FILED
November 4, 2021
INDIANA UTILITY
REGULATORY COMMISSION

STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

PETITION OF INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER)
COMPANY, AN INDIANA CORPORATION, FOR)
AUTHORITY TO INCREASE ITS RATES AND)
CHARGES FOR ELECTRIC UTILITY SERVICE)
THROUGH A PHASE IN RATE ADJUSTMENT; AND)
FOR APPROVAL OF RELATED RELIEF INCLUDING:)
(1) REVISED DEPRECIATION RATES; (2)) CAUSE NO 4557(
ACCOUNTING RELIEF; (3) INCLUSION OF CAPITAL) CAUSE NO. 45576
INVESTMENT; (4) RATE ADJUSTMENT)
MECHANISM PROPOSALS; (5) CUSTOMER)
PROGRAMS: (6) WAIVER OR DECLINATION OF)
JURISDICTION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN)
RULES; AND (7) NEW SCHEDULES OF RATES,)
RULES AND REGULATIONS.)

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

PUBLIC'S EXHIBIT NO. 7

PUBLIC (REDACTED) TESTIMONY OF

OUCC WITNESS CYNTHIA M. ARMSTRONG

NOVEMBER 4, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

Tiffany Murray, Attorney No. 28916-49

Deputy Consumer Counselor

Randall C. Helmen, Attorney No. 8275-49

Chief Deputy Consumer Counselor

TESTIMONY OF OUCC WITNESS CYNTHIA M. ARMSTRONG CAUSE NO. 45576 INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

1	Q:	Please state your name, business address and employment capacity.
2	A:	My name is Cynthia M. Armstrong, and my business address is 115 W. Washington
3		St., Suite 1500 South, Indianapolis, IN, 46204. I am employed as a Senior Utility
4		Analyst in the Electric Division for the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer
5		Counselor ("OUCC"). A summary of my qualifications can be found in Appendix
6		A.
7	Q:	What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?
8	A:	I discuss Indiana Michigan Power Company's ("I&M" or "Petitioner") request to
9		accelerate the recovery of its noncurrent SO ₂ emission allowance inventory.
10		Specifically, I recommend the Commission approve I&M's request for accelerated
11		recovery of noncurrent SO ₂ emission allowances subject to the OUCC's
12		recommended modifications. I also discuss I&M's plan to comply with the Coal
13		Combustion Residuals ("CCR") Rule and the Steam Electric Power Generating
14		Effluent Limitation Guidelines ("ELGs") at the Rockport Generating Station
15		("Rockport Plant").
16	Q:	What did you do to prepare for your testimony?
17	A:	I reviewed I&M's Verified Petition, Direct Testimony, Exhibits, and Data
18		Responses submitted in this Cause relevant to I&M's emission allowance inventory

and major capital projects for non-nuclear generation. I also reviewed past agreements I&M made with other American Electric Power ("AEP") Eastern affiliates impacting I&M's emission allowance inventory, including the Interim Allowance Agreement ("IAA"). Furthermore, I reviewed the Commission's Cause No. 45253 Final Order, regarding Duke Energy Indiana's ("DEI") requested accelerated recovery of its noncurrent emission allowance inventory. Finally, I reviewed recent revisions to the federal CCR Rule and the 2020 ELG Reconsideration Rule.

To the extent you do not address a specific item or adjustment, should that be construed to mean you agree with Petitioner's proposal?

No. Excluding any specific adjustments or amounts I&M proposes does not indicate my approval of those adjustments or amounts. Rather, the scope of my testimony is limited to the specific items addressed herein.

II. NONCURRENT SO₂ ALLOWANCES

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

Q:

A:

Please describe I&M's request regarding its noncurrent SO₂ allowance 14 Q: 15 inventory. 16 A: I&M requests authority to accelerate recovery of its noncurrent SO₂ allowance 17 inventory currently recorded in FERC Account 158. I&M proposes recovering the 18 Indiana jurisdictional share of approximately \$26 million in noncurrent SO₂ 19 allowances over a six-year amortization period beginning in January 2023 20 continuing through December 2028. I&M further proposes recovering the accelerated amortization of noncurrent SO₂ inventory via its Environmental Cost Recovery ("ECR") Rider. ¹

Q: Does the OUCC take issue with I&M's proposal for accelerating recovery of noncurrent SO₂ allowances?

