



Control Number: 49737



Item Number: 321

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-19-6862  
PUC DOCKET NO. 49737



APPLICATION OF SOUTHWESTERN § BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE  
ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY FOR §  
CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE §  
AND NECESSITY AUTHORIZATION § OF  
AND RELATED RELIEF FOR THE §  
ACQUISITION OF WIND §  
GENERATION FACILITIES § ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

**OFFICE OF PUBLIC UTILITY COUNSEL'S  
PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Office of Public Utility Counsel ("OPUC") offers the following proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law for consideration:

**A. Findings of Fact**

**Background and Procedural History**

1. Southwestern Electric Power Company (SWEPCO) is a wholly owned subsidiary of American Electric Power Company (AEP) and is a fully integrated electric utility serving retail and wholesale customers in Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana.
2. SWEPCO provides electric generation, transmission, and distribution services in Texas under certificate of convenience and necessity (CCN) number 30151.
3. On July 15, 2019, SWEPCO filed an Application with the Public Utility Commission of Texas (Commission) for a CCN to acquire an interest in three wind generation facilities (Selected Wind Facilities) located in Oklahoma.
4. Through a request for proposal process, SWEPCO and its sister company, Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO), contracted to acquire project companies owning the following wind facilities: (1) Traverse at 999 megawatt (MW); (2) Maverick at 287 MW; and (3) Sundance at 199 MW, subject to receipt of regulatory approvals and satisfaction of other conditions. Each of the wind facilities is owned by an affiliate of Invenergy LLC. SWEPCO contracted to acquire 54.5% of each facility, or a total of 810 MW. The total price for the wind facilities, including all interconnection and upgrade costs, is \$1.86 billion. Total project costs, including purchase and sale agreement price adjustments and owner's costs, are expected to be \$1.996 billion, and SWEPCO's 54.5% share is \$1.088 billion.

5. The Commission referred the Application to the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) on August 22, 2019.
6. SWEPCO provided notice of the Application by publication once a week for two consecutive weeks in newspapers having general circulation in each county in SWEPCO's service territory. SWEPCO's notice by newspaper publication was completed on September 5, 2019.
- 6.7. SWEPCO's individual notice to its Texas retail customers by bill insert was completed on September 17, 2019.
- 7.8. SWEPCO provided individual notice to Commission Staff (Staff) and the Office of Public Utility Counsel (OPUC) by hand delivering a copy of SWEPCO's filing to each party's counsel. Individual notice was also provided to the legal representative of all parties in Docket No. 46449, SWEPCO's most recent base rate case, and Docket No. 47461, SWEPCO's CCN application for the Wind Catcher project, by providing each party with a copy of SWEPCO's filing either by hand delivery, courier, or U.S. First Class mail. This individual notice was completed on July 15.
- 8.9. The following parties intervened and participated in this docket: Texas Industrial Energy Consumers (TIEC), OPUC, Golden spread Electric Cooperative (GSEC), East Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc. and Northeast Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc. (ETEC-NTEC); International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 738 (IBEW); Cities Advocating Reasonable Deregulation (CARD); and Walmart Inc. (Walmart). Staff also participated in this docket.
- 9.10. On September 12, 2019, the Commission issued its Preliminary Order identifying the issues to be addressed in this proceeding.
- 10.11. The hearing on the merits commenced on February 24, 2020 and concluded on February 26, 2020.
- 11.12. The parties submitted initial post-hearing briefs on March 9, 2020 and reply briefs on March 17, 2020.
- 12.13. On March 1-1, 2020, SWEPCO filed proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.
- 13.14. On March 19~~7~~, 2020, Intervenor and Staff responded to SWEPCO's proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.
- 14.15. The record closed on\_\_\_\_\_.

**Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Standard of Review**

16. The Commission may approve an application and grant a certificate if the Commission finds that the certificate is necessary for the service, accommodation, convenience, or safety of the public.

~~17. The Commission has determined that it may grant a CCN for economic purposes.~~

~~18.~~17. SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities is will not expected to result in the probable lowering of costs to customers.

~~19. SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities is expected to provide significant customer savings under a robust set of scenarios and will add diversity to SWEPCO's generation fleet, positioning SWEPCO to meet customers' low-cost energy needs under a range of circumstances that may prevail in the future operate at a net loss for SWEPCO's Texas ratepayers.~~

~~18.~~ The guarantees offered by the Company ~~further are not sufficient to~~ assure a probable lowering of costs to customers.

~~19. The Selected Wind Facilities were not proposed to address any issues with the adequacy of existing service.~~

~~20. The Selected Wind Facilities were not proposed to address a need for additional service.~~

~~21. Because there is no need for the project to serve retail load, the addition of the project will not improve service.<sup>1</sup>~~

~~20.~~22. Texas has already met its renewable energy goals, so the project will have no effect on those goals.<sup>2</sup>

~~21.~~23. The Commission finds that SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities is not necessary for the service, accommodation, or convenience of customers.

~~22. The Commission has considered the effect of granting the certificate on electric utilities serving the proximate area.~~

~~23. There is no evidence that any other Texas utility will be unfairly or inappropriately allocated any transmission upgrade costs associated with the Selected Wind Facilities~~

---

<sup>1</sup> Application of Southwestern Electric Power Company for Certificate of Convenience and Necessity Authorization and Related Relief for the Wind Catcher Energy Connection Project in Oklahoma, Docket No. 47461, Order at 11 (Aug. 13, 2018).

