• • •

## COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA SCC-CLERK'S OFFICE STOCUMENT CONTROL CENTER STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION 2021 MAY 28 A 9 34

## PREFILED STAFF TESTIMONY

## **APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY**

For approval of a rate adjustment clause, BC-RAC, pursuant to §§ 56-585.1 A 6 and 56-585.1:9 of the Code of Virginia

PUR-2020-00259

May 28, 2021

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Anna L. Clayton DIVISION OF UTILITY ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE	PART A
Turner L. LaBrie DIVISION OF UTILITY ACCOUNTING AND FINANCE	PART B
Timothy A. Morris DIVISION OF PUBLIC UTILITY REGULATION	PART C

PART A

## Summary of Direct Testimony – Anna L. Clayton

My testimony includes the following findings and conclusions:

- 1. A total Projected Cost Recovery Factor of \$4,834,562 for the rate year beginning December 1, 2021, and ending November 30, 2022, should be approved.
- 2. Staff's recommended revenue requirement is \$54,361 less than the Company's proposed revenue requirement.
- 3. Staff recommends that the Commission direct the Company to remove the capital investment and operations and maintenance expense associated with AMI and DACR as non-incremental costs from the Projected Cost Recovery Factor.
- 4. Staff recommends that the Commission direct the Company to recalculate the lifetime revenue requirement excluding the AMI and DACR costs as non-incremental costs in its next BC-RAC filing.

## PREFILED TESTIMONY OF ANNA L. CLAYTON

## APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259

## MAY 28, 2021

# 1Q.PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND THE POSITION YOU HOLD WITH THE2STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION ("COMMISSION").

A. My name is Anna L. Clayton. I am a Principal Utility Specialist with the Commission's
Division of Utility Accounting and Finance.

#### 5 Q. PLEASE PROVIDE A SUMMARY OF THE CURRENT PETITION.

A. On January 28, 2021, Appalachian Power Company ("APCo" or the "Company") filed a
petition ("Petition") with the Commission pursuant to §§ 56-585.1 A 6 and 56-585.1:9 of
the Code of Virginia ("Code") for approval of a rate adjustment clause, designated as the
BC-RAC, to recover the incremental costs of providing broadband capacity under the
Company's broadband capacity pilot project in Grayson County, Virginia ("Grayson
Broadband Project" or "Project").

12 In this proceeding, APCo has requested approval of its proposed BC-RAC to 13 recover the incremental costs of providing broadband capacity to a nongovernmental 14 internet service provider ("ISP") in areas of Grayson County that are unserved by 15 broadband. APCo is requesting that the Commission approve a rate adjustment clause

1

1	("RAC") for the capital investments, for the rate year beginning December 1, 2021, and
2	ending November 30, 2022 ("Rate Year"). The Company is requesting a Projected Cost
3	Recovery Factor ("Projected Factor") revenue requirement of \$4,888,923 and True-Up
4	Factor revenue requirement of \$0.1

## 5 Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY?

- 6 A. My testimony in this proceeding addresses:
- Staff's review of the rate year revenue requirement and projected costs for the
  BC-RAC;
  The incremental broadband costs; and
  - The incremental broadband costs, and
  - Staff's review of the lifetime revenue requirements for the BC-RAC.

## 11 Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR CONCLUSIONS REGARDING YOUR RATE

12 YEAR ANALYSIS.

10

13 A. My conclusions are as follows:

14	٠	The Company's Rate Year costs are within the \$60 million cap established by
15		the Code;
16	•	Staff excludes a modest level of costs that are non-incremental, thus not eligible

- Staff excludes a modest level of costs that are non-incremental, thus not eligible
   for recovery in a RAC pursuant to Code § 56-585.1:9, that would otherwise
   have been incurred for the Company's AMI and DACR;
- The Company properly reflects projected third-party lease proceeds as an offset
   to the BC-RAC revenue requirement; and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Petition at 1 & 5; See Appendix A to this testimony for an explanation of these factors. This is the Company's first request for cost recovery through the BC-RAC, thus there is no over-or under-recovery balance at this point to reconcile.