A:

No, as long as the OUCC's recommended recovery changes, as I describe below, are adopted. The OUCC is aware I&M has significantly decreased its use of SO₂ allowances. Tanners Creek Generating Station's retirement, coupled with installing the Dry Sorbent Injection ("DSI") systems on Rockport Units 1 and 2, have resulted in I&M emitting less SO₂ over the last decade. Additionally, the zero-cost SO₂ allowances I&M is awarded each year exacerbate this issue because addition of zero-cost allowances lowers the weighted average SO₂ inventory cost, which decreases annual consumption expense and the rate at which I&M recovers the remaining inventory costs. I&M will not emit enough SO₂ to fully consume the allowances remaining in its inventory by the end of 2028, when Rockport Units 1 and 2 are currently planned to retire.²

If I&M accounts for the reduction to noncurrent allowance inventory included in rate base as I discuss below, the proposal will benefit both I&M and its ratepayers. I&M will fully recover the costs of more expensive allowances procured prior to the major changes in environmental regulations, unit retirements, and pollution controls impacting its allowance consumption over the past decade. If the

¹ Direct testimony of I&M witness Dona Seger-Lawson, p. 35, lines 4-17.

² While the Cause No. 45546 Settlement Agreement regarding Rockport has not yet been approved, Section ³ of the Agreement states that if I&M and AEG acquire Rockport Unit 2, they will permanently retire the Unit no later than December 31, 2028.

1 OUCC's recommended changes are adopted, ratepayers will benefit from the 2 reduction in the remaining inventory balance, which lowers the return on inventory 3 customers must pay in base rates over what they could expect to pay if the inventory 4 balance was slowly reduced. 5 Q: What changes to I&M's noncurrent SO₂ allowance recovery proposal does the 6 **OUCC** recommend? 7 To mitigate the annual rate impact of recovering noncurrent SO₂ allowances, the A: 8 OUCC recommends recovery be amortized over 12 years instead of the 6 years 9 I&M proposes. Additionally, the overall amount to be recovered from ratepayers 10 should be reduced to reflect that, consistent with the Cause No. 45546 Settlement 11 Agreement ("Rockport 2 Settlement") pending Commission approval, Rockport 12 Unit 2 will no longer provide Indiana retail service after December 7, 2022.³ 13 Finally, I&M should offset its accelerated recovery of allowance costs with a credit 14 to account for the reduction in noncurrent SO2 allowance inventory included in rate 15 base. 16 Why is a 12-year amortization period more appropriate for recovering the Q: 17 noncurrent SO₂ allowance inventory? 18 A: While SO₂ allowance consumption is traditionally tied to coal-fired generation, in 19 I&M's case, most of its noncurrent SO₂ allowances were acquired years ago at a 20 high cost under the IAA between AEP Eastern Interconnection Agreement ("AEP Power Pool") members. 4 Under the IAA, I&M was required to purchase its 21 22 Member Load Ratio ("MLR") of the AEP Eastern System Allowance Bank

³ Cause No. 45546, Settlement Agreement, Section 4.

⁴ OUCC CONFIDENTIAL Attachment CMA-1, I&M's Response to OUCC Data Requests 13-7 and 13-10, pp. 1-2.

("System Allowance Bank") annually.⁵ The MLR was based on I&M's system demand and firm power sales to non-AEP Power Pool members,⁶ therefore, any off-system sales to non-member parties from I&M's nuclear and hydroelectric facilities could have increased I&M's obligation to purchase SO₂ allowances from the System Allowance Bank. Thus, the OUCC finds it is reasonable to consider the remaining lives of I&M's full generation fleet in determining an appropriate amortization period.

Amortization over the next 30 years (when I&M's last hydroelectric facility is assumed to retire) would be unreasonable. However, a 12-year period coincides with the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit 1's anticipated retirement date in 2034.⁷ Additionally, the Commission approved a 12-year amortization for DEI's noncurrent SO₂ allowance inventory,⁸ therefore, the OUCC's recommendation is reasonable when compared to the Commission's previous approval for another utility requesting similar treatment.

Why is it reasonable to allocate a portion of the noncurrent SO₂ allowance inventory costs to the Rockport Unit 2 owners?

17 A: Rockport Unit 2 benefited from being a part of the AEP Eastern Power Pool. The
18 Power Pool Agreement provided Rockport Unit 2 access to sell power and capacity
19 to other AEP Eastern companies, and a portion of the SO₂ allowances I&M acquired

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

⁵ Modification No. 1 To the AEP System Interim Allowance Agreement ("IAA Modification No. 1"), Section 4.5, p. 15. Filed with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") on 6/24/1996, Docket No. ER96-2213-000. Approved 8/30/1996.

