Q. High industrial, right?
3	wanted purchase environ green energy, basically,	<b>3</b> A for the environmental attributes, yes,
4	or RECs under Option B.	4 because they have ESG codes.
5	And I think we asked for that information,	5 Q. So if you didn't have the high industrial
6	but the Company declined to provide it. So I	6 A. Right.
7	Q. But your your proposition is that all of	7 Q then it probably wouldn't be feasible, or
8	the customers should be made to pay more for their	8 it would be very expensive?
9	energy, even though it's a small amount here?	9 A. Well, it would be more expensive. It would
10	A. Yes.	10 be an adder
11	Q. That that if that this might make sense	11 Q. Adder. Okay.
12	if some if they've had some customers that wanted	12 A to their standard rates, so
13	to voluntarily do that under that	13 CHAIR HATTON: Or if Kentucky had green
14	A. That's right.	14 energy requirements
15	Q option, the tariff?	15 THE WITNESS: Right. If there was
16	A. Yeah. And and in Louisiana, and to use	16 CHAIR HATTON: for for its 17 THE WITNESS: an RPS standard, yes.
17	that as an example, again, there are some industrial	17THE WITNESS: an RPS standard, yes.18That's correct, yes.
18	customers that that they have a subscription	19 CHAIR HATTON: Yeah. Okay. Sorry.
19	program for solar resources Q. Uh-huh.	20 Follow-ups?
	A basically. And they the the	21 Redirect.
	industrial customers have to cover the cost of those	22 MR. GISH: Yes, if you if you don't mind.
23		23 CHAIR HATTON: Sure.
	in this case, if all of that green energy was	24 MR. GISH: We had not planned to ask
25	available to industrials and the Company remained at	25 questions, but here we are.
	159	161
1	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION
1 2	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for	1 CROSS-EXAMINATION 2 By Mr. Gish:
2 3	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> </ol>
2 3 4	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li><b>A. Yes.</b></li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah. A. And only those who really wanted to have	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah. A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah. A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah. A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them Q. Yeah.	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah. A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them Q. Yeah. A if they chose to do that	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah. A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them Q. Yeah. A if they chose to do that	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah. A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them Q. Yeah. A if they chose to do that Q. I don't know how	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who will voluntarily pay for organic, pasturized eggs.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) Okay. You testified earlier</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who will voluntarily pay for organic, pasturized eggs.</li> <li>A. Of course. Yes. It's the same thing here.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) Okay. You testified earlier</li> <li>that Kentucky Power didn't discuss the the option</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who will voluntarily pay for organic, pasturized eggs.</li> <li>A. Of course. Yes. It's the same thing here.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) Okay. You testified earlier</li> <li>that Kentucky Power didn't discuss the the option</li> <li>of using Tariff RPO as a as a vehicle to monetize</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who will voluntarily pay for organic, pasturized eggs.</li> <li>A. Of course. Yes. It's the same thing here.</li> <li>Some people are just willing to pay more. So</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) Okay. You testified earlier</li> <li>that Kentucky Power didn't discuss the the option</li> <li>of using Tariff RPO as a as a vehicle to monetize</li> <li>the RECs under this agreement; is that right?</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who will voluntarily pay for organic, pasturized eggs.</li> <li>A. Of course. Yes. It's the same thing here.</li> <li>Some people are just willing to pay more. So CHAIR HATTON: Okay.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) Okay. You testified earlier</li> <li>that Kentucky Power didn't discuss the the option</li> <li>of using Tariff RPO as a as a vehicle to monetize</li> <li>the RECs under this agreement; is that right?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who will voluntarily pay for organic, pasturized eggs.</li> <li>A. Of course. Yes. It's the same thing here.</li> <li>Some people are just willing to pay more. So CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) Okay. You testified earlier</li> <li>that Kentucky Power didn't discuss the the option</li> <li>of using Tariff RPO as a as a vehicle to monetize</li> <li>the RECs under this agreement; is that right?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You testified</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed. Q. Yeah. A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them Q. Yeah. A if they chose to do that Q. I don't know how A because Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who will voluntarily pay for organic, pasturized eggs. A. Of course. Yes. It's the same thing here. Some people are just willing to pay more. Some customers are willing to pay more. So CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION By Commissioner Regan:	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) Okay. You testified earlier</li> <li>that Kentucky Power didn't discuss the the option</li> <li>of using Tariff RPO as a as a vehicle to monetize</li> <li>the RECs under this agreement; is that right?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You testified</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ol>
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>risk for it but could resell it to their industrials at a premium cost, or their other customers, for that matter, as well, then the the all customers would not be at risk or harmed.</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A. And only those who really wanted to have those resources and the environmental attributes could pay extra for them</li> <li>Q. Yeah.</li> <li>A if they chose to do that</li> <li>Q. I don't know how</li> <li>A because</li> <li>Q feasible it is under this customer base, but I think that it's sort of you know, the whole country is complaining about what what they're paying for eggs, but there are still customers who will voluntarily pay for organic, pasturized eggs.</li> <li>A. Of course. Yes. It's the same thing here.</li> <li>Some people are just willing to pay more. So CHAIR HATTON: Okay. EXAMINATION</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Gish:</li> <li>Q. You mentioned the testimony of Company</li> <li>rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Coon, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Did you read it?</li> <li>A. Yes, I did.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Can you turn to page 10? Do you have</li> <li>it handy?</li> <li>A. I'm not sure that I do.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: I can provide with you a copy of</li> <li>page 10.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>MS. GLASS: But I only have this one copy. I</li> <li>apologize.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Okay.</li> <li>Q. (By Mr. Gish) Okay. You testified earlier</li> <li>that Kentucky Power didn't discuss the the option</li> <li>of using Tariff RPO as a as a vehicle to monetize</li> <li>the RECs under this agreement; is that right?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. You testified</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ol>

## 41 (Pages 158 to 161)

	1.00	1.64
	162	164
1	Q asked what was missing and you said	1 A. I don't think it really makes much
2	referenced the Tariff RPO.	2 difference, you know, whether it's a hundred percent
3	A. And your question is incorrect. What I did	<sup>3</sup> or 93 percent or what.
4	was I addressed in my direct testimony and what I	4 Q. But that would make a difference of what its
5	responded to Commissioner Stacy was that there was	5 actual UCAP would be
6	no testimony with respect to the revenues recovered	6 A. Well, I think you're
7	from customers under Option A or under Option B, and	7 Q correct?
8	my recommendation of those revenues, in lieu of	8 A. True. Other than that, yes. It doesn't make
9	third-party revenues from the sale of RECs, be used	9 any difference other than that, yes.
10	as an offset within Tariff PPA.	10 Q. And then you testified that an option here
11	No no witness, rebuttal witness from	11 would be that the Commission set a guarantee for the
12	Kentucky Power addressed that issue.	12 REC price in the agreement?
13	Q. (Indiscernible)	13 A. Or make whole, basically, yes.
14	A. (Indiscernible)	14 Q. Okay. Are you aware of any other solar
15	Q avoided capacity and REC revenue, regardless of where it comes from, should be flowed	15 agreements that the Company that the Commission
16 17	through Tariff PPA	<ul><li>16 has agreed to where such a provision is in this</li><li>17 state has worked, that the provision has been</li></ul>
18	A. That's correct.	18 included?
19	Q. Okay.	19 A. I am not aware of anything of that nature. I
20	A. Yes.	20 was asked a question how could this work, and I I
21	Q. And you also testified that none of the	21 gave a potential solution to that.
22	sensitivity analysis showed a that the costs of	22 Q. Okay. Yeah. But if that that there are
23	the projects were that the offset revenues	23 other REPAs that have been approved that have
24	exceeded the cost of the project; is that right?	24 that are solar projects don't include this indicates
25	A. No. I think I said every year in the base	25 that they wouldn't, correct?
	163	165
1	analysis showed a loss, and I'm referring to the	1 A. Well, I haven't analyzed the other REPAs,
2	original Company analysis.	2 whether or not there are any that have been approved
3	In other words, you bought high, sold low in	<sup>3</sup> or not. I was just asked if there was some way to
4	every one of the 15 years in the Company's original	4 make this one work, and I said I said one option
5	analysis. Lost money.	5 is to essentially ensure that it would at least
6	Q. But you're familiar with Table NMC-R1; is	6 break even
7	that right?	7 Q. And
8	A. Yes.	8 A. – and it would be economically not harmful
9	Q. And that sensitivity analysis shows that in	9 to customers.
	four of the situations the reve the revenues from	10 Q. And this REPA provides approximately
	the offsets exceed the cost; is that right?	11 3 percent of the Company's energy requirements; is
12	A. That that is a comprehensive analysis and	12 that correct?
13	it includes the value of the RECs as well.	<b>13 A. It displaces other purchases.</b>
14	Q. Yes. That's right.	14 Q. Right. But it's 3 percent of the project,
15	· ·	
16	A. Yeah.	15 right?
16 17	A. Yeah. Q. Okay.	<ul><li>15 right?</li><li>16 A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li></ul>
17	<ul><li>A. Yeah.</li><li>Q. Okay.</li><li>A. And what I what I was referring to was the</li></ul>	<ul> <li>15 right?</li> <li>16 A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li> <li>17 about 3 percent of the Company's energy right now</li> </ul>
17 18	<ul> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And what I what I was referring to was the purchase of the energy at 83.68 per megawatt hour</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li> <li>about 3 percent of the Company's energy right now</li> <li>would be just replaced by purchases from this REPA.</li> </ol>
17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And what I what I was referring to was the purchase of the energy at 83.68 per megawatt hour and selling it at roughly half that price.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li> <li>about 3 percent of the Company's energy right now</li> <li>would be just replaced by purchases from this REPA.</li> <li>Q. Right. But then</li> </ol>
17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And what I what I was referring to was the purchase of the energy at 83.68 per megawatt hour and selling it at roughly half that price.</li> <li>Q. You testified about this hypothetical</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>15 right?</li> <li>16 A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li> <li>17 about 3 percent of the Company's energy right now</li> <li>18 would be just replaced by purchases from this REPA.</li> <li>19 Q. Right. But then</li> <li>20 A. It doesn't change the total amount of energy</li> </ul>
17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And what I what I was referring to was the purchase of the energy at 83.68 per megawatt hour and selling it at roughly half that price.</li> <li>Q. You testified about this hypothetical thousand-megawatt thermal project, right?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>15 right?</li> <li>16 A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li> <li>17 about 3 percent of the Company's energy right now</li> <li>18 would be just replaced by purchases from this REPA.</li> <li>19 Q. Right. But then</li> <li>20 A. It doesn't change the total amount of energy</li> <li>21 that is purchased.</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And what I what I was referring to was the purchase of the energy at 83.68 per megawatt hour and selling it at roughly half that price.</li> <li>Q. You testified about this hypothetical thousand-megawatt thermal project, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li> <li>about 3 percent of the Company's energy right now</li> <li>would be just replaced by purchases from this REPA.</li> <li>Q. Right. But then</li> <li>A. It doesn't change the total amount of energy</li> <li>that is purchased.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Fair enough. But it does produce</li> </ol>
17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And what I what I was referring to was the purchase of the energy at 83.68 per megawatt hour and selling it at roughly half that price.</li> <li>Q. You testified about this hypothetical thousand-megawatt thermal project, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>15 right?</li> <li>16 A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li> <li>17 about 3 percent of the Company's energy right now</li> <li>18 would be just replaced by purchases from this REPA.</li> <li>19 Q. Right. But then</li> <li>20 A. It doesn't change the total amount of energy</li> <li>21 that is purchased.</li> <li>22 Q. Okay. Fair enough. But it does produce</li> <li>23 it does replace the energy that is purchased without</li> </ul>
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Yeah.</li> <li>Q. Okay.</li> <li>A. And what I what I was referring to was the purchase of the energy at 83.68 per megawatt hour and selling it at roughly half that price.</li> <li>Q. You testified about this hypothetical thousand-megawatt thermal project, right?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And that assumes that the ELCC in the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>right?</li> <li>A. Yeah. So the other purchases that provide</li> <li>about 3 percent of the Company's energy right now</li> <li>would be just replaced by purchases from this REPA.</li> <li>Q. Right. But then</li> <li>A. It doesn't change the total amount of energy</li> <li>that is purchased.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Fair enough. But it does produce</li> </ol>

42 (Pages 162 to 165)

	166		168		
1		1			
	detrimental based upon the Company's own analysis.	1 2	CHAIR HATTON: Anything further?		
	It's a it's a net loser on the energy purchases.	3	MR. WEST: I do not.		
4	<ul> <li>3 You're buying high at 83.68 and you're selling at</li> <li>4 roughly half of that. Then the question is and</li> </ul>		CHAIR HATTON: Any reason why we couldn't allow Mr. Kollen to go catch his plane?		
5	that's based upon your forecasts.	45	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.		
6	Then the question is whether the RECs have	6	CHAIR HATTON: You may be excused, sir.		
7	sufficient value to fill that that gap. And		Need a little break, Candace?		
8	under the Company's analysis, they do not. And I	8	Would you like to take a little break?		
9	think that the Company's analysis, they do not. And I	9	MS. SACRE: Thank you.		
10	extremely optimistic.		10 CHAIR HATTON: All right.		
11	Q. But there's no protection in their current	11	MR. KURTZ: Can we call our witness, Your		
12	if Winter Storm Uri or Winter Storm Elliott happens	1	Honor?		
13	again I'm sorry. If Winter Storm Elliott happens	13	CHAIR HATTON: Let's have a ten-minute break.		
14	again, there's in this piece of generation or,	14	(Recess from 2:37 p.m. to 2:53 p.m.)		
15	I'm sorry, the energy we purchased under this REPA	15	MS. SACRE: You are on the record, Chairman.		
16	would be at \$83.68, not \$3,000, right?	16	CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Intervenors, call your		
17	A. Well, there's no	17	next witness, please.		
18	Q. Is that right?	18	MR. KURTZ: Chairman, Leah Wellborn.		
19	A. I – I don't know. I think that's an	19	CHAIR HATTON: Hello. Please raise your		
20	exception to the normal circumstances here, and I	20	right hand to be sworn.		
21	don't know what other energy would be available.	21	Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are		
22	For example, I've made the argument that	22	about to give is true and correct under penalty of		
23	you've got a small resource leading the need for a	23	perjury?		
24	larger resource, and I don't think that it's	24	THE WITNESS: I do.		
25	appropriate to do it that way.	25	CHAIR HATTON: Please have a seat.		
	167		160		
	167		169		
1	I think it's more appropriate to take on the	1	Tell us your full name and business address.		
2	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a	2	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial		
2 3	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going	2 3	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075.		
2 3 4	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource.	2 3 4	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel.		
2 3 4 5	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the	2 3 4 5	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.		
2 3 4 5 6	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here.	2 3 4 5 6	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been		
2 3 4 5 6 7	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and	2 3 4 5 6 7	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz:		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn?		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn? A. I do.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn? <b>A. I do.</b> Q. Was this prepared by you or under your		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn? A. I do.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn? A. I do. Q. Was this prepared by you or under your supervision? A. It was.		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in that period would be at \$83.68 and not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn? A. I do. Q. Was this prepared by you or under your supervision?		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in that period would be at \$83.68 and not A. Yeah.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn? A. I do. Q. Was this prepared by you or under your supervision? A. It was. Q. If I were to ask you the same questions as		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 100 111 12 13 14 15 166	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in that period would be at \$83.68 and not A. Yeah. Q something else?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn? A. I do. Q. Was this prepared by you or under your supervision? A. It was. Q. If I were to ask you the same questions as those contained therein, would your answers be the		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in that period would be at \$83.68 and not A. Yeah. Q something else? A. I understand that.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION By Mr. Kurtz: Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn? A. I do. Q. Was this prepared by you or under your supervision? A. It was. Q. If I were to ask you the same questions as those contained therein, would your answers be the same?		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in that period would be at \$83.68 and not A. Yeah. Q something else? A. I understand that. Q. Okay.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Tell us your full name and business address. THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial</li> <li>Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075. CHAIR HATTON: Counsel. MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor. LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been</li> <li>first duly sworn, testified as follows: DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you</li> <li>direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Was this prepared by you or under your</li> <li>supervision?</li> <li>A. It was.</li> <li>Q. If I were to ask you the same questions as</li> <li>those contained therein, would your answers be the</li> <li>same?</li> <li>A. They would.</li> <li>Q. Any corrections or additions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in that period would be at \$83.68 and not A. Yeah. Q something else? A. I understand that. Q. Okay. A. And if the market was \$12 per megawatt hour,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>Tell us your full name and business address.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial</li> <li>Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Counsel.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been</li> <li>first duly sworn, testified as follows:</li> <li>DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you</li> <li>direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Was this prepared by you or under your</li> <li>supervision?</li> <li>A. It was.</li> <li>Q. If I were to ask you the same questions as those contained therein, would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. They would.</li> <li>Q. Any corrections or additions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any corrections or additions to your data</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in that period would be at \$83.68 and not A. Yeah. Q something else? A. I understand that. Q. Okay. A. And if the market was \$12 per megawatt hour, then it would increase the loss by buying at the 83.68. It's a two-edged sword Q. Right.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Tell us your full name and business address.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial</li> <li>Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Counsel.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been</li> <li>first duly sworn, testified as follows:</li> <li>DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you</li> <li>direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Was this prepared by you or under your</li> <li>supervision?</li> <li>A. It was.</li> <li>Q. If I were to ask you the same questions as those contained therein, would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. They would.</li> <li>Q. Any corrections or additions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any corrections or additions to your data responses?</li> </ul>		
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I think it's more appropriate to take on the large resource first and then determine if there's a reason and a rationale, justification for going after a 4.8 megawatt accredited capacity resource. I think you've got the dog or the cart before the horse here. Q. I think we can argue about different dogs and carts here, but A. Yes. Q the but just so we're clear, if energy prices in the market are \$3,000 or \$150 or \$90, the Company's purchases under this REPA would protect that that whatever small amount that is, 150,000 megawatt, whatever the whatever it is in that period would be at \$83.68 and not A. Yeah. Q something else? A. I understand that. Q. Okay. A. And if the market was \$12 per megawatt hour, then it would increase the loss by buying at the 83.68. It's a two-edged sword	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Tell us your full name and business address.</li> <li>THE WITNESS: Leah Wellborn, 570 Colonial</li> <li>Park Drive, Suite 305, Rosville, Georgia 30075.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Counsel.</li> <li>MR. KURTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.</li> <li>LEAH WELLBORN, called by KIUC, having been</li> <li>first duly sworn, testified as follows:</li> <li>DIRECT EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Kurtz:</li> <li>Q. Ms. Wellborn, do you have in front of you</li> <li>direct testimony and exhibits of Leah Wellborn?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. Was this prepared by you or under your</li> <li>supervision?</li> <li>A. It was.</li> <li>Q. If I were to ask you the same questions as those contained therein, would your answers be the same?</li> <li>A. They would.</li> <li>Q. Any corrections or additions?</li> <li>A. No.</li> <li>Q. Any corrections or additions to your data</li> </ul>		

## 43 (Pages 166 to 169)

	170	1	72
1	for cross.	1 additional level of accuracy available that they	
2	CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Mr. Gish.	2 didn't use, and so I I do think it would be more	
3	MR. GISH: Yeah, just a few.	3 accurate to include it.	
4	CROSS-EXAMINATION	4 Q. Okay. And then in your sensitivity analysis,	
5	By Mr. Gish:	5 you use an entry price that is 20 percent lower than	
6	Q. Ms. Wellborn, can you turn to the last page	6 Kentucky Power's 2023 fundamentals, equal to those	
7	of your testimony, page 13?	7 fundamentals, and then 20 percent higher. And then	
8	A. Yes.	8 you also use scenarios of REC pricing of zero	
9	Q. And hi, welcome to Kentucky. I know it's	9 dollars per megawatt hour, \$5 per megawatt hour.	
10	your first first time here to give testimony.	10 Kentucky Power's 2023 forecast, and the Virginia	
11	A. Thank you. Good to be here.	11 alternative compliance payment group; is that	
12	Q. Your last statement there, it says, (Reading)	12 correct?	
13	I conclude the REPA is uneconomic in 10 of the 12	13 A. That's correct.	
14	sensitivity cases, which, including the Company's	14 Q. Those are okay. How did you select the 20	
15	case, results in a net cost of approximately	15 percent below and 20 percent above, or how how	
16	15 million net present value.	16 did you make that determination for that?	
17	Is that did I read that correctly?	17 A. I wanted to capture some level of	
18	A. That's correct.	18 uncertainty. I won't say that the 20 percent was	
19	Q. Okay. And when you say "uneconomic," you	19 based on a specific level of uncertainty. I think	
20	meant that it just costs money, right? It the	20 the updated 2024 fundamentals that we got in the	
21	A. The cost exceeds	21 rebuttal showed variability outside of that 20	
22	Q the net cost of the project, right?	22 percent.	
23	A. The net cost.	23 So I think 20 percent was a conservative sort	
24 25	Q. So is no net cost the standard for	24 of upper bound/lower bound assumption to start wi	ith,
ZJ	certificates of public convenience and necessity in	25 just to demonstrate that that energy value isn't	
	171	1	73
1	171 the Commonwealth of Kentucky?	1 static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I	73
1 2	the Commonwealth of Kentucky? A. I don't think it's the standard. I think	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> </ol>	73
	the Commonwealth of Kentucky? A. I don't think it's the standard. I think it's an important consideration.	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4	<ul><li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li><li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think it's an important consideration.</li><li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li></ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4 5	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4 5 6	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4 5 6 7	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were. MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> </ol>	73
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the</li> <li>seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony,</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the</li> <li>seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony,</li> <li>it's your position they should be using the</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> <li>So it's not that I'm trying to assign that</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the</li> <li>seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony,</li> <li>it's your position they should be using the</li> <li>seven-day forecast as opposed to the on-peak. Can</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> <li>So it's not that I'm trying to assign that</li> <li>it's specifically more reasonable, but it is a bound</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the</li> <li>seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony,</li> <li>it's your position they should be using the</li> <li>seven-day forecast as opposed to the on-peak. Can</li> <li>you just elaborate on that and explain why?</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> <li>So it's not that I'm trying to assign that</li> <li>it's specifically more reasonable, but it is a bound</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the</li> <li>seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony,</li> <li>it's your position they should be using the</li> <li>seven-day forecast as opposed to the on-peak. Can</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> <li>So it's not that I'm trying to assign that</li> <li>it's specifically more reasonable, but it is a bound</li> <li>case that I think is important to see.</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the</li> <li>seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony,</li> <li>it's your position they should be using the</li> <li>seven-day forecast as opposed to the on-peak. Can</li> <li>you just elaborate on that and explain why?</li> <li>A. Sure. I mean, in the ideal world, you would</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> <li>So it's not that I'm trying to assign that</li> <li>it's specifically more reasonable, but it is a bound</li> <li>case that I think is important to see.</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>That's all I have, Chair.</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the</li> <li>seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony,</li> <li>it's your position they should be using the</li> <li>seven-day forecast as opposed to the on-peak. Can</li> <li>you just elaborate on that and explain why?</li> <li>A. Sure. I mean, in the ideal world, you would</li> <li>get the most accurate forecast you can, which could</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> <li>So it's not that I'm trying to assign that</li> <li>it's specifically more reasonable, but it is a bound</li> <li>case that I think is important to see.</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>That's all I have, Chair.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Commissioner Stacy?</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think</li> <li>it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were.</li> <li>MR. GISH: No further questions.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff?</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions.</li> <li>CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how</li> <li>Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy</li> <li>prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony, it's your position they should be using the seven-day forecast as opposed to the on-peak. Can you just elaborate on that and explain why?</li> <li>A. Sure. I mean, in the ideal world, you would get the most accurate forecast you can, which could include hourly or monthly values. So the Company's</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> <li>So it's not that I'm trying to assign that</li> <li>it's specifically more reasonable, but it is a bound</li> <li>case that I think is important to see.</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>That's all I have, Chair.</li> <li>CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Commissioner Stacy?</li> </ol>	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	<ul> <li>the Commonwealth of Kentucky?</li> <li>A. I don't think it's the standard. I think it's an important consideration.</li> <li>Q. The standard is lowest reasonable cost?</li> <li>A. I'm not aware of the specific standard.</li> <li>I'm I'm just focused on what the economics were. MR. GISH: No further questions. CHAIR HATTON: Okay. Staff? MR. WILLIAMS: Just a couple of questions. CROSS-EXAMINATION</li> <li>By Mr. Williams:</li> <li>Q. So there's been some discussion around how Kentucky Power is basically basing its energy prices, whether it's the on-peak forecast versus the seven-day forecast. And based on your testimony, it's your position they should be using the seven-day forecast as opposed to the on-peak. Can you just elaborate on that and explain why?</li> <li>A. Sure. I mean, in the ideal world, you would get the most accurate forecast you can, which could include hourly or monthly values. So the Company's analysis just used the annual on-peak value, even</li> </ul>	<ol> <li>static. It isn't a fixed, known market price, as I</li> <li>think we've discussed also today.</li> <li>Q. Oh, yes. Thank you.</li> <li>And then just one more. So you use zero</li> <li>dollars per megawatt hour as the lowest estimate for</li> <li>the REC price. I just want to ask you: How likely</li> <li>is that outcome in your opinion?</li> <li>A. I don't think I have a specific likelihood</li> <li>assignment to it. I think it's a it's a good</li> <li>bound case to see in a sensitivity analysis.</li> <li>I've seen other economic analysis where the</li> <li>REC value is sort of a an upside risk, right? So</li> <li>you kind of start the analysis assuming a zero REC</li> <li>value, and then you sort of add on to that what it</li> <li>could monetize at.</li> <li>So it's not that I'm trying to assign that</li> <li>it's specifically more reasonable, but it is a bound</li> <li>case that I think is important to see.</li> <li>MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you.</li> <li>That's all I have, Chair.</li> <li>COMMISSIONER STACY: I don't have any</li> </ol>	

