ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ronald M. Sullivan Jesse T. Mountjoy Frank Stainback James M. Miller Michael A. Fiorella Allen W. Holbrook R. Michael Sullivan Bryan R. Reynolds* Tyson A. Kamuf Mark W. Starnes C. Ellsworth Mountjoy

January 15, 2013

Via Federal Express

RECEIVED JAN 1 6 2013 PUBLIC SERVICE

COMMISSION

Jeff DeRouen **Executive Director Public Service Commission** 211 Sower Boulevard, P.O. Box 615 Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615

*Also Licensed in Indiana

In the Matter of: an Examination by the Public Service Re: Commission of the Environmental Surcharge Mechanism of Big Rivers Electric Corporation for the Six-Month Billing Periods Ending January 31. 2012 and July 31, 2012, and the Pass Through Mechanism of its Three Member Distribution Cooperatives. PSC Case No. 2012-00534

Dear Mr. DeRouen:

Enclosed for filing in the above referenced matter are an original and seven copies of Big Rivers Electric Corporation's responses to the Commission Staff's first request for information and an original and seven copies of the direct testimony of Nicholas R. Castlen in support of the reasonableness of the environmental surcharge mechanisms of Big Rivers Electric Corporation, Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation, Kenergy Corp. and Meade County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation. A copy of this letter, the testimony, and the responses have been served on all parties of record.

Sincerely,

Ry

Tyson Kamuf

TAK/ei Enclosures

cc:

Telephone (270) 926-4000 Telecopier (270) 683-6694

> 100 St. Ann Building PO Box 727 Owensboro, Kentucky 42302-0727

Albert Yockey Lawrence V. Baronowsky Nicholas R. Castlen Gregory J Starheim G. Kelly Nuckols Burns E. Mercer

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012, AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES CASE NO. 2012-00534

VERIFICATION

I, Lawrence V. (Larry) Baronowsky, verify, state, and affirm that the data request responses filed with this verification for which I am listed as a witness are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

Lawrence V. (Larry) Baronowsky

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY) COUNTY OF HENDERSON)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me by Lawrence V. (Larry) Baronowsky on this the <u>14</u> day of January, 2013.

Notary Public, Ky. State at Large My Commission Expires_

Notary Public, Kentucky State-At-Large My Commission Expires: July 3, 2014 ID 421951

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012, AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM OF ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION COOPERATIVES CASE NO. 2012-00534

VERIFICATION

I, Nicholas R. Castlen, verify, state, and affirm that the Direct Testimony and data request responses filed with this verification for which I am listed as a witness are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

cholas R. Castlen

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY) COUNTY OF HENDERSON)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO before me by Nicholas R. Castlen on this the 14 day of January, 2013.

Notary Public, Ky. State at Large My Commission Expires august 6, 2016

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF KENTUCKY

In the Matter of:

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE)
COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL)
SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS)
ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-)
MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING)
JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012,)
AND THE PASS THROUGH MECHANISM OF)
ITS THREE MEMBER DISTRIBUTION)
COOPERATIVES)

Case No. 2012-00534

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

NICHOLAS R. CASTLEN

ON BEHALF OF

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION, JACKSON PURCHASE ENERGY CORPORATION, KENERGY CORP., AND MEADE COUNTY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION

FILED: January 16, 2013

Case No. 2012-00534 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 1 of 9

1 2 3 4		DIRECT TESTIMONY OF NICHOLAS R. CASTLEN
5	Q.	Please state your name and business address.
6	A.	My name is Nicholas R. Castlen, and my business address is Big Rivers
7		Electric Corporation ("Big Rivers"), 201 Third Street, Henderson,
8		Kentucky, 42420. I am a Staff Accountant at Big Rivers.
9	Q.	Please summarize your education and professional experience.
10	A.	I received a Bachelor of Science in Accounting (Magna Cum Laude) from
11		the University of Kentucky in 2006 and a Master of Science in
12		Accounting from the University of Kentucky in 2007. I became a
13		Certified Public Accountant ("CPA") in 2007, receiving the Kentucky
14		Society of CPAs Award of Excellence for achieving the highest score on
15		the Auditing & Attestation section of the uniform CPA exam.
16		Before assuming my current position at Big Rivers, I was a
17		Revenue Accounting Analyst at LG&E and KU Energy LLC from
18		December 2009 through April 2012, where I was responsible for
19		various accounting, reporting, and analysis roles for retail and
20		wholesale, electric and gas utility revenues. From January 2006 to
21		December 2009, I was employed by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP as an
22		Audit and Assurance Associate.
23	Q.	Please summarize your duties at Big Rivers.
24	A.	My primary responsibilities at Big Rivers include preparing the monthly
25		filings for the Company's Fuel Adjustment Clause (Form A) and Case No. 2012-00534 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 2 of 9

1		Environmental Surcharge, accounting for the Non-Fuel Adjustment
2		Clause Purchased Power Adjustment and Unwind Surcredit rate
3		mechanisms, accounting for Big Rivers' various debt obligations, and
4		ensuring compliance with the Company's debt covenants.
5	Q.	Have you previously testified before the Kentucky Public Service
6		Commission ("Commission")?
7	A.	No.
8	Q.	On whose behalf are you filing this testimony?
9	A.	I am filing this testimony on behalf of Big Rivers and its three member
10		distribution cooperatives, Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation
11		("JPEC"), Kenergy Corp. ("Kenergy"), and Meade County Rural Electric
12		Cooperative Corporation ("Meade County") (collectively, "the Members").
13	Q.	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
14	Α.	The purpose of my testimony is to describe the application of Big Rivers'
15		environmental surcharge mechanism as billed from August 1, 2011
16		through July 31, 2012 (which corresponds to the expense months of
17		June 2011 through May 2012). Additionally, I have coordinated with
18		Big Rivers' Members in the preparation of this testimony and prepared
19		the responses to the Commission Staff's First Request for Information
20		("Commission's Initial Requests") that accompany this testimony.
21		This testimony also includes information the Members have
22		provided me in support of their pass-through mechanisms that are also
23		under review in this proceeding and that the Members use to pass
		Case No. 2012-005

Case No. 2012-00534 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 3 of 9

1		through to their retail members the costs Big Rivers charges to them
2		under Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism. As can be seen
3		in my response to Item 2 of the Commission's Initial Requests, the
4		review period for the Members' pass-through mechanisms that
5		corresponds to the August 1, 2011 through July 31, 2012 billing period
6		for Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism are the billing
7		months of September 2011 through August 2012 for non-dedicated
8		delivery point customers, and August 2011 through July 2012 for
9		dedicated delivery point customers (<i>i.e.</i> , there is no billing lag for
10		dedicated delivery point customers).
11	Q.	Please provide a brief overview of Big Rivers' environmental
12		surcharge mechanism.
13	A.	Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism was approved by the
14		Commission by Order dated June 25, 2008, in Case No. 2007-00460,
15		which was part of the transaction that unwound Big Rivers' 1998 lease
16		with E.ON U.S. LLC and its affiliates (the "Unwind Transaction") and
17		that the Commission approved by its Order dated March 6, 2009, in
18		Case No. 2007-00455. Big Rivers' environmental surcharge went into
19		effect immediately following the July 16, 2009, closing of the Unwind
20		Transaction for service commencing July 17, 2009.
21		Big Rivers' environmental compliance plan approved by the
22		Commission in Case No. 2007-00460 (the "2007 Plan") consists of a
23		program and the costs associated with controlling each of sulfur
		Case No. 2012-00534 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 4 of 9

Page 4 of 9

dioxide ("SO₂"), nitrogen oxide ("NO_x"), and sulfur trioxide ("SO₃"). The 1 2 environmental surcharge costs Big Rivers may recover under KRS 3 278.183, and its environmental compliance plan, include reagent costs, 4 sludge and ash disposal costs, and allowance costs. 5 For the SO₂ program, Big Rivers recovers through its 6 environmental surcharge mechanism the costs of reagents, the costs 7 for the disposal of coal combustion byproducts (fly ash, bottom ash, 8 and scrubber sludge), and the costs of purchasing SO₂ emission 9 allowances. For the NO_X program, Big Rivers recovers the costs of 10 reagents and the costs of purchasing additional NO_X emission 11 allowances as needed. For the SO_3 program, Big Rivers recovers the 12 costs of a reagent. Due to generating unit design and Big Rivers' 13 compliance plan, no Big Rivers generating unit utilizes all the same 14 reagents. Depending on the unit facilities, various reagents are used to treat the flue gas, thereby removing the three targeted emissions. The 15 SO₂ reagents are comprised of emulsified sulfur, lime, fixation lime, 16 17 limestone, dibasic acid, and sodium bisulfite. The NO_X reagents are comprised of anhydrous ammonia and emulsified sulfur. The SO₃ 18 19 reagent is comprised of lime hydrate. Note that the 2007 Plan included 20 only operating and maintenance ("O&M") costs. 21 In its Order dated October 1, 2012, in Case No. 2012-00063, the 22 Commission approved certain additions to the 2007 Plan relating to the

23 Mercury and Air Toxics Standards rule. The additions (the "2012 Plan")

Case No. 2012-00534 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 5 of 9

1 involve installing activated carbon injection and dry sorbent injection 2 systems and emission control monitors at the Big Rivers Coleman, 3 Wilson, and Green generating stations; and installing emission control 4 monitors at Henderson Municipal Henderson & Light's Station Two 5 generation station. The 2012 Plan includes both the capital and O&M 6 associated with the projects, as well as recovery of Big Rivers' actual 7 costs incurred in Case No. 2012-00063 (amortized over three years). 8 Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism allows Big 9 Rivers to recover costs related to the 2007 Plan (which only includes O&M costs) and the 2012 Plan, less proceeds from by-product and 10 11 emission allowance sales, plus or minus an ongoing cumulative over- or 12 under-recovery adjustment.