⁶ IAA Modification No. 1, Sections 1.13, 1.15, 1.16, and 1.17, pp. 5-6.

⁷ Direct Testimony of Jason A. Cash, Attachment JAC-1, pp. 9-10.

⁸ Cause No. 45253, Final Order (Approved June 20, 2020), pp. 161-162. Although this case has been appealed, DEI's emission allowance treatment is not among the issues being challenged.

2 Rockport Unit 2 to take advantage of other AEP Eastern companies' overcompliance with the Title IV Acid Rain Program⁹ and delayed the unit's need to 3 4 install additional SO₂ pollution controls. Additionally, while Petitioner procured noncurrent SO₂ allowances in the past, 5 6 their consumption impacts ongoing O&M costs for Rockport 2. I&M's proposed 7 ratemaking treatment for noncurrent allowances essentially reduces the weighted 8 average cost of inventory ("WACI") for allowances retired to cover Rockport Unit /allowance.¹⁰ This 9 2's Title IV SO₂ emissions from \$ /allowance to 10 11 . As part of the Rockport 2 12 Settlement, I&M agreed to exclude any going-forward costs associated with the 13 ownership and operation of Rockport 2 in rates after the lease expires. 11 Without 14 the special ratemaking treatment I&M requests, Rockport Unit 2's ongoing 15 Thus, it is reasonable for Rockport Unit

under the IAA served to cover Rockport Unit 2's SO2 emissions. The IAA allowed

2's owners to pay a portion of the noncurrent SO₂ allowance inventory costs.

I allocated noncurrent SO₂ allowance inventory costs based on the owners'

remaining use of Rockport Unit 2 compared to the unit's total expected life. This

_

16

17

18

1

⁹ OUCC CONFIDENTIAL Attachment CMA-1, p. 2.

¹⁰ OUCC CONFIDENTIAL Attachment CMA-1, p. 4. Please note that I&M states on CMA-1, p. 1, that there was an accounting adjustment made to the model provided,

¹¹ Cause No. 45546, Settlement Agreement, Section 4(a).

Q: Why is it necessary to account for the reduction in noncurrent allowance inventory?
 A: I&M includes approximately \$25.4 million (Total Company) for allowance inventory in forecasted rate base, ¹³ which is mostly comprised of noncurrent SO₂ allowances. ¹⁴ If I&M only recovers inventory costs in an accelerated manner but does not account for the corresponding reduction in inventory, I&M will be recovering a higher return on allowance inventory through base rates than the actual amount in inventory. As I mentioned previously, the main benefit to ratepayers for accelerated allowance recovery is the corresponding reduction of allowance inventory included in rate base. Absent a credit to reflect I&M's reduced inventory

adjustment reduces the Total Company noncurrent allowance inventory costs to be

While I&M has consistently filed a new rate case every two years, there is no requirement for it to do so and no guarantee that customers would actually receive the full value of I&M's allowance recovery proposal. If I&M receives special ratemaking treatment for its noncurrent SO₂ allowance inventory, ratepayers should receive the maximum benefit possible from such ratemaking treatment.

in the ECR, ratepayers would only see this benefit after I&M's next rate case, where

rate base would be updated to reflect the reduced allowance inventory.

¹³ Petitioner's Exhibit A-6, p. 1, line 6. If I&M's recommended jurisdictional separation factor is approved, the Indiana jurisdictional portion will be approximately \$17.7 million.

¹² OUCC Attachment CMA-2.

¹⁴ OUCC CONFIDENTIAL Attachment CMA-1, pp. 17-18. I&M's other allowances inventories (Annual NO_X and Seasonal NO_X)

After adjustments, what is the OUCC's recommended annual recovery for 1 Q: 2 **I&M's noncurrent SO₂ allowances?** 3 A: Once adjustments removing a certain portion of Rockport Unit 2 allowances and 4 extending the amortization time period from 6 years to 12 years are made, the 5 OUCC recommends I&M be allowed to recover \$1,969,000 annually (Total Company)¹⁵ in the ECR beginning in January 2023 and continuing through 6 7 December 2034. If the ECR expires for any reason in the future, I&M can seek 8 approval to track the remaining costs through another appropriate recovery 9 mechanism. 10 Additionally, the annual amount recovered from ratepayers through the 11 ECR should be offset by a credit to account for the accompanying decrease to noncurrent allowance inventory included in rate base. 16 12 III. ROCKPORT CCR AND ELG COMPLIANCE PROJECTS What Rockport Plant environmental compliance projects does I&M identify 13 Q: 14 during the capital forecast period? 15 A: I&M witness Timothy C. Kerns describes CCR and ELG Environmental 16 Compliance projects included in the capital forecast period. He explains the CCR

¹⁵ *Id.* Assuming I&M's proposed Indiana Jurisdictional energy factor of 68.56712% is approved, this would equate to \$1,350,000 annually on an Indiana-jurisdictional basis.

