1

JAN 27 2014 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY 1 BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 CASE NO. 2012-00503 3 In the Matter of: 4 PETITION AND COMPLAINT OF GRAYSON RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING PURCHASE OF ELECTRIC POWER AT THE RATE OF SIX CENTS PER KILOWATT HOUR UP TO 9.4 MEGAWATTS

OF POWER VS. A RATE IN EXCESS OF SEVEN
CENTS PER KILOWATT HOUR PURCHASED
FROM EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE
UNDER A WHOLESALE POWER CONTRACT AS

AMENDED BETWEEN GRAYSON RURAL
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION AND
EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.

11

12

DEPOSITION OF ANTHONY CAMPBELL

13

14

On Wednesday, the 8th day of January, 2014, at the approximate hour of 10:02 a.m., at the Hampton Inn, located at 1025 Early Drive, Winchester, Kentucky, before me, Nicol L. Voiles, Court Reporter and Notary Public within and for the Commonwealth of Kentucky, ANTHONY CAMPBELL, Witness, gave his oral deposition in the causes pursuant to Notice of Counsel for the respective parties as herein above set forth. Said deposition was taken for the purpose of discovery and any and all other purposes permitted by the Kentucky Rules of Civil Procedure.

20

19

21

22

22

23

24

CBS REPORTING
P.O. BOX 7
SCOTT DEPOT, WEST VIRGINIA 25560

(304) 397-6910 * 1-855-546-3321

CBS REPORTING

1	APPEARANCES:	On behalf of Grayson Rural Electric:	
2		Hon. W. Jeffrey Scott	
3		W. Jeffrey Scott PSC 311 West Main Street	
4		P.O. Box 608 Grayson, Kentucky 41143	
5 6			
7		On habite of Hank Wankingha	D
8		On behalf of East Kentucky Cooperative:	LOMBI
		Hon. Mark David Goss	
9		Goss Samford PLLC 2365 Harrodsburg Road, Suit	e B-325
10		Lexington, Kentucky 40504	
11		ALSO PRESENT:	
12		Don Mosier	
13		Carol Ann Fraley Don Combs	
14		Bradley Cherry	
15			
16		I N D E X	Page
17	EXAMINATION O ANTHONY CAMPB		
18		Y MR. SCOTT	3
19	EXAMINATION B	I MR. SCOTT	3
20			
21	EXHIBITS		None
22			
23		RTIFICATION	114
24		E	None Waived

ANTHONY CAMPBELL 1 2 of lawful age, Witness herein, having been first 3 duly cautioned and sworn, as hereinafter certified, was examined and said as follows: 4 5 MR. SCOTT: Who is the gentleman to your 6 left? 7 MR. GOSS: That is Don Mosier. 8 MR. SCOTT: You want him --9 Yeah, he's my corporate MR. GOSS: 10 representative for the purpose of the deposition. 11 EXAMINATION 12 BY MR. SCOTT: 13 Q. Would you state your name for the record please? 14 15 Anthony Scott Campbell. Α. 16 Q. Mr. Campbell, why are you here today? 17 Α. I was being deposed by Grayson. 18 And you're seated in a room at the Q. 19 Hampton Inn in Winchester; is that correct? 20 That's correct. Α. And did someone inform you that this is 21 0. 22 the place you needed to be? 23 Α. Correct. And were you informed that there would 24 Q.

be a deposition today?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

- A. Correct.
- Q. And did you receive that information by way of a phone call or did your secretary tell you or did you get an e-mail or a letter or how were you informed of that?
 - A. E-mail.
- Q. Okay. And when you were put on notice to be here, did you know who would be asking you questions?
 - A. No, I didn't. But I just assumed.
- Q. Did you know the number of questions that you would be asked?
 - A. No.
 - Q. Did you know when you were put on notice to be here how long the deposition would take?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. When you got that notice, did you know the number of attorneys who would be asking you questions?
- 21 A. No.
- Q. All right. But nevertheless you arrived at the time that that notice advised you that you needed to be here; correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Have you ever given a deposition before?
 - A. Yes.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

- Q. And in what kind of case?
- A. It was a litigation over transmission.
- Q. And would you tell us please by whom you are employed and what your job title is?
- A. East -- I'm employed by East Kentucky
 Power Cooperative and my title is CEO, president
 and CEO.
- 11 Q. Okay. And how long have you had that 12 title?
- A. For just a little over four and a half years.
- Q. And how old a man are you?
- 16 A. 54.
- Q. And did you go to college?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Where did you go to college?
- 20 A. I went -- my undergraduate or my
- 21 graduate?
- 22 Q. Undergrad.
- A. Undergrad was at Southern Illinois
- 24 University, Carbondale, Illinois.

```
Is that where Walt Frazier went?
1
        0.
2
        Α.
              I don't know.
 3
              Carbondale, Illinois. Did you graduate
        Q.
   from Southern Illinois?
 4
5
        Α.
              Yes, sir.
6
              And when did you graduate?
        Q.
 7
        Α.
              1993.
8
        Q.
              And after that did you start attending
9
   and complete a graduate program?
10
              Not immediately, but soon after that,
        Α.
11
   yes.
12
              Where was that?
        Q.
13
              University of Illinois.
        Α.
14
        Q.
              And did you complete a graduate program
15
   there?
16
        Α.
              Yes.
17
        Q.
              And what was that?
              Masters in business administration.
18
        Α.
19
              Okay. And do you have any other
        Q.
20
   degrees?
21
        Α.
              No.
22
              And when did you get your masters in
        Q.
23
   business administration at the University of
   Illinois?
24
```

A. 1996.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. After that did you start working somewhere?
 - A. Actually I started working right after I got my undergraduate degree.
 - O. Where was that?
 - A. Corn Belt Energy -- Corn Belt Cooperative, Corn Belt Electric Cooperative.
 - Q. Okay. And where was that?
- 10 A. Bloomington, Illinois.
- 11 Q. And that is Illinois State, isn't it?
- 12 A. Yeah, it's Illinois State in
- 13 Bloomington, correct.
- 14 Q. Doug Collins?
- 15 A. Yeah, yes, sir.
- 16 Q. And how long did you work there?
- 17 A. I was there five years.
- 18 Q. Okay. And what did you do there?
- 19 A. I -- well, I started in as -- I'm trying
- 20 to think what my title was, but it was head of
- 21 electronics, IT. I was really hired to put in
- 22 their SCADA system. They didn't have anything.
- 23 Didn't have any automation whatsoever. Automate
- 24 their substations, things like that. I don't

remember my title exactly. I was in charge of purchasing too.

- Q. So you started there in '93ish?
- A. Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

- Q. And stayed there a couple years after you got your MBA?
- A. Yeah, that is right, uh-huh.
 - O. And then left there and went where?
 - A. I went to Soyland Power Cooperative.
- 10 Q. Where was that?
- 11 A. That was in Decatur, Illinois.
- 12 Q. And what did you do there?
- A. I was -- I don't remember my title
 either, but I was really a power sales. You know,
 I went out and tried to sell power, small deals to
- 16 off system sales.
- 17 O. And was that a distribution?
- 18 A. No, it was a G&T.
- 19 Q. And how long did you work there?
- 20 A. About a year.
- Q. How did you perform the essential
- 22 functions of your task at Soyland? What did you
- 23 do to accomplish your job?
- A. Well, you know, mostly was to try to

structure deals such that the cooperative could make money and mitigate risk and then find opportunities out there with the end consumers.

- Q. To whom did you make sales?
- A. Well, we were working with -- when I left, we were working close to a deal with a city up in Chicago, by Chicago, Charleston or somewhere like that, St. Charles, St. Charles. And then we were in Missouri trying to do a deal with Citizens Electric actually.
 - Q. Who owned that cooperative?
- A. Well, we had owners, just distribution owners that owned the cooperative. I can't tell you how many because it was kind of in a transition, a flux period.
 - Q. So you were there about a year?
- 17 A. Yes.

- O. And then went where?
- A. Then the CEO of Corn Belt Electric

 Cooperative actually had just took over another

 distribution system and came and asked if I would

 come back.
 - Q. And did you?
- 24 A. I did.

```
1
        Q.
              As?
2
        Α.
              Vice president of engineering and
 3
   operation.
 4
        0.
              And how long did you stay there?
5
        Α.
              Five years.
6
              Okay. So we're now what about 2002 or
        Q.
   so or 2001?
7
8
        Α.
              3.
9
        Q.
                  Okay. And then where did you go?
              3.
10
              Then I went to -- I was hired at
11
   Citizens Electric Cooperative -- actually
12
   Corporation over at St. Genevieve, Missouri.
13
        Q.
              And what did you do there?
14
              President and CEO.
        Α.
15
        Q.
              And did you say that was or was not a
16
   cooperative?
17
        Α.
              It was a cooperative.
18
        0.
              And the name of it again was what?
19
        A.
              Citizens Electric Corporation.
20
              Citizens?
        0.
21
        Α.
              Yeah.
22
              And how long did you stay there?
        Q.
              I was there six years.
23
        Α.
```

And then how many members did that

24

Q.

```
cooperative have?
1
2
        A.
             None. It was just -- it was owned by
 3
   itself.
 4
        0.
             Oh, okay.
5
             You mean end consumers you're talking
        Α.
 6
   about?
7
             Yeah. It was a distribution
        0.
8
   cooperative?
             I see what you are asking. I was
        Α.
   thinking you were thinking it was a G&T. It had
10
11
   owners. I don't remember, but I'm thinking like
   30,000 roughly.
12
13
             Okay. And was it when you left there
14
   that you came to East Kentucky?
15
             That's correct.
        Α.
16
             And that was four and a half years ago?
        0.
17
        Α.
             That's correct.
18
             In this other case in which you gave a
        0.
   deposition, by whom were you employed at that
19 l
20
   time?
21
             Corn Belt Energy Corporation.
        Α.
22
             Is that the only deposition you have
        Q.
231
   ever given?
24
        Α.
             That's the only one.
```

Q. Okay. Then you know then as we go through here this morning that when I ask you a question and you want to say yes, it's better to say yes than uh-huh because we have a court reporter over here that is taking everything down. If you want to say no, it's better to say no than huh-uh or if you do not understand a question that I have asked or if I have not stated it very clearly, that you can just ask me to repeat it and I will. Okay?

- A. That's good advice. Thank you.
- Q. And I would like to also see if you and I could agree that -- I hope this would work this way. If I say in a question "did you" or if I refer to "you", I'm going to try to do that in a way that "you" means East Kentucky Power. Is that okay to try to -- unless I say, "now,

 Mr. Campbell, in this question when I say you, I want it to be Mr. Campbell." All right? Can we do that? Is that okay?
 - A. It's up to counsel.

MR. GOSS: Yeah.

THE WITNESS: As far as I am concerned.

Q. I don't know. It just seems to me that

that might work. If I say you, then --

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- A. You means East Kentucky Power Cooperative.
- If I say you, I'm talking about East Kentucky Power. Okay. I don't know if that is good or not. Anyway, I just thought it might be a way to try to get through this.

East Kentucky Power is owned by who?