<sup>2</sup> Id.



~~pursuant to the SPP FERC approved OATT and Golden Spread Electric Cooperative's request for a "hold harmless" guarantee from SWEPCO should be denied by the Commission.~~

~~24. There will be no adverse effect on site-specific factors such as community values, recreational and park areas, historical and aesthetic values, or environmental integrity in Texas because the Selected Wind Facilities are located entirely within the state of Oklahoma.~~

~~25.24. Texas has already met its renewable energy goals so SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities will have no effect on reaching those goals.~~

### **Analysis of Economics of Selected Wind Facilities**

26. Prudent resource planning ~~dietates-~~ requires that the Company make decisions based on the best information available at the time, considering all reasonable and necessary sensitivities and factors that could have a significant impact on a economics of the project. to stress test the benefits forecast.

~~27. Giving undue credence to an unlikely series of events that mathematically result in a net cost to customers would mean ignoring the more probable and reasonable range of outcomes in which the proposed projects produce significant savings for customers. Ignoring unfavorable projections to focus solely on hoped for positive outcomes is an irresponsible method of project selection.~~

### **RFP Selection Process**

~~28.27.~~ SWEPCO uses an internal integrated resource plan or IRP to identify resources to serve customers, over a 20-year planning period.

~~29. SWEPCO's 2018 and 2019 internal IRPs identified wind resources as economic and recommended that they should be added beginning in 2022. According to SWEPCO's internal IRP, customers would benefit by adding up to 1,200 MW of wind generation—600 MW by 2022, and an additional 600 MW by 2023.~~

~~30. An important factor in acquiring wind resources was the federal Production Tax Credit (PTC), which helps to reduce the cost of wind energy for customers. Proceeding now helps achieve at least 80% of the value of the PTCs.~~

~~31.28.~~ Based on SWEPCO's 2018 and 2019 internal IRPs, SWEPCO decided ~~resolved~~ to acquire additional wind resources through a competitive request for proposals (RFP) process.

~~In preparing the RFP, SWEPCO followed the steps required by the Louisiana Public Service Commission (LPSC) Market Based Mechanism (MBM) Order.~~

~~32.29.~~ The RFP was a sole-source solicitation for build-transfer-own wind projects, and the Company did not consider purchased-power-agreement options.

~~33.~~ The process was transparent and open, allowing potential bidders and stakeholders opportunities to ask questions about the RFP.

~~34.30.~~ On January 7, 2019, the Company issued the RFP for up to 1,200 MW of wind generation resources. The Company sought projects on a turnkey basis in which it individually, or together with its AEP affiliate utility operating company PSO, would acquire through a PSA all of the equity interests in the project company whose assets consist solely of the selected project.

~~35.31.~~ The Company sought projects that: (1) are physically located in, and interconnected to, the Southwest Power Pool (SPP) in Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, or Oklahoma; (2) are not currently experiencing, or anticipated to experience, significant congestion or deliverability constraints; and (3) balance project performance and deliverability to the AEP West load zone in the Tulsa area.

~~36.32.~~ In addition, the Company sought projects that are either in service or that would be placed in service by December 15, 2021, and thus qualify for at least 80% of the Production Tax Credit value.

~~37.33.~~ SWEPCO ~~widely~~ publicized the RFP- on its website, to a list of known wind project developers, and in industry trade publications and organizations.

~~38.34.~~ SWEPCO followed the process established in the RFP ~~from the time it was issued on through to the identify ieation of~~ the Selected Wind Facilities.

~~39.35.~~ On March 1, 2019, SWEPCO and PSO (collectively, the Companies) received 35 bids representing 19 unique wind projects totaling 5,896 MW. Fifteen projects were located in Oklahoma and four in Texas.

~~40.36.~~ No bids were submitted by the Company or an AEP affiliate, as such a submission was specifically prohibited by the RFP.

~~41.37.~~ Eight of the wind projects, constituting 2,631 MW, failed to meet all of the eligibility and threshold requirements and so were removed from further consideration. Eleven of the 19 wind projects, totaling 3,265 MW, passed these requirements.

~~42.38.~~ The top three ranked bids (Traverse, Maverick and Sundance) became the Selected Wind Facilities.

~~43.39.~~ The Companies selected 1,485 MW of wind resources, not 2,200 MW, the combined amount solicited in their RFPs. This decision was based on bid economics, geographic



locations, and deliverability relative to the Companies' load. ~~The Companies concluded that 1,485 MW provide customers the best combination of price, performance, and risk for all bids received in response to the RFPs.~~

44.40. Once the Selected Wind Facilities were identified, the Companies took additional steps ~~÷ (1) continued with due diligence activities; (2) released their consulting meteorologist to develop the bottom-up wind energy resource assessment; and (3) initiated formal contract negotiations~~ that resulted in the Purchase and Sale Agreements or PSAs.