Compliance project involves comprehensive plan development and implementation

for Rockport plant compliance with the CCR Rule, and capital expenditures are

\$2.760 million over the 2021-2022 forecast period. ¹⁷ As part of I&M's CCR

-

17

18

19

¹⁶ Since this credit would rely on other rate components the Commission has yet to decide (i.e., authorized rate of return, Indiana jurisdictional separation factor), I do not provide a calculation for this amount. Such a credit would be better addressed in the ECR proceeding when I&M begins recovery of noncurrent allowances.

¹⁷ Direct Testimony of I&M witness Timothy C. Kerns, p. 18, lines 1-9.

2 existing CCR material and establishing a CCR compliant pond and tank-based 3 chemical treatment system by May 11, 2023. I&M will also permanently close the West Bottom Ash Pond through removal of existing CCR material. 18 4 5 Mr. Kerns explains the Unit 2 ELG Compliance project involves developing 6 and implementing a comprehensive plan for the Rockport Plant to comply with the 7 ELG, which requires Rockport to cease discharging bottom ash transport water as 8 soon as possible. He indicates I&M's forecasted 2021-2022 total capital 9 expenditures for the ELG is approximately \$20 million, but this investment will be 10 avoided if the plant is retired by 2028. 19 11 Q: Is I&M requesting recovery of costs associated with capital projects for 12 compliance with the CCR or ELG Rules in this Cause? 13 No. It appears I&M is notifying the Commission of these projects and associated A: 14 capital expenditures during the test year but is not requesting Commission approval 15 or associated cost recovery. I&M indicates neither the CCR nor ELG Compliance 16 project costs are included in the revenue requirement for this Cause, as they will

Compliance project, it will close the East Bottom Ash Pond by removing the

made after the Rockport Unit 2 lease expires.²¹

1

17

18

19

not be in service until after the test year ends. ²⁰ Additionally, as part of the Rockport

2 Settlement, I&M agreed to not seek recovery of ELG Compliance investments

¹⁸ OUCC Attachment CMA-3, I&M's Response to OUCC Data Requests 13-2 and 13-3, p. 1.

¹⁹ Kerns, Direct, p. 18, lines 10-16.

²⁰ OUCC Attachment CMA-3, pp. 2-3.

²¹ Cause No. 45546, Settlement Agreement, Section 3 states, "I&M and AEG agree that in no event shall I&M customers be responsible for any costs related to ELG investments or other new investments at Rockport Unit 2 incurred after termination of the Lease."

Q: Does the OUCC have any concerns with these projects?

Yes. However, the OUCC's concerns lie more with the projects' future cost recovery and not with their technical necessity. Even though these project costs will not be included in the revenue requirements in this case, the OUCC notes its concern regarding their potential cost recovery in future rate proceedings. Some activities associated with the CCR Compliance projects are related to ash pond closures. Since I&M recorded Asset Retirement Obligations ("AROs") for ash pond closures and has been recovering these costs through rates, the OUCC notes that any closure activities should be funded from these AROs first and not treated as a capital investment. While the new CCR-compliant ash pond I&M plans to construct to serve Rockport for its remaining life would qualify as a new capital project, closing the East Bottom and West Bottom Ash Ponds would not.

IV. <u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>

Q: Please summarize your recommendations.

14 A: I recommend the Commission approve I&M's request to accelerate recovery of
15 noncurrent SO₂ allowances through the ECR subject to the OUCC's recommended
16 adjustments, which include extending the amortization period from 6 years to 12
17 years and allocating a portion of allowances to Rockport Unit 2 after the lease ends
18 in December 2022. When these adjustments are applied, I&M's allowed annual
19 recovery for noncurrent SO₂ allowances would be \$1,969,000 (Total Company)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

A:

²² *Id*, p. 1.