- We have 16 owners, distribution cooperatives that own us.
- And one of those owners is Grayson Rural Q. Electric: correct?
 - Α. That is correct.
- And is there a contract that is known as 0. a wholesale power contract that East Kentucky Power has with its distribution cooperative owners?
 - That is correct. Α.
 - And was that entered into in 1964? ο.
- I don't remember the exact date, but Α. close to that.
- And has it been supplemented or amended 0. two or three times with one of those amendments 23 l called Amendment 3 to the wholesale power

contract?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And what is it that East Kentucky Power believes Amendment 3 does?
- A. Well, our interpretation of Amendment 3 is that it allows our end consumer or our owners, 16 owners, to procure power outside of our system to a certain percentage without having EKPC as their provider.
- Q. Let me back up a little bit and ask you to explain what your job duties are as president and CEO? What is it that either by board policy or written directive from the board as a whole you believe your actual day-to-day duties are.
- A. My day-to-day duties are operating the

 -- running the cooperative and relative to the

 strategic plan developed by our board of directors

 given in the confines of the policies that we have

 and contracts that we have.
 - Q. Does East Kentucky Power have a COO?
- 21 A. Yes.
 - Q. And who is that?
- 23 A. Mr. Don Mosier.
 - Q. And that is Mr. Mosier that is seated

1 over here to your left?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Or to the left of your attorney?
- A. Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- Q. And what are the duties of the COO?
- A. The chief operating officer is actually responsible for all day-to-day operating responsibilities of the cooperative generation, the delivery system, actually power purchases, making sure we comply with environmental, things like that.
- Q. Okay. Does that wholesale power contract as you, Tony Campbell, understand it --
- A. Was that Tony Campbell me or not East Kentucky Power?
- Q. It's Tony Campbell. It's Tony Campbell or Mr. Campbell. I will call you Mr. Campbell.
- 18 As Mr. Campbell understands it, do you,
- 19 Mr. Campbell, believe that that wholesale power
- 20 contract requires East Kentucky Power to deliver
- 21 electric power to the distribution cooperatives?
- 22 A. Yes. It actually in my -- and this is
- 23 Tony Campbell's thought process. It not only
- 24 requires us to deliver power to our 16 owners, but

it requires our 16 owners to buy power from East Kentucky Power Cooperative.

- Q. It requires, does it not, East Kentucky to sell and deliver to the 16 distribution cooperatives and also the 16 distribution cooperatives to buy and receive that power; correct?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. And the only modification of those things is what Amendment 3 would allow?
- 11 A. That's correct.

- Q. All right. Now, would you agree with me, would East Kentucky agree with me, that East Kentucky under that wholesale power contract is to pay for all final connections at points of delivery?
- A. I'm not sure I'm understanding the question. Could you ask that again please?
- Q. Okay. Do you know if that contract requires East Kentucky to pay for all final connections at points of delivery?
- A. And you're talking -- I just want to
 make sure I understand the question. You are
 talking like all the facilities' final connections

being the hardware, the substations to our delivery points?

Q. Yeah. Let's just -- let's just take a look here. Let me show you a document here and you can show your lawyer here in case he wants to look at that to see if that -- and there may be more than one copy there. I think that might be a copy of the wholesale power contract.

MR. GOSS: What are you asking him?

- Q. Do you see on the section there,
 Mr. Campbell, right in numerical paragraph 2?
- A. Uh-huh.

- Q. Can you read that?
- A. Sure. You want me to start with the 2?
- 15 Q. Correct.
 - A. Electric characteristics and delivery points. Electric power and energy to be furnished hereunder shall be alternating current, three phase, four wide, 60 cycle. The seller shall make and pay for all final connections between the systems of the seller and the member points of delivery.
- Q. So the answer to my question I asked you a minute ago would be yes?

- A. For all physical connections, yes.
- Q. Okay. Could I have all of that back?
- A. Certainly.
- Q. I believe that sheet there might be --
- A. Sorry.

18 l

- Q. For what purpose that is like that I don't know. So what does that mean? What does that mean that section you just read?
- A. Well, to me that would mean like the substations, all the transmission line, the meters to our metering point, that we pay for all the breakers, all the regulators, transformers, et cetera, to get electric power to flow to our end consumers or owners.
- Q. And then the next section, section 3 that kind of goes on. I don't know if it's kind of redundant from the previous section or if it's trying to add something else, but it says the seller shall own, read that part right there.
- A. Okay. Substations, the seller shall install and own, maintain the necessary substation equipment at the points of connection. Want me to read on?
- 24 Q. Yeah.

A. The seller shall own and maintain switching and protective equipment which may be reasonably necessary to enable the member to take and use electric power and energy hereunder and to protect the system of the seller. Meters and metering equipment shall be furnished and maintained by the seller and shall be located at the point of delivery on the low voltage side of such transforming equipment. Member will be responsible for reading meters and making reading information available to seller.

- Q. Now, would you agree with me, sir, and would East Kentucky agree with me that Amendment 3 to this contract does not change the provisions that you just read?
- A. No. That is correct. I agree with you that we should still own all the physical equipment.

MR. GOSS: Jeff, just for the record let the record reflect that the witness was reading from subsection 3 of the October 1, 1964 wholesale power contract between East Kentucky and Grayson and previously paragraph 2.

Q. Does East Kentucky Power send the

```
distribution cooperatives a notice once each year
 2
   of the rate that they are going to be charged for
 3
   this power?
 4
             I don't know that I can answer that.
                                                     I
5
   would assume so, but I don't know that for sure.
6
             If it does, and would you through
        Q.
7
   counsel agree to provide a copy of any notice that
8
   has been sent annually for that purpose in the
9
   last, let's say each of the last three years?
10
             I would think we would.
11
             MR. GOSS: Yes, yes. So let me just
12
   make sure.
               You want 2010, '11, '12 or 2011, '12,
13
   '13? What three years do you want?
14
             MR. SCOTT: Start with '10.
15
             MR. GOSS: '10, '11, '12.
16
             MR. SCOTT:
                          And '13. So we will call it
17
   four years.
18
             MR. GOSS:
                        And 13.
             Upon what is that rate based?
19
        Q.
20
             The cost of service study that we have
        A.
   done in the past and taking it to the Public
21
22
   Service Commission and had approved.
23
             In that cost of service study most
        0.
```

recently I quess, you tell me if I'm wrong, would

have been submitted to the Public Service

Commission in 2010, 167 case I think is the case

number maybe, where you got your last rate fixed?

- A. That is right. We used as I recollected that cost of service study we used in 2010 for the rate -- base rate increase that we requested was maybe dated by a year or two, but I'm not sure of that.
- Q. Whenever it was. That was the one that
- 11 A. That was the basis --

- Q. -- was submitted on which the rate that came out of that case was set?
- A. That is correct, yeah. The Commission set -- allowed us to set those rates based on that cost of service study.
- Q. And is there an expense associated with administrative and general expenses of East Kentucky that are components of that?
 - A. I'm not sure what you're asking, please.
- Q. Is there an expense of administrative and general expenses or a heading such as that that is a component of --
- A. Oh, the rates?

Q. Yes.

- A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. And what is it that fits within administrative and general?
 - A. Well, there is a whole host of things in administration and general that are -- the way we book administrative and general. In fact it starts with the salaries, it starts with legal fees, a whole host of things. In fact I've been trying to push accounting on modifying that. I think there are probably too many things in A&G that shouldn't be.
- Q. And maybe should be assigned somewhere else. Is that your point?
 - A. Exactly, correct.
- Q. And that is part of the cost of service study that was submitted?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You have stated that Amendment 3, what
 East Kentucky believes Amendment 3 does or can do.
 Let me ask you if you got some letters from Carol
 Fraley and I'm not going to ask you if you
 received notice from Carol Fraley because that'd
 probably be met with an objection because that is

what lawyers do when they talk about words that 1 have some meaning or term of art or something like 2 3 that. So I'm not going to give Mr. Goss the 4 opportunity to object to that. But I'm going to 5 ask if you got certainly pieces of correspondence 6 from Carol Fraley and they be deemed to be 7 whatever it is that they would be deemed to be 8 rather than somebody trying to argue if its, 9 quote, unquote, noticed. But did you get a letter 10 dated June 22, 2012 from Carol Fraley? 11 Yes, I did get a letter from Α.

- Q. And is that a copy of it that you've got in your hand?
 - A. Is this the letter?

12

13

14

15

20

21

22

23

Miss Fraley.

THE WITNESS: Would you want to check that letter?

MR. GOSS: Yeah. Let me check. Yeah.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

- Q. And did you get a letter here -- this purports -- this is an unsigned copy, but did you get a letter dated August 9, 2012 from Carol Fraley?
- A. I did get a letter from Miss Fraley on

```
1
   the 29th of August -- on the 9th of August.
                                                  I'm
2
   sorry.
 3
             And is that a copy of it?
        Q.
 4
        Α.
             Yes.
5
        Q.
             That I have handed you. And did you
6
   also get a letter from Carol Fraley actually
   addressed to you I believe January 18, 2013?
8
             MR. GOSS: Yes.
9
              THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
10
        Q.
             And is that a copy of it that you've got
11
   there?
12
             Yes, sir.
        Α.
13
             And did you also get a letter from Carol
        0.
14
   Fraley dated September 26, 2013?
15
             MR. GOSS: Yeah.
16
             THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
17
        Q.
             The last one seems to be drafted a whole
18
   lot better than the other ones, wouldn't you
19
   agree?
20
              I'm not an attorney. So I wouldn't
21
   know.
             Well, you don't have to be an attorney.
22
        Q.
23
   I mean an MBA could answer that question.
   whatever -- and you have got copies of all of
24
```

those with you there; right?

A. Correct.

- Q. And whatever it is that makes up the content of those letters, the words that are in there, the paragraphs that are used, and the meaning that you gleaned from them, whatever meaning you gleaned from them, you did glean a meaning from them, didn't you?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. All right. And you received them at or about the time of a day or two following the date on each of the letters, wouldn't you think?
- A. That's correct.
- Q. So the one in September 26, 2013 you probably got in September. The one in January 18, 2013 you probably got in January.
 - A. I think that is a fair assumption.
- Q. Okay. Go to the very first one there, the June 2012 letter.
- 20 A. Okay.
 - Q. When you got that, what did you do with it or about what did you do? Did you have a discussion with somebody? Did you notify somebody, Mr. Mosier or an attorney or a staff

member or a secretary or anybody?

A. Well, let me just read this letter again and make sure I'm on the right page with you. I don't want to give you misinformation.

(Pause in proceedings).

A. Yeah, this is the letter. As I recollect, when I received this letter I think I called -- I did a number of things. I called Miss Fraley and said that I was in receipt of the letter and that we would be taking it to the board. I called the chairman of the board and shared this letter and told him that I was going to put it on the agenda and I believe I shared it with David Smart and maybe -- I don't know if I shared it with Don or not. But I did because I said we were going to put it on the SI Committee for discussion.

MR. GOSS: Say for the record what the SI Committee is.

THE WITNESS: The Strategic Issues

Committee is a committee of our board of directors

at East Kentucky Power Cooperative.

Q. Now, that letter refers to a certain

1 number of megawatts, does it not?

A. Correct.

- Q. And what is that number?
- A. Well, the peak demand of 2009 to 2011 is 71.4 megawatts.
- Q. Yeah. I guess it has got a lot of them on it. All right. Very good. Would you go to the August letter, August 9, 2012 letter?
 - A. I have that letter.
- Q. And similarly when you got it -- and you have already said you did get it. When you got it, what did you do with it?
- A. Let me just read it. I want to make sure that I'm on the same page. So this -- this letter I'm sure I didn't call Miss Fraley, but I did call Chairman Hawkins, told him that I received this, David Smart and I think Don Mosier too and stating that we would put this on the SI Committee.
- Q. David Smart is general counsel for East 21 Kentucky Power?
- A. General counsel for East Kentucky, yes, sir.
- Q. And does that letter, that August 9

letter, inform East Kentucky that Grayson intends to purchase from Magnum Drilling of Ohio 5 megawatts of power commencing in the year 2012?

A. That is correct.

- Q. Now, does 5 megawatts of power mean anything to East Kentucky with respect to Grayson and that letter? Does that number 5 have any particular meaning?
- A. Well, the only -- I mean I'm not sure what it meant for Grayson, but to me and East Kentucky Power Cooperative it meant that it would qualify under Amendment 3 to be allowed with 90-days notice.
- Q. Okay. Would it also mean that it would be within 15 percent of Grayson's load ratio?
- A. I don't remember what your load ratio was at the time, but as I recollect, you were below that and so it would have been within the 15 percent.
- Q. Okay. And certainly 5 megawatts would have been significantly less than 5 percent of East Kentucky's production; correct?
- A. That is -- well, our three-year rolling average? Is that what you mean?