45. ~~The Companies completed a thorough due diligence review of the Selected Wind Facilities including technology, overall project design, land leases, transmission and interconnection, qualification for PTCs, environmental/wildlife impact assessment, and the expected energy output (MWh).~~

46. ~~The due diligence will continue through a series of requirements in the PSAs.~~

47.41. Because of the importance of the expected energy output, each developer was required to submit an independent assessment of the wind resource and expected energy output. The independent analyses were required to include one-year, five-year, 10-year, 20-year and 30-year production forecast estimates for the various probability of exceedance values (P50, P75, P90, P95, and P99).

48.42. The Companies hired Simon Wind Inc., (Simon Wind) ~~an experienced consulting firm,~~ to (1) independently review wind resource assessments and the expected energy output included in each of the RFP proposals; and (2) develop a wind energy resource assessment for each of the Selected Wind Facilities.

49.43. Subject to regulatory approval, SWEPCO and PSO will share the benefit and the cost of the Selected Wind Facilities consistent with their ownership shares of 54.5% and 45.5%, respectively.

50. ~~SWEPCO reasonably identified the benefits to customers of acquiring additional wind resources.~~

51. ~~SWEPCO reasonably selected the Selected Wind Resources through its RFP process.~~

51.44. The three Selected Wind Facilities that SWEPCO and PSO selected through the RFP process will be located in north central Oklahoma and will total 1,485 MW of installed nameplate capacity, as follows:

	Traverse	Maverick	Sundance
Size (Nameplate)	999 MW	287 MW	199 MW
SWEPCO Share	544.5 MW	156 MW	108.5 MW

Planned Commercial Operation Date	2021	2021	2020
--------------------------------------	------	------	------

~~52. The Selected Wind Facilities will be engineered to have a design life of 30 years.~~

~~53.45.~~ SWEPCO seeks approval to acquire 54.5% of the Selected Wind Facilities, with PSO to own the remaining 45.5%.

~~54.46.~~ The winning bidders will build the projects, which the Companies will then purchase on a turnkey basis.

~~55.47.~~ The estimated total installed capital cost for the Selected Wind Facilities is approximately \$1.996 billion (of which SWEPCO's share is approximately \$1.088 billion).

~~56.48.~~ This cost includes (1) each wind project's purchase price under the respective PSAs, (2) PSA price adjustments, and (3) owner's costs.

~~57.49.~~ The purchase price includes ~~all~~ costs associated with interconnecting the facilities to the SPP transmission system and any assigned network upgrade costs.

~~50.~~ The purchase price excludes associated owners costs, Allowance for Funds Used During Construction (AFUDC) applied to the owner's costs, PSA price adjustments, and contingency, all of which must be added to the PSA purchase price to calculate the estimated installed capital cost.

### **Economic Modeling**

~~51. The three primary components in calculating the economics of the Project are: (1) the revenue requirement of the wind facility, (2) the avoided cost benefits projected by SWEPCO, and (3) the value of Production Tax Credits for which the Project may be eligible.~~

~~52. SWEPCO's sensitivity analysis did not account for a realistic range of possible future conditions.~~

~~53. SWEPCO's estimation of net cost savings benefits for ratepayers is significantly overestimated due to the Company's use of outdated, higher natural gas price assumptions that are untethered to current market conditions, failure to include potential future gen-tie line costs, reliance on a P50 production output level with only a 50% chance of success, and use of a hypothetical carbon tax.~~

~~54. The ultimate project costs and cost savings benefits for ratepayers are largely uncertain.~~



55. The risk of the Project's failure to provide net cost savings benefits is borne primarily by SWEPCO's ratepayers. The Company's ratepayers are responsible for the capital costs of the project, along with the guaranteed return to SWEPCO's shareholders, and will likely see minimal to no cost savings benefits in return and may even experience net costs related to the Project.

~~— SWEPCO reasonably employed standard utility used internal economic modeling methods to forecast the projected customer savings of the Selected Wind Facilities, consisting of a base case (with and without a carbon emission burden) along with sensitivities based on higher and lower gas and power price forecasts, a lower level of energy production for the Selected Wind Facilities, and cases based on higher than expected congestion costs that resulted in construction of a generation tie line.~~

56. Future natural gas prices are an essential element of the Project's cost savings benefits calculation. The higher the expected future natural gas prices, the greater the expected cost savings benefits from the project.<sup>3</sup>

57. Natural gas prices are important because fuel prices are a key component in determining the supply stack, or merit order, for the dispatch of generating units.<sup>4</sup>

~~— Each of AEP's past forecasts, dating back to 2007, has been on the high side of actual natural gas prices.~~<sup>5</sup>

58. SWEPCO's natural gas price forecasts start out higher than current natural gas prices and have been higher than actual prices for several years<sup>6</sup>

59. ~~Under all of the cases presented by the Company, customers would benefit from SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities.~~

60. ~~SWEPCO also reasonably determined a power and gas price at which the Selected Wind Facilities would break even, i.e., have a net present value of customer savings of \$0.~~

61. ~~Under a reasonable range of assumptions, SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities will provide benefits to customers.~~

62.59. ~~As with other variables that impact the benefits that customers are expected to receive from the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities, the focus—~~ The analysis of natural

---

<sup>3</sup> Id. at 17.

<sup>4</sup> Id.

<sup>5</sup> ~~Id.~~

<sup>6</sup> Id.

gas prices should not be focus on any one forecast of future natural gas prices but, instead, on a reasonable the a full range of such forecasts and the relative probability of each forecast.