44 (Pages 170 to 173)

174	170
174	176
1 what I was going to ask. Thank you.	1 MS. GLASS: I'm sorry. Can you say that
2 CHAIR HATTON: I have one. Just a second.	2 again?
3 It's one that's sort of just to you. Okay.	3 MR. GISH: February 14th.
4 Actually, I think mine got answered as well.	4 MS. GLASS: That would be fine. Thank you.
5 So that's it.	5 CHAIR HATTON: A little Valentine.
6 Redirect?	6 MS. GLASS: Yes.
7 MR. KURTZ: No redirect.	7 CHAIR HATTON: A love letter.
8 CHAIR HATTON: All right. Any any reason	8 MS. GLASS: Our our gift to the
9 why this witness couldn't be excused?	9 Commission.
10 All right. Thank you.	10 CHAIR HATTON: And our final order is due
11 THE WITNESS: Thank you.	11 March 25th.
12 CHAIR HATTON: I have three exhibits.	12 Simultaneous briefs, should you want to
13 It's the conclusion of your case, right?	13 submit them, by February 21st? Any objection to
14 MR. KURTZ: Yes, Your Honor. I move the	14 that?
15 admission of KIUC Exhibits 1, 2, and 3, the first	15 Simultaneous responses, if any,
16 two of which are confidential.	16 February 28th?
17 CHAIR HATTON: And you've already said no	17 MS. GLASS: That works.
18 objection.	18 CHAIR HATTON: Okay. And then, again, our 19 final order will be due March 25th.
19 Any other exhibits I'm forgetting besides	
20 KIUC's three?	20 Okay. Anything else we need to take up 21 before we all adjourn?
21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No objection.	21 before we an adjourn? 22 MS. GLASS: No, Your Honor.
22 CHAIR HATTON: Any reason why Mr. Wolffram	22 MS. CLASS. No, Four Honor. 23 CHAIR HATTON: All right. Thank you,
23 couldn't be excused?	23 CHAIR HATTON. All right. Thank you, 24 everyone. We are adjourned.
24 MR. GISH: No.	24 everyone: we are adjourned. 25 (Hearing adjourned at 3:01 p.m.)
25 CHAIR HATTON: All right.	2.5 (Treating adjourned at 5.01 p.m.)
175	
175	
1 MR. VAN ZYL: No, ma'am. Excuse me.	
2 CHAIR HATTON: Were you about to say	
3 something else?	
4 MR. VAN ZYL: No, I was not.	
5 CHAIR HATTON: Okay.	
6 MR. VAN ZYL: I was just trying to be able to	
7 speak, actually.	
8 CHAIR HATTON: Okay.	
9 MR. VAN ZYL: My apologies.	
10 CHAIR HATTON: All right. Any motions at	
11 this time?	
12 Staff, how long do you believe you would need	
13 to get DRs out, if any?	
14 MR. VAN ZYL: To get DRs out, we could do	
15 a excuse me request for information by	
16 January 31st, 2025. I think there's just a few	
17 items identified.	
18 CHAIR HATTON: That's Friday.	
19 MR. VAN ZYL: That's Friday, yes.	
20 CHAIR HATTON: Okay.	
21 MR. VAN ZYL: We could do that.	
22 CHAIR HATTON: How long would the parties	
23 like to respond? February 14th, is that	
24 MR. GISH: I guess it that would be	
25 sufficient, yes.	

45 (Pages 174 to 176)

				177
1	*	*	*	
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

Page	178
- a g o	±, 0

A	142:7	134:18 135:23	afternoon 111:24	70:11,12 77:4
<b>a.m</b> 7:1 30:13,13	acknowledgment	137:15 153:22	111:25 143:3,4	77:16 83:5 97:9
36:19,20 66:2,3	43:8	154:20 162:4	AG-KIUC	100:25 110:23
78:22,22 82:3,4	acquire 23:7	162:12	108:21	117:12 118:11
83:22,23 95:13	48:21 139:20	addressing 9:11	<b>agree</b> 34:4,10	123:3 151:25
95:14 99:13,14	141:7,23 142:8	13:20 17:19	41:6 50:21	158:9 165:20
106:1,2 123:18	156:2,6	adequate 33:11	53:13 69:13,17	167:13
<b>ability</b> 15:8 45:11	acquired 96:21	73:10 78:1	71:8,14 73:2,7	<b>amounts</b> 110:19
148:22	97:25	<b>adjourn</b> 176:21	74:12 83:14	110:20 128:12
<b>able</b> 26:23 48:2	acquires 18:10	adjourned	111:7,13,16	141:7
57:9 63:14	acquiring 18:17	176:24,25	agreed 59:17	analysis 14:25
68:13 69:9	acquisition 97:9	adjustment	71:22 72:18	15:5 24:15 32:1
84:17 104:12	Act 37:15 127:11	54:17 56:17	164:16	32:8,23 33:24
119:5 175:6	actively 58:19	70:17 136:7	agreement 1:7,9	34:3,16,16
	59:3	administration	7:10,13 32:7	37:20 43:10
<b>above-market</b> 31:24	actual 95:2	37:2 63:18,20	42:22 72:20	85:10 87:4,5,7
<b>absence</b> 146:5	115:24 116:3	64:1 83:8	73:4 79:2 81:9	87:8 89:12
	164:5	126:24	81:10 96:4	103:4,13,16,17
<b>absolutely</b> 31:3	add 74:17 88:22	admission 174:15	100:13 101:17	110:8,12 111:3
53:7 59:20	148:15 156:14	admitted 26:8	101:18,21	112:22 121:21
76:10	173:14	131:25 132:2	161:20 164:12	122:8,25 125:7
<b>abut</b> 130:9	added 109:1,3	adopt 135:7	agreements 75:5	126:2 141:14
acceptable 103:1	131:18	adopt 155.7 adopts 134:19	102:3,5 164:15	146:17 150:5
<b>accepted</b> 63:6	adder 160:10,11	advantage	<b>ahead</b> 36:7	151:9,22
access 17:7 25:18	adding 75:16	104:12 141:3	145:22 147:10	162:22 163:1,2
25:18	119:8	advised 9:4	157:3	162:22 105:1,2
accidentally	addition 138:10	<b>AEP</b> 8:7 22:18,23	allegedly 25:11	166:1,8,9
64:10	additional 21:3	27:22 57:19	allocate 155:15	171:22 172:4
<b>account</b> 76:4	22:2 33:22 43:4	60:21 86:1	allow 9:15 45:14	173:10,11,13
119:2	61:24 62:13	87:24 94:3	51:16 168:4	analyze 19:22
Accounting 1:10	65:11 68:14	105:18 113:10	<b>allowance</b> 152:19	analyzed 165:1
7:14	69:9 172:1	120:9 123:2	allowances	v
accounts 15:12	additions 134:23	126:2 149:20	151:14,24	<b>analyzing</b> 12:3 148:5
accreditation	169:20,22	150:2,13 152:8	allowed 105:15	
14:15,19,23	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	150:2,15 152:8		<b>Angie</b> 1:16 7:17 <b>annual</b> 73:13
15:11 16:7	address 10:20,20		allowing 45:2	
17:22,25 56:6	10:23 14:1,4	<b>AEP's</b> 143:8,22	allows 21:21,22	85:10 171:22
accredited 14:5,8	16:20 19:8 20:8	144:13	44:5 45:4,16	<b>annually</b> 73:20
14:14,20 16:8	20:25 26:6	AEPSC 120:5	75:4	73:22
18:21 44:24	42:16 79:17,19	affect 16:5	<b>alternative</b> 41:5	<b>answer</b> 18:15
45:10,19 48:19	107:17,19	148:13	42:16 43:13	25:8 44:17 48:4
54:4 84:7 167:4	133:16,18	<b>affiliate</b> 22:18	65:22 172:11	49:16 60:20
accuracy 172:1	134:15 136:1	27:22	altogether 129:7	61:18 77:19,20
accurate 171:20	148:2 155:8,19	<b>affirm</b> 10:15	American 80:8	77:20 89:21
172:3	156:15 169:1	79:11 107:11	108:8	95:3 121:13
<b>achieve</b> 87:19	addressed 134:17	133:11 168:21	amount 31:8 52:2	145:22 156:10

#### Page 179

	1	I	I	
answered 174:4	136:3	<b>assign</b> 137:24	8:12,13,15 11:1	В
answering	approved 38:11	173:16	16:14 134:4	<b>B</b> 4:1 23:9,19
131:13	118:18 120:10	assigned 86:12	attorneys 5:17	57:15 108:21
answers 135:5,8	164:23 165:2	136:22 138:6	85:19	136:20 137:20
169:17	approves 134:19	139:21 142:10	attract 45:4	138:22,25
anybody 9:19	approving 1:6	assignment	58:24	155:22 158:4
10:1 59:24	7:9 47:13 79:1	138:10,16	attracted 67:12	162:7
91:22 106:16	approximately	139:16 140:2	attributes 141:10	<b>back</b> 17:5 30:16
anytime 55:22	14:7 44:21	173:9	141:24 142:9	34:7 40:22
128:4	73:16 84:12,13	Assistant 5:17	159:7 160:3	45:14 51:22
<b>anyway</b> 127:23	165:10 170:15	6:5	Authorization	56:14,23 57:14
127:25	arbitrage 141:20	associated 18:22	1:8 7:12	62:1 67:24 70:1
apologies 175:9	<b>area</b> 67:9 126:7	23:22 24:16,17	available 12:22	78:24 99:6,10
apologize 41:11	140:23	32:9,16 33:16	33:10 35:17	101:11 104:1
130:7 161:15	areawide 66:10	33:20 44:9,13	60:5 82:9	105:20 106:22
apparently 12:2	<b>argue</b> 167:7	44:25 45:11,14	109:17 118:4,7	107:4 124:6
appearance 8:1,7	argues 146:20	49:11 56:18	118:11 120:8	128:3,8 130:3
8:16	argument 146:1	60:4 74:19,20	135:11 140:17	133:21 145:2
<b>Appearances</b> 2:3	166:22	74:20,23 77:14	142:20 147:19	back-calculate
5:1 6:1	arguments	90:13 137:6	147:23 158:25	150:8,9
appeared 28:21	146:21	Associates	166:21 172:1	background
appears 51:6	Ashland 10:24	133:18	Avangrid 31:11	27:18 69:21
Applicant 8:2	asked 30:5 52:20	assume 28:6	33:17 99:18,19	balance 52:18
10:7 11:1	60:17 76:17,18	31:16 67:8	Avenue 5:18 6:6	balances 49:19
application 1:5	81:3,14,15	97:13,14,19	10:24	49:23
7:8 28:15 31:12	88:17 105:9	154:13	average 31:23	base 50:1,5
47:8 48:17 52:4	121:7 123:25	assumed 16:6	74:2 112:3	112:24,24
69:15 74:13	124:4 126:23	32:17,25 84:24	113:4 116:6,7,8	113:10,15
79:1	128:25 129:5	assumes 28:11	117:6 130:9,16	130:7,14
<b>apply</b> 75:22 98:5	129:23 135:4	163:23	130:19 149:22	146:17 153:25
100:12,18	157:23 158:5	assuming 16:7	averaged 119:23	154:5 159:13
appreciate 44:17	162:1 164:20	100:1 173:13	<b>avoid</b> 45:17	162:25
53:1 59:7 60:10	165:3	assumption	75:23	based 17:1 27:13
approached	asking 15:17	151:21 172:24	<b>avoided</b> 32:13,16	33:2,24 34:3
86:10	69:3 71:11	assumptions	32:20,25	39:2 40:2,7
appropriate	74:22 76:1	56:25	153:13 154:1	43:8,9 47:11
75:20 155:18	136:4	attached 17:19	162:15	51:5,12 56:25
166:25 167:1	aspect 137:15	attachment	award 93:2,21	60:22 61:16
approval 1:10	assessment 145:9	124:8,24	<b>aware</b> 9:13 10:1	73:15 74:1
7:14 136:4	asset 1:11 7:15	125:10,17	10:3 28:16,20	87:14,16 88:10
Approvals 1:11	14:17 19:3,4,6	attachments	75:15 85:1	97:13,19 102:4
7:15	21:20 33:9 52:6	124:11	91:14 94:18,25	113:10 116:2
approve 21:25	148:10	attempt 20:24	126:3,8 164:14	123:1,7 125:1
28:2 47:8 64:14	assets 42:20 46:8	attending 8:6	164:19 171:5	130:6 143:11
74:13 75:14	139:15	<b>attorney</b> 5:16 6:5		146:16 151:22
		-		1 10110 101122
	1	•	•	

Page 180

				_
152:18 166:1,5	140:1,22	<b>bill</b> 34:13 73:25	23:17 31:11	C
171:15 172:19	benefits 33:2,12	74:9,17,17,20	37:3 40:2,12	$\overline{\mathbf{C} 1:16 2:1 3:1}$
<b>basic</b> 69:24	33:14,15,23	billing 51:15	62:13,19 71:20	calculate 125:5
basically 51:16	34:11 37:14	75:23	81:4 91:5,9	calculated 112:2
56:21 74:7 87:3	44:5,9,25 45:11	<b>bills</b> 41:23 75:17	92:11 99:18	112:14,18,19
87:8 88:17	45:20 56:4 57:8	<b>bit</b> 20:15 22:8	101:8,14	calculation 17:21
117:23 118:3	57:13 60:4	32:1 45:22 49:1	105:10 117:16	50:2,7,13,15,21
141:13 144:11	69:22 70:1,2	53:19 54:6 60:1	134:14	51:14 111:7
153:17 155:12	71:10,12 94:14	60:3 63:22	bring 20:19	127:2 144:1
156:14 158:3	102:18 110:2	90:16 117:25	74:13 87:7	calculations 51:2
158:21 164:13	110:10,13,21	129:21 131:16	brings 22:2 74:21	calculator 84:17
171:13	110:22 111:15	147:11,13	broader 146:24	call 10:7 53:6
basing 171:13	111:16,17	BLAND 130:11	brokers 120:7	79:4 92:10
<b>basis</b> 42:18 53:21	112:15,20,25	<b>Blend</b> 8:8 29:4	brought 65:20	107:6 133:3,8
65:20 74:2	129:23,24	132:8,18	<b>build</b> 100:15	138:16,17
92:23 103:5	<b>best</b> 19:14 40:3	<b>board</b> 45:20	building 81:12	168:11,16
111:8,10,11	42:11 58:24	<b>Boehm</b> 5:12	96:6,9,11,13	called 11:9 80:1
112:15,21	79:12 107:12	<b>bonus</b> 60:22	<b>built</b> 31:5 77:15	92:17 108:1
113:1 118:25	148:22	<b>book</b> 28:19	97:24	134:4 136:8
119:1 123:4	<b>better</b> 37:23 63:7	<b>bottom</b> 117:10	bundled 91:11	169:6
126:10 143:22	83:18 91:25	120:13 143:17	business 10:20	calls 10:9 28:4
<b>Bear</b> 68:17	beyond 21:4	bought 97:22	10:23 22:13	79:6 92:7 107:7
becoming 20:10	33:23 48:5	120:22 163:3	23:13 24:10	Candace 6:8
began 151:16	64:20	Boulevard 1:17	79:16,19	36:16 82:6
beginning 13:16	<b>bid</b> 16:23 19:1	<b>bound</b> 172:24	107:16,19	83:19,20 95:12
behalf 8:5 86:8	36:25 39:8,13	173:10,17	133:16,18	99:12 105:23
86:22 115:15	40:9 43:2,9	bound/lower	169:1	113:22 168:7
<b>believe</b> 13:10,11	47:25 48:24	172:24	businesses 26:8	<b>cap</b> 165:24
14:24 15:23	56:8 70:14	<b>box</b> 5:5 48:11	58:16,25	<b>capacity</b> 13:7,15
21:24 22:15	91:15,16 92:21	<b>boxes</b> 48:10,17	<b>buy</b> 23:21 26:8	13:17 14:1,4,5
43:14 49:20,25	104:10 105:13	break 30:7 78:20	26:24 44:6	14:8,13,15,21
50:23 52:25,25	105:14	81:12 150:10	52:15 115:17	16:8 17:3,7,18
57:24 63:19	bidding 94:4	150:17 152:22	118:21 140:18	17:24 18:10,19
64:3,16 66:12	105:10	152:24 165:6	141:20 142:12	18:22 20:2,9,25
69:8 113:2	<b>bids</b> 18:13 39:3	168:7,8,13	142:16,17,17	26:6 27:12 28:8
121:13 122:2	42:6 62:5	break-even 150:6	<b>buyer</b> 101:15	32:14,17,25
123:23 124:3	<b>big</b> 30:25 34:15	150:20,24,25	<b>buyers</b> 119:12	38:4,6 41:16
125:18 137:14	46:8 47:19,22	153:6,9	<b>buying</b> 71:1,6	44:3,5,19,22,23
139:17 150:4	77:25 97:5	breaks 156:21	77:16 119:7	44:24 45:10,19
153:16 175:12	98:10 113:8	<b>Brian</b> 88:15	127:23,24	46:10 47:11
<b>benefit</b> 14:13	145:25 148:2	briefly 81:16	140:6 141:19	48:3,20 54:2,5
21:19 37:21	148:20 154:19	85:22	144:17,22	55:11,11 56:6
44:4 45:12	154:22	briefs 176:12	145:6 166:3	84:7 91:7
56:18 71:4	<b>bigger</b> 97:2 146:4	Bright 1:8 7:11	167:21	113:14 125:3,4
115:11 130:1,2	146:12	19:16 20:16		125:10 127:19

				Page 181
127:21 130:1	22:13 23:6	106:14,16,20	121:21 122:3	136:7
144:23 145:19	134:16 141:7	106:25 107:2,3	123:20 125:2	<b>clean</b> 22:14
146:2,4,12,25	149:4,24	107:9,15,21	126:24 149:11	127:10
147:1 148:14	150:13 152:20	109:19 111:21	165:20	<b>clear</b> 78:5 167:10
153:13,18,19	certainly 17:16	113:22 114:1,2	changed 50:14	client 151:1
153:21 154:21	60:25 75:10	114:9,13,21,25	50:15,22 110:7	clients 157:16
155:8 156:15	77:9	117:24 121:1,2	changes 62:2	close 28:19 35:25
162:15 167:4	certainty 20:7	126:15,16,18	68:11 101:1	94:11
capital 5:18 6:6	52:7 72:23	126:21 128:19	characterization	<b>coal</b> 18:3,4 27:19
83:4	128:12,17	129:23 131:3,6	33:8 35:13	54:23,23 55:8
<b>capture</b> 172:17	129:25 130:23	131:8,15,20,23	characterized	72:10,11,11
captured 154:1	certificate 24:2	131:25 132:3,5	13:20	77:5 96:11
<b>carbon</b> 142:3,6	66:19 90:24	132:10,13,16	charge 87:1	156:7
care 148:19	certificates 34:15	132:23 133:1,3	103:14	codes 160:4
careful 36:10	170:25	133:7,9,15,21	charges 94:1	Cohn 5:12 8:22
64:9 65:23	<b>Chair</b> 1:16 2:10	133:24 134:2	check 16:3,4 29:9	coincident
carrying 41:3	2:11,19,24 3:7	135:13,16,19	48:10 68:19	129:10
<b>cart</b> 167:5	3:8 7:3,17 8:11	142:25 145:12	74:5 84:18 85:8	cold 128:7
<b>carts</b> 167:8	8:20,23 9:4,8	154:7,10 157:1	114:15	collect 51:23
case 1:7 8:17	9:14 10:5,11,13	157:5 159:21	<b>choice</b> 61:16	86:24,25 87:5
11:20 30:20	10:19,25 11:4,7	160:13,16,19	<b>choose</b> 61:15	Colonial 133:19
32:3 49:24	12:23 27:2 29:7	160:23 168:1,3	choosing 65:3	169:2
50:24 69:16	29:12,17,22,24	168:6,10,13,16	103:11	<b>color</b> 114:22
78:25 107:4	30:1,3,5,10,15	168:19,25	<b>chose</b> 159:10	Columbus 79:19
112:1 113:10	30:20,23 36:11	169:4 170:2	Christen 8:7	107:20
113:11,15	36:16,18,21	171:8 173:20	Cincinnati 5:13	<b>column</b> 89:15
130:7,14	38:18 39:10,18	173:21,24	<b>circle</b> 145:2	<b>columns</b> 90:10
134:10,13,21	39:20,22,24	174:2,8,12,17	circumstances	combination
137:1 158:24	53:3 60:12 61:3	174:22,25	24:12,13 43:11	46:7 48:22
170:15 173:10	61:5 66:4,5,8	175:2,5,8,10,18	166:20	65:13
173:18 174:13	67:22,24 68:2,3	175:20,22	<b>cite</b> 127:15	combine 89:17
cases 170:14	68:18,24 76:14	176:5,7,10,18	<b>claim</b> 34:23 35:8	<b>come</b> 9:16 58:11
<b>catch</b> 64:11 168:4	78:7,10,12,15	176:23	115:10,14	65:2 71:17 87:8
cause 11:19 65:4	78:17,20,23,24	Chairman 7:2	120:24	94:10 106:22
126:25 134:20	79:9,15,21	30:12 38:14	claiming 35:14	126:4 137:25
152:1	81:18,20,24	47:3 83:24	35:14	<b>comes</b> 14:18 88:2
caveat 140:15	82:2,5,6,10,13	95:15 132:22	clarification	89:12 130:22
<b>CC</b> 19:4	83:14,17,25	168:15,18	38:23	162:16
<b>CCR</b> 28:15	85:12 95:7,9,11	challenges 54:22	clarify 41:25	coming 128:13
cellular 7:21	95:16 98:23	75:17	46:18	146:6
cents 31:23 32:3	99:10,12 102:9	Chandler 47:4	clarity's 45:25	commenced 7:1
32:4 68:3,4	102:11,13	change 38:10,11	classify 98:3,11	96:16
74:2 112:4	104:23,25	64:1 68:13 83:9	98:18	<b>comment</b> 9:16,19
113:5	105:2,20,23	101:7 109:5,8	clause 54:17	10:1
certain 15:2	106:4,7,10,12	113:8,12	56:17 70:17	comments 9:20