Q. Yeah.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- A. Yes, that would have been well within the three-year rolling average. Even when added back with the current Amendment 3 exercises that we already had out there.
- Q. So you said when you got the August 9 letter you called Mr. Hawkins?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And Mr. Hawkins is Paul Hawkins.
 - A. That is correct.
- Q. He's the chairman of the board of East Kentucky Power?
- 13 A. That is correct.
- 14 Q. And for what reason did you call him?
- A. To tell him that we needed to put this on the agenda of the next board meeting.
- Q. For the SI, the Strategic Issues
- 18 | Committee?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- Q. I want to show you another letter that I have received from your lawyer finally the weekend before Christmas and you can let your lawyer look at that.
- MR. GOSS: Yeah, yeah.

- Q. Is that a letter on East Kentucky's letterhead from its then general counsel to Larry Hicks the president and CEO of Salt River?
 - A. Yes, it is.

- Q. And the date of that is what?
- A. April 20, 2005.
- Q. And does that letter -- that is from Dale Henley?
 - A. This is from Dale Henley, yes.
- Q. And was Dale Henley at that time general counsel of East Kentucky Power?
- A. It -- the way he signed it, it says he was general counsel. That was before I started East Kentucky so I don't recollect, but --
- Q. Yeah. Does that letter from the general counsel of East Kentucky Power to Mr. Hicks, president and CEO of a distribution member owner cooperative of East Kentucky, tell Mr. Hicks that his earlier notice to East Kentucky of Salt River wanting to purchase a certain number of megawatts of power is within it's load ratio and is within the load ratio of East Kentucky's 5 percent and therefore need not be presented to the Allocation Committee?

A. It does.

- Q. Could you reconcile then, sir, the import of that or the content of that with the statement that you made a minute ago that when you got the August 9 letter from Grayson Rural Electric you notified Mr. Hawkins and said this needs to go to the committee?
 - A. Well, first thing is --
- Q. If there is a need to reconcile it. But I mean it seems that they are the same. You tell me what is different about them, if any?
- A. I'm not sure exactly where Mr. Henley was in the process of exercising Amendment 3, but after I came and was requested to exercise -- by a different owner to exercise Amendment 3, I quickly realized we didn't have a process in place and we needed one. And I adopted a process for Amendment 3 so everybody would get exactly the same treatment.
- Q. Is that process that you adopted one that is in writing?
 - A. No.
- Q. So when did you adopt this unwritten process?

- A. I don't recollect the exact date, but I can tell you that what stimulated that adoption was a request by Mr. Don Schaefer, president and CEO of Jackson Energy, request for 40 megawatts.
 - Q. Is that down in Bowling Green?

MR. GOSS: No, Jackson, Kentucky.

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. I mean the 40 -- no,

that was -- the 40 that they wanted was --

MR. GOSS: OMU.

MR. SCOTT: Was that the Wellhead thing?

MR. GOSS: OMU, Owensboro.

MR. SCOTT: Owensboro. I knew it was somewhere west of here. Yeah.

- O. And that was 2010? When was that?
- A. Well, I'm not sure of the exact dates, but we can certainly look those up and give them to you.
- Q. It's in some of this.
 - A. But it started, his first verbal request to me was when Jim Lamb who was vice president of power supply was still at East Kentucky. It was right after I started. So I'm going to guess about September of 2009. His formal request to me was probably very early in 2010.

- Q. I think we probably got that. So did you communicate this unwritten policy to anybody at all?
 - Α. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I get older.

- So whom did you communicate? Q.
- The board of directors. Α.
- 0. Is there a board minutes or are there minutes reflecting that?
- I don't know, Mr. Scott, but we can sure There should be something in the minutes check. where I just said, hey, we are going to have a process where we are going to bring these Amendment 3s back to the board of director and actually do what the Amendment 3 suggests we do.
- So you think if there was a board minute 0. reflecting that, that it would be in late summer, early fallish of '09, maybe into early 2010, somewhere in there?
- Actually -- well, I will have to check that out, Mr. Scott. First thing, the 40 megawatts -- we need to get our timeline square. And I don't have the exact dates and I do apologize for that. My memory is getting worse as But when Mr. Schaefer came for the

40 megawatts, I went back to Mr. Schaefer and had a meeting with him. No, he came in and had a meeting with Mr. Schaefer and I said look you can't do a 40 megawatt block, 7 by 24. You need to follow load and you need to designate load if you are going to do that.

And then he sent a request back to me and said I'm going to withdraw my 40 megawatt request because I started talking about the cost. You need -- you need to make sure that the other members are compensated for any stranded investment that we have. And then he said I will withdraw my 40 megawatts, although I still want to make sure that it is out there and let's try to fix this if you would. Fix the language of Amendment 3. That is what really promulgated the suggested Amendment 5 which was language to try to fix Amendment 3, which was unsuccessful.

- Q. Does that letter I handed you refresh your memory any?
- 21 A. Yeah. This is the letter.

MR. GOSS: Let me -- it's your
deposition, Mr. Scott, but we're handing him
letters and contracts and everything and we're

identifying them by date. I presume you're going to move for admission of these with the court reporter. And if you want to refer to them by date and then the letter that is fine or if you want to refer to them by exhibit number that might be better. Again I don't want to tell you how to do your deposition, but in fairness to the witness and in fairness to whoever reads this transcript, we probably need to maybe identify these documents as they are being handed to him or, you know, so the record will be made up in some fashion, however you want to do it.

- Q. Does that help you? That letter that you are looking at?
 - A. Uh-huh.

MR. GOSS: I'm sorry. Would you identify the letter by date and who the author is?

MR. SCOTT: We will get there, Mr. Goss.

MR. GOSS: Well, I mean you have asked him, Mr. Scott, to look at a letter you handed him.

MR. SCOTT: I know and I'm getting there. I mean if there is any other question you want me to ask, write them down and I will try to

ask them, you know.

MR. GOSS: Well, I mean, you have taken enough deposition, you ought to know how to -- and I know you know how to identify a document in fairness to the witness and whoever is reading a deposition transcript. So and I don't want to -- I don't mean to interrupt you, but if you can just identify the document so the record will be clear and then I will hush.

THE WITNESS: The letter that I'm looking at is from Jackson Energy Cooperative. It is to Wayne Stratton chairman of the EKPC board of directors from the Jackson Energy Cooperative board of directors dated September 1, 2010 regarding 40 megawatts, Amendment 3, 40 megawatt wholesale power contract purchase. This is the letter.

- Q. So we are then September of 2010 rather than September of 2009?
- A. No, no. I said he initially approached me roughly September of 2009 verbally saying, hey, we're looking at the 40 megawatt deal. Then he formally came in 2010. I just didn't know the date.

- Q. So go back to the Dale Henley letter that I showed you that is dated what?
- A. This date of Dale Henley letter from -- to Mr. Larry Hicks is dated April 20, 2005.
- Q. And it's your belief as president and CEO of East Kentucky Power that what Mr. Henley was conveying to Mr. Hicks was not the way you thought it should be handled with respect to Amendment 3 notices?
- A. Clearly I think my interpretation of this letter to Mr. Hicks is pretty sloppy work.
- Q. Okay. All right. You said something a minute ago about you told -- I believe you said you told Mr. Schaefer you can't -- cannot -- something about you cannot buy a 7 by 24 block of power. Did you say that?
- A. No. I said you have to designate the load.
 - Q. The load.

A. You can buy it although you can't come in and take a base load block of power off of our system. You have to designate load and then follow that load. If you want to buy a -- if Mr. Schaefer wanted to buy a block, 7 by 24 block,

follow the load, do whatever he wanted to do with the rest, that is fine. I didn't have a problem with that. And --

- Q. And you told him that.
- A. Yeah. And I also said that one would have to make sure that they paid all stranded investment to the other -- to cover the other members, to make sure there wasn't a subsidy going on.
- Q. Is that the position of East Kentucky Power today?
 - A. That if --

- 13 Q. What you just said?
 - A. So the position of East Kentucky Power is if an owner comes in and then wants something less equal to or less than their 5 percent share, we have no problem. We feel that that should just be really exercised on and we certainly would recommend.
 - Q. 5 percent or 15?
 - A. No, 5 percent, their 5 percent share. However if it goes over their 5 percent share, then we believe that it needs to go back to the Allocation Committee and be allocated to that

board or -- and I really promoted this, one cooperative working with another cooperative outside of our realm to do that.

- Q. You said their 5 percent share?
- A. Correct.

- Q. Distribution cooperative's 5 percent share of what?
- A. Our owners share of their three-year rolling average.
 - Q. And you get that position from what?
- A. Well, I get that position first thing is mathematically East Kentucky Power Cooperative is only exposed to 5 percent no matter who gets what. We really don't have a dog in the fight, a bone in the fight of how the owners split it up, but I do have a fiduciary responsibility as CEO of East Kentucky Power Cooperative to make sure that we try to do it as fair as we can.

My discussion with the board of directors was, look, if an owner wants to take their 5 percent share, their three-year rolling average, 5 percent share, they should be allowed to do about whatever they want with that, I mean given the confines of, you know, not endangering

the other owners. However if they go over that 5 percent share and then want to take more than that, then I think -- and I actually emphatically said it to the board, then you have an issue of fairness and think it needs to go through the process, which would be Amendment 3 and then push it into the 305. That is the way it is set up right now.

- Q. So 5 -- you're throwing --
- A. Although could I say one other thing?
- Q. Yeah. Go ahead.

- A. Do you mind? I also make an appeal at the same time that I did that and I actually did this through a presentation. I've probably done a number of them, but I made an appeal to all our owners to try to work together to solve this with the 5 percent because I think that would -- that really is the most fair thing.
- Q. Is that what started the Amendment 5?

 Is that what you are talking about or did it come after that?
- A. No. Amendment 5 came actually right
 after I received the formal request -- oh, I don't
 have that right now.

From Jackson. 0.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

From the Jackson Energy for the 40 megawatts. And the reason for that, Mr. Scott, was because I told Don that I wouldn't support First thing he -- it was written such that it was a 7 by 24 and you can't take a block of power away. I mean because clearly the Amendment 3 says load or loads and I pointed that out. we had a lot of discussion about that.

However, I asked him, I said look, I agree that Amendment 3 is not written as well as it should be and I have had meetings with other 13 counsel, older counsel that said the same thing. So I said, well, why didn't we just fix this and he said if you fix it, I will withdraw my 40 megawatt request and that is what started Amendment 5 to try to get to that process which ultimately failed, Amendment 5.

- Explain to me -- when you say 5 percent 0. in your answer there, 5 percent of what? What are you talking about?
- Α. The 5 percent of our owners? Is that what you mean?
- 24 Whatever you refer to it as. Whatever Q.

you meant for it to be. I want to know what you Tony Campbell or you East Kentucky think 5 percent means. 5 percent of what? We know 5 percent is a percentage. It's a percentage of what?

A. Let's go through our interpretation of the 5 percent. There is two 5 percents. One 5 percent is -- the way the Amendment 3 is, East Kentucky Power Cooperative and the wholesale power contract and Amendment 3 is exposed to potentially losing 5 percent of our three-year rolling average load, period. Can't go over that 5 percent.

Then when you start dispersing it, if you just look at it mathematically, each member really has 5 percent. And in the amendment,

Amendment 3, I believe it states -- or 305, I'm not sure. It says each member will get their 5 percent share. I mean mathematically that is the way it works. Right? Has to. And then a member has an option to go up to actually 15 percent if no one else is using, but nobody -- there is absolutely no owners that can go over our rolling, East Kentucky Power Cooperative's rolling three year 5 percent average in totality.

