

Archived: Thursday, May 31, 2012 3:59:35 PM
From: John Talbert
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2011 1:30:06 PM
To: Tom Shaw
Cc: Albert Yockey
Subject: FW: October 2011 Coal Combustion Residuals.pptx
Response requested: No
Importance: High
Attachments: [October 2011 Coal Combustion Residuals.pptx](#) ;

Tom,

I met with Eric regarding the status of our planning/cost estimates for our landfills in light of CCR. He said he didn't have anything newer than what was used in our PSC presentation some months back. Can you help me refresh my memory; were those cost estimates based on a "hazardous" or "non-hazardous" designation?

I'd appreciate your looking over the attached ppt. that will be used next week for the legislative committee hearing and advising me of any concerns.

Thanks.

John

From: Freibert, David [<mailto:David.Freibert@lge-ku.com>]
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2011 12:15 PM
To: John Talbert; 'barry.mayfield@ekpc.coop'; 'nick.comer@ekpc.coop'; 'jekeeton@aep.com'; 'van.needham@duke-energy.com'
Cc: 'dyates@kaec.org'; Siemens, George; Voyles, John
Subject: October 2011 Coal Combustion Residuals.pptx
Importance: High

Gentlemen:

Even as you're rechecking numbers and other things for inclusion in the draft presentation for the 11/3 IJC Natural Resources meeting, here is a next generation for your review, consideration and comment.

You'll note that it:

- Contains same final slide as before – and as did the KAM slide. I'd be ambivalent about it (and still may be), if Rocky hadn't introduced that "waive the white flag language" a month or two ago. But your call as to whether we include.
- A couple of "place setter" slides to introduce the specifics of the CCR regulations, subtitles C & D, etc.
- Similarly, a slide on current federal action on the issue – to let the committee know political context.
- For the group's consideration, a slide outlining the Beneficial Re-use issue.
- The 6th slide, you'll note, contains the cost impact info – but does so in context of overall "impacts" on utilities (work, decisions, etc.).
- On this one, it turns out that the only hard cost estimates we (LGE-KU) have are for the "non-hazardous" eventuality – and that may be the case for you, as well. It certainly was why EKPC has such a broad range. For purposes of this presentation – why don't we plug in our range for non-hazardous (without Duke, looks to be \$1.3b to \$1.4b) and simply note that, if the decision is hazardous, those costs will rise significantly?

Interested in general feedback, as well as specifics – at your earliest convenience.

The information contained in this transmission is intended only for the person or entity to which it is directly addressed or copied. It may contain material of confidential and/or private nature. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon, this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is not allowed. If you received this message and the information contained therein by error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your/any storage medium.