63-60. SWEPCO used The AEP's Long-Term North American Energy Market Forecast (Fundamentals Forecast) to forecast the expected project benefits. is a long term, weather-normalized commodity market forecast.

64. The Fundamentals Forecast recognizes that a range of potential price outcomes is possible. To complement the Base Case Fundamentals Forecast, four associated cases were also created: the Lower Band, Upper Band, Base No Carbon, and Lower Band No Carbon cases.

— The Fundamentals Forecast is made available to AEPSC and all AEP operating companies for purposes such as resource planning, capital improvement analyses, fixed asset impairment accounting, strategic planning and others.

65. The Fundamentals Forecast contained natural-gas-price projections for a base case, a high case, a low case, and a version of each of those cases that did not include an assumed carbon burden. The base case was the primary case used by SWEPCO to analyze the economics of the project. The base case used a levelized natural gas price of \$5.40 per MMBtu. SWEPCO's lowest price natural gas case (the low, no carbon case) used a levelized price of \$4.50 per MMBtu.

61. The current version of AEP's Fundamentals Forecast was created in April 2019.

62. Each of AEP's past forecasts, dating back to 2007, has been on the high side of actual natural gas prices.<sup>7</sup>

66. As with all the third party long term natural gas forecasts contained in the record of this case, the Fundamentals Forecast is a weather-normalized energy market forecast.

67. Because spot natural gas prices encompass periods of substantial variation from normal weather, when comparing historical spot natural gas prices to a weather-normalized forecast, it is important to account for the impact of weather on spot natural gas prices.

68. The record in this proceeding contains more than 40 long term, weather-normalized, publicly available and proprietary third party natural gas forecasts.

69. The vast majority of these long term forecasts are above or significantly above the natural gas breakeven price of the Selected Wind Facilities. The value in the multitude of these public and proprietary third party forecasts lies not in picking a single forecast on which to base a decision in

---

<sup>7</sup> See Docket No. 47461, Final Order at FoF 80.



this case. Instead, the multitude of the public and third party forecasts provides the bounds, on both the low and high sides, of reputable long-term natural gas forecasts.

~~70.63.~~ The evidentiary record in this proceeding establishes that the NYMEX futures prices represent actual transactions between buyers and sellers who put real money at risk in their day-to-day operations, but only in the near term of up to 36 months. The NYMEX futures prices, when trended to 2051, are \$3.10 per MMBtu.

~~71.~~ NYMEX futures are not weather-normalized and the NYMEX strips presented in this case were taken during the warmest winter in 125 years.

~~64.~~ Projections of NYMEX natural gas futures remain consistently below SWEPCO's break even gas forecast.

~~65.~~ SWEPCO's Base Case natural gas price forecast projection for 2020 was \$3.40 per MMBtu. Actual Henry Hub prices for the third week of February 2020 were between \$1.90 and \$2.00 per MMBtu.

~~66.~~ The evidentiary record in this proceeding fails to show that the natural gas price assumptions used by SWEPCO will result in a probable lowering of cost to consumers.<sup>8</sup>

~~72.~~ SWEPCO reasonably modeled locational marginal prices (LMPs) in the SPP by relying on the 2024 and 2029 PROMOD models developed by SPP and stakeholders in the Integrated Transmission Planning (ITP) process.

~~67.~~ SWEPCO evaluated the expected customer cost savings benefits of acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities both with and without a future ~~enforced~~-hypothetical carbon emission burden tax.

~~73.68.~~ SWEPCO's primary estimation of project cost savings benefits includes a future hypothetical carbon tax.

~~69.~~ As the Commission has previously found in Docket No. 47461, it is ~~possible that an enforced carbon emission burden will be imposed in the future~~ unreasonable to assume the imposition of a carbon tax.

~~70.~~ Although it is possible that a carbon tax will be imposed in the future, such a tax has not been imposed in the past, no such tax is in place now, and no credible evidence has been presented to show that the imposition of such a tax is likely in the future.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Id. at 18.

<sup>9</sup> Id. at 19.



- ~~74.71. SWEPCO's modeling of -locational marginal prices should not have included the carbon tax-burden component, and the calculation of the estimated customer cost savings benefits of the project should be reduced accordingly.~~<sup>10</sup>
- ~~75. The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined carbon dioxide to be a pollutant under the Clean Air Act, which makes CO2 emissions subject to limitation.~~
- ~~76. The possibility that such a carbon burden will be imposed in the future is greater than zero.~~
- ~~77. While the imposition of an enforced carbon emission burden may be unlikely in the near term, SWEPCO was prudent for studying the possibility in evaluating the Selected Wind Facilities, which are expected to have a useful life of 30 years.~~
- ~~78.72. SWEPCO unreasonably relied on an the overly optimistic P50 expected production output level to model the economic benefits of the Selected Wind Facilities since it is equally likely that energy production from the Selected Wind Facilities will be above or below that level there is only a 50% chance that the Selected Wind Facilities will meet or exceed that level of production.~~
- ~~79.73. It is not reasonable to base a determination of the economic benefits of the Selected Wind Facilities on the unlikely P95 output level of energy production since there is only a 95% chance that energy production from the Selected Wind Facilities will be that low meet or exceed that level of production.~~
- ~~80. The Selected Wind Facilities will have a minimum design or useful life of 30 years.~~
- ~~81. A 30-year design life was required by the RFP.~~
- ~~82. General Electric, the wind turbine supplier for the Selected Wind Facilities, evaluated the wind data and other site-specific information from an engineering perspective and determined that the loads are within the design loads for a 30-year life.~~
- ~~83. The site-specific analysis of General Electric is entitled to great weight.~~
- ~~84. The O&M and capital forecast is based on sustaining a minimum of 30 years of operation.~~
- ~~85. A 30-year design or useful life is reasonable for the Selected Wind Facilities.~~
- ~~86.74. SWEPCO reasonably modeled congestion and loss-related costs associated with the delivery of power to the AEP West load zone from the Selected Wind Facilities.~~