Q. So you say that each distribution

1 cooperative getting 15 percent of their average 2 coincident peak could exceed the 5 percent and 3 therefore that is why you believe there is this 4 fairness issue?

- A. It can't exceed the 5 percent. Clearly that is in the contract.
- Q. Well, if you did the math and they all did it, than that is greater than 5 percent.
 - A. Mathematically it would be greater.
- Q. So therefore that is why you think or East Kentucky thinks or maybe East Kentucky and Tony Campbell, that they ought not be able to get that for lack of a better term willy-nilly because in the aggregate if they did, it would exceed the 5 percent, which is not allowed by Amendment 3.
- A. Could you state that one more time? I just want to make sure because I'm not so sure.
- Q. Probably not, but I guess your position is that if Grayson Rural Electric got 15 percent of his average coincident peak, Jackson did, Owen did, and everybody did, then in the aggregate that would exceed 5 percent of East Kentucky's; correct?
 - A. Yes, and that is disallowed.

- Q. But Amendment 3 does not allow that?
- A. That is correct.

- Q. Now, tell me -- let me show you a document here. To satisfy Mr. Goss it's dated November 21, 2003. It has got a copy of exhibit 2 on there for reasons that I don't know. Probably something that I attached to the complaint in this case. It says Amendment 3 to the wholesale power contract. And I suggest to you that it is in fact Amendment 3 to the wholesale power contract?
 - A. Thank you.
- Q. You can show Mr. Goss that to see if he concurs if it is that.
 - A. Yes, sir, Mr. Scott. This is Amendment 3 to the wholesale power contract.
 - Q. And you see there where it says numerical paragraph 1 where it says general and general is underlined?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Go on over to the second page which would be still under general, but lower case a, where it says during any calendar year the member, blah, blah, blah. Do you see that?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.

- Q. May make or cancel any such election or elections by giving at least 90-days notice to the seller with respect to any load or loads. Do you see that?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Did I read that correctly?
- A. Yes.

- Q. Is that the language upon which you base -- East Kentucky bases and Tony Campbell bases its belief that you must designate a particular load on your system to which the 15 percent or up to 15 percent that you are going to buy outside East Kentucky would apply?
- A. Yes. And it actually says it again in paragraph B.
 - Q. Correct. With a greater than --
- 17 A. Yes.
 - Q. So is a load --
 - A. But I will -- I will say and this probably does need to be on the record. You know, I softened that in my thought process. Whether it be fair or unfair, softened that in that I kind of told the board of directors if an owner wants to come in for some of their 5 percent, not to exceed

their 15 percent of their load, that I think they should be able to do whatever they want. I don't think -- I don't think we care what you do with that. It's only in my personal opinion when you go over the 5 percent, then all of a sudden you get cost shifting and we have to just make sure that it is fair and equitable for everyone.

- Q. So if Grayson Rural Electric's -- if 15 percent of Grayson Rural Electric's average coincident peak is 9.3 megawatts, you think that they should only be allowed to use 3.1?
- A. No. I believe that Grayson Rural

 Electric can still exercise their right under

 Amendment 3 to request up to 15 percent of their

 average three-year -- rolling average three-year

 peak. However, if it's the 5 percent, let's say

 that number and I don't have a calculator with me,

 but it is roughly 3 megawatts. I believe --
- Q. Let's assume for purposes that 15 is 9.3. so the 5 would be 3.1. right?
 - A. Okay.

- Q. Okay.
- A. So assuming that is correct, I believe that the 3.1 should be -- the board should approve

and really I think the board approved just to make sure that everybody knows and that is in the minutes that Grayson is going to do something. I don't believe, that's my belief, Tony Campbell, that we should say that you have to designate a lead. I really think --

Q. If it's up to --

- A. Up to their 5 percent.
- Q. 5 percent of your 15?
- A. Right. Because every --
- 11 Q. And tell me why you say that?
 - A. My hypothesis is that every member has 5 percent of the load, of East Kentucky Power Cooperatives three-year rolling 5 percent average of our peak load. Every member has that 5 percent.
 - Q. You know it's not going to exceed East Kentucky's 5 percent if everybody took --
 - A. 5 percent.
 - Q. It's never going to get higher than that.
- A. Plus every owner has exactly the same opportunity to exercise their right for that 5 percent. And so if there is some cost shifting,

that is because one owner would chose not to exercise that right and cost shift back. But then I think when it goes over the 5 percent, then I thought well then we need to really go back into the 305 because there is probably going to be some cost shifting.

Q. Would you agree with me, Mr. Campbell, that -- I'm sure you won't, but I'm going to ask you. As we sit here today and you know we lawyers have sent stuff back and forth about notices or requests for election under Amendment 3 that Salt River has done or that Jackson has done or Farmers and just as a practical down to earth matter here I want to ask you, this thing has been in effect since what, November of 2003, a little over ten years. And the requests that have been made or the notices that have been sent to East Kentucky are a far cry from that 5 percent.

So is it your interpretation or your position that you just gave here one that is based upon things that aren't really in existence and maybe an effort to try to fix something that is really not broken?

A. And that's a really good question

actually. And so I agree with you in that we're a long ways from our East Kentucky Power

Cooperatives three-year rolling average peak.

We're a long ways from that. However I think I also have that fiduciary responsibility to say if something comes along and some owner has more than their 5 percent and everybody wants their 5 percent, there is not going to be enough to go around. And I just want to make sure that everybody understands that, because that is the only bone in the fight that I have.

I mean I'm really not worried about
let's say the 150 megawatts, our 5 percent, our
three-year rolling average 5 percent which is
going to go up now that we had this big peak
yesterday, but roughly it was about 150 megawatts.
I mean I can certainly mitigate that. We have a
staff that can do that as best we can as long as
it's fair with all the owners.

I only am concerned that if owners take over their 5 percent, that the other owners need to understand that there is still only -- we are only going to give up to that 5 percent so somebody is going to be left out.

Q. Tell me what you think defines your fiduciary duty?

- A. Well, I believe as a cooperative CEO that I need to follow the seven cooperative principles and that it has to be fair and equitable for everyone.
- Q. So to whom do you owe a fiduciary duty and what do you think sets forth that basis for your fiduciary duty?
- A. All of our owners. I think each and every one of our owners needs to be protected by me. I shouldn't favor any owner over another owner.
- Q. Is that the board of directors fiduciary duty rather than the president and CEO?
- A. I think it's the board of directors fiduciary duty too, but personally I think that is my ethical responsibility and fiduciary duty to our owners.
- Q. I have seen the number and done the math, but I can't remember it. If every co-op did go after their 15 percent, it would exceed the 150 by how much? Do you know off the top of your head?

- A. Well, it would -- it would exceed it mathematically by 10 percent.
- Q. Do you know what that number is off the top of your head?
- A. I don't off the top of my head, but I can hypothesize which I don't like to do in a deposition, but I will hypothesize.
 - Q. I'm not going to hold you to it.
- A. If East Kentucky Power Cooperative's 5 percent is 150 megawatts, assuming we had a 3,000 megawatt average peak, that is 150 megawatts. If it's 15 percent, it's going to be what, 400 and --
- 0. -- 50.

- A. -- 50 megawatts. So it's going to exceed that by 300 megawatts.
- Q. Do you East Kentucky have any document where RUS, Rural Utility Service, approved

 Amendment 3?
- A. Yes. I think they had to sign off on that, Mr. Scott. I don't have that in my hand.
- Q. I saw something referencing December of 2003 or something like that. Maybe even Christmas Eve, something like December 24, which I thought was strange. Could you provide --

A. If we have it, we can certainly provide that.

MR. GOSS: Tell me exactly what it is you want.

MR. SCOTT: RUS presumably sent written notification of approval of Amendment 3 and I believe it might have been in December of 2003 or whenever it was. And if East Kentucky has a copy of that, I would like to have a copy.

- A. In actuality too, Amendment 3 was written by RUS.
- Q. I was going to ask you that a minute ago when you said something about its drafting. Do you know who actually drafted that?
- A. I was told by Roy Polk I believe that Amendment 3 was drafted by Rural Utility Services and the reason that was done was because obviously they were the -- at the time they were the only lending institution we had and they wanted to make sure that they -- that it was drafted such that they still had adequate security for their loans.
- Q. Is it, sir, as reasonable to infer from the language in Amendment 3, 1A and 1B, that we looked at there a minute ago.

A. I have it before me.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. That the reference to load or loads is referencing the entirety of the distribution systems load as it is to believe that it is referencing a specific load of a customer on that system?
- Well, I think that is a really good Α. And we had some fairly intense question. discussion with Jackson Energy. You know, could you reference your load as a substation instead of a load. Now, I was told the spirit of this agreement, and that came from Roy Polk, that it was really for a new load, economic development new load, but it is really poorly written and doesn't say that. I met with Jackson Energy and also I believe I met with Owen, Mr. Crawford and Mr. Stallings and I said, well, I understand that is poorly written, but I believe you could in my interpretation of it say, hey, I want to have this industrial customer or this substation would be the load and deliver to that point.
- Q. But East Kentucky is not agreeing that that could be done at this point? Do I understand that correctly? That you don't think it could

apply to just a substation?

A. No. I haven't been in any discussions with anybody at East Kentucky that has given me any concern that you can't point to a load. As long as you can point to that load and then we know we won't serve that load anymore and it's within the guidelines of Amendment 3, I believe that would be fine.

Q. Well, you know what Grayson Rural Electric is trying to do here, don't you?

MR. GOSS: I'm going to object to that question. It's a very general question. Maybe you can be more specific.

Q. Well, that probably opens up for you to say a whole hell of a lot, but let me ask you this, do you know what Grayson Rural Electric is trying to do with respect to the content of the letters that were sent to you in June and August of 2012 and January of 2013 and September of 2013 and in the complaint that is filed with the Commission and the notice of amendment and Duke Energy? Do you know what it is that Grayson is trying to do?

A. I assume that Grayson is trying to buy

some portion of their load off of East Kentucky
Power Cooperative system.

O. From Duke?

1

3

4

5

6

- A. Well, whoever.
- Q. Yeah. Well, did you get from the -- I guess the September 26 letter that it was Duke Energy that they were seeking to buy that from?
- A. I think one was Duke and one was Magnum
 and I don't remember who the other one was. There
 was another one in there. When you went to 5
 megawatts, was that a different supplier? I don't
 know.
- Q. No. But you know that the September 26
 letter tells you that they want to buy power from
 Duke; correct?
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. All right. And have you seen any -- a financial model that a consultant from Grayson Rural Electric put together?
- 20 A. I have not.
- Q. Okay. You haven't seen anything from a 22 Mr. Greg Shepler with EnerVision?
- A. I haven't seen any of the documentation.

 24 I have heard about it, but I haven't seen

1 anything.

- Q. Do you have an understanding of how it is that Grayson Rural Electric believes that this can be accomplished purchasing this power from Duke and putting it on their system? Do you have an understanding of how you believe this can happen?
- A. I haven't been involved in those discussions, no.
- Q. Okay. All right. So you wouldn't know anything about that?
- 12 A. No.
- Q. Okay. Have you read the deposition of David Crews that was given here a couple months ago?
 - A. I haven't read it word for word, but I have scanned it.
- Q. Okay. All right. So why is it that

 19 East Kentucky believed Grayson can't do what it

 20 desires to do as you understand it?
 - A. So let me just make sure that the assumptions are right. I'm assuming that Grayson wants to take up to 15 percent of their three-year rolling average peak load to the market off of

East Kentucky Power Cooperative system. And I see no reason why you can't if you follow the rules and make sure that your obligations are paid. I mean I -- and we run it through the process and 305 -- either 305 is approved through the Allocations Committee or if your neighbors would want to give you some portion of their 5 percent, I see no reason why Grayson can't do that.