²³ Direct Testimony of I&M witness Jennifer C. Duncan, p. 17, lines 1-4, Attachment JCD-1, p. 11, line 43; Direct Testimony of I&M witness Tyler H. Ross, p. 10; Cash, Direct, p. 12, lines 24-27, through p. 13, lines 1-2; Rate Base Adjustment RB-2; WP-A-DEP-1 and WP-A-DEP-2.

beginning in January 2023. As an offset to accelerated allowance cost recovery,

I&M should also provide a credit to account for the accompanying reduction in the

noncurrent allowance inventory included in rate base.

Q: Does this conclude your testimony?

Xes.

APPENDIX A

1	Q:	Please summarize your professional background and experience.
2	A:	I graduated from the University of Evansville in 2004 with a Bachelor of Science
3		degree in Environmental Administration. I graduated from Indiana University,
4		Bloomington in May 2007 with a Master of Public Affairs degree and a Master of
5		Science degree in Environmental Science. I also completed internships with
6		Vectren's Environmental Affairs Department in the spring of 2004, with the U.S
7		Environmental Protection Agency in the summer of 2005, and with the U.S
8		Department of the Interior in the summer of 2006. I obtained my 40-hour OSHA
9		Hazardous Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) Certification.
10		have been employed by the OUCC since May 2007. As part of my continuing
11		education at the OUCC, I have attended the National Association of Regulatory
12		Utility Commissioners' (NARUC) week-long seminar in East Lansing, Michigan
13		I also annually attend the Indiana Chamber of Commerce's Environmenta
14		Conference.
15	Q:	Please describe some of your duties at the OUCC.
16	A:	I review and analyze utilities' requests and file recommendations on behalf of
17		consumers in utility proceedings. Depending on the case at hand, my duties may
18		also include analyzing state and federal regulations, evaluating rate design and
19		tariffs, examining books and records, inspecting facilities, and preparing various
20		studies. Since my expertise lies in environmental science and policy, I assist in
21		many cases where environmental compliance is an issue.
22	Q:	Have you previously provided testimony to the Commission?

1 A: Yes.

INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR DATA REQUEST SET NO. OUCC DR 13 IURC CAUSE NO. 45576

DATA REQUEST NO OUCC DR 13-07

REQUEST

Please refer to page 35, lines 18-27, of Witness Seger-Lawson's direct testimony and respond to the following:

- a. Please provide studies, modeling, underlying assumptions, calculations, and any other documents supporting I&M's forecast that it will have a December 31, 2028 noncurrent SO2 allowance inventory of \$25 million.
- b. Please provide I&M's monthly SO2 allowance inventory calculations for the past three calendar years. Please include supporting information including the beginning inventory balance, number of allowances added, sold, surrendered, or consumed, and any other adjustments necessary for determining the monthly ending inventory balance.
- c. Has I&M considered or attempted to sell SO2 allowances at a loss to reduce the impact of allowances remaining in inventory when its fossil fuel-fired generation retires at the end of 2028? If it has, please indicate how many allowances it has been able to sell at a loss to reduce inventory to date. If not, please explain why.
- d. Please provide the forecasted annual SO2 emissions from Rockport Unit 1 and 2, separately, through 2028.
- e. Is I&M required to surrender any of the SO2 allowances making up the noncurrent SO2 allowance inventory pursuant to the NSR Consent Decree? Please provide the amount of SO2 allowances I&M expects to surrender pursuant to the Consent Decree through the end of 2028.

Is the remaining inventory value mainly due to the SO2 allowances I&M acquired pursuant to the past Interim Allowance Agreement with other AEP Eastern subsidiaries? Please explain.

RESPONSE

I&M objects to the request on the grounds and to the extent the request seeks information that is confidential, proprietary, competitively sensitive, and/or trade secret. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objection, I&M provides the following response, with the confidential information being provided pursuant to the nondisclosure agreement between the parties.

- a. Please see OUCC 13-7 CONFIDENTIAL Attachment 1. The 2028 inventory value in this model run was shown as \$22.67M. An accounting adjustment was made since this time and the current 2028 book value is estimated at \$25.1M.
- b. Please see OUCC 13-7 CONFIDENTIAL Attachment 2.

INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR DATA REQUEST SET NO. OUCC DR 13 IURC CAUSE NO. 45576

- c. AEP has not seen selling the allowances at a loss as an option since there is a recovery mechanism for the cost the Company had incurred in this program.
- d. Please see OUCC 13-7 CONFIDENTIAL Attachment 3.
- e. I&M does not believe that SO2 allowances surrendered as part of the Consent Decree are relevant to the current case. I&M submits excess current year vintage allowances received annually at no cost from USEPA as part of the surrender provision. These allowance have essentially zero value and I&M customers bear no cost relating to their surrender.
- f. Yes. Compliance with federal mandates was managed by the Company on a fleet wide basis. This was determined to be the most cost-effective solution to the compliance requirements. Some operating companies incurred tremendous expense installing environmental controls that benefitted other operating companies. Other operating companies agreed to share the expenses by agreeing to purchase SO₂ allowances using an agreed upon formula.

Cause No. 45576 OUCC Attachment CMA-1 Page 3 of 18

> Indiana Michigan Power Company Cause No. 45576 OUCC 13-7 CONFIDENTIAL Attachment 1

CONFIDENTIAL - EXCLUDED FROM PUBLIC ACCESS PER INDIANA RULES ON ACCESS TO COURT RECORDS RULE 5 (FORMERLY A.R. 9(G))

Cause No. 45576 OUCC Attachment CMA-1 Page 8 of 18

Indiana Michigan Power Company
Cause No. 45576
OUCC Set 13, Q13-7
CONFIDENTIAL Attachment 3
Page 1 of 2

OUCC 13-7 CONFIDENTIAL Attachment 3

Cause No. 45576 OUCC Attachment CMA-1 Page 10 of 18

INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR DATA REQUEST SET NO. OUCC DR 13 IURC CAUSE NO. 45576

DATA REQUEST NO OUCC DR 13-10

REQUEST

Please provide I&M's monthly Annual NOx and NOx Ozone Season allowance inventory calculations for the past three calendar years. Please include supporting information including the beginning inventory balance, number of allowances added, sold, surrendered, or consumed, and any other adjustments necessary for determining the monthly ending inventory balance.

RESPONSE

I&M objects to this request on the grounds and to the extent this question seeks information that is confidential, proprietary, competitively sensitive and/or trade secret. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objection, I&M states that the allowance inventory is an annual program. Please see OUCC 13-10 CONFIDENTIAL Attachment 1 for the beginning and end balances for the past three calendar years.

Calculation of OUCC's Recommended Annual Noncurrent SO₂ Allowance Inventory Costs To Be Recovered Through the ECR Beginning 01/01/2023

Line No.	<u>Description</u>	(\$000s)	Source/Notes
1	Noncurrent Allowance Inventory as of 12/31/20 (Total Company) ¹	\$ 25,591	WP-IM-1, Historical Section 1, p. 1.
	Less Noncurrent SO ₂ Allowance Inventory allocated to Rockport Unit 2 operation after		
2	12/7/22 (Total Company)	\$ 23,623	Attachment CMA-1, p. 2, line 6
3	OUCC Proposed Amortization in years	12	
	OUCC Proposed Annual Noncurrent SO ₂ Allowance costs to be recovered via the ECR		
4	(Total Company)	\$ 1,969	Line 4 / 12
5	I&M's Proposed Indiana Jurisdictional Energy Factor	68.56712%	I&M witness Jennifer C. Duncan Direct, p. 12, lines 5-8; Attachment JCD-2, p. 5, line 3
6	OUCC Proposed Annual Noncurrent SO ₂ Allowance costs to be recovered via the ECR (Indiana Jurisdictional)	\$ 1,350	Line 4 * Line 5

Additional notes:

^{1.} The noncurrent allowance inventory includes a negligible amount of NOx Seasonal Allowances. However, NOx Seasonal inventory value does not impact the OUCC's calculations. (See OUCC CONFIDENTIAL Attachment CMA-1, pp. 6-7, 17-18.)

Noncurrent SO₂ Allowance Costs Allocated to Rockport Unit 2 Operations After the Lease Ends on 12/07/2022

Line No.	Description	(\$000s)		Source/Notes	
1	Noncurrent SO ₂ Allowance Inventory as of 12/31/2020 (Total Company)	\$	25,591	WP-IM-1, Historical Section 1, p. 1	
2	Noncurrent SO_2 Inventory Allocation to Rockport Unit 2 (Total Company)	\$	12,796	Line 1 * 0.5	
3	Years Rockport Unit 2 will operate after lease ends		6		
4	Age of Rockport Unit 2 at retirement		39		
5	Noncurrent SO_2 Inventory Allocation factor for Rockport Unit 2's operation after $12/07/2022$		15.38%	Line 3/Line 4	
6	Noncurrent SO_2 Inventory allocated to Rockport Unit 2's operation after 12/07/2022 (Total Company)	\$	1,969	Line 2 x Line 5	

INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR DATA REQUEST SET NO. OUCC DR 13 IURC CAUSE NO. 45576

DATA REQUEST NO OUCC DR 13-02

REQUEST

Please refer to page 18, lines 3-9 of Witness Kerns' direct testimony where he discusses CCR Compliance projects and respond to the following:

- a. Please list and describe each activity, major component, or subproject encompassing I&M's proposed \$2.760 million CCR project cost.
- Please provide a detailed cost breakdown of the activities, equipment, or other costs encompassing I&M's proposed \$2.760 million CCR project cost.
- c. Please indicate the Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering ("AACE") cost classification for the CCR compliance projects' cost estimate.
- d. Are these projects part of an overall CCR compliance project or strategy? Please explain.
- e. If the response to (d) is affirmative:
 - i. Please indicate the estimated in-service date of the full CCR Compliance project and provide its estimated cost.
 - ii. If the two CCR compliance projects Witness Kerns discusses are components of an overall CCR compliance project that will not be in-service until after the test year in this Cause, please explain why it is appropriate to include the partial CCR compliance project costs in rate base in this Cause.
- f. Do the projects included in the \$2.760 million estimate involve replacement of any plant in service? If so, how is I&M accounting for the retirements and what is the net impact to rate base for the CCR compliance projects when retirements are considered?

RESPONSE

- a. The activities in I&M's CCR compliance project include:
 - Closure of the East Bottom Ash Pond (BAP) by removal of the existing CCR material and establishing a CCR compliant pond and tank-based chemical treatment system by May 11, 2023 to manage CCR and non-CCR waste streams.
 - Permanent closure of the West Bottom Ash Pond by removal of the existing CCR material.

b. I&M objects to this request on the grounds and to the extent this question seeks information that is confidential, proprietary, competitively sensitive and/or trade secret. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objection, please see OUCC 13-2

Cause No. 45576 OUCC Attachment CMA-3 Page 2 of 3

INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR DATA REQUEST SET NO. OUCC DR 13 IURC CAUSE NO. 45576

CONFIDENTIAL Attachment 1, which is being provided pursuant to the nondisclosure agreement between the parties.

- c. The cost estimate is an AACE Class 3 cost estimate.
- d. Yes. The scope of the CCR project will meet the requirement of EPA Rule 40 CFR 257.103.
- e. I&M objects to the request on the grounds and to the extent the request mischaracterizes I&M's proposal in this proceeding. Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing objection, I&M provides the following response.
 - i. The estimated in-service date for CCR compliance is May 11, 2023. See cost summary provided in subpart b.
 - ii. The CCR capital expenditures discussed by Company witness Kerns are not included in I&M's proposed rates.
- f. When the Company records the retirement of an asset (or retirement unit), it follows FERC Electric Plant Instruction No. 10(b)(2). FERC Electric Plant Instruction No. 10(b)(2) states "When a retirement unit is retired from electric plant, with or without replacement, the book cost thereof shall be credited to the electric plant account in which it is included, determined in the manner set forth in paragraph D, below. If the retirement unit is of a depreciable class, the book cost of the unit retired and credited to electric plant shall be charged to the accumulated provision for depreciation applicable to such property. The cost of removal and the salvage shall be charged or credited, as appropriate, to such depreciation account." The CCR project is still under construction at the end of the forecasted Test Year.

Cause No. 45576 OUCC Attachment CMA-3 Page 3 of 3

INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR DATA REQUEST SET NO. OUCC DR 13 IURC CAUSE NO. 45576

DATA REQUEST NO OUCC DR 13-03

REQUEST

Please refer to page 18, lines 14-17, of Witness Kerns' direct testimony where he states that the 2021-2022 total capital expenditures for the ELG compliance project is approximately \$20 million and respond to the following:

- a. Please provide a detailed breakdown of the activities, equipment, or other costs that encompassing this \$20 million estimate.
- b. Please explain the difference between the \$20 million estimate provided above and the estimated \$50 million investment that I&M indicated it would avoid for ELG compliance in Cause No. 45546.
- c. What is the lead time necessary to complete the Rockport ELG Compliance project?
- d. What would be the latest date the Company could wait to begin constructing the ELG Compliance Project and still be able to meet the December 31, 2025 deadline in the 2020 ELG Reconsideration Rule?