# Page 182

	-				
9:23 10:4	<b>common</b> 101:4	153:6,15 155:3	conclude 106:4	consideration	
commercial 94:3	commonwealth	155:25 156:24	170:13	137:18 171:3	
94:21 101:22	1:1 59:14 66:13	158:6,25 161:3	concludes 106:6	considerations	
126:3	171:1	161:4 163:2	<b>Concluding</b> 3:12	54:8,12 55:13	
Commission 1:2	communicating	164:15	conclusion 28:4	57:4 90:3 137:6	
1:17 7:18 8:24	58:19	company's 13:14	174:13	considered 40:3	
13:19 19:11,14	companies 22:18	13:22,23 16:23	condition 126:6	65:22	
19:18,22 20:6	57:19 86:8,21	21:15 26:17	conditions 1:6	considering	
20:19 21:18,25	100:2 123:2	28:14 37:20	7:9 79:1	118:15	
28:1,17,21 29:2	142:5	56:16 70:17	<b>conducted</b> 32:10	constant 58:15	
31:12 38:11	<b>company</b> 1:5,8	72:2 73:6,13	confidential 2:7	113:14 125:19	
42:8 47:7 48:15	5:3 7:8,11 8:6	74:8,15,23	2:10,14,15,16	144:5	
51:13 64:13	11:10,16 14:22	129:9 134:17	2:18,20,23 3:3	<b>construct</b> 69:24	
75:14,19	16:22 17:3	136:12 137:14	4:3,4 9:10 36:1	129:17,19	
134:19 153:5	18:12 19:10,11	139:4 146:16	36:3,13,14,18	construction	
164:11,15	20:14,14,24	148:14,25	36:19 61:18	12:6,8 29:10	
176:9	21:3,7,10 22:1	163:4 165:11	64:10 65:24,25	31:9 55:20	
Commission's	22:16 23:6,7,9	165:17 166:1,8	66:2 67:20,22	66:21 96:8	
19:10 21:17,17	24:20 25:17	166:9 167:12	76:1,3 81:16	97:17	
Commissioner	26:7,12,19	170:14 171:21	82:3 83:13,16	consultant	
2:9,9,12,17,17	27:12 32:10	compared 32:24	83:22 89:23	108:10 134:12	
2:18 3:6,6,7,8	34:6,16 35:13	<b>compares</b> 32:6,8	94:12 95:8,13	134:12	
7:19 29:4 30:15	37:7,17 38:9	compensation	99:7,8,10,13	<b>consumers</b> 32:24	
30:18 39:23	39:6,8,12,14	60:21	102:22 104:1	contained 76:8	
53:5 60:9,12,13	40:8 43:4 45:2	<b>compiling</b> 103:17	102.22 104.1	169:17	
60:15 61:1	47:23,24 51:20	103:18	105:15,21	contemplated	
71:11 76:13,16	56:13 59:15,16	complaining	113:20,23	62:4	
89:5,10 95:18	60:2,8,23 63:11	159:15	113.20,23	contemplates	
98:20,23 99:2	63:21 64:3,21	completely	121:12 125:9	15:7 17:9	
99:11,17 102:8	68:13,15 69:15	129:16	131:14 132:1,1	contemplating	
126:16,17,18	69:18,21 70:1,6	compliance 62:3	132:8,13,16,19	16:19 30:7	
126:19 135:21	70:9,15,20,23	172:11	132:24 152:2	<b>context</b> 49:16	
142:24,25	70:24 71:14,16	comply 101:19	174:16	continue 16:25	
143:2 145:10	71:20,23 72:5,9	119:5	<b>confirm</b> 49:8	47:21 64:20	
154:9,12	72:20 73:3,8	component 54:5	64:4 116:19	<b>continued</b> 2:8,11	
156:25 157:3	74:12,21 75:4,8	63:16 151:9	117:3	2:15,18,23 3:1	
159:23 162:5	75:12,15,21	components	<b>confused</b> 35:1,12	6:1 25:24 36:23	
173:21,22,24	76:7 80:2 84:24	43:16	confusion 75:23	66:7 84:2 99:16	
173:25	108:2 136:2,4	comprehensive	connection 62:25	114:4	
<b>Commissioners</b>	136:11,20,25	163:12	conservative	continues 39:8	
81:5,15	137:7,18 139:1	<b>con</b> 47:13 94:16	172:23	39:12 52:1	
commodities	139:14,19	concept 127:17	<b>consider</b> 19:19	<b>continuing</b> 16:22	
55:1	140:2,17,23,25	concern 52:17	52:2,21 62:12	18:12	
commodity 33:20	146:20 147:18	concerns 40:14	75:12 90:12	<b>continuous</b> 96:7	
54:20 55:7	140.20 147.18	65:4	95:22 143:20	97:16	
57.20 55.1	177.20177.23		<i>JJ.22</i> 17 <i>J.20</i>	27.10	

Page 183

<b>contract</b> 23:9,14	108:6 109:5	160:18 162:18	75:5,13 90:6	120:17,21
26:13,16 32:24	111:24 120:25	164:7,25	97:12 100:22	141:12 142:17
34:18 37:12,25	121:5 131:10	165:12,24	110:20,24	credits 23:12,22
52:10 69:22,25	153:17 161:4	168:22 170:18	111:8,14,16	63:13,15,19
70:21 71:1,2,5	<b>copy</b> 161:11,14	172:12,13	112:14,19,25	69:7 127:1
71:6 74:24	corporate 57:23	corrections 11:23	136:5 153:18	cross 82:12
82:24 84:21	119:12 142:7	11:25 12:15,17	153:19 162:22	135:12 170:1
85:5 91:4,12	corporation 80:9	80:15 108:15	170:20	cross-examinat
92:3 94:17 95:2	86:7 87:3 108:9	108:17 109:11	counsel 8:1,7	2:6,7,8,8,14,15
102:18 118:17	142:18	134:23 169:20	10:7 11:7 79:4	2:16,22,22,23
127:18 134:19	corporations	169:22	79:21 107:6,21	2:24 3:9,11,11
136:3,5 137:12	24:3 142:2	correctly 154:5	169:4	12:22 13:1 27:4
137:22 138:7	<b>correct</b> 9:6 10:16	170:17	<b>country</b> 100:18	36:23 38:20
141:4 142:11	12:3,7 13:8	<b>cost</b> 24:21 26:24	138:12 159:15	69:4 80:23 82:9
143:10 144:17	16:13 17:7 18:5	31:22,25 32:6	County 31:7	82:15 84:2
145:15 146:18	23:16 24:18,19	32:24,25 33:3	55:21 66:10,22	85:14 109:18
150:11,17	26:10 27:20,24	37:21,21 40:16	67:15	109:21 111:22
152:1 153:3,22	31:20 33:1	41:20,24 43:2	<b>couple</b> 20:13	114:4 121:3
contracted 19:12	34:18,19,24	43:12,17,20	38:23,24 80:23	161:1 170:4
23:20 25:19	35:11 41:7,21	44:7 45:16	104:24 105:8	171:10
48:13	46:20 49:9 50:3	51:17 52:7,11	128:23 171:9	crossing 58:9
contracted-for	50:10,15 51:3	53:19,23,24	course 38:11,12	<b>CRR</b> 1:22
55:5	56:24 64:8	56:22,24 70:6,6	53:2 60:11	<b>CT</b> 19:4
contracts 149:13	65:15 67:6	70:7 71:7 73:6	130:10 140:14	cultural 96:1
<b>control</b> 98:3,6,11	70:21,22 71:2,3	74:15,15,17	155:21 159:18	current 26:23
98:17	71:17,18,25	75:8 83:4 92:9	Court 6:8	37:2 46:5 52:22
controlled	72:6,12,17,21	111:1 121:16	courtroom 7:5	53:22 56:16,25
152:12	72:22 73:6,10	121:16 129:22	30:1 133:24	63:20 83:8
convenience	74:3,4,10,18	137:12,21	<b>cover</b> 44:20,21	166:11
170:25	75:6 77:1 79:12	139:7 146:15	45:18,23 46:11	currently 9:11
conversation	84:5 90:8 92:8	150:20 151:1	46:12 158:22	12:12 13:24
29:21 30:9	92:13 98:17	151:15 153:3	<b>covered</b> 54:18	17:8 23:17 42:7
53:16 133:2	99:19 100:3	153:13 158:22	57:8 83:12	46:4 48:12,23
conversations	103:12 110:3,4	159:2 162:24	85:19	50:17,17 54:24
58:15	110:20 111:12	163:11 170:15	CPC 28:14	58:5 70:3 75:22
conversely	111:17,18	170:21,22,23	CRC 1:22	91:15,16 95:21
120:20	112:5,17 115:4	170:24 171:4	create 32:9 92:23	124:21 157:18
Coon 2:21 8:10	115:12,25	cost-benefit	154:14 156:6	<b>customer</b> 23:10
14:22 22:16	116:12,18,21	141:14	<b>creates</b> 32:18	23:14 26:16
26:20 32:10 60:2,8 63:21	117:2,7 120:19	<b>costs</b> 1:9 7:13	56:13	31:23 57:17
· ·	120:22 129:3,4 129:7,14 130:4	24:17 34:6,7 49:13 52:12	<b>creating</b> 28:8 75:12	58:2 67:18 69:13 74:2
68:13,15 69:8 85:2,9 90:17	130:5,6,25	49:13 52:12 56:15 62:3 63:3	<b>credit</b> 24:2 37:1,1	75:23 94:10,21
91:21,24 103:3	130:3,0,25	63:14 65:11	70:11,16 82:19	94:22 112:3
107:8,18 108:1	138:1,3 154:21	67:24,25 74:23	83:2 90:22,24	113:4 126:4
107.0,10 100.1	150.1,5 154.21	07.27,2377.23	05.2 70.22,24	113.7 120.7

Page 184

136:21,23	169:22	depend 18:23	45:5,8 55:22	142:15 162:4
138:8,14,19,20	date 86:25	19:3,5 48:25	57:11 58:14	169:8,11
138:25 139:22	101:22,25	140:3	59:4 67:13	direction 51:13
140:10,11	day 9:25 29:18	depends 141:13	80:10 87:23	directive 19:11
141:6,11,15	30:16 93:4	describe 23:24	95:20,24 126:9	19:14
157:6 159:13	day-ahead 92:21	described 19:21	155:5	directly 110:25
customer's 34:13	92:23 93:1,21	155:9	develops 87:22	136:20,22
customers 5:11	days 29:18	description 97:21	88:5,5	137:24 138:5
19:15 21:13	deal 64:14 76:19	109:9	dictates 93:10	139:1 141:2
22:7,19 23:8,21	153:12	designed 25:22	difference 93:17	142:10
24:3,22 25:12	deals 104:14	25:22 51:23	113:12 122:22	director 11:17
26:2,14,25 33:3	decide 94:4	desirability 67:8	123:3,9 145:19	disagree 26:3
33:6,9,11 34:1	102:21,23	detail 26:21	147:10 164:2,4	33:8 154:3
34:2,5,5,7	103:20	details 22:17	164:9	disclosure 49:15
35:18,21 42:11	<b>decided</b> 62:10,22	determinants	different 28:23	discount 104:13
43:21 44:7 45:5	decision 21:11	51:15	52:2 61:22	discovery 125:17
45:13,16 51:22	38:10 42:19,25	determinate	63:18 66:9,18	157:23
53:21 56:15,22	43:1 44:15	75:11	68:9 71:15	discuss 113:20
56:24 57:19	62:24 67:4	determination	114:22 129:7	161:18
58:16,20 59:2	74:23 87:14	43:24 44:15	133:24 137:5	discussed 83:13
59:15 60:5	decline 15:15	172:16	138:12 142:1	94:7 173:2
65:11 70:2,16	16:5,8,9 152:16	determine 75:19	167:7	discussion 50:19
71:7 72:10,24	declined 151:17	148:11,20	differentiate	128:24 171:12
73:5,10 75:18	158:6	167:2	143:21	discussions 97:11
94:14 111:1	decrease 15:25	determined	difficult 59:10	displaced 153:20
112:9 123:14	dedicate 58:1	70:20	150:23	displaces 127:20
128:17 136:17	<b>defer</b> 37:7,17	detrimental	diminishing 15:3	165:13
137:19 138:21	63:21 64:21	166:1	15:6	diversification
139:10 140:20	deficiency 153:2	develop 88:8	direct 2:6,13,21	42:12 60:23
155:12,15,23	defined 123:17	114:21	3:5,10 11:12,20	diversified
155:24 156:23	degradation	developer 37:14	12:1,6 13:5,13	147:13
157:7,8 158:1,8	84:25 85:4	55:17 63:2,6	14:6 19:22	diversify 42:10
158:12,18,22	degree 52:7	64:19 82:23	27:11 31:14	diversifying
159:2,4,16,20	delay 40:15	84:15 85:6	32:3 33:6,25	44:10
162:7 165:9	delayed 61:23	95:19 96:19	41:1,25 46:1	diversity 21:19
customers' 74:17	<b>deliver</b> 72:11	97:7,12 98:19	80:4,12 81:21	21:21 33:13
D	demand 22:14	99:25 101:4,10	108:4,12	42:16 45:3
daily 126:10	119:8,9,14	104:10	109:12 110:1	71:15 146:21
data 11:21 12:9	129:19 139:22	developers 55:19	110:25 112:1,1	divided 20:4
14:24 15:23	152:18 157:22	100:14	112:13 113:9	divulging 105:19
39:4 80:13,16	160:1	developing 152:1	113:11,16	<b>docket</b> 16:22
80:19 100:10	demanding 25:12	152:3	134:7,20 135:8	<b>document</b> 115:22
108:13,16,20	demonstrate	development	137:16 138:10	<b>dog</b> 146:9 167:5
109:13 135:1,2	22:6 172:25	21:22 22:10 33:16 44:13	138:16 139:16	dogs 167:7
107.15 155.1,2	<b>deny</b> 48:16	33.10 44:13	140:2 142:11	<b>doing</b> 13:3,4 43:7
1	I		I	I

Page 185

				2
87:7 95:5	44:13 45:5,8	163:23	90:22,24,24	entered 138:7
104:13 109:23	55:22 57:10	Electric 80:8	91:5,8,15,16	entering 8:6,16
121:20 130:7	58:14 59:4	108:8	92:9,16,19	26:12 37:25
152:10	67:13 89:12	Electronic 1:5	94:15 113:10	entire 63:11
dollar-per-meg	102:19 103:3,5	7:8	113:13 115:7	151:9
70:4	102:13 105:5,5	<b>ELG</b> 28:15	115:14,19	entirety 47:8
<b>dollars</b> 101:1	104:6 126:9	eligible 82:25	120:18,21,24	48:16
113:5 128:7	134:11 146:17	eliminate 24:17	121:19,23	entitled 41:15
130:9 172:9	148:1 152:9	eliminated 35:11	122:10,19	47:17
173:5	155:5 173:11	37:2	126:6 127:1,20	entitlement
double 118:4,11	economical 63:12	Elliott 166:12,13	127:21,23	28:13 115:20
118:22	economically	email 9:21	128:15 129:2,6	120:23
doubled 116:23	165:8	emissions 24:24	129:21 130:4,6	entity 34:22 46:2
draft 86:3,21	economics 60:4	25:5,13 26:4,9	130:14,21	entrance 8:1
<b>Drive</b> 133:19	144:25 146:22	69:8 142:4	137:24 141:2	entreaty 94:24
169:3	156:20,21	emissions' 24:25	141:17,18	entry 172:5
<b>driven</b> 17:6	171:6	25:4,7	142:17 143:9	environ 158:3
driving 103:15	economies	emissions-free	143:21,21,24	environmental
drop-off 124:19	104:15	25:13	143:25 144:2,2	24:4 95:25
dropped 116:14	<b>Economy</b> 127:10	employed 80:8	144:6,7,8,12	115:10 141:10
116:20	EDR 94:10,16,16	employer 11:15	146:3,6 149:6	141:12,24
<b>DRs</b> 175:13,14	126:5	11:16 80:6	150:24 151:10	142:8 159:7
<b>due</b> 86:25 176:10	effect 71:1,5	108:6,8	152:11,12	160:3
176:19	136:6	encompassed	154:15,15	<b>EPA</b> 21:2
duly 11:10 80:2	effectively 15:1	91:11	155:2,8,13,14	EPA's 62:2,7
108:2 134:5	effects 134:15,16	end-balance 94:1	155:19,25	equal 172:6
169:7	efficient 81:1	ends 18:17	156:7,14 157:9	equation 43:16
duplication	effort 150:19	ener 14:3 130:8	157:22 158:3,9	equipment 97:23
19:20,24 22:4	eggs 159:16,17	energy 1:6,7 7:10	158:24 160:14	97:23
duplicative 20:11	eight 18:18	7:10 14:1 17:3	163:18 165:11	equivalent
	either 20:21 21:7	20:25 22:14	165:17,20,23	147:25
E	25:18 48:13,20	23:12,15,22	166:2,15,21	<b>ESG</b> 142:1 160:4
E 2:1 3:1 4:1	51:20,22 57:22	24:1,11 25:2,11	167:10 171:13	essentially 29:1
earlier 16:11	58:1 63:1 67:10	26:6 32:6,7,19	172:25	32:7 70:25 75:7
69:5 73:23	136:11,12,22	32:20,25 34:14	energy-only	83:3 136:10
83:13 96:4 98:9	137:19 138:25	34:23 35:4,8	129:22	143:25 151:18
124:3 126:23	139:3 152:10	38:4,6 41:16	engage 64:20	155:14 165:5
161:17	elaborate 26:20	44:3,4,18 45:7	engaged 58:19	Establish 1:10
early 151:15	76:8 171:18	48:3 56:4,7,17	59:3	7:14
earth 147:24	ELCC 14:15,19	57:22 60:23	<b>ensure</b> 19:13	estimate 77:4
East 5:13 22:18	14:23,25 15:7	63:13 69:6,14	21:12 43:1	110:10 147:2
22:23 57:19	15:11,15 16:7	70:1,23 72:17	165:5	173:5
easy 53:11	17:22,25 18:3	72:20 73:4,13	enter 1:8 7:12	estimated 41:20
economic 21:22	56:6 84:7 124:4	74:8 76:24,25	94:22 146:18	84:15
22:10 33:14,16	124:10 125:2	77:2,5 79:2	152:17	estimates 67:2
	•		•	

Page 18	3	6
---------	---	---

143:8,9 144:13126:20 128:21117:16,2167:1 70:7 72:8felt 61:estimation 63:13134:7 135:20124:10 128:1474:21 84:25figure	9
	/
	152:6
102:16 143:1 145:11 171:23 91:2 92:14,21 153:6	
	12 108:11
	5 11:19
	115:5
21:4 39:9,13 147:15 148:16 51:10 142:19 144:18 134:2	20
40:5 61:24 62:9 158:17 159:25 expenses 52:3 fact 15:12 76:24 filing 6	6:19
65:7,19 88:2 166:22 <b>expensive</b> 160:8 123:7 147:7 <b>fill</b> 146	:4,24
evaluated 20:14 exceed 111:16 160:9 factor 43:23 62:7 156:8	3 166:7
<b>38:1 39:5 63:17 112:15,20,25 experience 22:17 104:17 filled 6</b>	6:16
65:7         163:11         37:8 49:10         factored 37:14         final 21	1:2 90:1
evaluating 13:24 exceeded 162:24 97:14,20 100:7 factors 44:14 96:20	0 106:22
18:16 19:2 38:2       exceeds 170:21       105:12,18       75:11 76:5 90:2       176:1	0,19
42:12,23         43:15         exception         166:20         123:1         144:7         90:12         94:8         finance	e 88:16
	i <b>al</b> 34:2,4
67:16         78:13 108:11         experts 20:2         facts 47:12         87:7	
	:18 101:15
	25 124:9
	:6 126:12
64:7 94:9 131:9 168:6 <b>explained</b> 173:25 103:6,8 151:11 176:4	
evenly 99:5         174:9,23         explanation         165:22         fingers	
event 136:2 137:7 executed 81:10 61:15 fall 100:20 101:5 firm 15	
8	25 10:8
	0 12:1,10
	9 19:15
	3,25 55:4,4
	66:12
	8 68:7 80:2
10:6 22:5         132:1,2         153:18         120:14 129:2         81:2	
Evidently 83:21         exhibits 113:20         extra 12:2 136:18         fast 124:2         108:2	·
	9 118:2
112:10 169:11 174:12 extremely 166:10 160:7 121:1	/
	3 125:10
$\frac{91.24}{170.3,13,10}$	4 133:4
	5 136:2
	8 148:2,8
	9 167:2
	7 170:10
	0 174:15
	ear 84:14
	2 113:3
	2:11 70:20
	72:21
$105.6109.4$ $94.1100.66$ $58.560.566.74$ $e_{a}u_{a}50.6$ $120.1$	
105:6 108:4 84:11 90:6,6 58:5 60:5 66:24 fella 59:6 128:1	2,10