Staff's recommended revenue requirement is \$4,834,562, which is \$54,361 less
than that proposed by the Company.

## **Project Costs**

# 3 Q. WHAT ARE THE ESTIMATED CAPITAL COSTS OF THE GRAYSON 4 BROADBAND PILOT?

A. The Company estimates capital investment for the Project to be approximately \$27.5
million. This cost estimate includes construction of approximately 238 miles of 96-strand
fiber optic cable and all necessary hardware, right-of-way work, permitting, easements,
pole replacements (necessitated by fiber loading), telecommunications building to hub the
ISP electronics, engineering, and installation.<sup>2,3</sup>

## **Revenue Requirement**

# 10 Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE COSTS THAT THE COMPANY IS SEEKING TO 11 RECOVER IN THE BC-RAC.

A. In this proceeding, the Company has requested to recover the incremental costs of
 providing broadband capacity, as approved by the Commission in Case No. PUR-2019 00145. As shown in Table 1, the Company is requesting recovery of \$4,888,923 of which

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pre-filed testimony of Company witness Perdew at 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This capital cost estimate is more than the pilot scenario approved in Case No. PUR-2019-00145 ("Approval Petition") of \$16.7 million. *See* Appendix B to this testimony for the Company's response to Staff Interrogatory 03-006 for the explanation of the differences. The primary change to these estimates is the inclusion of contingencies and overheads in the \$27.5 million updated estimate.

\$1,880,964 are financing costs and \$3,007,959 are projected operating and maintenance
 ("O&M") expenses. This revenue requirement is net of the estimated revenues under its
 lease agreement with the ISP, GigaBeam.

## Table 1

## **Company Revenue Requirement**

	Amount	
Financing Cost	\$1,880,964	
Depreciation Expense	\$1,055,361	
Property Tax Expense	\$114,736	
Maintenance and Repair Expense	\$595,555	
Deferred Cost Amortization <sup>4</sup>	\$1,376,047	
ISP Revenue	(\$133,740)	
Total Revenue Requirement	\$4,888,923	

# 4 Q. WHAT QUALIFICATIONS ARE PLACED ON COST CONSIDERATION IN A 5 BROADBAND PILOT?

A. Code § 56-585.1:9 B limits the annual costs to \$60 million.<sup>5</sup> This Project does not exceed
 that annual cost cap. In addition, that Code section limits the costs subject to recovery
 from a rate adjustment clause as follows: "The incremental costs of providing broadband
 capacity pursuant to any such pilot program, net of revenue generated therefrom, shall be

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> As discussed on page 4 of Company witness Sebastian's direct testimony, the Company is deferring depreciation expense, O&M costs and financing costs on rate base calculated up to the beginning of the Rate Year and is proposing to recover them over the Rate Year in this Petition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The Commission ruled, in the Final Order of Case No. PUR-2019-00145, that the "costs" in that provision relate to the actual annual costs including capitalized, expensed, and deferred costs and not the annual revenue requirement. See Petition of Appalachian Power Company, For approval of a broadband capacity pilot program pursuant to § 56-585.1:9 of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUR-2019-00145, Doc. Con. Cen. No. 200310148, Final Order (March 5, 2020).

1

eligible for recovery from customers as an electric grid transformation project pursuant to

2 clause (vi) of subdivision A 6 of [Code] § 56-585.1 filed on or after July 1, 2020."

#### WHAT ARE THE COMPANY'S INCREMENTAL COST ASSUMPTIONS IN 3 Q.

- **THIS PROCEEDING?** 4
- The Company represents that the non-incremental costs in this proceeding are \$0.<sup>6</sup> This is 5 Α.
- consistent with what the Company presented in Case No. PUR-2019-00145.<sup>7</sup> The 6
- 7 Company represents the following:

[a]bsent the Project, the Company would not deploy fiber optic 8 cable in Grayson County. Rather, but for the Pilot Statute, APCo 9 10 would have used a wireless-based platform to meet its 11 communications needs in Grayson County, and would not have 12 installed any fiber optic cable. Indeed, a wireless-based platform would not be capable of supporting reliable Internet service to the 13 14 designated areas of Grayson County, in terms of both speed and availability. As a result, all of the costs of deploying fiber optic 15 infrastructure under the Project are incremental.<sup>8</sup> 16