---

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 19.

75. It is not reasonable to conclude that SPP would promote additional transmission solutions to address if congestion, ~~on the SPP transmission system rose to a level that made such solutions beneficial under SPP's Integrated Transmission Planning (ITP) criteria.~~
76. Although SWEPCO is not proposing in this case to construct gen-tie lines, the Company's economic analysis should include the consideration of gen-tie lines in order to fully evaluate the risks of higher levels of congestion.<sup>11</sup>
- 87.77. The total estimated cost of potential future gen-tie lines is approximately \$443,754,526.
- 88.78. SWEPCO failed to ~~reasonabl~~ demonstrate d that the Selected Wind Facilities would benefit customers if the Company builds a generation tie line to mitigate congestion cost increases on the SPP transmission system that are not addressed by the SPP ITP process.
- 89.79. Although SWEPCO proposed the Selected Wind Facilities based on the customer cost savings arising from production cost savings and PTC benefits, ~~the Selected Wind Facilities will also provide value by deferring the Company's future capacity needs~~ SWEPCO also attempted to justify the Project through future deferrals of needed capacity.
80. SWEPCO failed to reasonably analyze~~d~~ the value of deferring future capacity needs in evaluating the customer cost savings benefits of the Selected Wind Facilities.
- 90.81. SWEPCO failed to demonstrate any future capacity need.
91. ~~It was reasonable for the Company's economic analysis of the Selected Wind Facilities to consider both the amount of Production Tax Credits (PTCs) the facilities were expected to produce, as well as the carrying charges on the unutilized PTCs that would be treated as deferred tax assets for ratemaking purposes.~~
- 92.82. The amount of PTCs the Company may claim in any given tax year is dependent on the Selected Wind Facilities' production. The rate at which the credit is calculated is adjusted annually for inflation and is currently 2.5 cents per kilowatt hour (\$25 per megawatt hour) of output from the taxpayer's facilities.
96. Section 45 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (Code), the section that governs the calculation and use of PTCs, provides for a graduated phase-out of PTCs. Facilities whose construction began before 2017 are eligible for 100% of the available credits while facilities whose construction began after 2017 are eligible for decreasing amounts of the credits.

---

<sup>11</sup> TIEC In. Br. at 56-57.



97. Because of the various construction safe harbor provisions afforded ratepayers by Section 45 of the Code, it is expected that the Sundance facility will be eligible for 100% of the available PTCs and that the Traverse and Maverick facilities will be eligible for 80% of the available PTCs. The Selected Wind Facilities' qualification for the PTCs is not contested.
98. Aside from qualification for the PTCs under the Code, the amount of the PTCs is dependent on the output of the Selected Wind Facilities over their useful life.
99. If the Project output is less than forecast, the value of the Project would be reduced, both in the amount of energy it can deliver and the PTCs it can capture.
100. PTCs are accrued based on the number of kilowatt hours produced, so the amount of PTCs available for the Project will be impacted by the net capacity factors achieved by the Project.
101. SWEPCO's estimate of -customer cost savings benefits is based on a net capacity factor of 44.01%. If the output of the Project is lower, the amount of PTCs will be lower.
102. The availability of PTCs may be affected by future changes in federal tax law.
- ~~98.103. Because SWEPCO is only willing to guarantee output at a P95 level of production, and the PTC estimates are based on a P50 level of output, the Commission cannot rely on SWEPCO's projection of customer cost savings benefits from PTCs. of the extensive due diligence the Company performed with regard to the wind energy resource assessment, the Commission can be confident in the energy output expected from the Selected Wind Facilities.~~
- ~~99. Because Section 38 of the Code contains limitations on taxpayers' ability to recognize PTCs as they are generated, it is expected that the Company will be unable to use a number of the PTCs in the years in which they are generated and will need to carry them forward to future tax years. The Code applies these limitations on a consolidated group basis and allows taxpayers to carry unused PTCs forward to future tax years for a period of 20 years.~~
- ~~100. The Company determined the likely expected use of PTCs (as well as amounts of PTCs that are expected to be carried forward to future years) based on future projections of AEP consolidated tax liability. These results reflect expected annual limitations of the PTCs generated by the Selected Wind Facilities with the deferral of the cash tax benefits of the credits for periods of up to four years and peak cash tax deferral amounts of approximately \$300 million and \$232 million for the P50 and P95 production levels, respectively.~~
- ~~101. Even though the Company is not expected to be able to use all of the tax credits as they are produced, the Company is proposing to give its customers the benefits of all of the~~

generated tax credits as they are produced—regardless of whether they are reflected on the AEP consolidated tax return in the year in which they are produced.