RESPONSE

I&M objects to the request on the grounds and to the extent the request is not relevant to the relief sought in this proceeding, exceeds the scope of this proceeding, and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. In support of this objection, I&M notes that the referenced ELG compliance costs are not included in the revenue requirement in this proceeding and are not proposed for recovery through I&M's rate adjustment mechanisms. Furthermore, if the relief requested in pending Cause No. 45546 is granted, I&M does not expect to incur these costs.

a.-d. See objection.

AFFIRMATION

I affirm, under the penalties for perjury, that the foregoing representations are true.

Cynthia M. Armstrong

Senior Utility Analyst Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor

Cause No 45576 Indiana Michigan Power Co.

October 12, 2021

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor's Testimony Filing has been served upon the following parties of record in the captioned proceedingby electronic service on November 4, 2021.

Indiana Michigan Power

Teresa Morton Nyhart Jeffrey M. Peabody

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP

tnyhart@btlaw.com

<u>Jeffrey.peadbody@btlaw.com</u>

Courtesy copy:

Janet Nichols

Janet.nichols@btlaw.com

Jessica A. Cano, Senior Counsel

AEP SERVICE CORP.

jacano@aep.com

City of Marion, Indiana,

and Marion Municipal Utilities

J. Christopher Janak Nikki Gray Shoultz Kristina Kern Wheeler

BOSE MCKINNEY & EVANS LLP

cjanak@boselaw.com nshoultz@boselaw.com kwheeler@boselaw.com

Kroger

Kurt J. Boehm Jody Kyler Cohn

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

kboehm@bkllawfirm.com

jkylercohn@bkllawfirm.com

Justin Bieber

ENERGY STRATEGIES, LLC

jbieber@energystrat.com

John P. Cook

John P. Cook & Associates

john.cookassociates@earthlink.net

Jennifer A. Washburn

CITIZENS ACTION COALITION

iwashburn@citact.org

Courtesy copy:

Reagan Kurtz

rkurtz@citact.org

AESI Industrial Group

Joseph P. Rompala

Todd A. Richardson

Anne E. Becker

LEWIS & KAPPES, P.C.

JRompala@Lewis-Kappes.com

TRichardson@Lewis-Kappes.com

ABecker@Lewis-Kappes.com

Courtesy copy:

Amanda Tyler

Ellen Tenant

Atvler@lewis-kappes.com

ETennant@Lewis-kappes.com

City of Fort Wayne, Indiana

Brian C. Bosma

Kevin D. Koons

Ted W. Nolting

KROGER GARDIS & REGAS, LLP

bcb@kgrlaw.com

kkoons@kgrlaw.com

twn@kgrlaw.com

Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.

Jeremy L. Fetty

Liane K. Steffes

PARR RICHEY

jfetty@parrlaw.com

lsteffes@parrlaw.com

<u>SDI</u>

Robert K. Johnson

RK JOHNSON, ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

rkj@rkjattorneyatlaw.com

City of Muncie

Keith L. Beall

CLARK QUINN MOSES SCOTT & GRAHN LLP

kbeall@clasrkquinnlaw.com

Wal-Mart

Eric E. Kinder Barry A. Naum

SPILMAN THOMAS & BATTLE, PLLC

ekinder@spilmanlaw.com bnaum@spilmanlaw.com

OUCC CONSULTANTS

Glenn Watkins Jenny Dolen

TECHNICAL ASSOCIATES, INC.

watkinsg@tai-econ.com jenny.dolen@tai-econ.com

David J. Garrett

RESOLVE UTILITY CONSULTING PLLC

dgarrett@resolveuc.com;

Mark E. Garrett Heather A. Garrett

Edwin Farrar

GARRETT GROUP LLC

mgarrett@garrettgroupllc.com

garrett@wgokc.com

edfarrarcpa@outlook.com

Tiffany Murray

Deputy Consumer Counselor

Randall C. Helmen

Chief Deputy Consumer Counselor

INDIANA OFFICE OF UTILITY CONSUMER COUNSELOR

PNC Center

115 West Washington Street

Suite 1500 South

Indianapolis, IN 46204

infomgt@oucc.in.gov

TiMurray@oucc.in.gov

RHelmen@oucc.in.gov

317.232.2494 - Telephone

317.232.4237 – Murray Direct

317.232.4557 - Helmen Direct

317.232.5923 - Facsimile