- Q. What is it about Amendment 3 that says for Grayson to do this a neighboring cooperative must give them a portion of their 5 percent?
- A. There is nothing in there that says that.
 - Q. Okay.

A. So my interpretation, and I talked with the board about this, was if every member -- and I'm going to kind of restate, if every member wants to take their 5 percent, I don't believe East Kentucky Power Cooperative has any bone in the fight because really it's a fairness issue that you can mitigate yourself, if everybody gets their 5 percent.

If somebody wants to go over their 5 percent, I think from a cooperative principle that

is just a good thing to do and everybody gets
their 5 percent and somebody can give you a
portion of their 5 percent and I think there is no
bones in the fight there either. So to me I just
highly recommended that. That is just a good
cooperative way to solve the problem.

- Q. So Grayson could go out and get 6.2 megawatts from 15 other distribution co-ops and --well, no, that wouldn't -- yeah, 6.2 megawatts from 15 other distribution co-ops and to arrive at their total of 9.3, assuming 9.3 is 15 percent, and East Kentucky would think that that would be swell?
- A. Assuming the 9.3 is actually the three-year rolling average of your peak demand, I believe that we would just run that through just like we do on everyone else. It is just 5 percent. And I don't think there should be -- in my personal opinion, that is Tony Campbell's opinion, and the board has said that seems fair and equitable. There shouldn't be any stranded investment because every owner has the same opportunity with those 5 percent. That doesn't mean we won't have to exercise something, but that

1 -- I see no reason why that won't work.

- Q. Let me change to something else here,
 3 Mr. Campbell.
 - A. Could I say one other thing?
 - Q. Say whatever you want to say.
 - A. That is one avenue, but still Grayson could -- so the notices that were given to me were taken to the SI Committee and tabled. And then finally brought off the table and I think Ken Arrington made the motion actually and we -- we just did away with those. Right?

But you could -- Grayson still has the right, as does any of our owners, to petition East Kentucky Power Cooperative. We will run it through the SI Committee and then the SI Committee -- if it's over your 5 percent in all probability I would assume the SI Committee -- and I don't want to get ahead of them too far, but they will send that to the Allocation Committee. You may -- may well get that through the Allocation Committee and get it anyway. It may not make any difference. Although I'm sure there

will be stranded investment issue, but then I

don't know that for a fact.

Q. But this letter that Dale Henley sent that you said was sloppily done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A. Yes, I don't have that in front of me.
- Q. That references since Salt River's request was within its load ratio it need not go to the Allocation Committee. You think that that is improper. That irrespective of whether the number is within or over the load ratio, that it would still need to go to the Allocation Committee and you are required on Board Policy 305 to say that?
- A. Correct. So let me just specify. I think first off the Larry Hicks letter that Mr. Dale Henley wrote April 20, 2005, the two megawatt request that they made was still under their 5 percent. However he didn't take that into consideration. He only looked at East Kentucky Power Cooperative's 5 percent cap. And I don't think he took into any consideration -- the reason I thought it was sloppy, he didn't let anybody He didn't have it documented and he didn't know. let the board of directors know. And I think the board of directors need to know so that every system knows what is going on within our system.

Because no matter what -- no matter what power leaves, there is going to be some maybe almost minute and negligible, but there is going to be some impact to our power portfolio supply and they need to understand that.

- Q. And on that score Mr. Crews' deposition testimony at least partially and in his answers to interrogatories that he signed off on, and maybe Mr. Mosier, and I think two or three people signed off on those, talked about really the only impact to East Kentucky for Grayson to do this is the revenue loss of a little less than 4 million dollars. Is that 3. -- I think he said 3.6 one time. Then he said 3.993 or something maybe in the answers to interrogatories. Let's call it 4 million. Is that your recollection?
- A. Well, I saw those numbers, but obviously I don't know if the numbers are right. I don't know that those numbers have been scrubbed. They haven't been presented to me, but I mean it is a number that can be derived. You know, whatever that stranded investment is.
- Q. And he said that it was just the only impact is that the loss of that revenue and that

would be accurate, wouldn't it?

A. I think that's an accurate statement. The only thing is East Kentucky Power Cooperative will do everything we can to mitigate that. So it might be smaller than that actually. We will do whatever we can to mitigate that for you and the rest of our owners. So there is two costs, right, that -- potentially -- I'm just going to use somewhat of a hypothetical.

Let's assume Grayson gives us notice to buy their 15 percent. We take that to the SI Committee and the SI Committee would send that to 305 and you would get that allocation, then you transact and get your deal. We would have some stranded investment that would need to be mitigated and we would do our best to mitigate that for you as our owner and our other owners, but there is also a cost.

So that is why we have 18 months to try to mitigate that and then before you can come back, we have to have 18 months to mitigate that because there is going to be a -- you are never going to come back -- I can say this firsthand, you are never going to come back when markets are

low. You are going to come back at the worst possible time when markets are very high and so there is going to be some costs to blend that back in that -- and that is what that 18 months really does. You are kind of pushing that owner out there.

- Q. Let me interrupt you if I could and ask you does East Kentucky's deal with PJM change that in any way --
 - A. Well --

- Q. -- on how that operates?
- A. Yes, sir. It does change that significantly because there are some delivery issues that you will be doing with PJM. However, it doesn't change that from the Amendment 3 because the Amendment 3 we were in MISO at the time. So we have just really flipped from MISO to PJM.
- Q. But the PJM deal makes it easier, doesn't it, as far as East Kentucky is concerned, doesn't it?
- A. Does it make it easier? I don't know
 that I am qualified or experienced enough to say
 that it makes it easier for us, but --

Q. Okay.

- A. I don't know that I know that actually.
- Q. Okay.
- A. I really need to think that through, but I think we're indifferent. I don't think it makes any difference either way. I know. I see. Okay. Now I get it. I'm slow apparently. So what it does make it easier -- I don't think it makes it any easier from the transaction or -- and it may be even maybe a little more complicated as far as you have got a lot of costs and, you know, you have costs that you are going to have to pay and watch and materially that is -- that is a challenge.

I had that challenge back when I was at Citizens, but when you are small and not have the staff to do that. However, it does make being in PJM or MISO in a market makes it easier for us to mitigate stranded investment. So I think we can do a much better job mitigating the stranded investment than we could when we were on our own.

- Q. And certainly how East Kentucky works with PJM is not really contemplated in Amendment
- 24 3. I mean that is --

A. Well, it kind of is because it says you
will pay all MISO. MISO is just a market just
like this. So they were in MISO at the time. I
think they got out of MISO when LG&E and KU bought
their way out, I think that threw East Kentucky
out. But I'm not sure, Mr. Scott.

THE WITNESS: Could I get a cup of

THE WITNESS: Could I get a cup of coffee while you are --

MR. SCOTT: Yeah, sure. Do you all want to take a break?

MR. GOSS: The court reporter might want to. Let's take five minutes.

(Thereupon, a short break was taken.)

- Q. Mr. Campbell, what does behind the meter mean?
- A. Behind the meter means if you had that context that we're talking about means that if you had generation and it was operated behind the meter and serving all the load behind the meter but not having excess generation, that is where you would have to have a detented meter, feed it both ways.
- Q. In a response to document request that I sent early October, I received the weekend before

Christmas in this case, I was looking at and there is in that response that your lawyers sent letters 3 from other co-ops sending notice about exercising rights under Amendment 3 and things like that. 5 Have you had discussions with Paul Hawkins in the year 2012 or the first past of 2013 concerning 6 Farmers Rural Electric utilizing diesel generators 8 for peak shaving or other purposes?

- I don't recollect the conversation, but I'm sure I did. I'm sure I did. Certainly had conversations with Mr. Bill Prather, the CEO there.
- Do you know what is going on there with respect to those generators?
 - Α. Well, I -- I'm sorry.

1

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Whether they are using or how that applies if at all to Amendment 3?
- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt you. So I just found out about that I don't remember when, maybe mid 2012, early 2012. didn't realize they were doing peak shaving and they weren't a part of Amendment 3 actually. I think we were owned -- and this is really shooting from the hip a little bit, but I think

they were owned by hospitals or something and then Farmers ended up taking them over. But I didn't know about it and I don't believe they had exercised their right under Amendment 3 at the time.

so my conversations were, hey, you have got these out here. You have got two issues. I don't believe this is confidential with them. You have two issues, one is RICE MACT and if you are using them to generate power, peak clip, and you are an electric utility, they have to be -- they have to be licensed by the Department of -- Kentucky Department of Air Quality and they had to be careful. I was warning them about that and then the new RICE MACT rules that they were going to have to comply with.

And the second thing I said, if you are going to have those and you can generate, you have to be under Amendment 3. You should run those through under Amendment 3 since they are less than your 5 percent and they did. But I -- that was a long answer to your question. I apologize. I don't remember if that was with Chairman Hawkins.

Q. How did you learn -- how did you learn

of that? 1 2 MR. GOSS: I'm sorry. What was the 3 question? 4 Q. How did you learn of that? 5 I don't know how I learned of that, but Α. 6 it got to me somehow because I didn't know about 7 it. But I don't know who brought it to me, Mr. Scott. 9 Q. So is it your belief then, East 10 Kentucky's belief and Tony Campbell's belief, that 11 as a result of those conversations that you had 12 with Mr. Prather, written notice then was sent to 13 East Kentucky in an attempt to comply with 14 Amendment 3? 15 Α. I think they're complying with two Yes. 16 things, Mr. Scott. One was they were complying 17 with Amendment 3, but most importantly they were 18 complying with the wholesale power contract. So were there some dollars lost that 19 0. 20 should not have been lost by East Kentucky as a 21 result of them doing that? 22 Α. No. there wasn't. 23 Q. Then how were they earlier in

noncompliance with the wholesale power contract?

A. Well, first thing is the wholesale power contract says that everything that you sell to your customers will be purchased through East Kentucky Power Cooperative. That is our guarantee. Obviously we use that for our banks and when we buy assets. That is the first part.

The second part that you need to understand is if they are doing peak clipping -- when they were doing peak clipping with one of their owners, the end consumer, that is -- that is outside of the wholesale power contract. We can't stop that. To serve -- like hospitals serving their own load or whatever.

However, when they are doing peak clipping, which I think they were doing, we're -- that is within the wholesale power contract and they just can't do that. They have to stop that or we would have taken action.

The second thing is, and I'm sure this is your next question. I will go ahead and answer it. I have said that we didn't lose revenues and we didn't lose revenues because anytime owners peak clip, whether that be with a generator or whether that be with demand side management, that

is cost shifting. We're still going to recover at East Kentucky.

So that is much like what this is. This discussion with Amendment 3 is if owners go over their 5 -- their allotted 5 percent, if they want to take up to 15 percent, what you have is cost shifting. Because no matter what, being a cooperative, you know, we're going to recover our -- whether we have to have raised rates or whatever, we are going to recover and make enough margin that we cover our loan covenants and the Commission will grant that, but there is cost shifting from that.

Now, in Amendment 3 there is cost shifting too, right. Still those are under Amendment 3, but in my mind first thing is I think that is what the amendment says and we don't have any choice and everybody agreed to that, but also every member has the same opportunity to do that with their 5 percent.

- Q. What about their 15 percent?
- A. Yeah. I think every member has the right to petition East Kentucky Power Cooperative for 15 percent and we will run it through and see

what the Allocation Committee would allocate.

Q. What is it or where is it in Amendment 3 where it says that for a distribution cooperative to utilize 15 percent it must petition East Kentucky to do that?

A. Yeah. It -- and certainly I will concur with you that Amendment 3 is not well written whatsoever. However, there is two things, it doesn't say that, although when you look at the Policy 305, it was ratified by our board unanimously. Actually the person that made the motion was from Jackson Energy at the time and they were petitioning for 40 megawatts.