#### DOES STAFF HAVE CONCERNS WITH THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED 17 Q.

- 18 **INCREMENTAL COSTS?**
- Yes. In the Approval Petition, Staff witness Harris addressed concerns Staff had regarding 19 A.
- 20 the Company's predominant use of the facilities as the Company's communication network

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Pre-filed testimony of Company witness Perdew at 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See Petition of Appalachian Power Company, For approval of a broadband capacity pilot program pursuant to § 56-585.1:9 of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUR-2019-00145, Doc. Con. Cen. No. 190920085, Pre-filed Testimony of Company witness Sebastian at 9 (Sept. 6, 2019).

1	for advanced metering infrastructure ("AMI") and distribution automation and circuit
2	reconfiguration ("DACR") purposes. <sup>9</sup> As discussed above, the statute allows for recovery,
3	in a rate adjustment clause, of the incremental costs of providing broadband capacity. In
4	the Approval Petition, Staff witness Cizenski stated, "From a technical perspective, Staff
5	believes that other programs such as AMI and DACR are not essential to providing
6	broadband capacity [a]ccordingly, Staff believes that costs related to these programs are
7	therefore not incremental costs under the statute." <sup>10</sup> The Company also stated in response
8	to Staff Interrogatory No. 04-085 in that case:

9 While the "Additional Electronics for APCo fiber operations" are not essential to the primary goal of providing 10 11 middle-mile broadband capacity that will enable GigaBeam to provide Internet service at speeds greater than 10/1 MBps 12 13 in unserved areas of Grayson County, it is essential to the secondary goal of using fiber optic cable as the 14 communications platform for the Company's AMI meters 15 and DACR equipment, which will help improve electric 16 reliability in the County.<sup>11</sup> 17

## 18 Q. WHAT COSTS DOES STAFF BELIEVE TO BE INCREMENTAL?

A. As discussed above, in the Approval Petition, Staff took the position that the costs
 associated with AMI and DACR are not essential to providing broadband capacity, thus,
 those costs are not incremental and not eligible for recovery in the BC-RAC. Staff's

<sup>11</sup> See Appendix B.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Petition of Appalachian Power Company, For approval of a broadband capacity pilot program pursuant to § 56-585.1:9 of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUR-2019-00145, Doc. Con. Cen. No. 191230008, Pre-filed Testimony of Staff witness Harris at 7-8 and Appendix A (Dec. 18, 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See Petition of Appalachian Power Company, For approval of a broadband capacity pilot program pursuant to § 56-585.1:9 of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUR-2019-00145, Doc. Con. Cen. No. 191230008, Pre-filed Testimony of Staff witness Cizenski at 10 (Dec. 18, 2019).

1 position has not changed and, for this reason, the AMI and DACR costs are removed from 2 the capital investment and O&M expenses in the calculation of the Rate Year revenue requirement. The Company stated that it would cost approximately \$507,000 to install the 3 4 wireless infrastructure to support AMI and DACR if the fiber optic network proposed under 5 the Pilot was not available, plus estimated annual cellular costs of approximately \$26,400 and annual operations and maintenance costs of \$11,150.<sup>12</sup> Staff reduces the revenue 6 7 requirement by approximately \$73,000 in order to reflect only the incremental cost of 8 broadband service in the BC-RAC.<sup>13</sup>

## 9 Q. WHAT ARE THE COMPANY'S RECOVERY OPTIONS FOR NON-10 INCREMENTAL PILOT PROJECT COSTS?

A. Non-incremental pilot net costs, if they otherwise qualify as a grid transformation project,
 are also RAC-eligible pursuant to Code § 56-585.1 A 6. Non-incremental pilot net costs
 that are not included in an eligible grid transformation RAC would be treated as base rate
 items. This is summarized in the table below.