Page 187

r				2
129:24 149:9	125:18,21,22	<b>fuels</b> 71:17	gears 49:1	2:25 3:9,11 5:7
149:14 167:24	forecasters	<b>fulfill</b> 137:4	general 5:16,17	8:4 29:15 35:25
173:1	149:20	fulfilling 73:9	6:5 11:1 41:19	36:3,7,9 67:23
fixed-cost 52:6	forecasts 166:5	<b>full</b> 10:20 49:15	50:11 60:18	67:25 79:8,22
fixed-tilt 14:17	forever 106:17	79:16 92:14	97:4,21 105:17	80:5,22 81:2,13
15:18 124:15	forgetting 174:19	107:16 116:1	127:16 134:5	81:19,23,25
124:25	forgot 32:22	117:5 122:7	143:6 149:13	82:8 83:11
fleet 118:15	form 138:13	133:16 169:1	General's 8:12	104:24,25
flexibility 156:4	142:13	<b>full-blown</b> 81:9	8:14	105:1,4,7,22,24
flow 29:9 52:13	former 88:15	full-time 55:20	generalities	106:6,24
56:16 70:1	forms 138:11	120:6	54:10	107:22 108:5
flowed 162:16	forward 9:17	fully 99:8 118:7	generally 28:20	107:22 100:5
flowing 56:16	14:2 20:19,24	function 75:3	46:13,24 56:11	114:7,10,16,20
fluctuations	21:11 22:2,6	functionally 23:5	73:5 91:14	117:19 128:20
76:20 77:21	33:17 40:15,19	24:2 26:24 44:6	94:13	128:22 130:12
focused 142:5	42:17,21 43:25	52:14 70:12	generate 15:8	130:14 131:1
171:6	47:9 51:7 62:11	77:16	93:3,7 139:21	131:16,21,24
follow 25:10 27:8	62:12,18,22	functions 90:22	142:11	132:15 160:22
38:22 40:1	65:20 74:13,21	fundamental	generated 25:2	160:24 161:2
76:18 99:3	87:12,15	50:21 143:23	90:25 115:7	161:17 167:25
102:14	101:14 103:15	143:23 149:21	generates 91:5	170:2,3,5 171:7
<b>follow-on</b> 146:10	148:21 150:18	fundamentally	generating 15:13	174:24 175:24
<b>follow-up</b> 40:21	154:21 156:24	50:14	52:11 55:11	176:3
40:23 157:1	forward-looking	fundamentals	56:10,12 70:7	give 9:16,19
159:24	51:15	32:2 74:1	93:15	10:16 18:21
Follow-ups	<b>fossil</b> 71:17	112:23 113:11	generation 13:23	22:16 23:18,20
160:20	fossil-based	130:17 150:3	13:25 19:12	58:7 62:8 69:20
following 112:12	21:16	172:6,7,20	21:20 35:20	79:12 80:20
125:16	four 54:3 66:25	further 22:16	42:10 54:2,25	85:24 89:17
follows 11:11	163:10	26:23 106:7	58:7 92:6	90:19 104:13
80:3 108:3	Frankfort 1:17	121:1 131:1,5	118:15,16	107:12 109:14
134:6 169:7	5:5,18 6:6	167:25 168:1	127:24 129:14	127:16 133:12
footprint 22:23	frankly 156:10	171:7	166:14	143:6 168:22
35:5 142:6	<b>Friday</b> 175:18,19	<b>future</b> 15:16 31:2	generator 25:1,7	170:10
forecast 53:22	front 42:8 54:15	74:14 102:3	geographically	given 9:5 15:9
92:23 93:3	99:23 169:10	151:21	24:24	21:1,6 22:17
112:24 113:10	FRR 46:2 47:17		geopolitical	40:14 47:16
119:2 143:23	fruition 65:2	<u> </u>	71:24	51:10 54:23
143:23 147:3	FTEs 55:21	<b>gap</b> 165:25 166:7	Georgia 133:20	62:1 93:2 96:18
148:25 149:21	67:14,14	gas 54:21 55:7	169:3	96:18 101:20
150:3,14	fuel 54:17 56:17	71:25 72:6	getting 35:25	102:5
152:21 171:14	70:17 71:15	76:21 77:5,22	36:12,12 43:1	gives 14:19 33:11
171:15,17,20	136:7 146:21	156:7	94:11	55:3 136:17
172:10	fuel-independent	GATS 114:19	gift 176:8	<b>glad</b> 134:1
forecasted	71:21	115:6 120:15	<b>Gish</b> 2:13,19,21	Glass 2:6,11 5:3
	•		•	•

Page 188

8:3,4 10:9 11:8	51:7 53:11,14	157:22 158:3	118:10	131:8,15,20,23
11:13 12:21	53:15,15,18	157:22 158:5	Harlee 8:4	131:25 132:3,5
13:11 28:3				131:25 132:3,5
	56:21,23 58:10 62:23 74:7	<b>grid</b> 100:25 102:4	harm 33:6,9 34:1	132:23 133:1,3
68:22,25 69:2		-	34:2,4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
76:11 79:6	76:25 77:21,22	gross 110:20,23	harmed 159:4	133:7,9,15,21
106:23 107:7	87:3 91:14	ground 31:19	harmful 156:23	133:24 134:2
117:18 131:12	104:5,5 119:16	81:12 85:20	165:8	135:13,16,19
135:14 161:11	125:6,14	group 86:10 87:6	Hatton 1:16 2:10	142:25 145:12
161:14 176:1,4	130:20 140:6	172:11	2:11,19,24 3:7	154:7,10 157:1
176:6,8,17,22	140:25 141:18	grouping 17:2	3:8 7:3,17 8:11	157:5 159:21
<b>go</b> 16:17 18:1	145:22 148:10	groups 87:2	8:20,23 9:4,8	160:13,16,19
23:7 30:11 36:3	149:3,8 167:3	guaran 152:25	9:14 10:5,11,13	160:23 168:1,3
36:13 47:15	174:1	guarantee 152:8	10:19,25 11:4,7	168:6,10,13,16
48:20 50:15	good 7:3 8:3,21	152:25 164:11	12:23 27:2 29:7	168:19,25
56:1 60:17,17	8:23,25 10:11	guess 20:6 24:23	29:12,17,24	169:4 170:2
61:17,25 64:10	10:12 27:6,7	26:3 35:1,2	30:1,3,5,10,15	171:8 173:21
65:8,23,23,25	30:3 31:4,18	38:23 44:17	30:20 36:11,16	173:24 174:2,8
81:15 82:1	57:5 59:6,13,14	64:20 113:9	36:21 38:18	174:12,17,22
83:15 86:14,23	59:14,15,16	122:1 175:24	39:10,18,20,22	174:25 175:2,5
92:2 99:6	61:6,7 82:17,18	guidance 86:20	39:24 53:3	175:8,10,18,20
100:16 101:11	85:16,17	<b>guy</b> 120:21	60:12 61:3,5	175:22 176:5,7
101:18 102:22	101:17 102:18		66:5,8 67:22,24	176:10,18,23
104:1 105:15	106:16,21	H	68:2,3,18,24	Havens 8:4
105:17 106:25	109:24,25	<b>H</b> 4:1	76:14 78:7,10	head 15:22,25
117:10 121:25	111:24,25	half 85:1 113:5	78:12,15,17,20	17:24 18:8
124:6 125:6	143:3,4 170:11	163:19 166:4	78:24 79:9,15	28:10 46:14
139:10 145:22	173:9	hand 10:14 79:10	79:21 81:18,20	47:2 59:23
147:10 149:7	Goodness 29:14	107:9 133:10	81:24 82:2,6,10	66:17 68:12
149:16,18	Gotcha 82:10	155:16 168:20	82:13 83:14,17	heard 71:9 73:8
150:3 157:3	104:22	handy 161:9	83:25 85:12	73:23 84:8,9
168:4	gotta 102:6	happen 58:13	95:9,11,16	hearing 1:15 7:1
goal 58:23	government	59:19 61:20	98:23 99:10,12	7:24 29:5
<b>goals</b> 24:4,7	127:7,8,9	83:20 138:9	102:9,11,13	176:25
57:23 86:17,18	great 36:8 55:14	151:19	104:23,25	hearings 30:6
87:17 119:13	70:18 73:22	happened 151:13	105:2,20,23	heavily 157:20
142:1,7,19	106:23,24	151:23	106:4,7,10,12	heavy 157:21
goes 14:20 22:1	greater 140:1	happening 97:19	106:14,16,20	hedge 33:18
78:15 83:7	green 22:24 24:6	happens 36:25	106:25 107:3,9	44:10 72:16
93:20 115:20	25:11 34:21,23	92:16,17	107:15,21	128:5,10
124:25 125:19	35:8 115:16,19	105:11 146:6	109:19 111:21	147:14
going 7:5,22	120:18,21	166:12,13	113:22 114:2,9	Hello 168:19
15:10 16:17	141:6,7,18	happy 16:1 36:4	114:13,21,25	help 33:19 54:2,6
20:18 29:13,19	154:14,15	Harbison 5:4,8	117:24 121:2	86:3,4
31:22 45:17,22	155:2,13,14,19	8:5	126:16,18,21	helps 59:12
47:3 48:10 49:1	155:25 157:9	hard 58:17	128:19 131:3,6	Hey 86:11,15
	I	I	I	1

Page 189

				rage 100
88:14,17	82:14 84:1	hypothetical 47:4	includes 163:13	141:6,11,14
101:21	106:11 107:22	147:16 148:15	including 86:8	155:23,24
hi 13:3 121:5	109:17 111:20	163:20,24	170:14	158:17,22
170:9	113:19 131:5	hypothetically	incorporate	160:1,2,5
high 90:9 119:9	132:4,9 133:5	47:7,12 48:16	86:22	industrial-size
144:22 145:6	168:5,12 169:5	51:25 147:20	Incorporated	57:17
146:15 150:6	169:25 174:14	51.25 147.20	133:19	industrials 158:2
151:15,15	176:22	I	<b>incorrect</b> 162:3	158:25 159:1
160:1,2,5 163:3	hope 58:13,18	idea 123:22	increase 15:25	159:25
166:3	87:18,19	126:13 150:7	21:8 34:12	industry 137:25
higher 18:4	hopefully 58:2	ideal 171:19	41:22 56:22,24	138:4,5 157:21
92:10 97:18	127:15	Ideally 103:22	73:24,25 74:9	<b>Inflation</b> 37:15
113:9 127:21	hoping 58:10,13	identified 13:15	116:10 117:1	information
127:25 130:21	59:10	21:1 42:4,15	167:21	11:24 31:10
130:23 141:21	<b>horse</b> 167:6	44:3 175:17	increased 54:21	41:11 51:2
144:6 172:7	hour 12:12,13	identify 8:1 42:9	63:3,4 72:10	55:19 60:25
		43:4 57:9	116:17	64:22 66:18
<b>highest</b> 35:16 40:13 120:8	52:10 56:10,12	110:15,23	<b>increases</b> 40:16	
40:13 120:8	64:15 70:6,19	identifying 58:20		68:6,14 69:9 76:2 2 8 00:10
	90:25 91:4,5,9	imagine 149:1	74:18	76:3,3,8 90:19
highlight 114:22	92:5,12 102:17	impact 32:18	increasing	114:8,17,18
highlighted	106:22 116:5,8	37:9,11 41:21	151:11	116:2 157:23
114:8	116:15,18,21	63:25 67:7,17	incremental	158:5 175:15
highlighting	116:24 117:1,7	109:5 111:2	127:19	informed 151:22
114:11,12,22	136:19 140:12	112:3 113:4	incurred 153:20	infrastructure
115:23	144:16,16,21	impacted 72:2	incurs 34:6	80:10
hinted 54:7	145:4 150:21	impacted 72.2 impacts 32:9	independently	<b>inherent</b> 144:21
hire 67:5	163:18 167:20	71:24 72:8	139:20	inherently 143:8
hired 67:3	172:9,9 173:5	74:20	indicated 29:3	initial 122:17
historic 49:10	hourly 143:22		75:8 94:20	125:7
historically 49:8	149:22 171:21	important 88:4	indicates 53:22	initiatives 24:6
history 151:23	hours 84:12	89:2 90:3	164:24	inserted 12:2
152:19,19	117:15,17,22	137:17 171:3	indicating 28:17	installed 97:23
hit 88:20	118:2 123:12	173:18	indiscernible	instance 24:10
hold 98:17	123:13,16,17	impression 29:13	29:21 30:9 90:5	127:9
106:17	123:21 128:24	in-house 8:7	93:19 105:5	instructions 9:23
hole 146:4,25	128:25 144:5	incentive 140:24	133:2 138:2	Integrated 87:6
<b>holiday</b> 123:10	housekeeping	141:17,22	145:21 162:13	intend 119:24
home 88:20	131:17	include 33:15	162:14	137:1 148:7
honest 28:22	houses 120:4	47:17 86:5	individual 89:4	intended 85:21
121:6 142:16	huge 55:18	164:24 171:21	industrial 5:11	intent 118:18,20
Honor 8:3,21	157:16	172:3	22:14 23:14	intention 135:7,7
27:3 39:19	hundred 18:6,19	included 47:14	24:3 94:20	interactions
61:11 65:18	21:16 54:25	50:13 51:15	126:3 136:21	22:19
67:19 68:5,8,22	163:24 164:2	86:16 120:2	136:23 138:8	interconnect
78:9,14,19	<b>hurt</b> 147:14	141:9 164:18	138:14,19,20	100:24
L				

Page 190

interconnection	154:21 155:8	keeping 118:9	134:4 154:14	58:23 60:18,24
81:4,7,9 96:3	155:19 156:20	keeps 35:3,5	154:24 157:7	61:12 62:4 63:2
96:14 98:6	162:12	Ken 8:4	157:19 160:13	64:17,19,25
100:13,19,22	issued 28:17	Kennedy 133:18	161:18 162:12	65:10 66:17
100:22 101:17	39:14	Kenneth 5:7	170:9 171:1,13	67:8,15 68:12
101:18,21	issues 156:15	Kentucky 1:1,5,7	172:6,10	74:16 75:16,17
102:5	it'd 48:5	1:16,18,23 5:3	Kentucky-sited	77:11,13 78:1
interest 17:9,13	<b>ITC</b> 82:21,22,25	5:5,9,11,18 6:6	117:8	78:15 81:5
27:16 28:1,13	83:1,5,7	7:8,11,18 8:5	kgish@stites.c	82:21 85:20
28:24 41:8 46:9	item 75:23	10:9,24 11:9,16	5:10	86:13,17,24
69:13 145:15	121:15 124:8	13:6 16:18,19	kglass@stites.c	87:5,16 88:3,4
interrupt 29:8	items 50:14 75:16	17:9,12 18:9,10	5:6	88:12,12,14,19
interruption	89:1 175:17	18:17 19:7,8	kilowatt 144:16	88:25 89:1 90:5
77:24		20:8 22:22,24	kind 40:25 52:20	90:8,9,17 91:24
Intervenor's	J	27:16,21,25	54:9 58:12	92:20,22 93:7
61:12	<b>J</b> 1:22 5:7,16	28:7,24,25	64:23 69:20	94:12,23 95:11
<b>Intervenors</b> 64:8	133:18	30:17 31:1,5	77:23 80:25	95:23 96:7,8,9
133:3 168:16	jackhammer	41:6 43:11 46:1	85:22,24 93:16	96:13 97:4,8,11
Intervenors'	53:10	46:5,19,24	94:23 104:14	98:12,21
127:14	jackhammering	47:10 48:18	123:6 140:22	100:14 101:22
Intervention	29:18,19	49:25 52:2 55:5	146:2 173:13	101:23,23
5:17 6:5	January 1:15	60:21 67:4,10	<b>KIUC</b> 4:3,4,4	102:24 103:4
introduce 8:14	175:16	78:25 79:6 80:1	8:19,20,22 11:2	104:2,7,12,13
133:5	jkylercohn@b	84:14 85:6 86:9	114:2 130:12	104:14 105:17
invertors 96:15	5:15	86:10,13,20	132:1,2,2 169:6	112:11 114:10
investment 37:1	<b>job</b> 55:20 59:6	87:2,12,23 88:2	174:15	117:15 123:24
55:17 82:19	100:15 120:6	88:11,16 89:2	<b>KIUC's</b> 174:20	127:3 137:19
83:2	jobs 31:9 55:20	90:3 91:4 92:4	know 15:8,22,24	138:6 139:24
investor 141:17	66:9,21,23,25	92:13,20 94:3	17:14,14,22,24	140:8,9,11,17
142:14	67:23	94:19 95:5	18:20,20,25	140:18 141:13
investors 140:24	Jody 5:12 8:22	96:18 101:13	20:20 22:20,20	141:16,21
involved 94:8	<b>John</b> 6:4 7:19 9:2	101:13 102:21	22:23 24:2,3,5	142:1,2,18
103:10	joining 7:18 9:2	103:20 104:3	25:8,18,21	143:12 145:2
involvement	jointly 8:19	104:11 107:7	26:13 28:10	146:8,9,20
134:10,13	Jr 5:7	108:1 112:9	29:22 34:25	149:7 150:10
<b>iron</b> 31:18	<b>Jurgens</b> 6:3 8:25	115:24 116:4	35:3 36:25 38:9	150:17,23
<b>IRP</b> 13:14 17:8	85:18 121:5	117:6,7,9,13	38:10 42:11	151:10,22
27:13 28:6,11	jurisdictions	118:4,7,12,14	43:3,20 45:1,12	152:9,10 153:4
42:7 47:19,20	138:12	118:25 119:2	45:25 46:14	153:5,8,21
irradiance 93:8	justification	119:16,22	47:1,2 48:4	155:11,18,22
issue 30:25 86:7	22:12 167:3	123:14,19,21	49:6 50:16 51:1	156:1,10,19,22
86:11,23	K	124:7 126:10	51:9,16,22 52:7	157:7,21,21,25
118:24 119:14	<b>Katie</b> 5:3 8:4	127:12 129:6	54:21,23 56:4,5	157:25 158:23
145:25 146:4	keep 41:19	129:13,19	56:10 57:1,6,8	159:11,14
146:23 148:4	125:18	131:12 133:21	57:20,23 58:17	164:2 166:19
	123.10			

Page 191

	1	1	1	I
166:21 167:24	L	legal 28:4 98:16	listed 37:20	146:23 153:1
170:9	L 5:11	lesser 77:11	little 20:15 22:8	looked 42:5
knowing 128:16	Lacy 8:14	let's 23:10 28:22	32:1 35:1 45:22 119:1	
knowledge 49:18	laid 69:18	30:11 31:21	49:1 53:15,19	looking 21:14
79:13 91:18,19	land 98:1,6,11	34:14 47:9,9	54:6 60:1,3	22:20 26:17
107:12 118:14	100:17	51:25 56:1	63:22 90:16	38:3 45:6 55:10
123:7 124:21	landing 126:7	57:16 65:24	124:17 129:21	57:17,20 59:8
125:1 129:15	Lane 3:5 8:18	78:20,21 90:16	144:23,24	105:2 118:25
<b>known</b> 173:1	133:6,8,17	106:25 116:7	147:11 151:18	122:10 126:4
<b>knows</b> 91:24	134:4	130:15 136:21	168:7,8 176:5	143:5
106:16	language 28:20	144:20 147:15	live 86:23	looks 32:11 59:9
<b>KOGUT</b> 1:22	large 28:8 54:4	147:15,17	lkogut@mclen	59:10 103:24
Kollen 3:5 8:18	94:21 99:25	153:10 154:13	1:24	130:8,14
61:13 111:5	100:11,25	168:13	LLC 1:8,22 7:12	lose 21:7 40:17
127:18 133:6,8	123:3 126:3	letter 176:7	LMP 93:13	62:16 93:16
133:9,17 134:4	128:13 167:2	level 50:21 90:9	LMPs 93:6	loser 166:2
134:9 145:13	largely 19:3,5	150:16 172:1	load 15:4 19:13	losing 17:6 61:17
168:4	49:12	172:17,19	128:13 129:18	145:4
Kollen's 127:14	larger 7:5 23:10	Lexington 5:9	locally 66:16,25	loss 34:2 144:21
Kurtz 2:7,8,14,15	52:7 148:9,10	<b>lieu</b> 141:23 162:8	67:5	148:24 149:2,5
2:22,23 3:10	166:24	life 38:8 47:21	locate 22:21	149:8 163:1
5:11,12 8:21,22	largest 113:12	light 59:12	26:17 45:6	167:21
11:3 27:2,3,5	LAURA 1:22	likelihood 173:8	57:17 58:3,21	losses 143:10
28:5,6 29:6,7	law 83:9 101:7	limitation 56:5	140:23,25	144:14 145:3
29:11 30:21,23	lawyer 130:8	limited 56:6	141:1 155:4	Lost 163:5
30:24 36:2,6,8	lead 146:23	limiting 143:25	located 23:19	lot 17:6 83:20
36:15,21,22,24	147:24 148:18	line 12:5 14:7	27:19 33:18	85:19 93:20
38:14,17,24	leadership 86:14	27:15 41:3 75:3	44:12	100:19 102:14
41:18,19 78:8,9	leading 145:25	75:16,23	long 79:3 175:12	115:23 122:17
82:13,14,16	166:23	108:18,21	175:22	146:12 151:1
83:15 84:1,3	leads 40:25 44:18	lines 12:1 41:2	long-term 86:18	152:14 156:3
85:11 106:10	Leah 3:10 8:18	143:7	87:19 149:13	157:16,20
106:11 111:20	168:18 169:2,6	link 9:23	longer 65:5	Louisiana 141:5
111:21,23	169:11	liquidate 24:20	151:10	158:16 159:24
113:19 114:3,5	lease 96:22,25	26:19 45:12	look 14:19 15:24	Louisville 1:23
114:12,14,24	97:1,10,15,18	118:20	16:1 40:8,12	157:12
115:1,2 117:23	leased 96:24	liquidated 93:11	42:7 47:9 48:18	love 176:7
118:3 120:25	leases 97:2	liquidates 70:9	62:1 88:13,18	<b>low</b> 140:12
131:4,5,17,24	least-cost 26:1	liquidation 32:14	88:23 90:16	141:21 144:22
168:11,18	41:4 42:3,15	70:25 71:4	100:1 114:16	145:6 163:3
169:5,9,25	43:9,18 65:21	list 20:16,18	116:7 121:10	low-cost 56:7
174:7,14	Leave 79:2	25:24 27:12	121:19 124:24	lower 43:20
<b>kW</b> 23:11	leaves 16:12	40:18 86:14	125:9 128:1	122:16,19
Kyler 5:12 8:22	led 40:22	87:15 88:12,18	139:14 142:20	172:5
	<b>left</b> 20:3 34:21,21	88:23 103:21	143:17 144:14	lowest 171:4