And all of our board members say, yeah, that is how we're going to operate Amendment 3 by. That was a 305.

On the other hand Amendment 3 also doesn't state that an owner can go up -- can necessarily get their 15 percent. It just says you can't go over 15 percent. So it's not a -- in my interpretation, and I'm not an attorney, but my interpretation, it doesn't say you can necessarily get 15 percent. It just says you can't go over 15 percent.

Q. Wouldn't you take the language that says, "shall have the option from time to time with notice to the seller to receive electric power and energy provided at the aggregate measured in 15 percent -- or 15 minute," blah, blah, blah. That "shall" and "option to receive," does that not imply that it grants a right to the 15 percent?

MR. GOSS: Note my objection as to the question calls for a legal conclusion and the witness has not been -- has stated that he is not an attorney. If you can answer the question, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Well, all I can -- I'm not an attorney, but all I can say is that my interpretation is that it doesn't say you can necessarily go up to the 15, but it certainly says you cannot go over the 15 percent. But maybe my interpretation is incorrect.

Q. And as a matter of fact, you would agree, would you not, that with the Public Service Commission's order of July 2013 wherein it said, among other things, that there is no requirement in Amendment 3 that East Kentucky must grant

```
permission to receive the 15 percent?
2
        Α.
             I would like to see the language.
                                                  Ι
 3
   don't remember it.
 4
        Ο.
             Okav.
5
        Α.
             Right off hand if we have that please.
6
             MR. GOSS: If you want to point to that,
7
   then I am happy to show it to him.
8
             THE WITNESS: I apologize. I just don't
   remember that document well.
10
             MS. SCOTT: See if I don't spill my
   coffee here whether I find it.
11
12
             MR. GOSS:
                        Jeff, I think your question
13
   is correct up to the point where -- up to the
14
   point were you said 15 percent. I think you're
   right. I think the Commission said that East
15
16
   Kentucky --
17
             MR. SCOTT:
                         Well, that was the very last
18
   thing I stuck in here last night.
19
             MR. GOSS: I'm trying to find it myself.
20
             MR. SCOTT: So I would make sure that I
21
   had it.
            Here we go.
22
             MR. GOSS:
                        What page?
23
                          July 17, 2013 --
             MR. SCOTT:
24
             MR. GOSS:
                         I can show it to him, if you
```

just give me the page number. I have got it here in front of me to show him.

MR. SCOTT: Let me find it.

MR. GOSS: If you go to page 16, middle of the page. This is off the record.

(Thereupon, an off-the-record discussion was had.)

- Q. If you look there, your lawyer has found it for me there. I believe it says about the middle of the page, it is in the second paragraph that starts with "under Amendment 3", blah, blah, blah. But I believe there is a sentence there that says, "however, a review of Amendment 3 does not reveal any requirement that a member's purchase of power from an alternative source be approved by EKPC."
 - A. I see that sentence.
- Q. I don't know if that is an actual finding by the Commission, but at least it's a -- it could be determined to have been a finding. At least it's -- it's some dictum in there. But do you agree or disagree with that statement?
- A. Well, I don't know how this is -- I don't know the context that this statement is

made, but I guess I've got to get back to my interpretation of Amendment 3 -- my interpretation of Amendment 3, like I said East Kentucky doesn't have a bone in the fight. We are only exposed to losing 5 percent. Is that I'm hoping that it's fair and equitable to all of our owners as the load is dispersed. If the Commission determines that that is fair and equitable, then I will certainly accept the Commission's ruling.

- Q. Well, I would expect that. But now I've got to go back and see what started all of this. What question started it, but --
- A. You know, the MOU was another avenue that -- so let's just go through the process. I asked Jackson to withdraw their request for the 40 megawatts 7 by 24 deal and was trying to fix Amendment 3 because we knew there was different interpretations of Amendment 3.

However we were using East Kentucky's interpretation. And so then we came with Amendment 5 and that failed, clearly failed. And then four of the CEOs, our owner CEOs tried to fix Amendment 3 valiantly. And that avenue failed. And I don't remember what they called that. And

then all the owners, all the CEOs, our owner CEOs got together and I backed away. I purposefully backed away thinking that I might be the lightning rod that wasn't allowing this to get fixed and they derived the MOU.

Now, my interpretation of the MOU is that it's not necessarily fair. However, as I have said, East Kentucky Power Cooperative doesn't have a bone in the fight if all of our owners construe that the MOU is fair, then we will be all right with it and we will say that it is fair and I think the same thing with the Commission. If the Commission --

- Q. And I think you said that way back in May or June of 2012 at East Kentucky in some meeting you said that when there was -- maybe it was the Strategic Issues Committee that I was at you said, "you guys figure it out." Pointing to the distribution cooperative. "You guys come up with something."
- A. Probably didn't say it that way, but I certainly said --
 - Q. I mean words to that effect.
- A. If all of our 16 owners get together and

construe fairness, I'm fine with that certainly.

- Q. But you said there, Mr. Campbell, we knew that there were other interpretations to Amendment 3.
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And if Grayson Rural Electric gets 9.3 megawatts of power onto its system from Duke Energy or John's Electric Company or whoever it is and no other entity within East Kentucky system has asked for any outside power other than these that are disclosed, Jackson's two or whatever, and the differences to East Kentucky is 4 million dollars in revenue over a course of a year and East Kentucky has margins of 60 million dollars or 50 million dollars over the course of a year. What is wrong with that?
- A. Are you asking Tony Campbell or are you asking Tony Campbell East Kentucky?
- Q. Either way -- however you want to answer it. Just tell me which way it is when you start answering it.
- A. So I will answer it as Tony Campbell

 East Kentucky since I'm here being deposed as East

 Kentucky. To East Kentucky Power Cooperative I

think we're indifferent. It's just all -- all we are bound by is try to be fair and equitable and I think the fair and equitable part in Amendment 3 is our interpretation. However our owners that don't interpret it the same, I hope can come up with a resolution to what they consider fair and equitable and I don't have a bone in the fight then.

- Q. Are there owners who with that scenario that I just gave, the scenario that Grayson is seeking here, are there owners that you think disagree with that occurrence? Even though they at this point have not sought to use any of their allotment?
- A. I think that is a great question. So my interpretation of the MOU and everyone that signed it, and even Grayson initially had approved it. The only one that I can't speak for is Salt River. They didn't approve it at all.
- Q. Now, wait a minute. Nobody signed an MOU, did they?
- A. Or approved it I should say. I'm sorry.
 Approved the MOU. All of other owners approved it
 except for Salt River and Grayson did originally

or initially. I think -- I don't know that any owners other than maybe Salt River and I don't know -- I don't want to speak for Grayson. I don't think that is a problem.

- Q. Have you told me all you know about the Farmers' generators and the conversations and I could ask you more pointed questions, but if you can tell me that whatever you recall about all of that you think you have told me, I will shut up about it.
- A. Well, I believe you know everything that I know there.
 - Q. Now, don't be so sure of that. But just what you have said here today you think is all you know about it?
 - A. That's all I can certainly remember, yes.
 - Q. What do you know, if anything, about -I believe that was this year or -- strike that.

 2013 where discussions were held with Salt River regarding their, I think they call it Lock 7, and East Kentucky deciding well, they are going to bill you for some things and then maybe decide they are not going to bill you and then some

letter that maybe Mr. Crews sent to Salt River explaining a new arrangement. What do you know about any of that?

- A. Well, let me just tell you what I know. I'm assuming that is what you want me to do.
 - Q. Yeah.

- A. So that stems back to Jackson Energy's request for the 40 megawatts. When they requested the 40 megawatts --
 - Q. All roads lead to Jackson.
- A. Yeah, they do because that opened the door. I wasn't even paying attention to Amendment 3. Then when that happened, all of a sudden I really started opening all the books and all the doors and turning over all the stones and that is when I started running into, hey, we didn't really have a good methodology of doing this. We weren't even tracking it. Doing it very haphazardly. And I find that disheartening for East Kentucky.

So then I found out that we had their

Lock 7 and then I started taking a look at the

Lock 7 and I felt that they were being subsidized

by other of our owners. And I contacted Larry

Hicks and I said --

Q. When did you do that?

A. Oh, boy, it was a long time, Mr. -- ago, Mr. Scott. I'm going to guess 2000 and -- I'm guessing, totally guessing, but maybe fall of 2011 or, you know, when I finally dug into it and found out what was going on, maybe the summer of 2011.

I contacted Mr. Hicks and said, look, I get that you are doing this and we don't have a problem with that. I mean, you know, it wasn't done very well, but you're still under your 5 percent. Plus it was, you know, I mean to a certain degree you had to grandfather. Couldn't go back. But I said the transmission is clearly a subsidy, being subsidized by all the other owners and that is just not fair and equitable.

So then Mr. Hicks came in with the -his partner on the Lock 7 and we had a long
meeting with them complaining that, hey, we had a
deal. So I informed them to get all the paperwork
they had on the deal. If they could prove to me
that East Kentucky Power Cooperative had signed a
deal where we were going to pick up that
transmission and it was going to be fair and
equitable. He couldn't supply anything. He said

everything was verbal. And then I contacted the people he said it was verbal with and they disagreed that that was their understanding.

I don't know if that is true or not, but at any rate then I went to Don Mosier and David Crews and I said we've got a transmission issue and it's not fair and we've got -- we have got to fix this.

Q. When did you do that?

A. I'm going to guess that was probably the summer or fall of 2012. What we did, they went to Mr. Hicks and gave him notice that we were going to change that transmission. He asked for an opportunity to get that through KU because he said he knew the CEO of KU real well and he can get all -- because that is who it was flowing across.

Their power was flowing across KU.

There was a wheel there that was being subsidized by our other owners. And I said we were not going to do that. That that -- we just will not do that, allow that. So he said I know the CEO of KU and he will do this for free and chastised me quite a bit. And so we gave him an opportunity then to go to KU and get this deal done.

He never called us back. Never called us back. Then I finally had it in my tickler file. Came up. I called David Crews and/or Don Mosier. Maybe it would have been Don Mosier first, but I said go to Larry and change it. Don't care what you got to do. Fix this. We're not going to continue to pay this.

And then I don't remember what that came to fruition, but it was 2013 when we started telling Mr. Hicks, hey, this is the deal. We are going to change this. You have to pay at least this wheel.

- Q. It looks to me like in documents that I received in December of 2013 that there were some arrangements reached between East Kentucky and Salt River in the summer of 2013?
- A. Yeah, I would say -- I would say spring or summer.
 - Q. And those arrangements are what as initially and what did they become if they changed from what they were initially?
- A. I don't know that I'm the guy that can
 tell you that because I didn't -- I didn't
 consummate the deal or approve that deal. I just

wanted them to pay it, but I don't remember.

David Crews is the fellow that handled that and maybe Don can shed some light on that for you.

- Q. Well, you told David Crews or Don Mosier to fix it?
- A. Yeah. It needed to be fair and equitable.
- Q. Do you know if it got fixed? Do you know if it got fixed?
- A. Yes.

- Q. And how were you informed that it got fixed?
- A. That they -- that he was going to begin to pay some portion of his transmission obligation to make it fair and equitable.
- Q. Do you know if they are paying it?
- A. Yes, I do know. They are. They are doing it begrudgingly, but they are doing it.
- Q. And that commenced July or August or when did that commence?
- A. I don't recollect, but I would say sometime in there. I know initially Mr. Hicks had refused to pay and there was some discussion on what our actions would be and I told him I would

carry out my fiduciary responsibilities to the cooperative.

Q. Your lawyer sent me December 2 and then again on December 17 a copy of a May 9 letter from David Crews to Larry Hicks regarding this topic and there was some billings attached. There were some billings attached. Sounds like I'm from Carter County.

MR. GOSS: Jeff, was that in response to your request following David Crews' deposition?