13 Q. Please provide a brief overview of the Members' pass-through 14 mechanisms.

A. The Members' pass-through mechanisms allow each Member to bill its
retail customers for the portion of Big Rivers' environmental surcharge
that Big Rivers bills each Member. JPEC's pass-through mechanism
was approved by the Commission in Case No. 2008-00010; Kenergy's
mechanism was approved by the Commission in Case No. 2008-00009;
and Meade County's was approved by the Commission in Case No.
2007-00470.

22

Case No. 2012-00534 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 6 of 9

Have there been any changes to Big Rivers' environmental 1 **Q**. 2 surcharge mechanism since the prior review in addition to those 3 described above? The only changes to Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism 4 Α. 5 were those approved by the Commission in Case No. 2012-00063. In addition to the changes described, other notable changes approved in 6 Case No. 2012-00063 include a rate of return on capital expenditures 7 8 associated with the 2012 Plan and allocating environmental surcharge 9 costs based on a rolling 12-month average of Total Adjusted Revenues 10 rather than on a kWh basis. Has Big Rivers sold any SO_2 or NO_X allowances during the expense 11 Q. 12 months of June 2011 through May 2012? 13 No. Big Rivers has not sold any SO₂ or NO_x allowances during the A. 14 expense months of June 2011 through May 2012. Has Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism been 15 Q. accurately compiled, and is it operating as intended? 16 17 Α. Yes. Have the Members' pass-through mechanisms been accurately 18 Q. 19 compiled, and are they operating as intended? The Members believe their pass-through mechanisms have been 20 Α. 21 accurately compiled and are operating as intended. 22

1	Q.	Are the amounts charged under Big Rivers' environmental
2		surcharge mechanism during the review period just and
3		reasonable?
4	А.	Yes.
5	Q.	Are the amounts charged under the Members' pass-through
6		mechanisms during the review period just and reasonable?
7	A.	The Members believe the amounts charged under their pass-through
8		mechanisms are just and reasonable.
9	Q.	Do Big Rivers and its Members have additional over- or under-
10		recovery amounts they believe need to be recognized?
11	A.	No. Big Rivers and its Members are not requesting any additional over-
12		or under-recovery amount. The normal over/under recovery carry-
13		forward element of Big Rivers' environmental surcharge mechanism is
14		operating as intended.
15	Q.	Does Big Rivers currently recover any capital costs through its
16		environmental surcharge mechanism?
17	A.	No. Big Rivers does not currently recover any capital costs through the
18		environmental surcharge mechanism. However, Big Rivers will begin
19		recovering capital costs associated with the 2012 Plan, consistent with
20		the approvals granted in Case No. 2012-00063, once construction on
21		the approved projects begin. Construction for approved projects is
22		expected to begin in 2013.
23		

1 Q. What Base Environmental Surcharge Factor ("BESF") cost did Big

2 **Rivers use during the review period?**

- 3 A. Big Rivers had no environmental surcharge related costs in its base
- 4 rates during the review period.
- 5 Q. Is Big Rivers proposing to change the BESF cost as part of this
- 6 proceeding?
- 7 A. No.

8 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

9 A. Yes, it does.

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012 CASE NO. 2012-00534

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information Dated December 13, 2012

January 16, 2013

Item 1) Prepare a summary schedule showing the calculation of 1 2 E(m) and the surcharge factor for the expense months covered by the billing periods under review. Form 1.1 can be used as a model for this 3 summary. Include the expense months for the two expense months 4 5 subsequent to the billing period in order to show the over- and underrecovery adjustments for the months included for the billing period. 6 7 Include a calculation of any additional over- or under-recovery amount Big Rivers believes needs to be recognized for the billing periods under 8 9 review. Include all supporting calculations and documentation for the 10 additional over- or under-recovery. 11 **Response)** Please see the attached 7-page schedule, in the format of Form 12 13 1.10, covering each of the expense months from June 2011 through July 2012 (i.e. the 12 months under review plus the immediately following two 14 15 months), which were billed August 2011 through September 2012. No 16 additional over/under recovery is sought by Big Rivers Electric Corporation. 17 18 19 Nicholas R. Castlen Witness)

20

Case No. 2012-00534 Response to PSC 1-1 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 1 of 1

Case No. 2012-00534

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2011 - May 2012

1	E(m) =OE - BAS, where						
2	OE = Pollution Control Operating Expenses			* ****			* • • • • • •
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product and A	llowance Sales		June 2011			July 2011
5							1
5			F	nvironmental		E	nvironmental
6				mpliance Plans			npliance Plans
7				, P			
8							
9	OE		\$	2,420,131		\$	2,659,704
10	BAS	222		-	=		-
11							
12	E(m)	=	\$	2,420,131		\$	2,659,704
13	L						
14 15	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Bill	ng Factor					
16	Calculation of Juristictional Environmental Surcharge Dif	ing i actor					
17							- <u> </u>
18	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expense Month			80 100218%	=		80.578072%
19	Jurisdictional $E(m) = E(m) x$ Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio	=	\$	1,938,530		\$	2,143,138
20	Adjustment for Over/(Under) Recovery			79,834	=		39,570
21	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)			-			1,455
22	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus Adjustment			1 0 0 0 0 0			
23	plus Prior Period Adjustment	#	\$	1,858,696	=	\$	2,105,023
24	Indiational Combon Manufala Indiational Kash Color for the	Month =		881,295,826	=		956,369,264
25 26	Jurisdictional S(m) = Monthly Jurisdictional Kwh Sales for the	e Month =		881,293,820	-		936,369,264
20 27							
27	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:						
29	Net Jurisdictional E(m) / Jurisdictional S(m); Per Kwh	=		\$0.002109	-		\$0.002201

Case No. 2012-00534

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2011 - May 2012

1 2	E(m) =OE - BAS, where OE = Pollution Control Operating Exp					-	
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product	and Allowance Sales		August 2011		Se	ptember 2011
5							
6				Environmental			nvironmental
0			С	ompliance Plans		Co	mpliance Plans
7							
8 9	OE	_	s	2,406,272		\$	2,530,984
10	BAS		Ψ			Ψ	2,550,501
11	DAD						
12	E(m)	aut.	\$	2,406,272	-	\$	2,530,984
13							
14	L						
15	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharg	e Billing Factor					
16							
17	The list of the list of the Device Configuration Manuals	_		80,598111%	==		77,472540%
18	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expense Month		\$	1,939,410		\$	1,960,818
19 20	Jurisdictional E(m) = E(m) x Jurisdictional Allocation R Adjustment for Over/(Under) Recovery		Ф	1,939,410	=	Ъ.	(67,266)
20 21	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)			150,207			(07,200)
21	Net Jurisdictional $E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m)$ plus Adju	stment for Over/(Under)					
23	plus Prior Period Adjustment	=	\$	1,781,123	=	\$	2,028,084
24							, ,
25	Jurisdictional S(m) = Monthly Jurisdictional Kwh Sales	for the Month =		925,832,222	=		837,087,680
26							
27							
28	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:						
29	Net Jurisdictional E(m) / Jurisdictional S(m); Per Kwh			\$0.001924	-		\$0.002423

Case No. 2012-00534

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2011 - May 2012

1 2	E(m) =OE - BAS, where OE = Pollution Control Ope	erating Expenses						
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from B	y-Product and Allowance Sales		0	ctober 2011		No	ovember 2011
4								
5				E	vironmental		F	nvironmental
6					npliance Plans			mpliance Plans
7					F			
8								
9	OE		2;m	\$	2,784,016		\$	2,412,062
10	BAS		20		-	200		-
11				¢	2 704 016	D	c	2 412 0(2
12 13	E(m)			\$	2,784,016	0	\$	2,412,062
13	L							
15	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental	Surcharge Billing Factor						
16								
17								
18	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expense M		~		79 224543%	-		82 179667%
19	Jurisdictional E(m) = E(m) x Jurisdictional Al	location Ratio	12	\$	2,205,624	Ŧ	\$	1,982,225
20	Adjustment for Over/(Under) Recovery		11		(170,566)			49,922
21	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)	-lus A diverse and for Orace ((1) dee)	0 <u>m</u>		-			-
22 23	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus Prior Period Adjust		10	\$	2,376,190	202	\$	1,932,303
23 24	plus Phot Period Adjust	mem		æ	2,570,190		ц,	1,932,505
25	Jurisdictional S(m) = Monthly Jurisdictional K	wh Sales for the Month			857,617,102	222		846,592,875
26					,			
27								
28	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billin	g Factor:						1
29	Net Jurisdictional E(m) / Jurisdictional S(m);	Per Kwh	765		\$0.002771	-		\$0.002282