Page 192

Heari

Internal i					Taye 172	
	173:5	152:17 155:17	meeting 38:6	Mike 8:13.21	monev 37:23,24	
			0		•	
lunch 106:21         marketing 118:8         12:13 64:15         37:19,22,22         150:15 151:2           M         32:13 55:7         90:25 91:9         110:3,14 11:8         170:20           M 5:3         37:17,68:16         Mary 7:19         102:17 116:4,8         111:9,13,15         month 31:24 68:4           Ma'am 9:7 35:25         149:6,7 151:16         116:14,18,21         112:16,21,25         month 31:24 68:4           Mary 7:19         116:24 117:1,7         170:16         113:5 117:12           Matter 2:6,6,11         144:16,21         millions 101:1         month 31:24 68:4           14:3 132:25         20:2 74:5,6,11         144:16,21         minor 11:25         month 6:3 9:1           main 5:4,8 49:4         130:8 150:20         147:25 150:21         minor 11:25         morning 7:3 8:3           Matter 2:4         magawatts 13:7         47:4 66:1         59:25 61:6,7           maximg 45:18         Matters 2:4         magawatts 13:7         47:4 66:1         59:25 61:6,7           manager 80:10         Matters 2:4         magiunder 19:17         13:15,16,17         minute 30:11         85:17 12:2:3           mandate 127:11         maximum 119:16         16:20 17:6 18:1         misunderstood         9:12 175:10           March 176:11,19         8		-				
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				-		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		0				
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	M				-	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	<b>M</b> 5:3			-		
36:17         68:16         Mary 7:19         116:24         117:1,7         170:16         113:5         117:12           79:22         83:11,11         materialize 94:17         117:15,17,22         millions 101:1         monthly 41:22           85:13         102:10         math 16:15         18:7         118:1         136:19         mid 54:15         81:18           114:3         132:25         20:2         74:5,6,11         140:12         144:5         160:22         73:25         74:2           main 5:4,8         49:4         130:8         150:20         147:25         150:21         minor 11:25         53:9           maintenance         matter 7:7,25         163:18         167:14,20         minus 16:11         8:21,23,25         67:1         102:16         135:9         167:14,20         minute 30:11         10:11,12         8:21,23,25           67:1         maximize 119:17         13:15,16,17         minuse 78:21         82:17,18         85:16           103:15,19         120:9         14:8,11,3,14         missing 162:1         85:17         122:2           mander 127:11         maximum 119:16         16:6,10,11,12         missinderstood         9:12         9:12         9:12         9:12         9:12	<b>ma'am</b> 9:7 35:25		,			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	36:17 68:16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
85:13       102:10       math 16:15       118:1       136:19       mind 54:15       118:1       16:22       17:21         114:3       132:25       20:2       74:5,6,11       140:12       144:5       160:22       17:21         main 5:4,8       49:4       130:8       150:20       147:25       150:21       minor       11:25       53:9         maintenance       matter 7:7,25       163:18       167:14,20       minus 16:11       82:1,23,25       66:3       82:1,23,25       66:6       66:1       59:25       61:6,7         making 45:18       maximize 119:17       13:15,16,17       minutes 78:21       82:17,18       82:17,18       85:16         55:2       97:16,17       120:9       14:8,11,13,14       missing 162:1       85:17       123:23         146:1       maximum 119:16       16:6,10,11,12       missing 162:1       85:17       123:23         146:1       maximum 119:16       16:20       16:20       17:6       18:11       9:12       17:12:1         manager 80:10       95:1       122       18:6,19       20:2,4       62:15       Mountain 1:8       19:11       12:175:10         March 176:11,19       maxise 11       45:19       48:6       12:22	79:22 83:11,11	č	,			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	-				e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	
175:1 main 5:4,8 49:4 maintenance 41:12,13 66:24 67:184:18 116:11 130:8 150:20 matter 7:7,25 102:16 135:9 102:16 135:9 172:9,9 173:5mine 96:11 174:4 minor 11:25 108:17 minuts 16:11 minuts 30:11 10:11,12 27:6,7making 45:18 55:2 97:16,17 103:15,19 146:1Matters 2:4 maximut 119:17 120:9megawatts 13:7 13:15,16,17 14:8,11,13,14minute 30:11 missing 162:1 missing 162:1 missing 162:1 missing 162:1 missing 162:1 missing 162:1 missing 162:1Moriah 6:3 9:1 53:9manager 80:10 95:1 95:1McLendon-Ko 1:2216:017:6 18:1 16:20 17:6 18:1 18:6,19 20:2,4minutes 78:21 62:15Motoms 9:9,11 missing 162:1 missing 162:1 m	114:3 132:25					
main 5:4,8 49:4 maintenance 41:12,13 66:24 67:1130:8 150:20 matter 7:7,25 102:16 135:9147:25 150:21 163:18 167:4 163:18 167:4 108:17minor 11:25 108:17 minus 16:1153:9 morning 7:3 8:3 8:21,23,2567:1 67:1148:8 159:3172:9,9 173:5 maximize 119:17minute 30:11 13:15,16,1710:11,12 27:6,7 59:25 61:6,7maximize 119:17 103:15,19120:914:8,11,13,14 14:8,11,13,14missing 162:1 missing 162:182:17,18 85:16 85:17 123:23manager 80:10 95:1122meas 58:11 64:17 67:8 76:216:20 17:6 18:1 87:25 92:18missing 162:1 14:8;19 48:19missinderstood 91:2 175:10March 176:11,19 margin 145:1104:1,5 116:11 104:1,5 116:11148:17,18 148:17,1828:8,18,25 22:2 27:17,1831:11 37:3 40:3 31:11 37:3 40:3Marte 2:21 107:18 108:1 107:18 108:1128:14 141:25 128:14 141:2522:10 23:24 22:10 23:2438:4,7,8,12 38:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11 91:10 92:11market 32:7 48:6,21,24145:17 152:18 157:12 17:1944:18,19 50:1 135:22 161:3 merly 127:20146:5,7,13 merly 127:2091:10 92:11 146:5,7,1344:14 54:20 55:1 56:9 63:24 64:23 72:12,17 77:17 72:12,17 77:17 72:2 92:11,22meat 46:17 meat 46:17 meat 46:17 meat 46:17merly 127:20 merly 127:20mitchell's 18:3 merly 127:20 met 86:13 merly 127:20mitchell's 18:3 mouth 150:14 mouth 150:14152:21 mouth 150:224 22:11,22meas 18:6 merly 127:20merly 22:3 merly 127:20mitchell's 18:3 mouth 150:14	175:1					
maintenance 41:12,13 66:24 67:1matter 7:7,25 102:16 135:9163:18 167:4 163:18 167:4108:17 minus 16:11morning 7:3 8:3 8:21,23,25making 45:18 55:2 97:16,17 103:15,19Matters 2:4 maximize 119:17 120:9megawatts 13:7 13:15,16,17minus 16:11 minus 16:118:21,23,25 8:21,23,25146:1 manager 80:10 95:1maximum 119:16 12:216:6,10,11,12 16:20 17:6 18:1 18:6,19 20:2,4minus 16:11 45:19 48:199:12 175:10 9:12 175:10March 176:11,19 Marie 2:2112:2 118:6,17 104:1,5 116:1116:6,125:4 14:8:17,1817:10,13,19,22 20:16 23:1820:16 23:18 21:11 37:3 40:3March 176:11,19 Marie 2:21128:14 141:25 107:18 108:1 104:1,5 116:11148:17,18 145:17 152:1828:8,18,25 41:1,24 42:240:12 62:13,19 44:18,19 50:1Markt 32:7 63:24 64:23 72:12,17 77:17 77:22 92:11,22means 18:11 71:19,23 74:7 170:2013:522 161:3 merts 43:6 metering 120:3147:7 134:1417:10,20 met 86:13 metering 120:314:12 47:17 47:19 mix 42:17 47:19152:21 12:11 22:8	main 5:4,8 49:4		,			
41:12,13 66:24 67:1102:16 135:9 102:16 135:9167:14,20 167:14,20Inorming 1:2:13;25 minus 16:11 minus 30:11Inorming 1:2:13;25 8:21,23,25making 45:18 55:2 97:16,17 103:15,19Matters 2:4 120:9megawatts 13:7 13:15,16,17initue 30:11 minutes 78:21 missing 162:1 $8:21,23,25$ 8:21,7,18 85:16 8:17,123:23146:1 manager 80:10 95:1maximum 119:16 1:2216:6,10,11,12 12:9minutes 78:21 14:8,11,13,14 16:6,10,11,12 $8:17,123:23$ misunderstood95:1 95:1 95:11:22 1:2218:6,19 20:2,4 45:19 48:1962:15 Mitchell 17:7,9Mountain 1:8 7:12 19:16mandate 127:11 manner 34:9 March 176:11,19 87:25 92:18Matter,17:1148:16 104:1,5 116:1125:22 27:17,18 148:17,18Mitchell 17:7,9 20:16 23:18March 176:11,19 Marie 2:21 107:18 108:1 108:1128:14 141:25 128:14 141:2522:10 23:24 22:10 23:2438:4,7,8,12 38:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11 91:10 92:11market 32:7 63:24 64:23 72:12,17 77:17 77:22 92:11,22mean 18:11 71:19,23 74:7 meant 46:17 merits 43:6 metering 120:3Mitchell's 18:3 mix 42:17 47:19 mix 42:17 47:19 mix 42:17 47:19mouth 150:14 152:21 move 10:5 20:24 21:11 22:8						
67:1101:19:20172:9,9173:5minute 30:11101:1,12 27:6,7making 45:18Matters 2:4megawatts 13:7177:9,9173:5minute 30:1110:11,12 27:6,755:2 97:16,17maximize 119:1713:15,16,17minute 30:1110:11,12 27:6,7103:15,19120:913:15,16,17minute 30:1159:25 61:6,7148:8 109:17120:914:8,11,13,14missing 162:185:17 123:23146:1maximum 119:1616:6,10,11,12missing 162:185:17 123:23manager 80:10McLendon-Ko16:20 17:6 18:1misunderstood9:12 175:1095:11:2218:6,19 20:2,462:15Mountain 1:8manner 34:964:17 67:8 76:284:6 125:417:10,13,19,2220:16 23:18March 176:11,1987:25 92:18147:17 148:1625:22 27:17,1831:11 37:3 40:3margin 145:1104:1,5 116:11148:17,1828:8,18,2540:12 62:13,19Marie 2:21118:6,17mentioned 16:1130:25 37:2471:20 81:4 91:5107:18 108:1128:14 141:2522:10 23:2438:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11market 32:7145:17 152:1841:1,24 42:246:9 48:1399:18 101:8,1445:18 46:25157:12 171:1944:18,19 50:1146:5,7,13105:10 117:1648:6,21,24means 18:11135:22 161:3147:7134:1454:20 55:1 56:971:19,23 74:7merly 127:20Mitchell's 18:3mouth 150:1463:24 64:2371:19,23 74:7merly 127:20mix 42:17 47:19152:21		,			0	
making 45:18Matters 2:4megawatts 13:747:4 66:159:25 61:6,755:2 97:16,17maximize 119:1713:15,16,17minutes 78:2182:17,18 85:16103:15,19120:914:8,11,13,14missing 162:185:17 123:23146:1maximum 119:1616:6,10,11,12missing 162:185:17 123:23146:1maximum 119:1616:6,10,11,12missing 162:185:17 123:23120:91:2218:6,19 20:2,462:159:12 175:1095:11:2218:6,19 20:2,462:159:12 175:10manner 34:964:17 67:8 76:284:6 125:417:10,13,19,2220:16 23:18March 176:11,1987:25 92:18147:17 148:1625:22 27:17,1831:11 37:3 40:3margin 145:1104:1,5 116:11148:17,1828:8,18,2540:12 62:13,19Marie 2:21118:6,17mentioned 16:1130:25 37:2471:20 81:4 91:5107:18 108:1128:14 141:2522:10 23:2438:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11market 32:7145:17 152:1841:1,24 42:246:9 48:1399:18 101:8,1445:18 46:25157:12 171:1944:18,19 50:1146:5,7,13105:10 117:1648:6,21,24means 18:11135:22 161:3147:7134:1454:20 55:1 56:971:19,23 74:7merity 43:6mix 42:17 47:19152:2172:12,17 77:17170:20met 86:13mix 42:17 47:19152:2172:22 92:11,22measure 88:6metering 120:35:1421:11 22:8	-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
55:2 97:16,17 103:15,19 146:1maximize 119:17 120:913:15,16,17 14:8,11,13,14minutes 78:21 missing 162:182:17,18 85:16 85:17 123:23manager 80:10 95:1maximum 119:16 McLendon-Ko16:6,10,11,12 16:20 17:6 18:1misunderstood 62:1582:17,18 85:16manadate 127:11 manner 34:9mean 58:11 64:17 67:8 76:216:20 17:6 18:1 87:25 92:18misunderstood 62:159:12 175:10March 176:11,19 margin 145:1mean 58:11 104:1,5 116:11148:17,18 104:1,5 116:1125:22 27:17,18 118:6,1731:11 37:3 40:3 104:1,5 116:11Marie 2:21 107:18 108:1 market 32:7118:6,17 128:14 141:25mentioned 16:11 22:10 23:2430:25 37:24 38:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11 91:10 92:11market 32:7 48:6,21,24 54:20 55:1 56:9 63:24 64:23 72:12,17 77:17 77:22 92:11,22157:12 171:19 meant 46:17 170:20 measure 88:641:1,24 42:2 metring 120:346:9 48:13 mix 42:17 47:19 mkurtz@bklla99:18 101:8,14 152:24 21:11 22:8	making 45:18		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
103:15,19Indication (17)1010;10101010;1010146:1120:914:8,11,13,14missing 162:185:17 123:23manager 80:10McLendon-Ko16:6,10,11,12missing 162:1motions 9:9,1195:11:2218:6,19 20:2,462:159:12 175:10mandate 127:11mean 58:1145:19 48:1964:17 67:8 76:284:6 125:417:10,13,19,22March 176:11,1987:25 92:18147:17 148:1625:22 27:17,1831:11 37:3 40:3margin 145:1104:1,5 116:11148:17,1828:8,18,2540:12 62:13,19Marie 2:21118:6,17mentioned 16:1130:25 37:2431:11 37:3 40:3107:18 108:1128:14 141:2522:10 23:2438:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11market 32:7145:17 152:1841:1,24 42:246:9 48:1399:18 101:8,1445:18 46:25157:12 171:1944:18,19 50:1146:5,7,13105:10 117:1648:6,21,24means 18:11135:22 161:3147:7134:1454:20 55:1 56:971:19,23 74:7merely 127:20Mitchell's 18:3mouth 150:1463:24 64:2372:12,17 77:17170:20met 86:13mix 42:17 47:19152:2177:22 92:11,22measure 88:6metering 120:35:1421:11 22:8			e			
146:1 maximum 119:16 95:1maximum 119:16 McLendon-Ko 1:2216:6,10,11,12 16:6,10,11,12missing 10:11 misspoke 136:15 misunderstood 62:15motions 9:9,11 9:12 175:10mandate 127:11 manner 34:9 March 176:11,19 margin 145:1122 64:17 67:8 76:2 87:25 92:1816:6,10,11,12 18:6,19 20:2,4 45:19 48:19misspoke 136:15 misunderstood 62:15motions 9:9,11 9:12 175:10March 176:11,19 margin 145:164:17 67:8 76:2 104:1,5 116:1184:6 125:4 147:17 148:16 148:17,18Mitchell 17:7,9 25:22 27:17,187:12 19:16 20:16 23:18 31:11 37:3 40:3 40:12 62:13,19Marie 2:21 107:18 108:1 107:18 108:1104:1,5 116:11 118:6,17 128:14 141:25148:17,18 22:10 23:2428:8,18,25 30:25 37:2440:12 62:13,19 71:20 81:4 91:5Market 32:7 45:18 46:25145:17 152:18 157:12 171:1941:1,24 42:2 44:18,19 50:146:9 48:13 146:5,7,1399:18 101:8,14 105:10 117:1648:6,21,24 63:24 64:23 72:12,17 77:17 72:12,17 77:17 77:22 92:11,22meant 46:17 measure 88:6merety 127:20 met 86:13 metering 120:3Mitchell's 18:3 mix 42:17 47:19 mix 42:17 47:19 mix 42:17 47:19	-				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
manager 80:10 95:1McLendon-Ko 1:2216:20 17:6 18:1 18:6,19 20:2,4misunderstood 62:159:12 175:10mandate 127:11 manner 34:9McLendon-Ko 1:2216:20 17:6 18:1 18:6,19 20:2,4misunderstood 62:159:12 175:10March 176:11,19 margin 145:164:17 67:8 76:2 87:25 92:1884:6 125:4 147:17 148:16misunderstood 62:159:12 175:10March 176:11,19 margin 145:164:17 67:8 76:2 104:1,5 116:1184:6 125:4 148:17,1817:10,13,19,22 20:16 23:1820:16 23:18 31:11 37:3 40:3Marie 2:21 107:18 108:1104:1,5 116:11 128:14 141:25148:17,18 22:10 23:2428:8,18,25 38:4,7,8,1240:12 62:13,19 71:20 81:4 91:5Market 32:7 45:18 46:25128:14 141:25 157:12 171:1922:10 23:24 44:18,19 50:138:4,7,8,12 146:5,7,1391:10 92:11 105:10 117:16Matched 16:17 48:6,21,24means 18:11 71:19,23 74:7 63:24 64:23 72:12,17 77:17 72:12,17 77:17 77:22 92:11,22meat 46:17 measure 88:6metering 120:35:14	· · ·			6		
95:11:2218:6,19 $20:2,4$ 62:15Mountain 1:8mandate 127:11nean 58:1118:6,19 $20:2,4$ 62:15Mountain 1:8manner 34:964:17 $67:8 76:2$ 84:6 $125:4$ Mitchell $17:7,9$ 7:12 $19:16$ March 176:11,1987:25 $92:18$ 147:17 $148:16$ 25:22 $27:17,18$ 31:11 $37:3 40:3$ margin 145:1104:1,5 116:11148:17,1828:8,18,2540:12 $62:13,19$ Marie 2:21118:6,17mentioned 16:1130:25 $37:24$ 91:10 $92:11$ 107:18 108:1128:14 $141:25$ 22:10 $23:24$ 38:4,7,8,1291:10 $92:11$ market $32:7$ 145:17 $152:18$ 41:1,24 $42:2$ 46:9 $48:13$ 99:18 $101:8,14$ 45:18 $46:25$ 157:12 $171:19$ 44:18,19 $50:1$ 146:5,7,13105:10 $117:16$ 48:6,21,24means $18:11$ 135:22 $161:3$ Mitchell's $18:3$ mouth $150:14$ 54:20 $55:1 56:9$ meant $46:17$ merely $127:20$ Mitchell's $18:3$ mouth $150:14$ 77:22 $92:11,22$ measure $88:6$ metering $120:3$ 5:1421:11 $22:8$				-	-	
mandate 127:11 manner 34:9mean 58:11 64:17 67:8 76:245:19 48:19 84:6 125:4Mitchell 17:7,9 17:10,13,19,227:12 19:16 20:16 23:18March 176:11,19 margin 145:187:25 92:18 104:1,5 116:11147:17 148:16 148:17,1825:22 27:17,18 25:22 27:17,1831:11 37:3 40:3 40:12 62:13,19Marie 2:21 107:18 108:1104:1,5 116:11 118:6,17148:17,18 128:14 141:2522:10 23:24 22:10 23:2438:4,7,8,12 38:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11 91:10 92:11market 32:7 45:18 46:25145:17 152:18 157:12 171:1941:1,24 42:2 44:18,19 50:146:9 48:13 146:5,7,1399:18 101:8,14 105:10 117:1648:6,21,24 54:20 55:1 56:9 63:24 64:23means 18:11 71:19,23 74:7135:22 161:3 merits 43:6 merits 43:6 met 86:13 metering 120:3Mitchell's 18:3 mix 42:17 47:19 mkurtz@bkllamouth 150:14 152:24 21:11 22:8	0					
manner 34:9March 176:11,1964:17 67:8 76:284:6 125:417:10,13,19,2220:16 23:18Marie 145:164:17 67:8 76:284:6 125:417:10,13,19,2220:16 23:18Marie 2:21104:1,5 116:11148:17,1828:8,18,2540:12 62:13,19107:18 108:1128:14 141:2522:10 23:2438:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11market 32:7145:17 152:1841:1,24 42:246:9 48:1399:18 101:8,1445:18 46:25157:12 171:1944:18,19 50:1146:5,7,13105:10 117:1648:6,21,24means 18:11135:22 161:3147:7134:1454:20 55:1 56:9meant 46:17merely 127:20Mitchell's 18:3mouth 150:1472:12,17 77:1777:22 92:11,22measure 88:6metering 120:35:1421:11 22:8						
March 176:11,19 margin 145:187:25 92:18 104:1,5 116:11 118:6,17147:17 148:16 148:17,1825:22 27:17,18 25:22 27:17,1831:11 37:3 40:3 40:12 62:13,19Marie 2:21 107:18 108:1104:1,5 116:11 128:14 141:25148:17,18 22:10 23:2428:8,18,25 30:25 37:2440:12 62:13,19 71:20 81:4 91:5market 32:7 45:18 46:25145:17 152:18 157:12 171:1941:1,24 42:2 44:18,19 50:146:9 48:13 146:5,7,1399:18 101:8,14 105:10 117:1648:6,21,24 54:20 55:1 56:9 63:24 64:23means 18:11 71:19,23 74:7 170:20135:22 161:3 merits 43:6 merits 43:6 met 86:13 metering 120:3Mitchell's 18:3 mix 42:17 47:19 5:14mouth 150:14 152:21				-		
margin 145:1104:1,5 116:11148:17,1828:8,18,2540:12 62:13,19Marie 2:21118:6,17148:17,1828:8,18,2540:12 62:13,19107:18 108:1128:14 141:2522:10 23:2438:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11market 32:7145:17 152:1841:1,24 42:246:9 48:1399:18 101:8,1445:18 46:25157:12 171:1944:18,19 50:1146:5,7,13105:10 117:1648:6,21,24means 18:11135:22 161:3147:7134:1454:20 55:1 56:971:19,23 74:7merely 127:20Mitchell's 18:3mouth 150:1463:24 64:2371:19,23 74:7merely 127:20mix 42:17 47:19152:2172:12,17 77:17170:20met 86:13mix 42:17 47:19152:2177:22 92:11,22measure 88:6metering 120:35:1421:11 22:8						
Marie 2:21118:6,17mentioned 16:1130:25 37:2471:20 81:4 91:5107:18 108:1128:14 141:2522:10 23:2438:4,7,8,1291:10 92:11market 32:7145:17 152:1841:1,24 42:246:9 48:1399:18 101:8,1445:18 46:25157:12 171:1944:18,19 50:1146:5,7,13105:10 117:1648:6,21,24means 18:11135:22 161:3147:7134:1454:20 55:1 56:971:19,23 74:7merely 127:20Mitchell's 18:3mouth 150:1463:24 64:2371:20 20met 86:13mix 42:17 47:19152:2177:22 92:11,22measure 88:6metering 120:35:1421:11 22:8				-		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	S.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
market $32:7$ 145:17 152:1841:1,24 42:2 $46:9 48:13$ $99:18 101:8,14$ $45:18 46:25$ $145:17 152:18$ $41:1,24 42:2$ $46:9 48:13$ $99:18 101:8,14$ $48:6,21,24$ $157:12 171:19$ $44:18,19 50:1$ $146:5,7,13$ $105:10 117:16$ $54:20 55:1 56:9$ $71:19,23 74:7$ merely 127:20Mitchell's 18:3mouth 150:14 $63:24 64:23$ $71:19,23 74:7$ merely 127:20mix $42:17 47:19$ $152:21$ $72:12,17 77:17$ $170:20$ met $86:13$ move 10:5 20:24 $77:22 92:11,22$ measure $88:6$ metering 120:3 $5:14$ $21:11 22:8$		-				
45:18 46:25       157:12 171:19       44:18,19 50:1       146:5,7,13       105:10 117:16         48:6,21,24       means 18:11       135:22 161:3       147:7       105:10 117:16         54:20 55:1 56:9       71:19,23 74:7       merely 127:20       Mitchell's 18:3       mouth 150:14         63:24 64:23       meant 46:17       merts 43:6       mix 42:17 47:19       152:21         72:12,17 77:17       170:20       met 86:13       mkurtz@bklla       move 10:5 20:24         77:22 92:11,22       measure 88:6       metering 120:3       5:14       21:11 22:8						
48:6,21,24       means 18:11       135:22 161:3       147:7       134:14         54:20 55:1 56:9       71:19,23 74:7       merely 127:20       Mitchell's 18:3       mouth 150:14         63:24 64:23       meant 46:17       170:20       met 86:13       mkurtz@bklla       152:21         77:22 92:11,22       measure 88:6       metering 120:3       5:14       21:11 22:8			,			
54:20       55:1       56:9       71:19,23       74:7       merely       127:20       Mitchell's       18:3       mouth       150:14         63:24       64:23       meant       46:17       merits       43:6       mix       42:17       47:19       152:21         72:12,17       77:17       170:20       met 86:13       metering       120:3       5:14       21:11       22:8			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
63:24 64:23       meant 46:17       merits 43:6       mix 42:17 47:19       152:21         72:12,17 77:17       170:20       met 86:13       mkurtz@bklla       move 10:5 20:24         77:22 92:11,22       measure 88:6       metering 120:3       5:14       21:11 22:8						
72:12,17 77:17       170:20       met 86:13       mkurtz@bklla       move 10:5 20:24         77:22 92:11,22       measure 88:6       metering 120:3       5:14       21:11 22:8		·	•			
77:22 92:11,22 measure 88:6 metering 120:3 5:14 21:11 22:8						
	-			<u> </u>		
	,		e	-		
92:2293:12,13 105:13measuring87:22 mechanismmethod153:12 153:14mode7:2236:18 99:1540:1942:21 43:2562:10,12	· · · · ·	0				
110 04 100 ( <b>a</b> micenanism +).7 155.14 )).15						
			01			
120 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12						
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
		,				
			0	5	e	
151:15     152:13     137:8     146:2     5:19     139:5     40:15     51:14	131.13 132.13	13/:8 146:2	5:19	139:5	40:15 51:14	