MR. SCOTT: Yeah. Actually David
Samford's letter is December 2 and your letter is
December 17.

MR. GOSS: Yeah.

- Q. And there is just -- and there is discussion in there about NITS and all that kind of -- OATT and all that stuff that I --
- negotiated should it be point to point or should it be NITS. And as I recollect, and I am really recollecting, but I remember, you know, we wanted to be fair and equitable on both sides and Larry was pointing out some things, but I was told it was -- it ended fair and equitable and they were

paying.

Q. Let me get to what I'm really after on this thing just to see if I understand all I know about it.

MR. SCOTT: Do you have the August 22 letter, Mark David, from David Crews? Actually it's basically I hate to say memorandum of understanding, but it looks like it's a letter where -- that you sent me December 17?

MR. GOSS: Yeah, and believe it or not I think that is about the only document I don't have in my notebook. I didn't include that. So if you could show it to him.

Q. Let me show you this. This was sent to me by Mr. Goss under cover of December 17. And it appears to be a letter of -- I think it's called letter of agreement or something like that where Larry Hicks and Mr. Crews both signed acknowledging an arrangement on this matter. Is that basically what you think that is?

- A. That is what I would interpret this to be.
- Q. Have you seen that before?
 - A. Yeah, I have. I don't recollect it, but

I'm sure I did. Because I was pushing hard to get this done.

- Q. Read that first sentence there.
- A. "This letter is to confirm our discussions of July 17, 2013."

- Q. Well, shot, let me -- yeah, see where I have marked that? That is my markings there.

 "EKPC has worked with PJM to have the Lock 7 resource be treated as a behind the meter resource at the PJM treatment coupled with the Amendment 3 MOU." And I have made a remark there. How -- how is the MOU applicable there?
- A. I don't know. That is a good question, Mr. Scott, that I can't answer. But I can certainly find out.
- Q. I'm just tickled to death that about four times you've said those are great questions. Why would the MOU be applicable?
 - A. I can't answer that.
- Q. Let me ask you if it might be this.

 Might it be that if the MOU were in effect, then
 this arrangement would be within the MOU, but if
 it is not in effect, then it would not be
 appropriate and would be in noncompliance with

Amendment 3?

- A. Yeah. I think -- I think I need to check this out because I want to make sure Mr. Hicks is paying everything he is supposed to be paying.
- Q. All right.
- A. I'm sorry I can't shed more light on that.
 - Q. That's good. That's good.
- 10 A. I want to know too.

kind of means what it says.

- Q. Tell me what distributed generation is or what that means. What that term means.
- A. Distributed generation to me means smaller -- not the mainframe generation that we have. Smaller generation is distributed out closer to the load to the system. A lot of times it can be behind the meter, but it doesn't necessarily have to be behind the meter. And a lot of times end consumers can have it or even our owners could have distributive generation.

 Distributed throughout system. It really just
- Q. If a distribution cooperative had one of its members use solar panels at their let's say

home and is that distributed generation?

- A. I think that could be construed as distributed generation.
- Q. If a member system of East Kentucky

 Power had generators that were behind the meter

 utilization, does East Kentucky believe that that

 is something that must come within the purview of

 Amendment 3?
 - A. Were you saying our owners have that?
- 10 Q. Yes.

- A. Yes, it has to because the wholesale power contract prevents any of our owners from generating and selling retail.
- Q. So behind the meter doesn't change that at all?
 - A. Doesn't make any difference.
- Q. If it is -- if there is a member owner of East Kentucky that has a generator that is declared or stated to be used solely where there is an outage or something like that, is that something that is within Amendment 3? And does that exist anywhere?
- A. Yeah, I think that does exist. It probably exists at a lot of our owners that have

generation for their facilities and I think that is outside the wholesale power contract because they are not used for peak clipping and things like that, but just for a backup generation source.

- Q. Redundant?
- A. Correct.

- Q. How does East Kentucky monitor that, if it does?
- A. Well, you know, that is always a challenge with every G&T is how you monitor that and I think some of these things kind of happen over time and we don't know about it and I think we just need to do the best we can to try to find out if somebody is utilizing distributed generation in counter to the wholesale power contract. But we don't have a clearcut way. We don't -- we're -- we don't make everybody sign everything every year that you are not doing that. So we hope that everybody enjoys the cooperative principles and doesn't do that.
- Q. Are there one or two of these generators at Farmers that are -- did I see there where one of those was supposedly just for backup or did I

make that part up?

A. Well, I'm talking beyond what I really know, but it is my understanding they were for backup and their end consumer went a different direction or left and they were just left sitting there. But I believe -- I believe --

MR. GOSS: Here is the letter that says for backup -- for emergency backup service. That is the first letter.

THE WITNESS: Okay. My counsel Mr. Goss has given me a letter from Mr. Prather to our chairman that says they were for backup. Oh, it says they are -- the units are used to provide emergency backup service.

- Q. So why is it --
- A. And to an industrial member and for peak shaving conservation. The units are owned though by Farmers Rural Electric Cooperative.
- Q. And there is another one though that is owned by East Kentucky or their plan is to have one that will be owned or is owned or will be owned beginning in 2015 by East Kentucky. What is the deal on that?
 - A. That is a landfill. That -- and I was a

lot more involved with that. That is going to be a landfill project that's at the city landfill that they have. East Kentucky -- well, it wouldn't be a profitable if Farmers couldn't run that through Amendment 3 and avoid our cost at the end. Keep that under their 5 percent.

So East Kentucky is going to own that and operate that, but we won't take any risk. All the risk will be shed to Farmers. So Farmers really ultimately is doing that.

- Q. How is the Green Valley landfill work up our way? How is that --
- A. The Green Valley is owned by East
 Kentucky Power Cooperative as just exactly a part
 of our power supply portfolio.
 - Q. What is the production there?
- A. I don't know. Specifically on that one I can't tell you. But overall we're generating about 16 megawatts and a lot of credits. We have a lot of credits there, but that's all I know.
- Q. Let's talk just for a minute. I'm about through, Mr. Campbell, but tell me how PJM -- well, strike that.

24 There was -- there was a letter that I

think Miss Fraley sent you several months ago about any documents that East Kentucky has executed concerning its involvement with PJM and I believe you responded and said here they are and you had I think maybe a cover letter with it or something. And then you said I believe that there are other documents to be signed or words to that effect.

- A. That letter came from me?
- 10 Q. I think it was from you.

В

- A. I don't recollect that letter.
- Q. But anyway, to the extent that you can, do you think you and your counsel could gather up whatever documents there are that set forth East Kentucky's involvement with PJM and make a copy and send that to us. You sent a couple, but I seem to recall a reference that there is still something to be signed or something like that and this goes back maybe even before -- I think you started -- was it July or June when you --
- A. June 2009. Who me?
- 22 O. East Kentucky.
- 23 A. I thought you meant my start date.
- Q. East Kentucky into PJM.

- A. Yes, June 1, 2013.
- Q. And this was in that time May maybe or even April, but -- and you said there were -- I believe that there were other documents to be signed.
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And could you maybe take a look and see what there are.
 - A. Sure.
- Q. And make a copy of them and send that to us?
- A. Sure. There were lots of documents that had to be consummated and those are all done.
- Q. You sent two or three and then I think you referenced that there were others. Tell me how PJM works. Tell me what -- how that deal gets done and how the power gets distributed or I guess transmitted rather.
- A. Well, PJM is just a market and PJM has been in existence for a long, long time. Probably the oldest market in the United States and probably the most successful market so far in the United States. But what happens there is we still own our transmission system, we still own our

generates and still have the load, but PJM actually manages all of that for us as a market and our transmission system at the high voltage level they do, but not the subtransmission or any of our distribution owners systems.

Every day they have a day ahead and then the realtime market. And you have to pick your own strategy. Every day we bid the load in as we expect it. We do mostly day ahead because we are very conservative and we don't want to speculate. Then we will bid in the day ahead. They will go out to the market -- we bid in our load and we bid in our generates.

So we have really separated them completely. Our load is completely separated from our generators now. And our generators are truly just a hedge against our load. Every day we will bid those in and PJM with start down through the generator list and they will say, okay, we got this load to serve with day ahead and they will keep picking these generators and say, okay, we are going to run this one tomorrow, this one tomorrow, and then you will get to the bottom, and they will say we don't

need these depending on what the day is like.

Recently they have been saying we need everything.

- Q. And that is based upon the cost of generation that they --
 - A. Yes.

- Q. -- they would -- PJM would look at the cost of production of one generating plant being higher than another and then use that data to base their decision?
- A. They go from the lowest cost to highest cost. Always start that way. And of course there is a lot of other things that go into that. You know, depends on where the generation is, what the transmission constraints are to get that generation to the load. I mean you can't take something from here and serve New England, right, because of all the transmission congestion.

They take all those things into consideration. So then you get a price and you are going into the real day. Then you start to settle out, right, because we project what our load is, but sometimes weather systems don't come in or humidity may change, whatever it is or maybe a Gallatin goes offline, something like that. Our

load doesn't match the day ahead and it may not match under or may not match over.

So then that is settled in the realtime market. And the realtime market is same with the generators have a realtime. They may call on more generators or they may call on less generators.

If they call on less and you're scheduled to run, you know you are going to get paid whatever that amount is because all the load is going to be paying for that.

If they come in let's say they need more, they call on extra. Then they will do an economic dispatch and it is whatever -- it's whatever the market bears for the generate -- for the load that didn't get predicted right and for the generator that wasn't called on. So then it settles out every day.

So we're -- we have a team that is strategizing every day trying to make sure that we match up and make sure that we hedge. So the -- the nice thing -- there is a lot of things about PJM. One of the nice things is if we have excess generation, we can sell it into the market to somebody that is away from here. And we did that

last summer. But then in the market like when 2 it's really cold, like and we need everything we 3 can get, we can import. And we have kind of -- we have kind of done away with those boundaries around us. PJM allows us to import because we can just buy people. They have to serve that load. Although the cost is whatever it is every five 8 minutes. I mean the costs change.

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And so then the hedge is -- I lost my train of thought. The real hedge is our steel in the ground. That is our hedge. And it may be at \$35 or \$23 or whatever it is, but if the market happens to be less than that, we will idle these plants. And I mean that there are other numbers that go into it. Like you can't idle a coal plant and bring it back without spending a lot of money heating it back up. We will idle those and we will buy from the marker to exploit that for the end consumer. Did I confuse you?

- Like Spurlock -- Spurlock runs more than 0. the others; right?
- Spurlock is our least cost asset and Α. actually Spur 3 and 4 are the least cost because they can burn the lowest cost coal. So the fuel

is so cheap. Spur 1 and 2 are a little bit higher, but they are our next least cost and they run almost all the time. Although in off peak times during the fall and the spring we have seen some potential opportunities to idle either Spurlock 1 or Spurlock 2.

Now, there is a lot that goes into that strategy other than just price, right. When we idle that, we also serve steam to Inland Container up there and we only have two units that can serve steam. Unit 1 and unit 2 and unit 2 is the traditional one. It's a 550 megawatt generator and they have grown so much. It really works better if they are on unit 2. So we have a little concern if we really start to idling that we need to keep our steam going to them. They are paying for that.

Also we don't want any hiccups when those units come back on. And there is also a maintenance analysis that we do. You know, when you ramp these coal units up, they don't really like going up and down. They kind of like being taken to the top. So it costs us a little bit more. We have to bill that into our scheme. So

```
to make a long story short, mostly those units run
1
  full out all the time.
```

- Except when they are -- you do the maintenance?
 - Α. Maintenance.
- 0. You got to bring them down for that.
- 7 Α. Yes, sir.

the market.