Case No. 2012-00534

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2011 - May 2012

1 2	E(m) =OE - BA OE	 S, where Pollution Control Operating Expenses 						
3	BAS	= Total Proceeds from By-Product and Allowance Sales		D	ecember 2011		J	anuary 2012
4								
-				Е	nvironmental		E	nvironmental
6				Co	mpliance Plans		Co	mpliance Plans
7								
8								
9	OE			\$	2,551,793	=	\$	2,098,557
10 11	BAS		-		-	==		-
12	E(m)			\$	2,551,793		\$	2,098,557
13	L(m)			Φ	2,001,790		4	2,090,007
14		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,						
15	Calculation of	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor						
16								
17								
18		Allocation Ratio for Expense Month	=		82 469837%	-		91.151956%
19		E(m) = E(m) x Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio		\$	2,104,460		\$	1,912,876
20	-	or Over/(Under) Recovery	#2		(30,281)	11		155,752
21		djustment (if necessary)	=		her			35,632
22	Net Jurisdictio	onal E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus Adjustment for Over/(Under)						
23		plus Prior Period Adjustment	=	\$	2,134,741	-	\$	1,792,756
24	T 1.11.11 1				016 011 000			030 110 700
25	Jurisdictional	S(m) = Monthly Jurisdictional Kwh Sales for the Month			915,011,009	-		930,110,760
26 27								
27	Invictional	Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:						
20 29		onal E(m) / Jurisdictional S(m); Per Kwh			\$0.002333			\$0.001927
ر	r tet surfsurent				40.002000			55.001727

Case No. 2012-00534

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2011 - May 2012

1	E(m) = OE - BAS, where						
2	OE = Pollution Control Operating Expenses						
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product and Allowance Sales		Fc	ebruary 2012		N	March 2012
4							
5			E	nvironmental		5.	nvironmental
6				mpliance Plans			npliance Plans
7							
8 9	OE		\$	1,841,907	202	s	2,129,639
10	BAS		Φ	1,041,207		Ф	2,122,002
10	BAS			-			
12	E(m)		\$	1,841,907	=	\$	2,129,639
12			Ψ	.,		4.	-,,
14				······································			
15	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor						
16							
17							
18	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expense Month	=		93 544609%	-		87.541398%
19	Jurisdictional $E(m) = E(m) x$ Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio		\$	1,723,005		\$	1,864,316
20	Adjustment for Over/(Under) Recovery	072		35,207			(142,533)
21	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)	===		-			-
22	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus Adjustment for Over/(Under)						
23	plus Prior Period Adjustment		\$	1,687,798	105	\$	2,006,849
24							
25	Jurisdictional S(m) = Monthly Jurisdictional Kwh Sales for the Month	=		856,369,280	-		871,854,578
26							
27							
28	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:						
29	Net Jurisdictional E(m) / Jurisdictional S(m); Per Kwh			\$0.001971	-		\$0.002302

Case No. 2012-00534

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2011 - May 2012

1	E(m) = OE - BAS, where				
2	OE = Pollution Control Operating Expenses				
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product and Allowance Sales		 April 2012		 May 2012
4					
5					
6			nvironmental mpliance Plans		nvironmental mpliance Plans
7					
8					
9	OE	122	\$ 1,865,211	=	\$ 2,260,070
10	BAS		-	-	-
11					
12	E(m)	=	\$ 1,865,211	=	\$ 2,260,070
13			 		
14					
15	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor				
16			 		
17					
18	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expense Month	===	87.947998%		84.892343%
19	Jurisdictional $E(m) = E(m) \times Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio$		\$ 1,640,416	-	\$ 1,918,626
20	Adjustment for Over/(Under) Recovery		30,627		(77,445)
21	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)	222	-	=	-
22	Net Jurisdictional E(m) = Jurisdictional E(m) plus Adjustment for Over/(Under)				
23	plus Prior Period Adjustment		\$ 1,609,789		\$ 1,996,071
24					
25	Jurisdictional S(m) = Monthly Jurisdictional Kwh Sales for the Month		838,142,312	н	897,592,232
26					
27					
28	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:				
29	Net Jurisdictional E(m) / Jurisdictional S(m); Per Kwh	-	\$0.001921	=	\$0.002224

Case No. 2012-00534

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT Calculation of Total E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor

For the Expense Months: June 2011 - May 2012

1	E(m) = OE - BAS, where						
2	OE = Pollution Control Operating Expenses						
3	BAS = Total Proceeds from By-Product and Allowance Sales			June 2012			July 2012
4							
5							
6				nvironmental npliance Plans			invironmental mpliance Plans
7							
8							
9	OE		\$	2,182,005		\$	2,440,704
10	BAS	502 1		~	==		-
11							
12	E(m)	==	\$	2,182,005		\$	2,440,704
13		······					
14							
15	Calculation of Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor						
16		/		······································			
17	r (1) de al Allandia, Datis Callingues Manth			89,358343%			89.836556%
18	Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio for Expense Month	=	\$	1,949,804		\$	2,192,644
19	Jurisdictional $E(m) = E(m) \times Jurisdictional Allocation Ratio$		ъ	1,949,804	=	Φ	(9,462)
20	Adjustment for Over/(Under) Recovery			114,400			(9,402)
21	Prior Period Adjustment (if necessary)			-			-
22	Net Jurisdictional $E(m) =$ Jurisdictional $E(m)$ plus Adjustment for Over/(Under)		\$	1,835,318	222	\$	2,202,106
23	plus Prior Period Adjustment		Ф	1,055,510		Ъ	2,202,100
24	Jurisdictional S(m) = Monthly Jurisdictional Kwh Sales for the Month	==		893,259,338	-		974,156,163
25	Jurisdictional S(m) = Montinity Jurisdictional K.wn Sales for the Montin	-		093,239,330			974,150,105
26 27							
	Jurisdictional Environmental Surcharge Billing Factor:						
28 29	Net Jurisdictional E(m) / Jurisdictional S(m); Per Kwh	=		\$0.002055			\$0.002261
29	Net junistictional E(m) / junistictional 3(m), Pel Kwi	_		90.002033	_		90,002201

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012 CASE NO. 2012-00534

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information Dated December 13, 2012

January 16, 2013

1 Item 2) For each of the three Member Cooperatives, prepare a summary schedule showing the Member Cooperative's pass-through 2 3 revenue requirement for the months corresponding with the billing 4 periods under review. Include the two months subsequent to the billing periods included in the review periods. Include a calculation of any 5 6 additional over- or under-recovery amount the Member Cooperative 7 believes needs to be recognized for the billing periods under review. Include all supporting calculations and documentation for the 8 9 additional over- or under-recovery.

10

Response) The attached two sets of schedules (Attachment 1 for non-11 dedicated delivery points and Attachment 2 for dedicated delivery points) 12 reflect Big Rivers' Members' environmental surcharge pass-through for the 13 months corresponding to Big Rivers' expense months of June 2011 through 14 May 2012, applied to Members' invoices for the service months of July 2011 15 through June 2012, which Big Rivers billed to its Members August 2011 16 through July 2012. There is no billing lag for dedicated delivery point 17 18 customers.

19

As requested by the Commission, the attached schedules include the Members' two billing months immediately following the review period. The information on the attached schedules was obtained from the Members' monthly Environmental Surcharge Schedules provided by Big Rivers'

> Case No. 2012-00534 Response to PSC 1-2 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 1 of 2

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012 CASE NO. 2012-00534

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information Dated December 13, 2012

January 16, 2013

1	Members.	Other	than	the	on-going	cumulative	over/under	recovery
2	mechanism	, no additio	nal ov	er/u	nder recov	ery amount	is requested.	
3								
4								
5	Witness)	Nicholas R	. Cast	len				

Case No. 2012-00534 Response to PSC 1-2 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 2 of 2

Case No. 2012-00534

Item No. 2 (Attachment 1 of 2)

					Witne	ss: N	vicholas R. C	astl	len	
1						K	ENERGY CO	RP.		
2					ENVIRON	MEN	VTAL SURCH	IAI	RGE REVIEW	
3				N	ON-DEDICA	TED	DELIVERY	PO	INT CUSTOMERS	
4										
5	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)	·	(e)	 (f)
6										
7		ł	Big Rivers'							(Over)/Under
8			Invoice						ES Amount Billed	Recovery
9			ES Amount)ver)/Under		Total		to Kenergy's	[(d) for 2nd preceding
10		f	or Service		Recovery		ecoverable		Customers	month less (e)
11	Mo/Yr		Month		[from (f)]		[(b) + (c)]		(Line 11 per Filing)	 for current month]
12	Jun-11	\$	247,066	\$	(18,298)	\$	228,768	\$	218,521	\$ (18,298)
13	Jul-11	\$	285,991	\$	(33,530)	\$	252,461	\$	206,790	\$ (33,530)
14	Aug-11	\$	265,771	\$	(22,290)	\$	243,481	\$	251,058	\$ (22,290)
15	Sep-11	\$	164,119	\$	22,335	\$	186,454	\$	230,126	\$ 22,335
16	Oct-11	\$	198,801	\$	41,309	\$	240,110	\$	202,172	\$ 41,309
17	Nov-11	\$	239,207	\$	6,383	\$	245,590	\$	180,071	\$ 6,383
18	Dec-11	\$	245,405	\$	(18,012)	\$	227,393	\$	258,122	\$ (18,012)
19	Jan-12	\$	265,490	\$	(35,770)	\$	229,720	\$	281,360	\$ (35,770)
20	Feb-12	\$	188,210	\$	(660)	\$	187,550	\$	228,053	\$ (660)
21	Mar-12	\$	160,757	\$	24,108	\$	184,865	\$	205,612	\$ 24,108
22	Apr-12	\$	175,208	\$	24,959	\$	200,167	\$	162,591	\$ 24,959
23	May-12	\$	185,378	\$	8,491	\$	193,869	\$	176,374	\$ 8,491
24	Jun-12	\$	239,299	\$	(25,007)	\$	214,292	\$	225,174	\$ (25,007)
25	Jul-12	\$	279,677	\$	(16,746)	\$	262,931	\$	210,615	\$ (16,746)
26	Aug-12	\$	261,409	\$	(38,289)	\$	223,120	\$	252,581	\$ (38,289)
27	Sep-12	\$	184,234	\$	26,539	\$	210,773	\$	236,392	\$ 26,539
28	Oct-12	\$	229,117	\$	26,214	\$	255,331	\$	196,906	\$ 26,214

Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen

Case No. 2012-00534

Item No. 2 (Attachment 1 of 2)

1]	ACKSON PU	RC	HASE ENERC	GY (CORPORATION	
2					ENVIRON	ME	NTAL SURCH	IAI	RGE REVIEW	
3				N	ON-DEDICA	TEL	DELIVERY	PO	INT CUSTOMERS	
4										
5	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)	 (f)
6										
7			Big Rivers'							(Over)/Under
8			Invoice						ES Amount Billed	Recovery
9			ES Amount	((Over)/Under		Total		to JPEC's	[(d) for 3rd preceding
10			for Service		Recovery	I	Recoverable		Customers	month less (e)
11	Mo/Yr	<u> </u>	Month		[from (f)]		[(b) + (c)]		(Line 11 per Filing)	 for current month)]
12	Jun-11	\$	144,106	\$	14,433	\$	158,539	\$	101,730	\$ 14,433
13	Jul-11	\$	161,441	\$	(46,811)		114,630	\$	173,049	\$ (46,811)
14	Aug-11	\$	150,142	\$	(31,635)	\$	118,507	\$	118,726	\$ (31,635)
15	Sep-11	\$	91,106	\$	(39,248)	\$	51,858	\$	197,787	\$ (39,248)
16	Oct-11	\$	108,148	\$	29,974	\$	138,122	\$	84,656	\$ 29,974
17	Nov-11	\$	133,425	\$	41,526	\$	174,951	\$	76,981	\$ 41,526
18	Dec-11	\$	136,326	\$	5,497	\$	141,823	\$	46,361	\$ 5,497
19	Jan-12	\$	141,807	\$	(26,544)	\$	115,263	\$	164,666	\$ (26,544)
20	Feb-12	\$	100,203	\$	(60,167)	\$	40,036	\$	235,118	\$ (60,167)
21	Mar-12	\$	87,448	\$	13,260	\$	100,708	\$	128,563	\$ 13,260
22	Apr-12	\$	98,801	\$	22,614	\$	121,415	\$	92,649	\$ 22,614
23	May-12	\$	107,604	\$	6,074	\$	113,678	\$	33,962	\$ 6,074
24	Jun-12	\$	137,485	\$	(8,118)	\$	129,367	\$	108,826	\$ (8,118)
25	Jul-12	\$	159,783	\$	(41,043)	\$	118,740	\$	162,458	\$ (41,043)
26	Aug-12	\$	149,078	\$	(39,874)	\$	109,204	\$	153,552	\$ (39,874)
27	Sep-12	\$	102,979	\$	(25,321)	\$	77,658	\$	154,688	\$ (25,321)
28	Oct-12	\$	124,094	\$	30,011	\$	154,105	\$	88,729	\$

Case No. 2012-00534

Item No. 2 (Attachment 1 of 2)

1			MEAD	E CC	OUNTY RUR	AL.	ELECTRIC CO	DOI	PERATIVE CORPOR	ATI	ON
2					ENVIRON	ME	INTAL SURCE	IAI	RGE REVIEW		
3				N	ON-DEDICA	ΓEI	D DELIVERY	PO	INT CUSTOMERS		
4											
5	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)		(e)		(f)
6											
7		I	Big Rivers'								(Over)/Under
8			Invoice						ES Amount Billed		Recovery
9		F	ES Amount	(0)ver)/Under		Total		to MCRECC's		[(d) for 1st preceding
10		t	for Service		Recovery]	Recoverable		Customers		month less (e)
11	Mo/Yr		Month		[from (f)]		[(b) + (c)]		(Line 11 per Filing)		for current month]
12	Jun-11	\$	88,908	\$	(10,893)	\$	78,015	\$	63,841	\$	(10,893)
13	Jul-11	\$	104,974	\$	(16,512)	\$	88,462	\$	94,527	\$	(16,512)
14	Aug-11	\$	96,473	\$	13,138	\$	109,611	\$	75,324	\$	13,138
15	Sep-11	\$	60,123	\$	26,053	\$	86,176	\$	83,558	\$	26,053
16	Oct-11	\$	76,716	\$	2,321	\$	79,037	\$	83,855	\$	2,321
17	Nov-11	\$	97,263	\$	(8,659)	\$	88,604	\$	87,696	\$	(8,659)
18	Dec-11	\$	103,832	\$	(22,888)	\$	80,944	\$	111,492	\$	(22,888)
19	Jan-12	\$	116,024	\$	(5,252)	\$	110,772	\$	86,196	\$	(5,252)
20	Feb-12	\$	81,574	\$	11,072	\$	92,646	\$	99,700	\$	11,072
21	Mar-12	\$	63,360	\$	22,776	\$	86,136	\$	69,870	\$	22,776
22	Apr-12	\$	67,443	\$	7,056	\$	74,499	\$	79,080	\$	7,056
23	May-12	\$	67,261	\$	(8,468)	\$	58,793	\$	82,967	\$	(8,468)
24	Jun-12	\$	85,423	\$	(6,928)	\$	78,495	\$	65,721	\$	(6,928)
25	Jul-12	\$	101,201	\$	(18,683)	\$	82,518	\$	97,178	\$	(18,683)
26	Aug-12	\$	93,643	\$	11,111	\$	104,754	\$	71,407	\$	11,111
27	Sep-12	\$	66,693	\$	18,493	\$	85,186	\$	86,261	\$	18,493
28	Oct-12	\$	92,678	\$	3,928	\$	96,606	\$	81,258	\$	3,928

Case No. 2012-00534

Response to Item No. 2 (Attachment 2 of 2)

Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen

1		KENE	RGY CORP-ENVIRON	MEI	NTAL SURCHARC	E RE	EVIEW	
2			DEDICATED DELIV	ERY	POINT CUSTOM	ERS		
3								
4	(a)		(b)		(c)		(d)	
5					:			
6		E	Big Rivers Electric					
7			Invoice		Service Month		Monthly	
8			Amount		to		Over/Under	
9	Service		for Service		Retail		(Column (b)	
10	Mo/Yr		Month		Consumer		less column (c)	
11	Jul-11	\$	1,462,904	\$	1,462,904	\$		-
12	Aug-11	\$	1,523,959	\$	1,523,959	\$		-
13	Sep-11	\$	1,294,421	\$	1,294,421	\$		-
14	Oct-11	\$	1,693,436	\$	1,693,436	\$		-
15	Nov-11	\$	1,875,153	\$	1,875,153	\$		-
16	Dec-11	\$	1,601,460	\$	1,601,460	\$		-
17	Jan-12	\$	1,645,740	\$	1,645,740	\$		-
18	Feb-12	\$	1,279,677	\$	1,279,677	\$		-
19	Mar-12	\$	1,406,362	\$	1,406,362	\$		-
20	Apr-12	\$	1,586,599	\$	1,586,599	\$		-
21	May-12	\$	1,362,914	\$	1,362,914	\$		-
22	Jun-12	\$	1,523,700	\$	1,523,700	\$		-
23	Jul-12	\$	1,460,830	\$	1,460,830	\$		-
24	Aug-12	\$	1,588,815	\$	1,588,815	\$		-

Case No. 2012-00534

Response to Item No. 2 (Attachment 2 of 2)

Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen

1		 JACKSON PURCHASE	EN	ERGY CORPORA	TION
2		ENVIRONMENTAL	. SU	RCHARGE REVIE	W
3		DEDICATED DELIVI	ERY	POINT CUSTOM	ERS
4					
5	(a)	(b)		(c)	(d)
6					
7		Big Rivers Electric			
8		Invoice		Service Month	Monthly
9		Amount		То	(Over)/Under Recovery
10	Service	for Service		Retail	(Column (b)
11	Mo/Yr	Month		Consumer	Less column (c)
12	Jul-11	\$ 1,673	\$	1,673	\$ -
13	Aug-11	\$ 1,411	\$	1,411	\$ -
14	Sep-11	\$ 787	\$	787	\$-
15	Oct-11	\$ 905	\$	905	\$-
16	Nov-11	\$ 862	\$	862	\$ -
17	Dec-11	\$ 1,032	\$	1,032	\$-
18	Jan-12	\$ 887	\$	887	\$-
19	Feb-12	\$ 559	\$	559	\$-
20	Mar-12	\$ 499	\$	499	\$ -
21	Apr-12	\$ 1,352	\$	1,352	\$ -
22	May-12	\$ 1,117	\$	1,117	\$ -
23	Jun-12	\$ 702	\$	702	\$-
24	Jul-12	\$ 400	\$	400	\$ -
25	Aug-12	\$ 962	\$	962	\$

28

29

30 Meade County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation has no dedicated delivery

31 point customers.

Case No. 2012-00534 Attachment (2 of 2) to Response for PSC 1-2 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 2 of 2 •

.