Page 193

r				2
154:21	142:8 146:2,3	nice 29:19	29:17 30:20	8:12,14,15
much-needed	146:12 147:21	Nicole 2:21 8:10	37:19 66:12	offset 24:11,21
59:1	148:3,11,18	107:8,18 108:1	78:25 99:23	24:24 25:5,20
multiple 29:2	166:23 168:7	nine 9:10 35:23	100:4 107:4	26:9 32:19
87:13 104:14	175:12 176:20	124:25	112:10 117:4	33:19 63:14
119:4	needed 62:6,13	<b>nit</b> 151:14	117:11 122:16	69:8 137:11
<b>multitude</b> 124:11	needing 119:11	<b>NMC-4</b> 110:18	125:5,6 127:16	139:6,11
124:12	needs 12:6 14:1	NMC-R1 163:6	125.5,0 127.10	144:24 162:10
<b>must-take</b> 144:17	17:3 20:25 26:6	<b>no-regrets</b> 40:19	<b>numbers</b> 66:18	162:23
must-take 144.17	27:12 38:6	44:2	85:9 109:1,3	offsets 163:11
N	45:24 46:12	nominal 37:22	116:16	
N 2:1,1 3:1,1	47:1 48:3 58:20	85:7 111:8,10	110:10	<b>offsetting</b> 25:13 26:4 52:12
name 7:17 10:20		· · · ·	0	77:14
10:22 79:16	73:13 74:8	nonappealable	$\overline{02:13:150:1}$	
107:16,18	118:25 147:18	96:20	oath 132:3	offtake 101:15
121:5 133:16	negates 102:18	nonclean 24:11	<b>OATT</b> 50:1,4	offtaker 64:24
133:17 169:1	negative 146:16	25:2	51:10	<b>Oh</b> 13:12,13 29:6
nameplate 14:11	negotiate 136:20	nonconfidentia	object 28:3	46:17 67:25
14:20 17:23	155:23	102:25	, °	77:7 83:14
	negotiated	noncost 102:15	<b>objection</b> 75:21 131:18 174:18	105:1 110:17
84:4,5	102:17 136:24	noneconomic		114:9 116:3
<b>natural</b> 54:21	negotiating	64:13	174:21 176:13	122:9 132:10
71:25 72:6	147:23	nongas-related	obligated 92:4,4	173:3
nature 139:25	negotiation 87:16	72:7	obligation 48:22	<b>Ohio</b> 5:13 79:20
164:19	95:2	nonprice 76:5	obligations 137:4	107:20
necessarily 104:4	negotiations	89:2,15,15 90:2	137:8	oil 76:21 77:22
117:9 118:7	94:19	90:12 94:8	obviously 15:10	okay 7:6 8:20
141:16	Nelson 1:23	nonpricing 90:11	33:21 43:5 48:6	9:18 10:5 11:4
necessary 35:20	net 28:19 32:24	90:11 99:4	54:16 55:16	11:5 12:23
146:2 148:12	33:5,25 34:11	nonthermal	60:2 67:11,15	13:13,18 14:25
necessity 22:13	37:20 110:2,12	25:16 35:17	128:8	16:10 17:5 18:9
170:25	110:20 111:9	40:13 42:4	occupation	20:1 22:8,24
need 13:6,15,20	111:14 120:3	<b>norm</b> 123:6	134:10	23:13 24:8,15
14:4 16:10,20	122:3,15,18	normal 106:3	occur 46:13	25:10 27:2,21
17:6,18,20 18:2	123:3 142:3	132:11,12	occurs 46:15	29:11,25 30:2
19:9 20:4,9	143:11 166:2	155:13 166:20	off-peak 121:20	30:14 31:21
28:2,9 29:9	170:15,16,22	normally 153:25	122:8,21	32:5 35:8 36:2
36:3,10 38:4	170:23,24	notating 132:23	128:25 129:2	36:6,21 37:19
42:10 44:4,22	net-present-val	<b>note</b> 116:1	129:17 144:9	38:14 39:22
46:12 47:11	111:11 112:15	noted 16:21	149:25 150:1	41:10,18,24
61:17,20 83:10	112:20 113:1	<b>notice</b> 9:5 10:4	171:24	47:3 48:15 49:1
89:23 99:6	<b>never</b> 100:12	96:19	offer 105:19	49:15,20 50:6
101:19,21	130:23,23	notified 9:18	155:11	50:10,23 52:20
102:22 104:1	new 8:15 62:3	November 115:3	offered 147:19	53:6,13 60:9
119:12 121:11	75:12	NOx 151:14	offering 14:13	61:1,6 63:10,23
132:13 134:18	news 31:4,18	<b>number</b> 18:21	office 5:16,17 6:5	64:7 65:3 66:14
1	1	I	I	I

Page 194

				2
66:20 67:3 68:2	165:22 167:19	45:5,8 55:23	outcome 173:7	168:14 176:25
68:17 70:18	168:16 170:2	59:4 67:13	output 23:21	<b>P.O</b> 5:5
71:9 72:9,23	170:19 171:8	opportunity 44:6	41:17 58:1	<b>P.P.A</b> 1:9 7:13
73:12,17,22	172:4,14	61:17,21 62:17	84:25 92:14	package 65:14
74:3 75:2 76:7	173:19,21,24	94:16	93:11 94:2,5	142:20
79:9 81:19 83:2	174:3 175:5,8	opposed 171:17	101:16	packaged 103:23
83:7,17 84:7,11	175:20 176:18	opposite 61:13	outside 172:21	packages 142:20
84:20 88:3,9	176:20	opted 63:7	outstanding 9:8	packaging 104:4
89:10,20 90:14	on-122:21	optimistic 166:10	9:12	page 2:3 3:3 4:3
92:2 93:14,16	129:17 171:24	optimize 94:5	outward 15:24	12:1,5 13:5,9
94:7 95:16	on-peak 122:8	option 23:4,5,9	over/under 51:18	13:11 14:6 24:9
99:11,20 100:1	123:8,12,13,17	23:18,19,21	over/underrec	27:11 31:14
101:7 102:8,11	128:24 129:1	26:15,22 40:3	50:20	41:2,3 108:18
104:22 105:20	129:18,18	43:18,19 57:15	overall 13:23,25	110:1 115:2,22
106:4,14	143:24 144:3,6	57:15,25 58:4,8	19:16,24 26:1	125:10 127:15
109:10 110:5,9	144:9,12	97:15 98:1,9,13	32:18 35:20	127:16 143:7
110:19,23	149:23,24	98:18 136:9,16	43:22 51:17	143:17 153:11
111:4,7,13	171:14,17,22	136:17,18,20	67:7	161:8,12 170:6
112:1,8,12	on-peak/off-pe	137:20,20	overrecovered	170:7
113:8,18 114:2	143:15	138:22,25,25	51:21	paid 97:8
114:6,13 115:1	on-site 96:10,15	139:19 140:10	overrecovery	panel 124:23
115:10 116:3	on-the-fly 130:8	140:16 141:23	51:23	panels 96:15
116:10,13	on/off 122:24	155:22 158:2,4	overstated 144:3	paper 110:11,16
117:10,15,20	once 23:5 32:15	158:15 161:18	overstates 143:8	110:18 122:8
118:3 120:13	42:14 70:14	162:7,7 164:10	144:12	papers 111:2
120:20 121:2,8	148:3	165:4	overview 143:6	122:13
122:9,11	ones 39:18	options 16:25	overwhelm	paragraph 12:11
123:19,25	103:24 125:16	23:5,16 39:5	148:10	parallel 87:6
126:16,22	ongoing 41:12	42:24 45:7	owe 92:11	parentheses
127:14 131:3,6	66:23 67:14	140:9	owned 19:12	12:11
131:8,15,20,23	97:12	order 1:5 7:9	25:18 27:21,22	<b>Park</b> 133:19
132:6,21 133:1	<b>online</b> 9:19 14:18	11:1 28:14	46:8 48:13 55:5	169:3
133:7 135:13	101:25 102:6	61:18 96:20	99:18	Parkway 1:23
135:19 140:1	operate 99:20	118:21 132:7	owners 97:1	parsing 87:1
142:24 143:16	171:23	139:21 176:10	119:15	part 13:22,25
144:10 145:10	operating 57:19	176:19	ownership 28:1,7	14:25 15:4,7
145:24 149:9	86:8,21 123:2	orders 21:18	28:24 41:8	17:18 18:13
150:16 151:11	operation 66:24	28:16,21 29:2	<b>owns</b> 27:16	19:24 22:12
153:10 154:6,6	66:25 104:21	51:14		24:15 26:1,5
154:23 155:1	operations 94:4	organic 159:17	$\frac{\mathbf{P}}{\mathbf{D}_{19,12}}$	33:21 35:19
156:25 159:21	opined 127:18	organized 151:17	<b>P</b> 18:13	38:5 39:8,13
160:11,19	<b>opinion</b> 140:21	original 62:5,11	<b>p.m</b> 107:1,1	41:7 47:17,20
161:8,13,16,17	145:14 173:7	62:12 122:25	113:23,24	49:20 50:7,23
162:19 163:16	opportunities	163:2,4	123:18 132:19 132:20 168:14	60:20 61:14
164:14,22	21:23 33:17	originally 62:4	152.20 108:14	63:10 70:4 73:5

Page	195
r ago	

74:15 108:21	pays 60:21 69:21	periods 171:24	98:5 100:8,12	point 23:6 26:11
136:25	70:6,20	perjury 10:17	100:21 101:11	28:23 30:8 31:2
partial 116:25	peace 106:17	79:13 107:13	101:20,24	38:9 47:20
117:5	peak 121:20	133:13 168:23	102:7 105:11	77:12 103:1
participate 45:13	122:24 123:16	permitting 96:2	114:19 115:6,7	106:21 121:9
participating	129:6,10	<b>Perry</b> 31:7 55:21	119:4,9,9,20	127:5 139:9
23:8	penalty 10:16	66:9,22 67:14	120:15 123:18	153:6
participation	79:13 107:13	person 91:25	125:2,7,8	pointed 119:10
32:13,16 45:15	133:12 168:22	115:20	127:25 128:13	points 151:12
particular 41:13	pending 42:8	personally 91:20	129:3,17 144:2	policy 114:21
47:11 48:11,16	49:21 62:10	126:8	144:8,20	portfolio 13:25
49:7 61:16	Pennsylvania	perspective	148:24 149:6	21:15,20 26:2,5
78:13 137:15	137:3 139:3	24:25 25:4,7	149:22	33:14 35:20
138:19	140:13,19	37:12,13 38:13	<b>PJM's</b> 102:1	42:10,13,17
particularly	people 118:8	42:3 43:20 44:1	124:9	43:23 44:10
146:5,19	120:3,17	45:9 54:16 56:7	<b>PJM-wide</b> 119:1	45:4 54:25 58:7
parties 139:5,12	159:19	58:23 66:13	plan 14:1 42:9,9	119:3
175:22	per-megawatt	90:4,5 146:11	47:17 102:7	<b>portion</b> 16:24
party 142:12	37:11	PH 46:6	plane 168:4	18:1 57:20 58:1
156:1	percent 20:4,8	phase 87:16	planned 20:17	122:12
pass 45:14 51:22	21:16 27:21,22	physical 33:18	160:24	Portions 49:22
56:14	44:21,21 46:9	41:5 44:10	planning 16:9	position 11:15,17
passage 62:7	54:3,25 73:12	72:16	46:15 47:15	28:25 51:9
passed 34:7	73:16,17,22	<b>pick</b> 65:1 140:9	48:6 87:6,19,25	58:23 63:18
passing 56:23	74:8,9 76:23	<b>picked</b> 56:9	88:1 102:1,4	80:7 108:7,9
pasturized	82:19 83:3,3,3	105:11 154:2	119:19,20	171:16
159:17	85:1 116:10,14	<b>picture</b> 146:12,24	124:20 129:14	<b>positions</b> 66:15
Pat 7:19	116:17,21,23	148:2,20	134:11	positive 15:6
path 156:24	117:2 120:1	154:22	plans 104:3	67:16
patient 7:4	121:6 123:8	<b>piece</b> 166:14	plant 26:5 27:17	possibility 62:16
pause 29:8	124:18,23,25	pipeline 76:21	46:9	64:18
pause 25:6 pay 31:16 85:6	125:19 163:24	77:23	played 44:14	possible 17:12,15
91:5,6,7 92:4,5	164:2,3 165:11	pipelines 72:6	<b>Plaza</b> 79:19	17:17 18:9 20:9
94:2 130:21	165:14,17	<b>PJ</b> 45:17	107:19	39:5 48:5 58:24
136:18 139:1	172:5,7,15,15	<b>PJM</b> 14:15,23	please 7:21 8:1	59:13 149:3
144:19 155:12	172:18,22,23	15:15 16:9	10:19 11:14	156:11,12
155:16 158:8	percentage 14:20	32:13,16 35:3	61:18 64:10	possibly 24:12
159:8,17,19,20	60:22 82:25	45:14,15,17,23	79:9,15 80:7	posted 9:24
paying 52:9,9	100:11 117:3	46:6,15,22 50:4	82:2 99:12	potential 21:22
128:18 136:19	perform 87:4	51:10 55:2 56:8	105:23 107:9	25:23 26:15
141:8 144:15	performed	56:9,13 64:2	107:15 108:6	40:15,16,17
144:15 159:16	141:14	70:15 76:25	114:15 132:16	42:12 43:19
payment 85:10	period 54:19,24	77:2,18 81:4,6	133:10,15	47:25 58:16
97:18 172:11	85:5 125:21,22	81:9 91:16,17	168:17,19,25	63:1 64:25
payments 97:16	167:15	92:7,17 93:1	PLLC 5:4,8	94:10 140:22
payments 77.10	10/.15	72.1,11 73.1		77.10 170.22
	l		I	Ι

# Page 196

				5
142:14 164:21	30:17 31:6	presenting 79:8	144:4,6 149:14	product 91:11
potentially 20:19	43:11 78:25	Presumably	149:23 151:12	109:1,3 141:12
21:8 22:2 26:17	104:3 123:21	140:8	167:11 171:14	production 37:1
33:14 42:20	124:7 129:6,13	pretty 53:9,11	pricing 37:10,15	program 155:11
45:4 48:1 58:20	157:7,19 172:6	106:20 113:14	62:1,8 90:10	158:19
62:1,3,6	172:10	140:12	99:4 113:14,15	progress 97:21
power 1:5,7 5:3	<b>PPA</b> 13:18 18:11	previous 30:5	122:21 123:8	project 14:7,23
7:8,11 8:5 10:9	18:13 19:1	39:3 108:23	129:2,17 137:5	19:16,25 20:10
11:10,16 13:6	42:23 49:2,8,11	109:2	141:4 143:15	21:5,7,8,11,25
16:18 17:12	49:14,20,23	previously	152:12,12	22:1,2,3,4,6,7
18:9,10,17 19:8	50:2,8,18 51:6	136:15	156:4 172:8	22:13 24:16
19:8 20:8 22:20	51:11,13,17,25	price 21:8 24:19	principal 108:10	25:15 34:10
22:22,24 23:3	70:5,8,12,13	32:10,11 37:11	private 82:1	35:15,24 37:5
27:16,22,23,25	74:14,24 75:4,5	37:12 52:10,15	pro 52:8	38:2,2,5,12
28:7 29:1 32:7	75:9 136:6	54:21 63:4,7	probably 29:9	40:13,15,17,18
34:21,22 41:6	137:13,22	64:15 69:25	65:10 130:19	40:19 41:4
46:2,5,19,24	139:8,11	70:4,20 71:2,6	160:7	42:15 43:2,4,9
47:10 48:18	153:19,23	72:21,23 73:24	problem 78:16	43:25 44:1,2,4
49:25 52:2 55:5	154:1,2 162:10	74:9 76:4,20,21	154:20	44:11,16,20,24
60:21 67:4 75:5	162:17	77:21 84:14	problems 76:21	45:3 47:13,14
79:6 80:2,8	Practices 1:10	89:1,13 91:15	proceed 68:24	47:15 48:17
84:14 85:6 86:9	7:14	92:10 102:17	96:19	52:8,15,19,23
86:10,14,20	preach 7:23	102:23,25	proceeding 33:22	52:24 54:13
87:2,12,23 88:2	predict 148:23	105:13 108:23	54:17,18 72:3	55:14,14 56:3
88:11,16 89:2	predicting 127:3	108:24 109:2,4	72:14 80:13	56:12 57:5,25
90:3 91:4 92:4	127:4	116:6,14 117:6	108:13	62:19 63:5 64:2
92:13,20 94:3	preemptively	118:21,23	process 18:14	65:1,2 67:12,16
94:19 95:5	146:1	120:8 125:15	19:2,16 20:21	69:19 70:2,10
96:18 101:13	preferred 42:9,9	127:21 128:1	35:18 42:5,13	70:14 71:11,12
102:21 103:20	Preliminary 2:4	128:12,16,17	46:16 47:15	71:20 73:2,13
104:11 107:7	premium 141:8	129:24,24	81:5,7 86:4	75:20 77:15
108:1,8 112:9	155:12 159:2	130:20,23	87:20,25 88:1	81:4,6,8,12
115:18 118:12	preparation	136:24 144:12	94:20 101:10	82:20,22,23,25
118:14 123:14	139:13	144:19 149:9	103:15 104:3	83:1,4 95:20,24
123:19 129:19	prepared 169:13	150:24,25	procuring 54:22	96:6,24 97:22
131:12 136:15	preparing 48:8	151:8,10 156:3	produce 15:10	100:23,24
136:22 138:6	present 6:7 33:6	163:19 164:12	84:12 117:16	101:3,9,14
138:18 141:7,7	33:25 37:22	165:24,25	165:22	103:23 104:7
141:10 142:9	75:17 110:2,13	167:24 172:5	produced 35:4	104:10 105:10
142:10 144:8	111:9,14 122:3	173:1,6	76:24 77:5 91:1	110:2 126:5
154:14,24	122:15,18	prices 33:21	120:16 121:22	130:2,3 155:5
161:18 162:12	123:4 143:11	54:21 71:25	produces 91:10	156:13,21
171:13	170:16	72:10,17 128:5	144:18	162:24 163:21
<b>Power's</b> 16:19	presentation	128:6 143:21	producing 92:9	163:24 165:14
17:9 28:24	10:6	143:21,24	123:11	170:22 171:23
	1	•	1	

Page	197
raye	т 97

project's 14:5	protract 81:20	pulled 101:8	25:3,9 30:3,22	<b>R</b> 46:24
32:12 45:15	protracted 81:21	114:18 116:2	35:2 40:22,25	raise 79:9 107:9
project-by-pro	prove 151:20	purchase 1:6	41:19 46:18	133:9 168:19
65:20	provide 9:23	7:10 23:11	55:9 56:19	raised 10:13
projected 15:15	15:23 17:19	72:20 73:4	60:18,20 61:19	155:15
85:6	18:18 26:20	76:25 77:2,6,17	76:13 81:2,13	ran 42:5
projecting 51:17	33:10 34:6,8	79:2 91:10	103:2 121:14	range 143:20
projects 17:2	56:4 59:1 68:14	92:14 158:1,3	122:1 126:22	ranking 87:9
20:17,20,22	69:9 71:14 73:9	163:18	128:25 129:5	89:19 103:7
35:23 40:7,9	74:7 110:5	purchased 24:10	145:3,7,23	rankings 103:18
42:14 43:15	127:19 136:22	48:5 75:5	162:3 164:20	rate 5:17 6:5 32:9
100:2,5,12,15	136:23 137:8	165:21,23	166:4,6	32:18 49:24
100:17,20	150:1 151:4	166:15	questioning	59:1 82:24
101:5 102:4	157:24 158:6	purchases 45:18	10:25 53:9,16	84:21 91:12
103:11 104:4	161:11 165:16	45:23 46:11,25	questions 12:18	111:2 112:2
104:21 105:12	provided 14:22	48:24 55:1	38:15 60:16	113:3 141:8
110:10 117:8	20:7 31:11	127:21 137:12	68:19,20 69:4	150:6 155:13
117:13 148:6	34:17 39:4 40:8	148:23 165:13	74:22 76:1,11	ratemaking
162:23 164:24	41:10 51:1	165:16,18	80:18,24 85:24	134:12,15,16
proper 153:14	55:19 57:21	166:2 167:12	86:15 90:18	136:5
property 31:15	66:19 88:25	pure 43:20	95:4,8 105:8,9	ratepayers 22:14
96:21,22,23,24	110:11 111:2	purely 103:4	106:5,8,11,13	41:21 53:19
97:10,25 98:3	122:7	purpose 7:24	109:12,20	rates 50:1,5
proposal 13:22	provides 33:18	26:9 35:19	121:1,7 124:1,4	153:25 154:5
14:4 20:3 37:16	44:4,5 45:3,7	69:14 131:13	124:8 125:24	160:12
86:25 88:19	72:20,23	purposes 38:23	126:15 128:23	rationale 167:3
89:4 136:10,12	165:10	<b>put</b> 22:5 33:17	131:2,5,14	read 161:6
136:25 139:4	providing 103:16	62:19 99:24	135:4,14,16,17	170:17
proposals 86:25	128:10	132:16 139:6	154:8 160:25	Reading 12:12
87:1,4,9 88:6	provision 164:16	150:14 152:21	167:25 169:16	27:15 143:20
88:24 89:19	164:17	putting 96:15	171:7,9 173:23	170:12
137:10	<b>PSC</b> 6:8 133:22		<b>queue</b> 64:2 100:5	reads 12:12
<b>propose</b> 47:20	145:14	Q	100:6,8,12,20	ready 60:16 65:8
proposed 49:25	psc.comment@	Q3 81:10	100:22 101:6	81:11,11 83:19
70:3 82:23	9:22	qualify 138:21	101:11 104:17	95:12 133:3
131:17 134:13	<b>public</b> 1:2,16	quantification	104:19	real 7:23 29:10
153:12 155:7	7:18 9:5,16,19	73:15	<b>quick</b> 7:23 29:10	66:11 77:20,20
proposition	9:23 10:1 66:4	quantified 33:2	43:24 66:11	154:19
153:9 158:7	82:5 83:24	33:12,23 34:12	121:10	real-time 92:22
protect 72:5,9	95:15 99:15	122:2	<b>quite</b> 18:25	93:5,24
76:20 167:12	102:9 113:25	<b>quantify</b> 31:13	122:17 156:10	really 29:19 59:6
protected 71:24	117:18,19	33:15	quote/unquote	77:9 104:17
77:9,10	132:21 145:15	quarter 74:3	22:3	115:18 121:10
protection	170:25	<b>question</b> 12:10	R	123:9 128:7
166:11	<b>pull</b> 47:3 100:6	15:7 20:6 24:23		144:25 145:18
B				