~~102.~~ As a result, it is appropriate for the Company to reflect any unused credits that it must carry forward to future tax years as deferred tax assets included in rate base. As long as customers obtain the full benefit of all the tax credits produced—even ones that the Company cannot benefit from until later tax years—it is appropriate to include the unused credits as deferred tax assets in rate base.

~~103.~~ The Company determined that, given the long-term nature of the investment in the Selected Wind Facilities, a 7.09% weighted average cost of capital was reasonable to apply to the deferred tax asset to determine an estimate of the likely carrying costs on the deferred tax asset over the life of the investment.

~~104.~~ No party to the proceeding objected to the Company's use of the 7.09% weighted average cost of capital to estimate carrying costs on the deferred tax asset given the long-term nature of the investment and this rate is reasonable.

83. SWEPCO ~~failed to~~ reasonably forecast and modeled the revenue requirement associated with the Selected Wind Facilities by using outdated, higher natural gas price assumptions that are untethered to current market conditions, failing to include potential future gen-tie line costs, relying on a P50 production output level with only a 50% chance of success, and using a hypothetical carbon tax.

#### **Proposed Conditions**

~~107.~~ The evidentiary evidence record establishes that the Company's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities will not result in the probable lowering of costs to customers with ~~or~~ without the guarantees currently offered by SWEPCO.

~~108.~~ SWEPCO offers guarantees to customers in this proceeding to help ensure that, even under unexpected circumstances, the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities will benefit customers

~~109.~~ SWEPCO is offering guarantees related to the Selected Wind Facilities' energy production levels, qualification for the PTC, and capital cost. These guarantees are identified in the direct testimony of SWEPCO witness Mr. Brice.

~~109.~~ These guarantees offered by the Company do not provide important and meaningful protections for ratepayers from the risks and costs associated with additional value to customers and should be adopted and modified in the certification of the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities.



- ~~111. SWEPKO and PSO have entered into comprehensive settlements filed in Arkansas and Oklahoma, respectively, that provide for the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities with enhanced guarantees.~~
- ~~112. The settlements expand the Minimum Production Guarantee to the full 30 year life of the Project and provide further assurances to customers regarding a deferred tax asset, if any, and off-system sales. Both settlements contain a most favored nations clause.~~
- ~~113. OPUC witness Mr. Nalepa urges the Commission to condition the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities on SWEPKO guaranteeing a P50 production level. Mr. Nalepa's recommendation is not reasonable because it penalizes the Company has based all projected benefits of the Project on a P50 production level for any deviation below average expected production.~~
- ~~114. OPUC witness Mr. Nalepa urges the Commission to condition acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities on SWEPKO guaranteeing energy cost savings based on the Company's Fundamentals Base Case Forecast of natural gas prices. Mr. Nalepa's recommendation is not reasonable SWEPKO has steadfastly refused to use market based NYMEX gas futures in its future projections of natural gas prices, and SWEPKO's project is for purely economic purposes because it constitutes a penalty for SWEPKO if circumstances deviate from those expected.~~

#### **Regulatory Approvals in Other Jurisdictions**

- ~~115. SWEPKO filed for approval of the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities in Arkansas before the Arkansas Public Service Commission in Docket No. 19-035-U on July 15, 2019.~~
- ~~116. A unanimous settlement of Docket No. 19-035-U was filed on January 24, 2020, which includes the option for the Company to acquire a larger share of the Selected Wind Facilities for Arkansas customers if another SWEPKO jurisdiction should deny its respective share.~~
- ~~117. SWEPKO expects an Order from the Arkansas Public Service Commission in May 2020.~~
- ~~118. SWEPKO filed for approval of the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities in Louisiana before the Louisiana Public Service Commission in Docket No. U-35324 on July 15, 2019.~~
- ~~119. SWEPKO expects an Order from the Louisiana Public Service Commission in May 2020.~~
- ~~120. PSO filed for approvals related to the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities in Oklahoma before the Corporation Commission of the State of Oklahoma in Cause No. PUD-201900048 on July 15, 2019.~~

- ~~121. A Joint Stipulation and Settlement Agreement was approved by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission in Cause No. PUD 201900048 on February 20, 2020, authorizing PSO's ownership of 675MW of the Selected Wind Facilities.~~
- ~~122. SWEPCO and PSO filed for approvals related to the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in FERC Docket No. EC2017-000 on November 15, 2019.~~
- ~~123. That Application was approved by FERC on February 21, 2020 for the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities by SWEPCO and PSO.~~

#### **Other CCN Issues**

- ~~124. SWEPCO has proposed the The Selected Wind Facilities as are an incremental resource to reduce the proposed to reduce customers' cost of energy for its customers.~~
- ~~125. SWEPCO maintained that the The Selected Wind Facilities will not diminish the reliability provided by its SWEPCO's existing resources or transmission system.~~
- ~~126. The Company has demonstrated it will ensure reliable ongoing operation and maintenance of the Selected Wind Facilities at a reasonable cost.~~

~~126. SWEPCO is not in the process of implementing customer choice in its service territory.~~