3

4

5

6

8

9

14

15

24

- Then will you pick up with Cooper or --I mean whatever else --
- 10 Α. Well, it could be the market. You know, because traditionally when we are doing 11 12 maintenance id spring and fall when the load is really low and we will replace a lot of that with 13
- Speaking of the steam, has -- who pays Q. -- does Fleming-Mason pay that? 16
- 17 MR. GOSS: Do you understand the 18 question?

THE WITNESS: I do understand the 19 question. I just don't know that I know the --20 remember the answer. And I should because we just 21 22 worked on that, but I know they do the electric, but I think the steam is direct. 23

> To Inland? 0.

- 1 Α. To us. East Kentucky to Inland. Ι 2 believe we bill that directly because there are no 3 margin put on. I know that for a fact. 4 remember that. There is no margin put on there by 5 Fleming-Mason. It is direct from us. But I don't 6 think we bill that through Fleming-Mason, but that 7 is all I can remember.
 - Q. Can you take a look and see?
 - A. Sure.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. Maybe and any documents that would evidence that.
 - A. We can get back with you on that.
 - Q. And then you mentioned --
- MR. GOSS: So you want to know specifically what --
- MR. SCOTT: Correct, the billing on that.
- 18 MR. GOSS: Billing reference. Okay
 - Q. And is there -- is that anything that -- did the Commission have to approve that arrangement?
 - A. Yes. The Commission approved that contract and arrangement.
 - Q. Do you know about when that was? How

long that has been?

- A. Well, initially, no, I don't remember, but it has been over ten years. I know that. So with have just had a modification, not really a modification, but it has just been reapproved by the Commission just recently, the contract.
- Q. Yeah, yeah. And then there is another special contract with Gallatin; right?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. And how is that done?
- A. That is negotiated. That is a three-way contract -- well, actually -- oh, I'm getting confused. I want to back up. Let me say Gallatin I know for sure is a three-way contract between --
 - O. Owen.
- A. -- Owen, East Kentucky and Gallatin.

 And we still sell through Owen. So they take the risk. If Gallatin wouldn't show up to pay their bill, it would default back to Owen. They would still owe us. But it's a three-way contract because it has nuances in the contract.
- Q. Do the other distribution co-ops basically help pay for that?
 - A. So you are asking if there is a subsidy?

So before we consummated the new contract. So that contract expires every so often. Before that one was consummated, and I don't remember the date on that, maybe the end of 2010 I believe. So we went from a ten-year contract to a five-year contract now. And I believe it was consummated in the fall of 2000 -- Septemberish 2010 and approved by the Public Service Commission.

There was some subsidy going on because the contract didn't cover some of the environmental -- actually Owen had some environmental -- they were losing money too. But with the new contract there is no subsidy. Now, I will say we don't make a lot of margin off of Owen or off of Gallatin. I think we should make more when we have another contract, which will be coming up here soon. We will -- because our cost of service says we need -- but we are not losing any -- there is no cost subsidization there now.

Actually I follow that quite closely. I mean, you know, every year at least or not -- six months, I will be asking what is our margins on this account.

Q. And East Kentucky's margins for 2013

were what?

- A. Well, we don't know for 2013 because our books just closed and we're in the process of working through all the depreciation.
- Q. Was there not just a board meeting yesterday or day before or some kind of --
- A. Yesterday was our board meeting, but remember we close -- we close our books and then it takes a while to get the numbers. So yesterday our board was looking at our close of November.

 But we haven't -- we just closed December and our accounting hasn't got that all --
- Q. So close the November looked like what for margins?

MR. GOSS: Hold on a second. Is that -I mean I know you don't mind Grayson knowing, but
is that confidential in any regard? Somebody that
might be reading this transcript, is that
something that --

THE WITNESS: Well, it's going to be in our annual report.

MR. GOSS: Okay. Fine.

THE WITNESS: It will be in our annual report. So just at the close of November, which

it wouldn't be specific. It would be close of December, but we were at about 61 million as I recollect.

- Q. Hey, speaking of yesterday or day -maybe it was the day before. Was there some kind
 of Strategic Issues Committee meeting that was
 going to discuss this distributed generation that
 we talked about a minute ago? Maybe some proposed
 modification or something like that?
 - A. Well --

- Q. Or do you know?
- A. Monday was a challenge because we moved both of our Board Risk Oversite Committee and our Strategic Issues Committee to the exact same time in the afternoon because it was so cold. So I didn't -- I was in the Board Risk Oversite Committee, but I think Don, he's the liaison to the strategic issues. He could probably answer that for you much better than me.
- Q. Mr. Ericton's deposition was Monday morning. He said he had to get down there and he thought there was some discussion on that, but he didn't know what it was going to be. So I just wondered if -- you think Mr. Mosier would know if

1 there was or not?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

- A. Yeah. What I do know is everything would have been informational. The only one thing that the Strategic Issues Committee --
 - Q. Not an action.
 - A. -- voted on, but that wasn't that issue.
- Q. Okay. Is it accurate that there were no -- let's go back to this Salt River thing. That there were no charges billed to Salt River prior to June 1 of 2013?
- 11 A. That is accurate.
 - Q. Is that something about which there should be some inquiry by East Kentucky on whether or not that is something that recoupment should be made or some kind of adjustment or something like that?
 - A. Well --
- 18 Q. In other word if it was --
- A. I know exactly what you are saying. I know exactly what you are saying and I -- you know, the sad thing is we were a little sloppy on the front end at East Kentucky unfortunately and we are kind of trying to clean these up. Should we go back and say, well, Salt River needs to pay

more?

- Q. But for Grayson filing this complaint, it may not have been brought up.
- A. No, no, no, no, no, no. That was a done deal anyway. He knew he was going -- way before you filed the complaint I had already gone to Salt River and said this is not fair. You have got to pay transmission. The question was what magnitude and when would he start.

I guess one could go either way on that. To a certain degree me as CEO of East Kentucky kind of said, look we have had sins in the past. We are turning over all the rocks. We are going to correct this for all of our owners and make it fair and equitable. And I didn't go back on that, but one could certainly say that we should maybe. I don't know.

- Q. But whether -- whether you should or shouldn't, whether East Kentucky should or shouldn't, you East Kentucky and you as CEO of East Kentucky said, well, let's at least start it now. Let's at least go forward.
- 24 A. Yes.

Q. Whatever should -- whatever did not happen, let's at least start now with what we think ought happen going forward?

- A. Clearly we have been cleaning up since 2010. Absolutely. I mean as I said initially, you know, I feel that I have a fiduciary -- an ethical responsibility to all of our owners that it is fair. Has to be fair. And if I find out there is a not fair, it is my fiduciary responsibility to fix it.
- Q. Can you get me documents -- Mr. Goss or maybe it's Mr. Samford in his December 2 letter attachment, had the billing to Salt River and it looked like the November billing was very minor. I'm not sure I understand why its amount was so much different. But can you get me through your lawyer documents evidencing what has been paid? I saw that billing, but I would like to see what has been paid.
- A. Sure. I think we can. And I'm going to look into the MOU language in that.
- Q. And this letter that you looked at that had the signature of Mr. Hicks and Mr. Crews, this letter of agreement, is that the way agreements

are done with distribution co-ops or is that something that maybe ought have been approved by the board rather than Mr. Crews and Mr. Hicks cutting the deal?

A. Well, I think -- you know, I think -MR. GOSS: First of all note my
objection to the phrase cutting the deal, but go
ahead and answer the question.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Thank you for objecting to that because I don't think it was cutting a deal.

MR. SCOTT: Well, it was kind of cutting a deal.

THE WITNESS: But it was certainly cleaning up a mess.

MR. GOSS: That's your interpretation.

I think the phrase is incorrect and unfair, but go ahead and answer the question.

THE WITNESS: So at East Kentucky Power Cooperative we have authority levels and I think we have to do that and try to get things done. Should we take that back to the board and have that approved? Well, I guess that gets back to kind of Amendment 3. Are they going to approve

```
everything on Amendment 3 or are they not? They
were made aware of it, of the correction to the
transmission cost. But I don't -- but I did not
take it to them and have them approve that
document.

O. Similarly the Farmers' situation was not
```

- Q. Similarly the Farmers' situation was not how that got --
 - A. That was taken back to the board.
- 9 Q. Oh, it was?
- 10 A. Yes, and approved, yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Do you know when that was? 2013?
- A. I don't recollect. It was 2013, yes,
- 13 sir.

7

- Q. So this Lock 7 matter even back in '05, that was not anything that East Kentucky ever quote, unquote, approved, was it? Basically just kind of acquiesced?
- A. Well, Dale Henley it looked like
 approved it, but I don't believe that that is a
 very good way to do it.
- Q. So it was kind of acquiesced rather than 22 formal approval?
- 23 A. Yes, it was not formal.
- Q. Mr. Campbell, I might be through. Could

we have a couple minutes here? I might be 1 2 through. 3 (Thereupon, a short recess was taken.) 4 MR. SCOTT: I am through with 5 Mr. Campbell. 6 MR. GOSS: For the record, Jeff, let me 7 make sure that we are on the same page in regard to what I am supposed to provide you because I 8 don't want to leave anything out. The first thing 10 I have is we are going to provide notices sent to 11 Grayson providing the cost of all power to Grayson for the four years, 2010 through 2013 inclusive. 12 13 The next thing we're to produce is written notification by RUS of Amendment 3s 14 15 approval. MR. SCOTT: Correct. 16 17 MR. GOSS: Notification given to East 18 Kentucky which probably would have been sometime in 2003. 19 Next we're to produce all documents 20 which were signed by East Kentucky and PJM in 21 order to finalize East Kentucky's integration into 22 23 PJM.

24

And then the final thing -- no, the next

to the last thing we are to produce. 1 2 MR. SCOTT: The Salt River --MR. GOSS: Any information describing 3 how billing is handled for the Inland Container 4 5 steam service. And then we're to produce documents which show what Salt River has actually 6 7 paid for transmission since this arrangement in 8 the summer of 2013. Is there anything else that I missed? 9 10 MR. SCOTT: No. 11 MS. FRALEY: Did you want Gallatin special contract. I've got down special contract. 12 MR. SCOTT: I didn't ask for that. 13 MR. GOSS: That's all. 14 15 MR. SCOTT: Because he said that there was no payment made before June of '13. So it 16 17 would be just --THE WITNESS: For transmission? 18 MR. SCOTT: Correct. 19 THE WITNESS: That is right. 20 MS. FRALEY: And you have got the most 21 recent cost of service study. 22 MR. SCOTT: Cost of service study is 23 filed in the 2010 167. 24

```
1
              MR. GOSS: So the only other thing,
2
   there has been a lot of documents that have been
3
   referred to. Are you going to move for their
   admission or --
 4
5
              MR. SCOTT: Nah.
              MR. GOSS: It's your deposition.
6
             MR. SCOTT: No. They will eventually
7
8
   make it in.
9
              (Thereupon, the deposition was concluded
   at 12:36 o'clock p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1 COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 2 CASE NO. 2012-00503 3 In the Matter of: 4 PETITION AND COMPLAINT OF GRAYSON RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING PURCHASE OF ELECTRIC POWER AT THE RATE OF SIX CENTS PER KILOWATT HOUR UP TO 9.4 MEGAWATTS OF POWER VS. A RATE IN EXCESS OF SEVEN CENTS PER KILOWATT HOUR PURCHASED FROM EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE UNDER A WHOLESALE POWER CONTRACT AS AMENDED BETWEEN GRAYSON RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION AND EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. 11 12 CERTIFICATION OF THE COURT REPORTER 13 14 I, Nicol L. Voiles, Stenotype Reporter and Notary Public within and for the Commonwealth of Kentucky, do hereby certify that the foregoing one hundred and fourteen (114) pages is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in this matter, as herein above set forth, and that I have 17 l no interest of any nature whatsoever in the 18 ultimate disposition of this litigation. 19 20 21 22 Stenotype Reporter 23 24