Page	1	9	8

146:11,14	41:17 73:3,5	41:16 44:6	76:15 154:11	119:9
148:13,17	received 69:22	45:12 69:6,7,10	157:4	reliable 33:10
154:20 156:9	70:2,24 118:19	70:10,11,25	<b>refer</b> 89:9 143:18	34:8 73:10
159:6 164:1	138:23	71:4 115:7,18	reference 16:2,4	reliant 54:25
171:25	receives 56:13	116:3 117:12	57:14 72:1,13	77:13,21 78:1
reason 40:11	70:10,15,24	118:4,13,15,18	referenced 41:20	relief 1:12 7:16
63:10,11 75:7	<b>Recess</b> 30:13	118:21 119:5	109:6 162:2	59:1
101:5,8,12	78:22 107:1	119:11,12,15	referring 42:1	rely 15:2 31:10
106:17 120:11	168:14	119:20 120:4,8	143:14 163:1	85:2
122:14 131:8	reclaimed 96:11	120:14,16	163:17	remain 17:18
154:13 167:3	recognize 48:8	136:11,12,13	reflected 63:4	156:20
168:3 174:8,22	75:25	136:23 137:2,4	reflecting 28:12	remainder 46:11
reasonable 26:1	recognizes 21:18	137:8,18	<b>Regan</b> 2:9,17,18	48:2 67:9
41:5 42:3,15	recollection 51:5	138:13 139:1,2	3:6,8 7:19 29:4	remained 158:25
43:13,17,18	75:2	139:5,10,20,22	30:15,18 60:12	remaining 16:12
65:22 171:4	recommendation	140:11,18	60:13,15 61:1	16:20 19:9
173:17	17:2 87:11	141:9 142:12	89:5,10 98:23	Remarks 3:12
reasonableness	103:19 162:8	145:1,8 150:9	99:2,11,17	remember 74:25
43:23	recommendati	150:16 151:20	102:8 126:18	120:3 152:2
reasons 20:13	87:13	152:11,14,18	126:19 142:25	remind 9:20
67:11 69:18	record 7:7 9:6,22	153:7 156:2	143:2 145:10	removal 51:10
rebuttal 11:20	10:21 11:19	158:1,4 161:20	159:23 173:24	remove 88:21
32:2 108:12,18	30:11,16 66:4	162:9 163:13	173:25	removed 51:11
109:13 110:6,8	78:25 80:7	166:6	regarding 81:3	121:9
110:12 112:18	81:22 106:25	red 29:23	regardless 47:18	renegotiation
113:9 119:10	107:4 113:25	redirect 2:11,19	92:6,7 93:6	64:15 83:9
121:18 122:2	117:18,19	2:25 68:21,23	162:16	renewable 1:6
122:13 161:4	131:21 132:22	69:1,4 104:23	region 137:25	7:10 22:20
162:11 172:21	168:15	105:6 106:6	140:25 155:4	23:11,12,14,22
<b>REC</b> 23:25 24:1	recorded 30:6	128:19,21	156:8 157:7	24:1 32:6 34:14
24:9,20,23 25:5	recover 52:3	160:21 174:6,7	registry 35:3,5	35:4 40:4 45:7
25:6 34:23	74:23 75:4,8,13	<b>reduce</b> 24:17	regular 34:22	57:22 58:6
52:13 63:24	recovered 69:23	45:15 56:15	regulated 80:9	63:13 69:6,14
91:6,6 108:22	69:25 70:5,13	137:21	regulations 21:2	72:19 73:4 79:2
108:24 113:15	137:22 139:7	reduced 32:1	regulatory 1:11	90:21,23,24
115:11 117:6	153:18 162:6	83:7	7:15 11:17	91:1 94:15
120:6 130:2	recovering 50:4	reducing 70:12	88:16 108:9	115:7,13
141:11 150:13	recovery 1:9 7:13	71:6 77:16	rehearing 50:18	118:16 119:3
150:25 151:8	49:7 136:5	142:6	reject 145:14	120:23 126:5,6
151:12 162:15	<b>RECs</b> 23:7,24	reduction 37:15	related 15:17	126:25 136:15
164:12 172:8	24:16 25:10	83:4 139:6	41:13 136:6,8	136:22 138:6
173:6,12,13	26:9,14,16,19	reevaluated	relates 14:15	138:18 139:18
recall 131:11,12	32:14,18 33:1	65:17	22:9 40:6 52:3	142:9 147:25
154:5	34:14,17,20	Reexamination	52:8,22	152:16
<b>receive</b> 32:12	35:6,10,10	2:12 3:7,8,8	relatively 44:25	renewables 99:19
J				

Page 199

				2
136:9	55:21 96:2	77:18 92:5	revenue 34:15	43:15,16 44:16
renewal 23:3	150:10	139:18 152:17	35:9 45:14	44:16 47:12
renovate 7:5	requirements	158:19,23	56:13,14 92:17	48:4 50:5 52:6
<b>REPA</b> 19:23	43:21 46:5	159:7	92:18 128:8	54:19 55:9,24
24:19,21 26:24	119:6 136:14	respect 139:4	162:15	60:9 61:9,9
32:11 41:9	160:14 165:11	162:6	revenues 32:15	62:21 67:10,23
47:16 63:2 70:5	requires 81:15	respond 127:17	52:13 69:23	68:18,20 71:21
75:9 83:12	98:5 100:25	175:23	70:15,16,23,24	72:24 74:11
112:14 118:21	resell 159:1	responded	77:14 90:6	78:12 79:4,9,15
127:19 128:1,4	residential 31:23	153:15 162:5	128:3 137:9,11	84:19 88:2
134:14 137:12	73:25 112:3,8	response 39:4	137:21 138:23	89:25 90:4
139:7,21	113:4 140:11	40:2 48:9 49:16	139:10 143:9	92:11 93:9 96:6
165:10,18	140:20 157:20	51:8 108:12,20	162:6,8,9,23	102:2 106:18
166:15 167:12	resolved 31:1	115:2 124:7	163:10	106:20 107:9
170:13	146:3 147:8	125:17	<b>review</b> 19:24	113:17 115:13
<b>REPAs</b> 164:23	resolving 37:24	responses 11:21	134:13	115:20 120:14
165:1	resource 14:16	12:19 38:24	reviewing 13:19	124:19 125:4
repeat 25:3 30:21	15:8,9,10,12	39:3 80:13,16	revised 67:18	125:13,20
rephrase 28:5	19:19 21:13,19	80:20 108:16	68:4	129:5,11,12
replace 25:22,23	21:21 23:19	109:14 135:1	<b>RF</b> 148:6	130:24 133:10
48:13 165:23	25:17,23,25	169:23 176:15	<b>RFP</b> 16:24,25	142:22 145:5
replaced 165:18	33:13 35:1,17	responsibility	18:14 19:2	145:13 147:6,9
Reporter 6:8	40:13 41:5 42:4	73:9	25:25 35:17,22	147:17 149:12
<b>Reporting</b> 1:22	43:5 45:13 48:1	rest 31:21 97:3	39:8,14,18,25	149:17,17
represent 110:21	48:12 55:3,5	restart 101:10	40:6 42:5,13	151:7 152:5
represents 14:7	56:8 57:22 61:9	result 19:23	48:1 61:16	153:2,19,20
19:19 71:21	61:14 64:23	25:24 28:14	82:24 86:11,16	154:7,18,22
72:16 89:24	71:21 72:7	33:4 34:12	86:17,19,22,23	155:1 157:17
90:2	74:14 87:6 92:8	52:19 63:25	87:18 94:20	157:17 158:14
<b>reprice</b> 20:22	96:1 134:14 136:9 145:16	70:10 74:16,17	95:1,1 104:11 148:6	160:2,6,15
62:6,23 repriced 63:2	146:19 147:13	resulting 52:18 results 65:11		161:4,20 162:24 163:7
request 10:2 12:9	147:19,22,25	100:21,21	<b>RFP-specific</b> 88:10	163:11,14,21
14:24 15:23	148:10,12,21	113:3 153:3	<b>RFPs</b> 39:14	163:25 165:14
109:7 121:15	166:23,24	170:15	40:10 85:23,25	165:15,17,19
135:2 175:15	167:2,4	retain 101:16	86:7,21 88:13	166:16,18
requested 49:6	resources 1:7	retains 17:12	rider 23:4 51:19	167:23 168:10
requests 11:21	7:11 15:2 16:23	retire 35:9,9	52:21 57:15	168:20 170:20
39:4 80:13,16	16:24 18:11,18	115:11 141:11	75:13,19 136:9	170:22 173:12
80:20 108:13	19:1 21:4,10	retired 35:6	136:14 140:16	174:8,10,13,25
108:16 109:13	39:7,9,13,16,16	115:8,14,21	<b>riders</b> 75:16	175:10 176:23
135:2	40:4 47:25 48:2	120:14,17,22	<b>right</b> 7:23 9:4,15	risk 21:6 159:1,4
require 96:19	48:23 61:25,25	retires 34:23	10:14 22:7,7	173:12
required 1:11	62:6,14,20,24	<b>returns</b> 15:3,6	24:12 30:4,15	<b>risks</b> 33:20
7:15 38:13	62:25 71:15,16	<b>reve</b> 163:10	36:16 38:3	<b>Riverside</b> 79:19
L				

Page	200

107:19	safe 33:10 34:8	133:15 168:25	sense 43:22 62:14	81:16 82:3
<b>RMR</b> 1:22	65:25	seated 10:19	130:16 139:2	83:22 95:13
road 38:10 43:5	sake 45:25	second 12:10	141:15 148:1	99:7,13 104:2
roads 96:9,10	sale 24:16 118:5	14:17 98:8	148:21 150:18	106:1 113:23
97:24	118:9 121:20	121:19 145:24	158:11	132:8,14,17,19
<b>Rogness</b> 6:4 9:2	162:9	174:2	sensitivity 112:22	set 7:22 12:10
role 85:23 86:6	sales 117:6	seconds 154:24	149:2 162:22	24:19 32:11
94:25	119:23 122:19	section 83:12	163:9 170:14	70:21 124:1
Rosville 169:3	145:4	secure 100:17	172:4 173:10	127:6,10 129:2
<b>Roswell</b> 133:20	salvaged 152:7	securing 54:23	sentence 108:25	129:9 164:11
roughly 18:6	152:22	securitization	separate 2:7,10	seven 18:6,18
20:5 32:3 112:7	salvaging 64:14	49:21	2:14,15,16,18	seven-day 171:15
163:19 166:4	Sandy 46:8 47:19	see 45:11,20	2:20,23 3:4	171:17
<b>RPO</b> 23:1,3,4	47:22 77:25	54:20 57:7	52:22 75:19	Seventh 5:13
26:15 57:15	satisfy 46:5 47:10	71:13 85:4 89:7	129:16,19	share 59:21
136:9,14 137:5	73:14	89:16 90:19	serve 15:4 19:12	sharing 105:16
137:9,20	saved 30:16	139:15 148:2	19:14 21:13	she'd 91:25
138:22 139:19	savings 144:24	150:20 153:10	22:7 26:2 35:18	<b>shed</b> 59:12
140:16 155:22	saw 33:21	173:10,18	35:20 42:11	sheet 40:8,12
158:2 161:19	sawing 29:15	seek 24:20	48:2 58:2	89:6,7,9,12,14
162:2	Sawzall 53:10	seen 57:18 63:25	136:13 138:19	89:16,22
<b>RPS</b> 119:5 127:5	saying 48:9 56:21	138:11 173:11	served 112:9	122:16
127:6 160:17	86:11 137:23	select 172:14	service 1:2,17,22	shepherd 86:4
<b>RTO</b> 46:23	154:19	selected 18:24	7:18 22:1,21	shift 49:1,25 50:6
<b>rubric</b> 87:21 88:5	says 108:22	19:3,6 20:23	23:20 26:18	shining 15:11,13
88:8 103:10	109:1 117:11	69:19	31:6,20 33:11	56:11 123:11
rule 21:3 62:2,8	140:16 170:12	sell 26:14,16	33:19 34:6,8	<b>shoes</b> 25:1,6
run 49:13 70:8	scale 104:15	27:25 28:7,11	44:11,12 45:6	<b>shook</b> 103:7
running 154:24	scarcity 54:23	34:17 44:6	47:16 55:17	short 20:16,18
<b>runs</b> 70:11	72:11	115:12,17,18	57:18 58:3,22	25:24 40:17
<b>rush</b> 61:19	scenario 62:21	118:12,15,18	58:25 66:10	87:15 103:21
rushed 61:22	scenarios 172:8	119:17,20,25	67:9 73:6,10	147:1
	score 89:3,6,7,9	120:7 136:11	74:16 80:9 86:6	short-term 45:18
S	89:13,16,18,22	136:12 140:13	87:3 108:9	46:10 48:24
<b>S</b> 2:1 3:1 4:1 12:7	89:25 90:1	140:19 141:21	121:16,16	shortage 156:8
Sacre 6:8 7:2	scored 35:23 40:6	154:15 155:2	126:7 136:18	shorter 48:20
30:12,14 36:17	40:10 42:14	seller 24:25 25:6	140:23 157:7	show 9:22 111:1
66:4,6 78:23	scorers 104:18	selling 34:20	157:19	115:23 124:9
82:1,5,7 83:21	scoring 35:16	35:10 63:14	services 11:17	149:21
83:24 95:15	40:7,8,12,13	119:24 120:4	157:10	showed 162:22
99:15 102:10	89:13,15 90:13	140:10,11	serving 18:1	163:1 172:21
106:3 107:2	Scott 2:5 10:22	144:1,8,20,22	session 2:7,10,14	showing 93:6
113:25 132:11	11:9	145:6 163:19	2:15,16,18,20	shows 32:23
132:21,25	scrapping 155:7	166:3	2:23 3:3 36:4	118:6 163:9
168:9,15	seat 79:16 107:16	sending 9:21	36:19 66:2	<b>sic</b> 150:15
L	•	•	•	•

				Page 201
<b>sig</b> 54:4	15:9 18:5 37:2	sorts 95:4 100:17	sponsoring 8:19	114:7 132:7
sign 100:13	37:25 39:15	sound 16:15,15	<b>spot</b> 127:25	146:9 148:14
signed 96:3	40:3 84:11,25	74:10 84:19	148:24 149:6	172:24 173:13
significant 52:18	91:16 93:10	sounds 81:24	spreadsheet	started 96:5,9,13
97:8	105:12 115:18	111:11 148:7	89:14	96:14 116:4
significantly 97:2	117:8,13	source 55:11	Stacy 2:9,12,17	121:20
silent 7:22	119:22 123:11	141:2 155:25	3:6,7 7:20	starting 13:7,13
similar 14:23	124:15,25	156:14	39:23 53:5 60:9	108:22 146:13
62:20 139:2,11	158:19 164:14	sources 71:15	71:11 76:13,16	state 11:14 13:6
similarly 108:25	164:24	146:7	95:18 98:20	27:15 55:9 80:6
simplify 50:12,12	solar-fixed	Sower 1:17	126:16,17	86:18 96:7
simply 75:21	124:23	space 7:4 37:9	135:19,21	108:6,23 110:1
138:14 154:4	solars 15:20	speak 20:15 54:9	142:24 154:9	127:7,7 164:17
Simultaneous	sold 24:9,24 25:5	58:14 91:22	154:10,12	stated 41:4 94:14
176:12,15	25:10 28:18,19	106:17 117:24	156:25 157:3	145:13
sir 27:14 31:7	35:6 92:6 93:12	175:7	161:24 162:5	<b>statement</b> 170:12
38:16 64:5	116:3 117:9,13	SPEAKER	173:21,22	states 13:14
168:6	120:20 138:14	174:21	<b>Staff</b> 6:2 8:24	99:21 100:2
sit 46:4 50:16	139:10,12	speaking 35:22	11:5 38:18	119:4,7
51:6 52:16	148:23 149:2,5	37:3 94:13	78:10 85:12,18	states' 119:5
site 96:12	149:8 163:3	<b>specific</b> 16:1,3	132:6 135:16	statewide 66:10
sitting 9:2 17:14	<b>solely</b> 71:17	23:13 24:13	171:8 175:12	<b>static</b> 173:1
25:9 60:24	<b>solution</b> 164:21			
		39:7 75:3,3,20	Staff's 9:11 12:10	status 81:3,6
situation 37:24	somebody 59:11	76:1 80:24	121:14,15	steel 31:19
148:14	65:1	87:17 100:10	124:7	steep 124:19
situations 163:10	somebody's	101:25 102:6	stage 95:20,23	step 13:19 17:5
six 18:5,18 117:5	58:10	145:3 171:5	stand 43:6 74:6	19:15 78:17
slated 47:15	Somewhat 147:4	172:19 173:8	78:18 133:8	131:10
slight 33:3 53:22	sorry 13:12 14:3	specifically 15:17	150:15 153:8	stepping 25:1,6
53:24	25:3 29:6 30:21	16:24 18:21	stand-alone	steps 19:13 21:4
slightly 130:21	39:10 40:24	21:2 22:17	25:25	stick 87:22
small 44:25 45:2	46:17 100:9	26:13 34:25	standalone 39:15	stipulate 82:24
45:10 50:6	104:25 105:24	37:5 40:5 45:1	39:24	stipulations
145:18 147:9	105:25 114:24	52:19,24 66:20	standard 119:3	94:23
158:9 166:23	117:24 132:15	67:13 95:1	141:8 160:12	Stites 5:4,8 8:5
167:13	160:19 166:13	123:14 126:4	160:17 170:24	stop 98:8
smaller 52:1	166:15 176:1	143:15 173:17	171:2,4,5	stopping 106:21
123:5 148:3,12	sort 86:4 87:21	specifics 16:18	standards 127:6	storage 39:15,24
148:21	87:22,24 90:1	17:11 31:13	standpoint 44:24	<b>Storm</b> 166:12,12
<b>SMEs</b> 87:2	91:22 94:8,13	35:2 91:23	52:5	166:13
103:16	97:14,18	spelling 12:4,7	stands 22:4 25:15	story 31:22
so-called 142:6	121:16 122:25	spent 152:1,3	104:7,7	straightforward
<b>SO2</b> 151:14	126:5,6 159:14	spikes 54:20	start 31:4 54:14	142:16
solar 1:7,8 7:10	172:23 173:12	sponsor 135:1	69:3 81:12	strategy 94:4
7:12 14:17 15:2	173:14 174:3	sponsored 12:9	96:17 97:16,17	105:19

Page 202

	1	I	1	1
stream 34:15	57:21,21 78:1	system 38:5,7	53:6,8 59:5	17:21 25:16
35:10	97:7 118:4,22	101:2,3 115:6	60:10 76:17	31:24 37:9
Street 5:4,8,13	119:14 137:19	120:16 121:21	tariff 1:9 7:13	42:21 46:14
stretch 149:1	139:22	systemwide	22:25 23:1,3,4	52:17 79:1 91:3
structure 26:23	support 55:22	142:8	23:16 26:15	92:3 97:4 142:3
141:4	supporting 44:11		49:2,8,11,14,20	146:23 167:24
studies 96:1,1	111:3	T	49:23 50:2,8,13	territory 22:21
stuff 93:20	suppose 121:25	<b>T</b> 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1	50:18 51:5,11	23:20 26:18
104:15	supposed 29:23	table 64:18 163:6	70:5,8,12,13	31:6,20 33:19
<b>sub</b> 85:8	sure 14:14 16:21	tail 146:9	74:24 75:4,9	44:11,12 45:6
subject 12:17	22:11 23:3 24:1	take 16:1 17:5	136:6,7,8,8,17	55:18 57:18
16:3,4 55:6	24:8 26:11	21:3 32:15 50:2	137:5,9,9,11,13	58:3,22,25
74:5 77:23	27:10 32:21	58:21 61:24	137:20,22	94:22 157:20
84:18 85:8	34:7 35:7 36:5	65:5 76:4 78:20	138:22,24	testified 11:11
submit 176:13	39:1,12 42:2	78:21 86:20	139:11,19	53:8,10 80:3
submitted 9:21	46:7 47:6,14	104:12 106:21	140:15 153:19	108:2 134:5
93:1	49:3,5 50:9	115:13 120:17	153:23 154:1,2	143:13 161:17
subscribed 23:6	53:17 54:11	120:21,23	155:22 156:4	161:22 162:21
subscription	55:12 56:20	121:10 138:13	158:2,15	163:20 164:10
155:11 157:10	57:12,14 65:21	141:1,1,17	161:19 162:2	169:7
158:18	70:3 75:15	144:18 148:19	162:10,17	testify 73:23
subsequent 68:9	76:14 77:25	150:19 155:14	tariffs 141:6	testimonies
substitutes	81:15 89:21	167:1 168:8	153:13	108:16
127:20	95:9 103:15	176:20	tax 37:1,1,14	testimony 2:5,13
success 55:18	120:1,9,10	taken 28:25 63:5	82:19 83:2	2:21 3:5,10
sufficient 166:7	123:24 126:12	takes 32:10 119:2	taxes 31:15	10:15 11:20
175:25	134:2 149:24	138:11	team 58:14 126:9	12:1,6 13:5,9
suggest 154:23	153:24 160:23	talk 34:14 45:22	telephone 7:21	13:14,21 14:6
Suite 1:23 5:8,13	161:10 171:19	57:13 59:25	tell 10:19 53:12	19:22 27:11
5:18 6:6 133:19	suspect 126:25	60:2 69:20 71:9	53:14 57:2,4	31:14 33:7,25
169:3	sustainability	100:4 104:2	73:12 79:16	41:1,25 46:1
sum 19:7 30:24	24:4 57:23	121:15 143:7	107:16 133:15	61:8 71:10
117:11 120:14	119:13	talked 25:21 44:2	134:9 135:25	73:15 79:11
summarize 71:13	swear 10:15	44:8 45:1 47:24	169:1	80:12,15,19,24
summer 73:18	79:11 107:11	56:5 61:8 124:3	tells 101:24	99:24 107:11
summer-peaking	133:11 168:21	126:10 129:21	ten-minute	108:12,12,18
46:22	swings 128:11	129:23	168:13	109:12,13
sun 15:11,13	144:25	talking 18:5 27:9	tender 169:25	110:1,24,25
56:11 123:11	switch 95:10	60:3 69:6 96:4	tends 118:12	111:5 112:2,13
supervision	sword 167:22	100:8 120:15	term 98:16	112:18 115:5
169:14	<b>sworn</b> 10:14	125:12 130:11	151:10 153:4	119:10 121:19
supplemental	11:10 79:10	130:12 153:11	terminates 28:13	122:2 127:15
115:3	80:2 107:10	154:17	terminating	133:11 134:17
suppliers 72:11	108:2 134:5	<b>Tanner</b> 2:5 8:9	17:10	134:20,24
supply 23:11	168:20 169:7	10:9,22 11:9	terms 1:6 7:9	135:8,9 136:2
	•	-	•	-