~~127. SWEPCO maintains that the The Selected Wind Facilities will have no effect on the implementation of customer choice in SWEPCO's service territory or the creation of stranded costs.~~

~~128. SWEPCO did not has continued to evaluate whether the acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities is in the public interest as demonstrated by the Company's use of outdated, higher natural gas price assumptions that are untethered to current market conditions, failure to include potential future gen-tie line costs, reliance on a P50 production output level with only a 50% chance of success, and use of a hypothetical carbon tax.~~

~~127.~~

~~128.124. SWEPCO is not in the process of implementing customer choice in its service territory.~~

~~129.124. The Selected Wind Facilities will have no effect on the implementation of customer choice in SWEPCO's service territory or the creation of stranded costs.~~



~~130.~~129. Electric Utilities are obligated to provide reliable service to customers at the lowest reasonable cost.

~~130.~~ The proposal of economic resources for certification is one means of meeting that obligation.

131. SWEPCO has failed to demonstrate that the Project will result in a probable lowering of costs for its ratepayers.

#### Rate Issues

~~132.~~ SWEPCO indicated in its Application that, in a future filing, it would request implementation of a generation cost recovery rider that will take effect on the date the Selected Wind Facilities begin providing service to customers, pursuant to 36.213 of the Public Utility Regulatory Act (PURA).

~~133.~~ The Company's Application indicates that it will also seek to flow the PTC benefits to customers through the generation cost recovery rider until the Company's investment in the Selected Wind Facilities is included in base rates. If the generation cost recovery rider

rule does not provide for a flow-through of PTCs, the Company will pursue a good cause exception or other available options to return the PTC benefits to customers concurrently with recovery of SWEPCO's investment in the facilities.

~~134.~~ In future rate cases, it is appropriate that SWEPCO be allowed to include in rate base the actual balance of unused PTCs, if any, associated with the Selected Wind Facilities. It is also appropriate that any unused PTCs included in rate base earn a return at the weighted average cost of capital set for that rate case.

#### Sale Transfer Merger Issues

135. PURA 14.101 requires an electric utility to report certain transactions to the Commission, including a transaction to "sell, acquire, or lease a plant as an operating unit or system in this state for a total consideration of more than \$10 million."

~~136.~~ The Selected Wind Facilities are wholly located in Oklahoma.

~~137.~~ Under the plain meaning of PURA 14.101(a), that Section does not apply to this proceeding. "This state" can only be read to refer to Texas.

~~138.~~ The Commission's implementing rule 16 TAC 25.74(b), specifically recognizes that §14.101 applies to an operating unit or system "in the State of Texas."

**[Findings of Fact if 14.101 is determined to apply:]**



~~136.~~ Without SWEPCO's provision of additional important and meaningful guarantees, ~~The the~~ Selected Wind Facilities would fail to meet the public interest as set forth in PURA §14.101.

~~139.~~137. In the context of this case, the Commission's application of the public interest standard overlaps with the controlling CCN standard of review — the probable lowering of costs to customers.

~~140.~~138. SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities is not in the public interest because it is not expected to lower costs for customers.

~~141.~~ SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities is in the public interest because it ~~will provide renewable energy credits that customers may acquire to meet their sustainability and renewable energy goals.~~

~~142.~~ SWEPCO's acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities will produce significant and immediate cost savings for SWEPCO customers, diversify SWEPCO's generation resources, and reduce fuel costs

~~143.~~ The Selected Wind Facilities will have no effect on the health or safety of customers or employees and will not result in the transfer of jobs from Texas.

~~144.~~ SWEPCO is paying a reasonable value for the Selected Wind Facilities and has diligently negotiated purchase agreements that assure reasonable pricing, performance, and risk mitigation to protect SWEPCO customers.

## **B. Conclusions of Law**

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Public Utility Regulatory Act, Tex. Util. Code 14.001, 37.051, 37.053, 37.056, and 37.057 (PURA).

2. SOAH has jurisdiction over this proceeding, including the preparation of this proposal for decision with findings of fact and conclusions of law, pursuant to PURA 14.053 and Tex. Gov't. Code 2003.049.

3. Notice of the Application was provided in compliance with PURA 37.054 and 16 Tex. Admin. Code 22.55 (TAC) because the Selected Wind Facilities are out-of-state facilities.

4. The Commission may approve an application and grant a certificate of convenience and necessity only if the Commission finds that the certificate is necessary for the service, accommodation, convenience, or safety of the public under PURA § 37.056.

5. SWEPCO has not shown that the project will result in the probable lowering of cost to consumers in accordance with PURA § 37.056(c)(4)(E).

6. SWEPCO has not met its burden of proof to show that the project is necessary for the service, accommodation, convenience, or safety of the public under PURA § 37.056.