	Incremental Costs	Non-Incremental Costs, but GTSA- Qualifying	Non-Incremental, Non-GTSA
Recovery Mechanism	RAC	RAC	Base Rates

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> The Company's responses to Staff Interrogatories 09-029 and 09-030. See Appendix B of this testimony.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Staff finds that the other costs proposed for recovery in this Petition are either incremental to the project of providing broadband service to Grayson County customers or have already been appropriately excluded as non-incremental costs.

# Q. HAS STAFF REVIEWED THE COSTS UNDERLYING THE PROJECTED FACTOR?

A. Yes, Staff reviewed the Company's projections and will continue to review the costs of the
 BC-RAC as they are incurred. While Staff does not take issue with the Company's
 projections at this time, Staff notes that any difference between these projections and the
 actual costs incurred will be handled through a future BC-RAC True-Up Factor.<sup>14</sup>

# 7 Q. PLEASE REVIEW THE CAPITAL STRUCTURE AND COST OF CAPITAL USED 8 TO CALCULATE THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT.

A. As discussed in the testimony of Staff witness LaBrie, Staff is recommending a capital
structure and overall weighted cost of capital for the Rate Year that differs from what the
Company proposed.<sup>15</sup> Staff's recommended overall weighted cost of capital is 7.183% for
the period through November 23, 2020, and 7.074% for the period after November 23,
2020. Incorporating this into Staff's calculation of the Projected Recovery Factor does not
materially change the revenue requirement.

## 15 Q. HAS THE COMPANY REFLECTED LEASE PROCEEDS AS A REDUCTION IN

## 16 ITS PROPOSED REVENUE REQUIREMENT?

17 A. Yes. Company witness Yoder states on page 6 of his direct testimony that "[r]ental
18 revenues received from third party use of the fiber cable will be used to offset the costs

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Of the \$27,500,000 of estimated capital investment, the Company has only incurred approximately \$744,021 of actual amounts as of the date of this filing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Staff's recommended capital structure can be found in Schedule 1 of Staff witness LaBrie's testimony.

incurred." The estimated revenues arising from these lease agreements have been treated
 as a reduction to the annual revenue requirements included in both the Projected Factor
 and lifetime revenue requirements.

## 4 Q. WHAT IS STAFF'S PROPOSED PROJECTED FACTOR REVENUE 5 REQUIREMENT?

A. Staff's total revenue requirement does not differ materially from the Company's as
presented in Table 1. Staff calculated revenue requirement is \$4,834,562.<sup>16</sup> This is
\$54,361 less than the Company's proposed revenue requirement.<sup>17</sup> See Table 2 for a
breakdown of this amount.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> In addition to removing the costs assolated with AMI and DACR, Staff's revenue requirement also incorporates the overall cost of capital as proposed by Staff witness LaBrie. While Staff's overall cost of capital does differ from the Company's slightly, this difference does not materially impact the revenue requirement. In addition, Staff's calculation includes capital investment dollars that are immaterially different from what was presented in the Company's application, a property tax rate that is not rounded and a correction to the calculation of maintenance and repairs expense.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Using this revenue requirement, the monthly residential billing rate would not change from \$0.00054/kwh. Staff witness Morris discusses the impacts on customers' bills in more detail.

## Table 2

## **Staff Revenue Requirement**

	Amount
Financing Cost	\$1,881,455
Depreciation Expense	\$1,055,364
Property Tax Expense	\$122,625
Maintenance and Repair Expense	\$604,251
<b>Deferred Cost Amortization</b>	\$1,377,852
Baseline O&M (AMI & DACR)	(\$35,421)
Baseline Financing Cost (AMI & DACR)	(\$37,824)
ISP Revenue	(\$133,740)
Total Revenue Requirement	\$4,834,562

## Lifetime Revenue Requirements

## 1 Q. DID THE COMPANY CALCULATE THE ESTIMATED LIFETIME REVENUE

## 2 **REQUIREMENT OF THE E-RAC?**

## 3 A. Yes, it did. As shown in Table 3 below, the Company estimates the nominal lifetime

4 revenue requirement of the BC-RAC to be \$62,141,649.<sup>18</sup>

## Table 3

## Lifetime Revenue Requirement

<b>Financing Cost</b>	\$19,761,471
<b>Depreciation Expense</b>	\$25,985,073
O&M Expense	\$16,395,105
Total Revenue Requirement	\$62,141,649

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> This amount is based on the Company's representation that all costs included in the BC-RAC are incremental. Staff did not have the level of detail to recalculate the lifetime revenue requirement excluding AMI and DACR costs.