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012 CASE NO. 2012-00534

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information Dated December 13, 2012

January 16, 2013

1 Item 3) For each of the three Member Cooperatives, provide a

2 description of the Member Cooperatives' monthly environmental

3 surcharge reporting process including the lag periods used by each

4 Member Cooperative.

5

Response) Non-Dedicated Delivery Point Customers: Big Rivers bills each of 6 its member distribution cooperatives (i.e. Meade County Rural Electric 7 Cooperative Corporation ("MCRECC"), Kenergy Corp. ("Kenergy"), and 8 Jackson Purchase Energy Corporation ("JPEC") (collectively, the "Members") 9 on a calendar month basis. Big Rivers' Environmental Surcharge ("ES") factor 10 is billed to each of its Members on a two-month lag. For example, Big Rivers' 11 ES factor calculated in the ES filing for its January 2012 expense month is 12 applied to service delivered to each of its Members during February 2012, 13 which is billed to the Members in March 2012. 14

15

Each Member prepares a monthly ES filing to pass their applicable ES 16 charges, billed to them by Big Rivers, to their non-dedicated deliver point 17 customers. The ES amounts billed by Big Rivers are included in the Members' 18 ES filings for the expense month during which those charges were incurred 19 by the Members (i.e. the month that the related service was delivered to the 20 Members). The ES factors, calculated in the Members' monthly ES filings, are 21 applied to their retail customers' bills rendered during the second month 22 following the Members' expense month. For example, ES charges billed to the 23

> Case No. 2012-00534 Response to PSC 1-3 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 1 of 3

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012 CASE NO. 2012-00534

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information Dated December 13, 2012

January 16, 2013

Members by Big Rivers in March 2012 (for service delivered to the Members
 during February 2012) are included in the Members' ES filings for their
 February 2012 expense month, which calculates the ES factor to be applied
 to the Members' retail customers' bills rendered during April 2012.

5

The timing differences associated with the Members' ES filings, described in 6 7 the response to the Commission Staff's Second Request for Information dated August 31, 2012 in Case No. 2012-00262, relates to the timing of when over-8 or under-recovery amounts for prior expense months are included in the 9 MCRECC's over- or under-recovery for an expense 10 Members' ES filings. month is included in the ES filing for the first expense month following that 11 12 expense month, Kenergy's over- or under-recovery for an expense month is included in the ES filing for the second expense month following that expense 13 14 month, and JPEC's over- or under-recovery for an expense month is included in the ES filing for the third expense month following that expense month. 15 For example, MCRECC's over- or under-recovery, of its' recoverable ES costs 16 for the February 2012 expense month, is included in its' March 2012 expense 17 18 month ES filing. Kenergy's over- or under-recovery, of its' recoverable ES 19 costs for the February 2012 expense month, is included in its' April 2012 expense month ES filing. JPEC's over- or under-recovery, of its' recoverable 20 ES costs for the February 2012 expense month, is included in its' May 2012 21 22 expense month ES filing.

23

Case No. 2012-00534 Response to PSC 1-3 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 2 of 3

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012 CASE NO. 2012-00534

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information Dated December 13, 2012

January 16, 2013

1 <u>Dedicated Delivery Point Customers</u>: Kenergy and JPEC bill their customers 2 with dedicated delivery points on a calendar month basis, including the 3 environmental surcharge amount for those customers in the same month 4 which they are billed by Big Rivers. MCRECC has no dedicated delivery point 5 customers.

- 6
- 7
- 8 Witness) Nicholas R. Castlen

Case No. 2012-00534 Response to PSC 1-3 Witness: Nicholas R. Castlen Page 3 of 3

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012 CASE NO. 2012-00534

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information Dated December 13, 2012

January 16, 2013

1 Item 4) Refer to Form 2.5, Operating and Maintenance Expenses, for

2 each of the expense months covered by each billing period under

3 review. For each of the expense line items listed on this schedule,

4 explain the reason(s) for any change in the expense levels from month

5 to month if that change is greater than plus or minus 10 percent.

6

7 Response) Please see the attached schedules of Operating and Maintenance 8 ("O&M") expenses, including the requested variance explanations, for the 9 expense months of May 2011 through May 2012. Please note, May 2011 is 10 only being shown for purposes of calculating the variances in the first month 11 of the review period.

12

Note: During the previous Two-Year Review of Big Rivers' Environmental 13 Surcharge (Case No. 2012-00262), Big Rivers identified errors in the 14 15 classification of certain O&M expenses on its monthly Form ES filings while preparing the response to Item No. 3 of the Commission Staff's Initial Request 16 for Information in that case, dated July 2, 2012. Specifically, Emulsified 17 Sulfur for SO2 was incorrectly classified as Emulsified Sulfur for NOx (for the 18 D.B. Wilson generation plant) in the November 2010 expense month filing, 19 and Hydrated Lime for SO3 was incorrectly classified as Reagent Lime for 20 SO2 (for the D.B. Wilson generation plant) in the January 2011 through 21 22 October 2011 expense month filings.

23

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIODS ENDING JANUARY 31, 2012 AND JULY 31, 2012 CASE NO. 2012-00534

Response to Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information Dated December 13, 2012

January 16, 2013

1	These errors related to the classification of expenses between different
2	recoverable O&M expense categories only. The total dollars included in the
3	original filings were correct and the errors had no impact on the calculations
4	of the ES factors during the related expense months. The total dollar
5	amounts included in the original filings were correct. Separate schedules
6	(including the original "As Filed" amounts and the corrected "As Revised"
7	amounts) have been prepared and included as attachments to this response.
8	The variance explanations are included in the "As Revised" schedule.
9	
10	
11	Witnesses) Nicholas R. Castlen (Schedules of O&M Expenses) and
12	Lawrence V. Baronowsky (Reason(s) for Changes in Expense
13	Levels)

Case No. 2012-00534 Response to PSC 1-4 Witnesses: Nicholas R. Castlen and Lawrence V. Baronowsky Page 2 of 2

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012 Item No. 4

(As Originally Filed)

NOx Plan:

				Jun-11 vs. May-11		Jul-11 vs. Jun-11		Aug-11 vs. Jul-11		Sep-11 vs. Aug-11
Expense Month	Ma	May-11	Jun-11	% Change	Jul-II	% Change	Aug-11	% Change	Sep-11	% Change
NOx Plan										
Anhydrous Ammonia	\$	88,949	\$ 205,033	131%	\$ 144,828		\$ 205,882	42%	\$ 149,901	
Emulsified Sulphur for NOx		•	1	See Note 1		- See Note 1	•	See Note I		- See Note I
Individual Expense Account Items		1	I	See Note 1		- See Note I	1	See Note I		- See Note I
Individual Expense Account Items		'	•	See Note 1		- See Note I	1	See Note 1		- See Note I
Total NOx Plan O&M Expenses	€9	88,949	\$ 205,033	131%	\$ 144,828	8 -29%	\$ 205,882	42%	\$ 149,901	-27%
SOJ Plan.										
2004 1 Idli.				Jun-11 vs. May-11		Jul-11 vs. Jun-11		Aug-11 vs. Jul-11		Sep-11 vs. Aug-11
Expense Month	Ma	May-11	Jun-11	% Change	Jul-11	% Change	Aug-11	% Change	Sep-11	% Change
SO2 Plan Expenses:										
Disposal-Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge (See Note 2)	\$	426,416	\$ 381,543	-11%	\$ 494,841	1 30%	\$ 167,113	-66%	\$ 360,680) 116%
Off Spec Gypsum		,	'	See Note I		- See Note I	'	See Note 1		- See Note I
Fixation Lime		253,487	200,039	-21%	220,278	8 10%	181,491	-18%	193,982	2 7%
Reagent-Calcium Oxide (landfill stab.)		1	1	See Note 1		- See Note 1	'	See Note 1		- See Note I
Reagent-Limestone		442,068	330,642	-25%	352,657	7 7%	405,123	15%	341,559	9 -16%
Reagent-Lime (See Note 3)		1,011,769	1,123,209	11%	1,219,178	8 9%	1,251,397	3%	1,269,024	1%
Emulsified Sulphur for SO2		1	7,393	See Note I		100%	7,233	See Note I		100%
Reagent-DiBasic Acid		191,424	111,874	-42%	147,533	3 32%	111,864	-24%	149,196	5 33%
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2		66,454	31,432	-53%	52,423	3 67%	56,146	2%2	50,751	-10%
Reagent-Hydroxy Basic Acid		'	'	See Note I		- See Note I	•	See Note 1		- See Note I
Total S02 Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 2,	2,391,618	\$ 2,186,132	-9%	\$ 2,486,910	0 14%	\$ 2,180,367	-12%	\$ 2,365,192	2 8%
SO3 Plan:										
				Jun-11 vs. May-11		Jul-11 vs. Jun-11		Aug-11 vs. Jul-11		Sep-11 vs. Aug-11
Expense Month	Ma	May-I I	Jun-l l	% Change	Jul-11	% Change	Aug-11	% Change	Sep-11	% Change
SO3 Plan Expenses.										
Hydrated Lime - SO3	69	19,658	, 59	-100%	\$	- See Note I	•	See Note 1	\$	- See Note I
Individual Expense Account Items		,	1	See Note 1		- See Note 1	•	See Note I		- See Note I
Individual Expense Account Items		•	t	See Note 1		- See Note I	•	See Note 1		- See Note 1
Total S03 Plan O&M Expenses	÷	19,658	•	-100%	\$	- See Note I	-	See Note 1	\$	- See Note I
Total	<u>S</u> 2.	2,500,225	S 2,391,165		S 2,631,738		S 2,386,249		S 2,515,093	
				1						8
	Note 1	: Percental	te change not c	alculated because the o	cost incurred du	Note 1: Percentage change not calculated because the cost incurred during the prior expense month was \$0.	onth was \$0.			
	Note 2	: The mon	hly totals for D	isposal Bottom Ash, I	Disposal Flyash	Note 2: The monthly totals for Disposal Bottom Ash, Disposal Flyash and Disposal Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge have been consolidated due to similarity to better facilitate	tom Ash/Sludge ha	ave been consolidated	due to similarity	to better facilitate