Page	203

				-
137:16 139:9	43:5 47:25 48:1	118:23,24	<b>Tier</b> 108:22,24	total-bill 53:21
139:13 143:5	48:24 61:24,25	121:6 124:6	time 9:15,16 19:9	totality 38:24
143:18 145:14	62:14,20,24,25	125:23,24	20:15 40:18,19	touched 30:19
151:13 153:11	74:13 147:16	126:14,23	42:19,25 44:16	57:10
153:16,17	163:21,24	128:16 136:14	54:19,24 58:16	tough 53:8,9
161:3,4 162:4,6	they'd 101:11	137:23 141:20	61:10,14,24	track 115:6
163:25 168:21	149:5	142:14,15	62:6,14 63:17	tracking 49:13
169:11 170:7	thing 56:2,3	146:15,16,22	82:10 88:14	51:11
170:10 171:15	68:19 129:7,16	147:3 148:9	102:7 103:24	tract 98:10
tests 19:18	130:3 138:9	149:18,22,23	123:11,23	trade 16:14
thank 8:11 11:8	145:24 151:19	149:25 150:20	139:18 145:16	traded 117:11
11:18 12:14,21	155:10 159:18	150:22 151:3,6	146:19 151:17	118:6
15:14 16:16	things 19:5 27:8	151:8 152:8,15	152:16 170:10	trajectory 149:22
27:3 30:23,23	29:15 59:19	153:10,14,15	175:11	151:11
36:22 38:14,16	71:24 72:2	154:3,4,7	timeline 21:12	transactions
38:17,19 53:1	81:21 88:4,13	156:12,19	61:23 62:11,12	115:24
61:1 66:5 68:25	88:18,19,20,21	157:22 158:5	62:20	transcript 1:15
69:12 70:18	95:21 98:5	159:14 162:25	times 54:7 84:21	2:7,10,14,15,16
72:4,15 73:1	114:23 124:3	164:1,6 166:9	100:19 122:18	2:18,20,23 3:4
75:24 76:12	135:22 136:1	166:19,24	timing 21:5,6	transformation
78:19,24 79:6	137:23 150:12	167:1,5,7 171:2	46:15 101:20	13:23
79:22 80:11	156:16	171:2 172:2,19	101:24 129:3	transformers
82:6,8,14 83:25	think 7:5 14:22	172:23 173:2,8	title 79:3 115:13	96:15
84:1 85:11	16:21 21:14,16	173:9,18 174:4	today 7:19,24 9:3	transmission
98:21,22 102:8	22:4,5,9,21	175:16	11:1 12:18	49:13 101:2,2
106:15,19,24	24:13 25:15,20	third 108:21	13:19 17:14	treatment 36:4
107:3,7,15,22	26:1,11,12	115:22 139:5	25:9 29:14,18	trigger 83:8
109:16 111:19	35:12,22 36:9	139:12 142:12	46:4 50:16 51:6	trouble 29:5
111:20 120:25	37:7,13 38:1,8	156:1	52:16 60:24	true 10:16 79:12
128:20 131:24	41:2,10,18 42:2	third-party	91:22 100:11	107:12 133:12
132:14,18	44:19 45:9 49:4	162:9	135:4 173:2	156:18,19
133:23 142:24	51:8,12 52:5,16	Thirty-four 68:3	<b>Toland</b> 8:14	164:8 168:22
145:10 168:5,9	54:14 55:16	thought 150:12	top 15:22,24	trying 29:8 75:22
169:5 170:11	56:3 57:8,14	156:9	17:24 18:7	91:13 146:1
173:3,19 174:1	59:1,22 61:21	thousand 23:11	28:10 46:14	152:6 173:16
174:10,11	62:18 66:15	147:17 148:16	47:2 59:22	175:6
176:4,23	68:18 69:17	148:17	66:17 68:12	turn 7:21 14:6
<b>Thanks</b> 7:3 36:8	75:15 77:8,12	thousand-meg	104:18,21	80:22 82:11
60:10	80:25 81:10,14	163:21	tossed 126:22	161:8 170:6
theirs 29:2	81:14 83:10,17	three 39:14 40:10	total 21:15 40:7	<b>Tussey</b> 2:8 6:3
thermal 16:24	85:19 88:3,4	54:3 73:16,17	65:13 66:9,12	9:1 38:19,21
18:10,13 19:1,4	91:13,21 94:15	73:22 74:8	67:17 73:19,21	40:1 52:25
21:4,10 25:23	95:7 99:6,23,24	76:23 101:23	89:9,13,16,18	74:22 78:11
35:23 39:7,14	104:1,9 105:16	113:5 174:12	89:19 110:13	two 20:20 23:4
39:16,16 42:22	105:18 114:14	174:20	121:16 165:20	43:16 101:23
JJ.10,10 T2.22		1/7.20	121.10 103.20	-+3.10 101.23
1	I	I	I	I

Page 204

				10.90 101
113:19 140:9	51:7 52:1	50:18 109:11	152:15 153:21	28:23 31:1
152:9 174:16	underrecovered	upgrades 100:25	163:13 166:7	127:10 137:3
two-edged	49:9,22 51:9,21	101:2	170:16 171:22	139:3 140:13
167:22	52:18	upper 172:24	172:25 173:12	140:18 172:10
two-unit 27:19	underrecovery	upside 173:12	173:14	Virginia's 127:9
two-year 33:22	49:11,17,19	Uri 166:12	valued 108:19	virtually 86:14
54:17 72:2,14	51:24	use 14:1 24:4,6	values 15:15 16:4	visibility 95:5
type 14:16,23	understand 20:1	26:18 87:21,22	18:4 108:19	volatile 33:20
15:9 19:4,5	24:8 45:10	122:24 137:4	109:6,8 121:23	volatility 55:6,7
104:15 138:7	53:18 55:24	141:18,22	122:25 124:10	129:25
157:8	85:22 86:3	144:6 147:15	171:21	voluntarily
typical 85:3	89:21 121:11	158:16 172:2,5	van 2:16,24 6:3	158:13 159:17
typically 24:10	122:15 129:1	172:8 173:4	8:25,25 9:7,10	<b>VP</b> 88:16
85:4 88:13,18	157:11,19	uses 137:7	10:3 11:6 85:13	<b>VI</b> 00.10
105:12,13	167:18	usual 133:25	85:15,18 89:20	W
100.12,10	understanding	<b>utilities</b> 119:11	95:7,10 105:9	wagging 146:9
U	19:21 21:17	utility 5:11 46:19	106:12,13	wait 21:9 62:23
UCAP 164:5	22:15,23 37:10	123:15	121:4,5 126:14	waited 62:18
<b>Uh-huh</b> 15:21	39:2 49:12 83:6	utility's 21:20	128:24 131:6,7	waiting 9:19
86:2 92:25	84:10 96:25	123:16	131:14 135:17	64:16
102:20 124:5	98:4	utilize 136:13	175:1,4,6,9,14	walked 29:1
124:16 125:13	understands	utilizes 137:18	175:19,21	walking 36:1
129:20 143:19	19:10		variability	want 22:8 27:8
149:15 158:20	understates	V	172:21	31:13 36:5,13
ultimate 24:21	143:9 144:13	vagaries 152:14	variable 52:14	45:22 50:11
52:15 90:1	undivided 27:16	vague 54:9	variety 42:6	57:13 59:6 64:9
ultimately 18:23	46:9	Valentine 176:5	58:15	64:9 69:20
19:6 20:20,22	uneconomic	valuation 151:23	various 71:10	76:18 78:4
26:14 34:11	101:3 158:23	value 15:1 16:6	86:8 87:1,2,9	81:14,20 85:22
40:6 43:3 56:15	170:13,19	24:20 28:19	137:2 138:11	86:15,18 88:21
58:22 89:3,18	UNIDENTIFI	32:17,17 33:1,6	141:5	89:20 90:19
90:17 103:20	174:21	34:1 37:22 56:6	vehemently 59:3	94:14 98:21
unable 64:13	<b>unit</b> 147:16,16	90:4 91:6,7,7	vehicle 161:19	100:23,24
unaddressed	unknown 48:11	110:2,7,9,13	verify 121:18	119:16,17
20:3	unrecovered	111:9,14,15	124:2	122:14 132:5
uncertain 19:9	49:22	119:17 120:10	versus 32:7 113:9	149:13 153:24
145:8 146:15	upcoming 124:18	121:20 122:5	113:11 115:7	154:15 155:25
151:9 152:15	update 109:9	122:15,19	129:1 140:4	157:9 173:6
uncertainty 21:1	110:5 115:3	123:4 124:18	141:18 171:14	176:12
128:14 172:18	updated 32:2	125:4,5 126:25	view 20:12 28:23	wanted 38:22
172:19	62:8 74:1 110:8	130:4,6 143:11	43:11 55:18	40:21 78:4
unclear 42:20	110:9 111:14	144:1,3,7,12,23	73:11 85:25	121:10,18
undergoing	112:23 125:8	145:1,7 146:15	146:11 165:25	126:6,12 155:2
13:24	130:17 172:20	146:16 150:9	viewed 67:15	155:4,5 156:2
underrecover	updates 11:23	150:16 151:15	Virginia 27:19	158:1,3,12
	upuaito 11.23		• • • <b>5</b> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, ,
	I	I	I	I

Page	205
r ago	

				5
159:6 172:17	33:23 34:12	Wheeling 27:23	153:17 160:15	151:18
wants 23:14	47:23 56:5	Williams 3:11	160:17 161:4	worthwhile 54:8
154:14	63:25 69:17	6:4 9:1 171:9	161:13,16	54:13
wasn't 41:11	85:19 88:12	171:11 173:19	162:11,11	wouldn't 41:12
43:9 104:17	89:11,11	willing 152:8	168:5,11,17,24	116:1 148:19
wasteful 19:20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	153:7 159:19		151:1 153:25
19:23 20:10	122:16,17 173:2	159:20	169:2,25 174:9 174:11	160:7 164:25
22:3		Winchester		
	website 9:24		witnesses 8:2,9	Wright 6:4 9:1
way 20:12 27:18	week 128:6	10:23	8:18 64:8	written 9:20
30:10 52:2	weekend 123:10	wind 39:15 40:4	137:15	wrong 53:12,18
55:15 58:24	weekly 86:13	winter 47:1	Wolffram 2:5 3:3	53:20 54:1,3
59:9,18 61:23	weighted 99:5	166:12,12,13	8:9 10:10,11,12	61:14,14 105:2
69:21,22 73:11	122:25	winter-peaking	10:18,23 11:9	145:16,16
80:25 104:16	welcome 66:6	46:19 123:15	11:14 13:3 27:6	149:4
115:16 127:2,4	82:7 133:21	123:21	38:22 69:3	www.mclendo
128:1 142:16	170:9	wish 58:18	80:24 81:3 94:7	1:25
143:13 150:17	Wellborn 3:10	withdraw 20:21	95:3 112:11	X
152:7 155:19	8:19 111:5	witness 10:22	124:4 125:25	
156:5 165:3	151:12 168:18	12:21 14:22	126:11,23	<b>X</b> 4:1 101:22
166:25	169:2,6,10,11	20:14 22:16	131:11,13	Y
ways 16:19	170:6	26:20 32:10	132:4 174:22	yeah 11:3 13:10
152:10	Wellborn's	37:7,17 38:16	wonder 143:5	13:13 14:12
we'll 7:25 10:5	143:18	39:12,19,21	word 12:2,6 34:1	16:16 17:11
18:16 92:2,2,23	went 115:5	40:9 49:4 53:2	108:19	24:13 29:17
125:25 150:16	116:23,25	60:2,8,11 61:12	words 145:25	
we're 9:12 18:5	weren't 20:22	63:21 64:3,21	155:14 156:22	31:20 35:12
19:2 20:1 24:9	62:4 64:24	68:13,15 76:7	163:3	36:9 54:14
25:20 30:12	135:23	78:13,14,16,19	work 7:6 58:17	55:16 57:3
35:14,18,25	West 2:6,22 3:5	78:21 79:5,14	68:11 86:7	60:13 67:25,25
36:4,12,12 38:2	5:4,8,16 8:13	79:18 82:12	110:11,16,18	69:17 78:2,6
38:3 41:15	8:13 12:23 13:2	85:2,9 89:7,11	111:2 120:6,6	81:8,23,25
42:23 43:7,15	13:12,18 27:1,9	90:17 91:24	122:7,12	83:15,17 86:6
48:23 52:9,9	27:19 28:22	94:7 95:3 98:22	123:13 152:7	88:8 93:18,23
53:14,15 55:2	29:22,25 30:2,4	103:3 105:25	164:20 165:4	95:11 99:25
62:22 66:4 82:5	31:1 38:25	106:15,19,22	worked 164:17	100:9 103:14
83:24 89:23	44:19 78:7	107:6,14,18	working 95:19	104:17,20
95:15 99:8,15	82:11,12 88:15	109:17 110:17	126:9	105:22 109:20
102:9 119:19	106:7,9 109:19	112:10 113:21	works 90:22	113:14 114:20
119:20 120:15	109:20,22	114:18 117:20	176:17	116:7 121:24
124:21 125:12	110:15,19	118:1 126:11	worksheet 99:3	122:4 124:11
129:1 132:11	111:19 112:12	126:23 127:14	121:22 122:17	125:15 127:12
132:21 149:4	124:3 131:3	127:18 131:9	worksheet's 99:4	127:13 129:16
154:16 167:10	133:5,8 134:3,8	133:4,14,17,23	world 171:19	130:18 131:23
we've 16:21 22:5	135:11 168:2	134:1 135:11	worrying 61:16	140:5,8 141:20
25:21 29:17	West's 69:4	135:15,18	worth 63:19	142:4 143:14
				147:12 148:25
	I	I	I	I

Page 206

	1	1		
150:22 151:8	your-all's 43:10	<b>101.8</b> 111:8,13	<b>14.96</b> 116:4	<b>20</b> 5:18 6:6
151:25 154:10	45:24 46:1	<b>102</b> 2:19	<b>143</b> 3:6	140:19 172:5,7
154:22 157:13		<b>105</b> 2:19	145 3:7	172:14,15,18
157:15 158:16	Z	<b>106</b> 2:20	14th 175:23	172:21,23
159:5,9 160:19	<b>Z</b> 89:22	<b>108</b> 2:21	176:3	<b>200</b> 128:7
163:15 164:22	Zachary 2:13 8:9	109 2:22	<b>15</b> 41:2 72:21	<b>2018</b> 115:24
165:16 167:16	79:7,18 80:1	11 2:6 12:5	78:21 92:14	116:4
170:3	<b>zero</b> 142:3 172:8	153:11	108:18 149:11	<b>2019</b> 116:8
year 31:23,24	173:4,13	<b>11:00</b> 123:18	149:19 163:4	<b>2020</b> 54:18 72:13
47:9,11 67:18	<b>ZMY</b> 89:8	<b>11:04</b> 78:22	170:16	72:14 116:13
68:7,11,11	<b>ZMY-3</b> 75:25	<b>11:07</b> 82:3	<b>15-year</b> 34:17	<b>2022</b> 13:14 27:13
81:11 84:11	89:22 99:7	<b>11:10</b> 82:4	72:19 85:5	42:7 54:19
85:1 108:23	<b>Zyl</b> 2:16,24 6:3	<b>11:12</b> 83:22	143:10 153:4	72:14 108:24
112:6,19 113:6	8:25,25 9:7,10	11:14 83:23	<b>150</b> 128:7 167:11	109:3
116:2,13,17,20	10:3 11:6 85:13	<b>11:25</b> 95:13	150,000 84:12,23	<b>2023</b> 18:14 172:6
116:25 117:5,6	85:15,18 89:20	<b>11:37</b> 95:14	117:16,22	172:10
117:17,21	95:7,10 105:9	<b>11:41</b> 99:13	118:1,19	<b>2024</b> 115:25
118:2,19	106:12,13	<b>11:46</b> 99:14	167:14	116:1 130:17
124:18,20	121:4,5 126:14	<b>11:53</b> 106:1	<b>1510</b> 5:13	172:20
125:11,14	128:24 131:6,7	11:57 106:2	154 3:7	<b>2024-00243</b> 1:8
143:10 147:2	135:17 175:1,4	111 2:22	157 3:8	30:20
150:4 162:25	175:6,9,14,19	<b>111(d)</b> 21:3 62:2	159 3:8	2024-2025
year's 109:2	175:21	62:7 65:4	<b>16</b> 41:2	124:20
yearly 123:4	<b>Zyl's</b> 131:14	<b>113</b> 2:23	<b>16.78</b> 116:21	<b>2024-243</b> 78:25
years 54:18 68:10		114 2:23	<b>161</b> 3:9	107:5
72:21 92:15		<b>115</b> 13:15	<b>1645</b> 10:23	<b>2025</b> 1:15 175:16
101:23,23	<b>0.2</b> 74:9	<b>12</b> 12:2,5 66:23	<b>169</b> 3:10	2025-2026
115:24 125:11	1	167:20 170:13	<b>170</b> 3:11	124:25
149:11,19	$\frac{1}{11:54:3108:22}$	<b>12.4</b> 116:20	<b>171</b> 3:11	<b>2026</b> 147:2
151:16 163:4	108:24 132:1	<b>12.44</b> 116:14	<b>173</b> 3:12	<b>2027</b> 14:18 47:16
yellow 114:8	143:7 174:15	<b>12.5</b> 84:16	<b>179</b> 85:7 111:8	<b>2028</b> 13:17 17:10
115:23	<b>14</b> 5:7174:15 <b>1-CP</b> 129:9	<b>12:01</b> 107:1	<b>18</b> 41:3	28:9,14 47:10
Yep 55:25 90:15		<b>121</b> 2:24	<b>19</b> 14:7	48:14,18
93:25 124:13	<b>1,000-megawatt</b>	<b>126</b> 2:24	<b>19.17</b> 116:18,19	146:13 147:18
124:22	147:22	<b>128</b> 2:25	<b>19.7</b> 117:2	<b>2030</b> 142:3
Yetzer 2:13 8:10	<b>1:04</b> 107:1	<b>13</b> 2:6 41:2 170:7	<b>19.78</b> 117:7	<b>204</b> 1:23
20:14 37:8,17	<b>1:11</b> 113:23	131 4:4,4	119:23	<b>2041</b> 47:21
40:9 64:4,21	<b>1:26</b> 113:23	<b>131,000</b> 112:8		<b>211</b> 1:17
76:7 79:7,8,18	<b>1:48</b> 132:19	<b>132</b> 3:3 4:3	2	<b>21st</b> 176:13
80:1,6,22 82:9	<b>1:56</b> 132:19	<b>134</b> 3:5	<b>2</b> 1:8 4:4 115:2	<b>22</b> 99:20
82:17 85:11,16	<b>10</b> 31:14 161:8,12	<b>135</b> 3:6	130:13 132:2	<b>22.10</b> 116:8
you-all 39:3	170:13	<b>14</b> 41:3	174:15	<b>223-3477</b> 5:6
41:20 49:6	<b>10:18</b> 66:2	14.6 33:5,25	<b>2-7</b> 108:21	<b>226-2300</b> 5:9
52:20,21	<b>10:22</b> 66:3	37:19,22	<b>2:37</b> 168:14	<b>23.9</b> 37:22
123:15	<b>10:37</b> 78:22 <b>100</b> 120:1	112:16	<b>2:53</b> 168:14	<b>2300</b> 5:8
	100 120.1			

Page 207

				2
24/7 15.4	27.11.112.6	(12.1.142.17	94 2.15	I
<b>24</b> /7 15:4	27:11 112:6 <b>4.08</b> 31:24	<b>6</b> 12:1 143:17	<b>84</b> 2:15	
<b>25</b> 115:3 140:13 <b>25-ish</b> 124:17	<b>4.08</b> 51:24 <b>4.7</b> 112:21,25	<b>60</b> 2:9 <b>61</b> 2:10	<b>85</b> 2:16 <b>859</b> 5:9	
<b>25-1511</b> 124.17 <b>25.33</b> 116:24	<b>4.7</b> 112.21,23 <b>4.8</b> 14:7,13,14	<b>634</b> 5:5	<b>86</b> 130:24	
117:1	15:1 16:5,11	<b>65,000</b> 122:6	<b>87.202</b> 110:3	
<b>250</b> 5:8	45:19 48:19	· · ·	07.202 110.5	
<b>250</b> 5.8 <b>2525</b> 1:23	125:4 147:25	<b>66</b> 2:10,11 13:16 <b>69</b> 2:11	9	
<b>2525</b> 1.25 <b>25th</b> 176:11,19	123.4 147.23	<b>696-5300</b> 5:19	927:15	
<b>26</b> 13:16 38:4	148.17,18	090-3300 3.19	<b>9:04</b> 7:1	
147:4,4	<b>4.8-megawatt</b>	7	<b>9:32</b> 30:13	
<b>27</b> 2:7 13:16 38:4	20:10 84:7	72:4 14:6 16:12	<b>9:33</b> 30:13	
125:13 147:4,5	<b>40</b> 83:3 144:20	121:14,15	<b>9:40</b> 36:19	
<b>28</b> 1:15 13:7	<b>40223</b> 1:23	143:7	<b>9:42</b> 36:19	
16:10 147:7	<b>40507-1758</b> 5:9	7:00 123:18	<b>90</b> 167:11	
<b>280</b> 66:21	<b>40601</b> 5:18 6:6	<b>70</b> 123:7	<b>93</b> 164:3	
<b>28th</b> 176:16	<b>40602-0615</b> 1:18	700 5:18 6:6	<b>95</b> 2:16,17	
<b>29</b> 32:3 68:4 74:2	40602-0634 5:5	16:20 122:4	<b>97.051</b> 110:14	
113:5	<b>42.50</b> 130:15,19	700-megawatt	111:15	
115.5	<b>421</b> 5:4	17:20	<b>99</b> 2:17,18,18	
3	<b>421-2255</b> 5:14	<b>708.2</b> 16:12 20:2	44:20,21,21	
<b>3</b> 1:9 4:4 89:8,16	<b>43.7</b> 116:14	<b>713</b> 13:6,17 16:10	121:6	
108:18 110:1	<b>43215</b> 79:20	17:5 20:4	<b>99.3</b> 20:4,8	
114:2 124:8	107:20	713-megawatt	,	
125:19 130:11	44 130:9	18:2		
132:2 143:7	<b>45</b> 130:9 154:24	<b>76</b> 2:12		
165:11,14,17	<b>45202</b> 5:13	765,000 122:23		
174:15	<b>47.7</b> 116:10	<b>790</b> 18:1		
<b>3,000</b> 166:16	<b>47.7</b> 110.10	790-megawatt		
167:11	5	17:23		
<b>3:01</b> 176:25	<b>5</b> 1:11 2:3 12:10			
<b>30</b> 83:2	13:5,9 136:19	8		
<b>30,000-foot</b> 85:25	140:12,20	80 2:13 14:11		
<b>30.34</b> 117:1,4	172:9	84:5		
<b>30075</b> 133:20	<b>50</b> 27:21,22 46:8	80-megawatt		
169:3	82:19 83:3	14:9 84:4		
<b>305</b> 133:19 169:3	116:23 130:22	800 147:21		
<b>31st</b> 175:16	<b>50-percent</b> 27:16	<b>82</b> 2:14,14		
<b>33</b> 124:23	28:1,7,13,24	<b>83</b> 2:15		
<b>34</b> 31:23 32:3	<b>502</b> 1:24 5:6,19	<b>83.26</b> 12:12		
112:4	<b>513</b> 5:14	83.68 12:13 70:19		
<b>36</b> 2:7,8 5:13	<b>53</b> 2:9	92:12 94:2		
66:22	<b>54</b> 116:17	144:15 149:7,9		
<b>38</b> 2:8	<b>570</b> 133:19 169:2	149:19 150:4,6		
·	<b>585-5634</b> 1:24	163:18 166:3		
4		166:16 167:15		
<b>4</b> 1:10 13:11	6	167:22		
1	I	I	I	I