7. SWEPCO is not entitled to approval of the application.

~~3.8.~~

~~Utilities may obtain a CCN for general economic purposes, not only when there is an increase in demand necessitating additional generation. See *Application of Southwestern Public Company for Approval of Transactions with ESI Energy, LLC and Invenergy Wind Development North America LLC, to Amend a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for Wind Generation Projects and Associated Facilities in Hale County, Texas, and Roosevelt County, New Mexico and for Related Approvals*, Docket No. 46936.~~

~~SWEPCO failed to provide sufficient guarantees to ratepayers akin to those approved by the Commission in Docket No. 46936.~~

5. ~~In compliance with PURA 39.501 (b) and 39.502(b) and 16 TAC 25.422(e), SWEPCO is not currently in the process of implementing customer choice in its Texas service territory.~~

6. ~~PURA 14.101 does not apply to this case because the Selected Wind Facilities are not located in the state of Texas.~~

7. ~~The grant or denial of a CCN is governed by PURA 37.056.~~

8. ~~The Commission should grant a CCN any time if it is in the public interest as determined by an assessment the factors in PURA 37.056.~~

~~The Commission may grant a CCN for a generation facility if it determines that acquisition of the facility will result in a probable lowering of costs to customers.~~

9. ~~The site-specific factors set out in PURA 37.056(4)(A)-(D) do not apply in this case because the Selected Wind Facilities are located in Oklahoma.~~

10. ~~PURA 37.056(4)(E) does not require that a utility provide a guarantee of lower costs or eliminate all risk associated with a project.~~

11. ~~Under PURA 37.056(4), projects proposed for economic reasons are subject to the same standards as any other project.~~

### C. Ordering Paragraphs



In accordance with these findings of fact and conclusions of law, the Commission issues the following Order:

1. The Commission denies the application, as outlined in this Order.

~~1.2.~~ All other motions, requests for specific findings of fact and conclusions of law, and any other requests for general or specific relief, if not expressly granted, are denied.

3. \_\_\_\_\_

1. ~~The proposal for decision is adopted to the extent consistent with this Order.~~

~~SWEPSCO's amendment to CCN number 30150 is denied. SWEPCO's CCN number 30150 is amended to include acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities as set out in SWEPCO's application, including the authorization to acquire a larger share of the Selected Wind Facilities if one of SWEPCO's other jurisdictions does not approve acquisition of the Facilities.~~

2. ~~If the Commission Decides to Grant the Amended CCN~~

~~SWEPSCO's CCN number 30150 is amended to include acquisition of the Selected Wind Facilities as set out in SWEPCO's application, including the authorization to acquire a larger share of the Selected Wind Facilities if one of SWEPCO's other jurisdictions does not approve acquisition of the Facilities, and with the following modifications consistent with this order:~~

3. ~~Consistent with its production guarantee, SWEPCO shall make an informational filing with the Commission on May 15 of the sixth and eleventh years of operation of each facility annually to report on the production level of the projects. If the production levels demonstrate a refund is owed to SWEPCO customersratepayers, SWEPCO shall include a request that a refund be provided as a rate rider.~~

4. ~~Consistent with its capital cost guarantee, SWEPCO shall not include gross plant in-service amounts in rate base for the Selected Wind Facilities greater than \$1.088 billion, including owner's costs and PSA price adjustments.~~

5. ~~If SWEPCO fails to meet the 38.144.01% net capacity factor consistent with its production guarantee, then SWEPCO shall credit to Texas retail customers the Texas retail portion of the production tax credit, including a gross-up for income tax, not generated because of underproduction of the Selected Wind Facilities and the additional energy costs incurred due to that underproduction.~~

6. ~~In future rate proceedings, SWEPCO may include in rate base as a deferred tax asset the actual balance of unused production tax credits associated with the Selected Wind~~


~~Facilities, which may earn a return at SWEPCO's weighted cost of capital set in the rate proceeding.~~

- ~~—— SWEPCO shall credit to Texas retail customers the production tax credits at the 100% level related to the actual output of the Sundance facility and the production tax credits at the 80% level related to the actual output of the Traverse and Maverick facilities.~~
- ~~—— SWEPCO shall calculate the difference between projected savings using its Base Case natural gas forecast and savings actually realized on an annual basis, and annually credit to ratepayers the resulting difference.~~
- ~~7. SWEPCO shall seek Commission approval prior to the construction of any future gen-tie line for the Project.~~
- ~~8. SWEPCO's application is granted to the extent consistent with this Order.~~
- ~~9. All other motions, requests for specific findings of fact and conclusions of law, and any other requests for general or specific relief, if not expressly granted, are denied.~~

March 19, 2020

Respectfully submitted,


Lori Cobos  
Chief Executive & Public Counsel  
State Bar No. 24042276

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Zachary Stephenson  
Assistant Public Counsel  
State Bar No. 24073402  
Chris Ekoh  
Senior Managing Public Counsel  
State Bar No. 06507015

OFFICE OF PUBLIC UTILITY COUNSEL  
1701 N. Congress Avenue, Suite 9-180  
P.O. Box 12397  
Austin, Texas 78711-2397  
512/936-7500 (Telephone)  
512/936-7525 (Facsimile)  
[zachary.stephenson@opuc.texas.gov](mailto:zachary.stephenson@opuc.texas.gov)  
[chris.ekoh@opuc.texas.gov](mailto:chris.ekoh@opuc.texas.gov)  
[opuc\\_eservice@opuc.texas.gov](mailto:opuc_eservice@opuc.texas.gov) (Service)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served on all parties of record in this proceeding on this 19th day of March 2020, by facsimile, electronic mail, and/or first class, U.S. Mail.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Zachary Stephenson