j) L 2 Š. , a nde Ì ode 2 consistency. Note 3: During the previous Two-Year Review of Big River's Environmental Surcharge (Case No. 2012-00262), Big Rivers identified errors in the classification of certain O&M filings. These errors related to the classification of expenses between different recoverable O&M expense categories only. The total dollars included in the original filings were correct and the errors had no impact on the calculations of the ES factors during the related expense months. Refer to the attached "AS REVISED" schedule for revised amounts and explanations for all variances greater than plus or minus 10%. expenses on its monthly Form ES filings while preparing the response to Item No. 3 of the Commission Staffs Initial Request for Information dated July 2, 2012. Specifically, Hydrated Lime for SO3 was incorrectly classified as Reagent Lime for SO2 (for the D.B. Wilson generation plant) in the January 2011 through October 2011 expense month Emulsified Sulfur for SO2 was incorrectly classified as Emulsified Sulfur for NOx (for the D.B. Wilson generation plant) in the November 2010 expense month filing, and

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012

Item No. 4 (As Originally Filed)

NOx Plan:								
		Oct-11 vs. Sep-11		Nov-11 vs. Oct-11		Dec-11 vs. Nov-11		Jan-12 vs. Dec-11
Expense Month	Oct-11	% Change	Nov-11	% Change	Dec-11	% Change	Jan-12	% Change
NOx Plan								
Anhydrous Ammonia	\$ 285,029	%06	\$ 178,881	-37%	\$ 253,669	9 42%	\$ 152,913	-40%
Emutsified Sulphur for NOx		See Note 1	•	See Note 1		- See Note I		See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items	1	See Note I	•	See Note 1		- See Note I		See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items	•	See Note 1	•	See Note 1		- See Note I		See Note I
Total NOx Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 285,029	90%	\$ 178,881	-37%	\$ 253,669	9 42%	\$ 152,913	-40%
SCO3 Blan.								
11111 T 700		Oct-11 vs. Sep-11		Nov-11 vs. Oct-11		Dec-11 vs. Nov-11		Jan-12 vs. Dec-11
Expense Month	Oct-11	% Change	Nov-11	% Change	Dec-11	% Change	Jan-12	% Change
SO2 Plan Expenses:								
Disposal-Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge (See Note 2) \$	\$ 447,681	24%	\$ 385,522	-14%	\$ 415,987	37 8%	\$ 300,249	-28%
Off Spec Gypsum		See Note I		See Note I		- See Note 1		- See Note I
Fixation Line	184.531	-5%	141,603	-23%	227,378	78 61%	220,402	-3%
Reagent-Calcium Oxide (landfill stab.)		Se	•	See Note 1		- See Note 1		- See Note I
Reagent-Limestone	366,658		391,337		393,510	10 1%	420,650	7%
Reagent-Lime (See Note 3)	1.082.876		937,043	-13%	977,518		722,163	
Emulsified Sulphur for SO2	7,197	š	7,114	-1%	7,251			100%
Reagent-DiBasic Acid	141.357		162,956	15%	157,581	31 -3%	178,628	13%
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2	50,419		71,083	41%	64,478	78 -9%	54,894	-15%
		5		Coo Note 1		See Mote I		See Note 1

	0,0,000	0/ 3	100,100				2222	
Reagent-Lime (See Note 3)	1.082.876	-15%	937,043	-13%	977,518	4%	722,163	-26%
Emulsified Sulphur for SO2	7.197	See Note 1	7,114	-1%	7,251	2%	1	-100%
Reapent-DiBasic Acid	141.357	-5%	162,956	15%	157,581	-3%	178,628	13%
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2	50,419	-1%	71,083	41%	64,478	%6-	54,894	-15%
Reagent-Hvdroxy Basic Acid		See Note I	1	See Note 1		See Note 1	•	See Note I
Total S02 Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 2,280,719	-4%	\$ 2,096,658	-8%	\$ 2,243,703	7%	\$ 1,896,986	-15%
SO3 Plan.								
1000 T 1001.		Oct-11 vs. Sep-11		Nov-11 vs. Oct-11		Dec-11 vs. Nov-11		Jan-12 vs. Dec-11
Expense Month	Oct-11	% Change	Nov-11	% Change	Dec-11	% Change	Jan-12	% Change
SO3 Plan Expenses:								
Hvdrated Lime - SO3	• •	See Note 1	\$ 22,450	See Note 1	\$ 33,587	50%	\$ 29,979	-11%
Individual Expense Account Items	•	See Note I	1	See Note 1	•	See Note 1	•	See Note I
Individual Expense Account Items	•	See Note I	•	See Note 1	-	See Note 1	•	See Note 1
Total S03 Plan O&M Expenses	-	See Note 1	\$ 22,450	See Note I	\$ 33,587	50%	\$ 29,979	-11%
Total	S 2,565,748		S 2,297,989		S 2,530,959		S 2,079,878	

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012

Item No. 4 (As Originally Filed)

		Feb-12 vs. Jan-12		Mar-12 vs. Feb-12		Apr-12 vs. Mar-12		May-12 vs. Apr-12
Expense Month	Feb-12	% Change	Mar-12	% Change	Apr-12	% Change	May-12	% Change
NOx Plan								
Anhydrous Ammonia	\$ 110,897	-27%	\$ 105,707	-5%	\$ 138,113	31%	\$ 151,920	10%
Emulsified Sulphur for NOx	•	See Note 1	ł	See Note 1	1	See Note 1	•	See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items		See Note 1	•	See Note 1	1	See Note 1	•	See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items		See Note 1	•	See Note 1	•	See Note I	•	See Note 1
Total NOx Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 110,897	-27%	\$ 105,707	-5%	\$ 138,113	31%	\$ 151,920	10%

			Feb-12 vs. Jan-12		Mar-12 vs. Feb-12		Apr-12 vs. Mar-12		May-12 vs. Apr-12
Expense Month		Feb-12	% Change	Mar-12	% Change	Apr-12	% Change	May-12	% Change
SO2 Plan Expenses:									
Disposal-Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge (See Note 2) \$	69	322,618	7%	\$ 374,561	16%	\$ 311,850	-17%	\$ 344,499	10%
Off Spec Gypsum		•	See Note I	1	See Note 1	'	See Note 1		See Note 1
Fixation Line		172,697	-22%	146,229	-15%	106,425	-27%	152,180	43%
Reagent-Calcium Oxide (landfill stab.)		•	See Note I	ŧ	See Note 1	•	See Note 1		See Note I
Reagent-Limestone		342,659	-19%	244,790	-29%	328,206	34%	361,321	
Reagent-Lime (See Note 3)		668,128	-7%	1,078,393	61%	795,307	-26%	1,102,422	39%
Emulsified Sulphur for SO2		1	See Note 1	7,133	See Note I	7,194	1%	•	
Reagent-DiBasic Acid		134,973	-24%	115,229	-15%	134,174	16%	61,195	
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2		54,232	-1%	37,412	-31%	17,670	-53%	5,311	
Reagent-Hydroxy Basic Acid		ı	See Note I	1	See Note 1	•	See Note I		See Note 1
Total S02 Plan O&M Expenses	÷	\$ 1,695,307	-11%	\$ 2,003,747	18%	\$ 1,700,826	-15%	\$ 2,062,932	21%

Ш.	
Pla	
3	
S	

		Feb-12 vs. Jan-12		Mar-12 vs. Feb-12		Apr-12 vs. Mar-12	2	May-12 vs. Apr-12
Expense Month	Feb-12	% Change	Mar-12	% Change	Apr-12	% Change	May-12	% Change
SO3 Plan Expenses:								
Hydrated Line - SO3	\$ 25,634	-14%	\$ 14,786		106.01		\$ 36,650	
Individual Expense Account Items		See Note 1					•	See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items	•	See Note 1		- See Note 1		- See Note I	•	See Note I
Total S03 Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 25,634	-14%	\$ 14,786		\$ 19,901		\$ 36,650	84%
Total	S 1,831,838		S 2,124,240		S 1,858,840	0	S 2,251,502	I

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012 Item No. 4 (As Revised)

NOx Plan:

				Jun-11 vs. May-11		1	Jul-11 vs. Jun-11		Aug-11 vs. Jul-11		Sep-11 vs. Aug-11
Expense Month		May-11	Jun-11	% Change	Jul-11		% Change	Aug-11	% Change	Sep-11	% Change
NOx Plan											
Anhydrous Ammonia	69	88,949 \$	205,033	131%	S 144	44,828	-29%	\$ 205,882	42%	S 149,901	
Emulsified Sulphur for NOx			•	See Note 1		•	See Note 1	•	See Note 1		See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items		,	1	See Note I		,	See Note 1	*	See Note 1		See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items			•	See Note 1		,	See Note I	•	See Note 1		See Note I
Total NOx Plan O&M Expenses	\$	88,949 S	205,033	131%	S 144	44,828	-29%	\$ 205,882	42%	\$ 149,901	-27%

SO2 Plan:

				Jun-11 vs. May-11		Jul-11 vs. Jun-11		Aug-11 vs. Jul-11		Sep-11 vs. Aug-11
Expense Month		May-11	Jun-11	% Change	Jul-11	% Change	Aug-11	% Change	Sep-11	% Change
502 Plan Expenses:										
Disposal-Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge (See Note 2)	69	426,416 \$	381,543	-11%	S 494,841	30%	\$ 167,113	-66%	\$ 360,680	116%
Off Spec Gypsum			•	See Note 1	•	See Note 1	•	See Note 1	,	See Note 1
Fixation Lime		253,487	200,039	-21%	220,278		181,491	-18%	193,982	2%
Reagent-Calcium Oxide (landfill stab.)		•	•	See Note 1	•	See Note I	•		•	See Note 1
Reagent-Limestone		442,068	330.642	-25%	352,657		405,123		341,559	
Reagent-Lime (See Note 3)		981,213	1,085,720	11%	1,165,314		1,198,747		1,216,629	
Emulsified Sulphur for SO2		•	7,393	See Note I	•	-100%	7.233	See Note 1	•	-100%
Reagent-DiBasic Acid		191,424	111,874	-42%	147,533		111,864		149,196	
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2		66,454	31,432	-53%	52,423		56,146		50,751	
Reagent-Hydroxy Basic Acid		•	•	See Note 1	•	See Note 1	•	- See Note 1		See Note 1
Total S02 Plan O&M Expenses	\$	2,361,062 [\$	2,148,643	%6-	\$ 2,433,046	13%	\$ 2,127,717	-13%	\$ 2,312,797	⁰ / ₀ 6

SO3 Plan:

				Jun-11 vs. May-11		Jul-11 vs. Jun-11		Aug-11 vs. Jul-11		Sep-11 vs. Aug-11
Expense Month		May-11	Jun-11	% Change	Jul-11	% Change	Aug-11	% Change	Sep-11	% Change
SO3 Plan Expenses:										
Hydrated Lime - SO3	69	50,214 \$	\$ 37,489	-25%	s 53,864		S 52,650		\$ 52,395	
Individual Expense Account Items		•	•	See Note 1		- See Note 1		- See Note 1		See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items		•	•	See Note 1		See Note 1		See Note 1		See Note 1
Total S03 Plan O&M Expenses	\$	50,214	50,214 \$ 37,489	-25%	\$ 53,864		\$ 52,650		\$ 52,395	%0
Total	s	2,500,225 S 2,391,165	\$ 2,391,165		S 2,631,738	I	S 2,386,249		S 2,515,093	
				11						

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012 Item No. 4 (As Revised)

NOx Plan:

			Oct-11 vs. Sep-11			Nov-II vs. Oct-II			Dec-11 vs. Nov-11			Jan-12 vs. Dec-11
Expense Month		Oct-11	% Change	Nov-11		% Change		Dec-11	% Change	J	Jan-12	% Change
NOx Plan						ł						
Anhydrous Ammonia	69	285,029	%06	s 17	78,881	-37%	\$	253,669	42%	\$	152,913	-40%
Emulsified Sulphur for NOx		1	See Note I		•	See Note 1		•	See Note 1		• ,	See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items			See Note 1		,	See Note 1		,	See Note 1		,	See Note 1
Individual Expense Account Items		•	See Note I		1	See Note 1		1	See Note 1		1	See Note 1
Total NOx Plan O&M Expenses	\$	285,029	%06	11 S	78,881	-37%	s	253,669	42%	s	152.913	-40%

SO2 Plan:

		Oct-11 vs. Sep-11		Nov-11 vs. Oct-11		Dec-11 vs. Nov-11		Jan-12 vs. Dec-11
Expense Month	Oct-11	% Change	Nov-11	% Change	Dec-11	% Change	Jan-12	% Change
SO2 Plan Expenses:								
Disposal-Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge (See Note 2)	S 447,681	24%	\$ 385,522	-14%	S 415,987	7 8%	\$ 300,249	-28%
Off Spec Gypsum	•	See Note 1	•	See Note 1		- See Note I		Se
Fixation Lime	184,531	-5%	141,603	-23%	227,378	8 61%	220,402	
Reagent-Calcium Oxide (landfill stab.)	•	See Note 1	•	See Note 1		- See Note 1		See
Reagent-Limestone	366,658	2%	391,337	7%	393,510	0 1 1%	420,650	
Reagent-Lime (See Note 3)	1,052,219	-14%	937,043	-11%	977,518	-	722,163	
Emulsified Sulphur for SO2	7,197	See Note 1	7,114	-1%	7,251	1 2%		-100%
Reagent-DiBasic Acid	141,357	-5%	162,956	15%	157,581	1 -3%	178,628	
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2	50,419	-1%	71,083	41%	64,478		54,894	
Reagent-Hydroxy Basic Acid	•	See Note 1	•	See Note 1		- See Note 1		See Note 1
Total S02 Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 2,250,062	-3%	\$ 2.096.658	-7%	\$ 2.243.703	3 7%	\$ 1.896.986	-15%

SO3 Plan:

			Oct-11 vs. Sep-11			Nov-11 vs. Oct-11			Dec-11 vs. Nov-11		Jan-12 vs. Dec-11
Expense Month		Oct-11	% Change	Nov-11		% Change	Dec-11		% Change	Jan-12	% Change
SO3 Plan Expenses:											
Hydrated Lime - SO3	\$	30,657	-41%	\$ 22,	22,450	-27%	s S	33,587	50%	\$ 29,979	9 -11%
Individual Expense Account Items		1	See Note 1		•	See Note 1		'	See Note 1		
Individual Expense Account Items		•	See Note 1		•	See Note 1		1	See Note 1		- See Note I
Total S03 Plan O&M Expenses	\$	30,657	-41%	\$ 22,	22,450	-27%	s S	33,587	50%	\$ 29,979	
Total	s	2,565,748		S 2,297,989	,989		S 2,530,959	0,959		S 2,079,878	8
							VILLAND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND				

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012 Item No. 4 (As Revised)

NOx Plan:

			Feb-12 vs. Jan-12		Mar-12 vs. Feb-12	-12		Apr-12 vs. Mar-12		May-12 vs. Apr-12
Expense Month		Feb-12	% Change	Mar-12	% Change		Apr-12	% Change	May-12	
NOx Plan										
Anhydrous Ammonta	69	110,897	-27%	s 105,707	.07 -5%	Ś	138,113	31%	\$ 15	51,920 10%
Emulsified Sulphur for NOx			See Note 1		- See Note 1		,	See Note 1		
Individual Expense Account Items	1	,	See Note 1		- See Note 1		1	See Note I		- See Note
Individual Expense Account Items		•	See Note 1		- See Note I		,	See Note I		- See Note I
Total NOx Plan O&M Expenses	s	110,897	-27%	S 105.707	.07 -5%	s	138,113	31%	S 15	151.920 10%

		Feb-12 vs. Jan-12		Mar-12 vs. Feb-12		Apr-12 vs. Mar-12		May-12 vs. Apr-12
Expense Month	Feb-12	% Change	Mar-12	% Change	Apr-12	% Change	May-12	% Change
SO2 Plan Expenses:								
Disposal-Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge (See Note 2)	S 322,618	1%	S 374,561	16%	S 311,850	0 -17%	\$ 344,499	10%
Off Spec Gypsum	•	See Note 1		See Note I		- See Note I	•	Sec
Fixation Line	172,697	-22%	146,229	-15%	106,425		152,180	43%
Reagent-Calcium Oxide (landfill stab.)	•	See Note I	•	See Note 1		- See Note 1	t	See Note 1
Reagent-Limestone	342,659		244,790	-29%	328,20		361,321	10%
Reagent-Lime (See Note 3)	668,128	-7%	1,078,393	61%	795,307	7 -26%	1,102,422	39%
Emulsified Sulphur for SO2	•	See Note I	7,133	See Note 1	7,15		•	-100%
Reagent-DiBasic Acid	134,973	-24%	115,229	-15%	134,174		97,199	-28%
Reagent-Sodium BiSulfite for SO2	54,232	-1%	37,412	-31%	17,670		5,311	-70%
Reagent-Hydroxy Basic Acid	•	See Note I	•	See Note 1		- See Note 1		See Note 1
Total S02 Plan O&M Expenses	\$ 1,695,307	%11-	\$ 2,003,747	18%	S 1.700.826	6 -15%	\$ 2.062.932	21%

SO3 Plan:

			Feb-12 vs Jan-12		1 Mar-12 vs Feb-12			Anr-17 vs Mar-17		Mav-17 vs Anr-17
Expense Month		Feb-12	% Change	Mar-12	% Change		Apr-12	% Change	Mav-12	% Change
SO3 Plan Expenses:									Y	
Hydrated Lime - SO3	69	25,634	-14%	s 14,786	6 -42%	69	106,91	35%	\$ 36,650	84%
Individual Expense Account Items		'	See Note 1		- See Note 1		1	See Note 1		
Individual Expense Account Items		•	See Note 1		- See Note 1		1	See Note 1		See Note I
Total S03 Plan O&M Expenses	\$	25,634	-14%	S 14,786		Ś	106,91	35%	\$ 36,650	
							1			
Total	s	1,831,838		S 2,124,240	0	s	1,858,840		s 2,251,502	1 1

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012 Item No. 4

(As Revised)

Note 1: Percentage change not calculated because the cost incurred during the prior expense month was \$0.

Note 2: The monthly totals for Disposal Bottom Ash, Disposal Flyash and Disposal Flyash/Bottom Ash/Sludge have been consolidated due to similarity to better facilitate consistency.

Note 3: During the previous Two-Year Review of Big River's Environmental Surcharge (Case No. 2012-00262), Big Rivers identified errors in the classification of certain O&M expenses on its monthly Form ES filings while preparing the response to Item No. 3 of the Commission Staff's Initial Request for Information dated July 2, 2012. Specifically, Emulsified Sulfur for SO2 was incorrectly classified as Emulsified Sulfur for NOX (for the D.B. Wilson generation plant) in the November 2010 expense month filing, and Hydrated Lime for SO3 was incorrectly classified as Reagent Lime for SO2 (for the D.B. Wilson generation plant) in the January 2011 through October 2011 expense month filings. These errors related to the classification of expenses between different recoverable O&M expense categories only. The total dollars included in the original filings were correct and the errors had no impact on the calculations of the ES factors during the related expense months. The amounts above reflect the corrected amounts. Refer to the "As Filed" table, attached, for originally filed amounts.

Variance Explanations:

Anhydrous Ammonia

Anhydrous Ammonia:	lia:
Jun-11 vs May-11	Jun-11 vs Mav-11 [39% Increase in price/ton and running #3 mill resulting in higher inlet NOx at Wilson and timing of deliveries at HMP&L
Jul-11 vs Jun-11	ul-11 vs.Jun-11 Removed #3 mill from service at Wilson and timing of product deliveries and invoicing at Wilson and HMP&L.
Aug-11 vs Jul-11	Aug-11 vs Jul-11 Product delivery and invoice timing at HMP&L and Wilson
Sep-11 vs Aug-11	Sep-i1 vs Aug-11 Reduced generation and mvoice timing at HMP&L
Oct-11 vs Sep-11	Oct-11 vs Sep-11 Timing of product delivery and invoicing at Wilson and HMP&L and running #3 mill resulting in higher inlet NOx at Wilson
Nov-11 vs Oct-11	Nov-11 vs Oct-11 Timing of product delivery and invoicing at Wilson and HMP&L and running #3 mill at Wilson only two weeks in November
Dec-11 vs Nov-11	Dec-11 vs Nov-11 Timing of product delivery and invoicing at Wilson and HMP&L
Jan-12 vs Dec-11	an-12 vs Dec-11 Timing of product delivery and invoicing at Wilson and HMP&L
Feb-12 vs Jan-12	eb-12 vs Jan-12 Reduced generation at HMP&L due to a planned outage and reduced generation at Wilson due to a forced outage
Apr-12 vs Mar-12 Increase due to a I	Increase due to a planned outage at Wilson in March
May-12 vs Apr-12 Increase due to a I	Increase due to a planned outage at HMP&L in April

- 11 - 1 - 11 - 11 - 11 - 11 - 11 - 11	termentation of neuron meters and meters reconstruction and one meter in our control in the meter in our control in the meters and and the meters
Aug-11 vs Jul-11	investees the second many accurate the second many accurate the second
Sep-11 vs Aug-11	Increased generation and volume and Landfill capping project began at Wilson and myoice tuning at Green and HMP&L
Oct-11 vs Sep-11	Increase due to landfill cappung, mulching and seeding completed at Wilson in October
Nov-11 vs Oct-11	Fewer tons hauled in November at Coleman due to contractor preference and landfill capping, mulching and seeding cost not included in November at Wilson
Jan-12 vs Dec-11	Fewer tons hauled in January at Coleman due to contractor preference, reduced generation at Green and invoice timing at Wilson
Mar-12 vs Feb-12 Anr-17 vs Mar-17	More tons hauled in March at Coleman due to contractor preterence, and increased generation at Green Eavor tons hauled in Anril at Coleman due to contractor preference, and increased generation of HMD&I. due to a planned outpute
May-12 vs Apr-12	Increased generation at Green and increased generation at HMP&L due to planned outage in April
Fixation Lime:	
Jun-11 vs May-11	Reduced generation at Wilson and Green
Jul-11 vs Jun-11	Increased generation at Wilson, HMP&L and Green
Aug-11 vs Jul-11	Timing of deliveries at Wilson and HMP&L
Dec-11 vs Oct-11	ikeduced Generation at Green due to planned outage and reduced usage at Wilson due to landfill needs. Increased usage due to landfill needs and timing of deliveries at Wilson.
Feb-12 vs Jan-12	une constructions and provide and traditional or construction and the to forced outlange at Wilson. Reductions and stated on landfill needs and reduced generation due to forced outlange at Wilson.
Mar-12 vs Feb-12	Reduced generation due to planned outage at Wilson
	Reduced usage based on landfill needs at Wilson and a planned outage at HMP&L
May-12 vs Apr-12	Increased usage based on landfill needs at Wilson and increased generation due to planned outage at HMP&L in April
Reagent Limestone:	
Jun-11 vs May-11	Keduced generation at Coleman and a forced outage at Wilson
Sen-11 vs Aug-11	rroauct detivery and invoice timing at witson Reduced seneration at Coleman and product delivery and invoice timing at Wilson
Feb-12 vs Jan-12	Reduced generation at Coleman and a forced outage at Wilson
Mar-12 vs Feb-12	Reduced generation due to a planned outage at Wilson
Apr-12 vs Mar-12	Increased generation due to planned outage at Wilson in March
May-12 vs Apr-12	Increased generation at Coleman
Reagent Lime:	
Jun-11 vs May-11	Increase in contract price at Green and HMP&L
Oct-11 vs Sep-11	Reduced generation due to planned outage at Green
11-10 AS 11-10	h - Junear generation oue to prainted outage and once outage at orient
Mar-12 vs Dec-11 Mar-17 vs Feb-17	Treeuced generation one to units on reserve standoy at Oreen Threeaced conversion due to units on home on reserve standby at Green
Anr-12 vs Mar-12	instructions performance on the results of the results of the results of the result of the result of the results of the
	Increased generation due to planned outage at HMP&L in April
Emulsified Sulfur for SO2:	r SO2:
Jui-11 vs Jun-11	Emulsified sulfur is ordered on an as needed basis and added in batch based on scrubber chemistry. Chemical was added at HMP&L in June and none was added in July
Sep-11 vs Aug-11	Emulsified sulfur is ordered on an as needed basis and added in batch based on scrubber chemistry. Chemical was added at HMP&L in August and none was added in Sentember
Jan-12 vs Dec-11	Emulsified sulfur is ordered on an as needed basis and added in batch based on scrubber chemistry. Chemical was added at HMP&L in December and none was added in
	January
N X 13 X	Emulcified culture ordered on an ac needed tack and added in head on complete chemical way of ded at EMD \$1 in Amil and none warded in Mon

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012 Item No. 4 (As Revised)

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION Case No. 2012-00534

> Case No. 2012-00534 Attachment to Response for PSC 1-4 Witnesses: Nicholas R. Castlen and Lawrence V. Baronowsky Page 8 of 9

Nov-11 vs Oct-11 Increase was due to the first delivery of the review period at HMP&L Jan-12 vs Dec-11 Less chemical was needed at Wilson and HMP&L as scrubber chemistry improved Mar-12 vs Feb-12 Less chemical was needed at Wilson as scrubber chemistry improved Apr-12 vs Mar-12 Less chemical was needed at Wilson and HMP&L as scrubber chemistry improved Apr-12 vs Mar-12 Less chemical was needed at Wilson and HMP&L as scrubber chemistry improved Apr-12 vs Mar-12 Less chemical was needed at Wilson and HMP&L as scrubber chemistry improved Reduced generation due to forced outage at Wilson and Timing of deliveries Reduced generation due to forced outages and timing of delivenes at Wilson (As Revised) Item No. 4 Increased generation at Wilson due to planned outage in March Increased generation at Wilson and higher ambient temperature Less chemical required due to lower ambient temperature Less chemical required due to lower ambient temperature Increased generation and timing of delivenes at Wilson Reduced generation due to planned outage at Wilson Reduced generation due to forced outages at Wilson Reduced generation due to forced outages at Wilson Reduced generation due to planned outage at Wilson Reduced generation due to forced outage at Wilson Timing of deliveries at Wilson Timing of deliveries at Wilson Timing of deliveries at Wilson Increased generation at Wilson Timing of deliveries Timing of deliveries Reagent Sodium Bisulfite for SO2 Reagent DiBasic Acid: Hydrated Lime-SO3 Jun-11 vs May-11 Jul-11 vs Jun-11 Oct-11 vs Sep-11 Nov-11 vs Oct-11 Dec-11 vs Nov-11 Sep-11 vs Aug-11 Apr-12 vs Mar-12 May-12 vs Apr-12 Feb-12 vs Jan-12 Mar-12 vs Feb-12 Jun-11 vs May-11 Sep-11 vs Aug-11 Jun-11 vs May-11 Jan-12 vs Dec-11 Feb-12 vs Jan-12 Mar-12 vs Feb-12 Nov-11 vs Oct-11 Jan-12 vs Dec-11 Jul-11 vs Jun-11 Aug-11 vs Jul-1 Jul-11 vs Jun-1

 Apr-12 vs Mar-12
 Increased generation at Wilson due to planned outage in March

 May-12 vs Apr-12
 Increased generation at Wilson and more chemical required due to higher ambient temperature

Response to Commission Staff's First Information Request Dated December 13, 2012

BIG RIVERS ELECTRIC CORPORATION

Case No. 2012-00534