## 1

2

# Q. HAS STAFF REVIEWED THE CALCULATIONS UNDERLYING THE LIFETIME REVENUE REQUIREMENT?

Yes. While Staff does not take issue with the methodology the Company used to calculate 3 Α. the lifetime revenue requirement of the BC-RAC, Staff does have a couple of differences 4 5 from the Company in its calculation. First, Staff applies the correct tax gross-up factor. 6 The Company inadvertently excluded the Virginia minimum tax from its gross-up factor. 7 Including Virginia minimum tax is appropriate and consistent with the gross-up factor used 8 by the Company to calculate the rate year revenue requirement. Second, Staff uses its 9 proposed cost of capital of 7.074%, as discussed in more detail by Staff witness LaBrie. In addition. Staff incorporates certain ratemaking inputs unintentionally omitted by the 10 Company in its calculation<sup>19</sup> and uses the un-rounded property tax rate. These adjustments 11 to the calculation result in a lifetime revenue requirement of \$61,392,249. This is \$749,400 12 13 less than the Company's total nominal lifetime revenue requirement.

## 14 Q. DOES STAFF HAVE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS REGARDING THE BC-

## 15 **RAC LIFETIME REVENUE REQUIREMENT?**

A. Yes. Staff recommends, consistent with the position that AMI and DACR costs are non incremental, that the Commission direct the Company to recalculate the lifetime revenue
 requirement to reduce it by the amount of non-incremental costs and include the updated
 lifetime revenue requirement calculation in its next BC-RAC filing.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> The Company inadvertently excluded the pre-rate year accumulated depreciation from the calculation of the total accumulated depreciation. In addition, the Company excluded the pre-tax weighted cost of debt from the calculation for some of the years.

## **Environmental Justice**

1	Q.	HOW DOES THE COMPANY'S PETITION, AND THE PROJECTS, RATES, AND
2		OTHER PROPOSALS CONTAINED THEREIN, ADDRESS ENVIRONMENTAL
3		JUSTICE (AS DEFINED IN CODE § 2.2-234)?
4	A.	In response to a Staff interrogatory, the Company states:
5 6 7		The Company's proposed broadband rate adjustment clause would not, if approved, result in negative environmental consequences or perceptible changes to viewshed. <sup>20</sup>
8	Q.	HOW DOES THE COMPANY'S SITING, PLANNING, AND CAPITAL PROJECT
9		AUTHORIZATION PROCESSES CONSIDER THE IMPACTS OF ITS
10		PROJECTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE?
11	А.	In response to a Staff interrogatory, the Company states:
12 13 14 15 16 17 18		The Company recognizes the importance of this issue and has convened a working group to review its processes and practices for project siting and outreach as it relates to potential environmental justice impacts. The working group is developing guidance to ensure projects do not disproportionately negatively affect low income and/or underrepresented communities. <sup>21</sup>
1 <b>9</b>	Q.	HOW DO THE COMPANY'S CAPITAL AUTHORIZATION PROCESSES

## 20 CONSIDER THE IMPACTS OF ITS PROJECTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL

**JUSTICE**?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> The Company's response to Staff Interrogatory 05-015. See Appendix B of this testimony.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> The Company's response to Staff Interrogatory 05-017. See Appendix B of this testimony.

A. In response to a Staff interrogatory, the Company states, "[t]he Company's capital
 authorization processes do not explicitly address environmental justice."<sup>22</sup> Further, the
 Company states that it does not maintain a database or other repository of information
 identifying low-income communities, fence-line communities, and communities of color
 in its service territory.<sup>23</sup>

## 6 Q. DOES THE COMPANY HAVE AN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE POLICY?

A. No. As the Company stated in Case No. PUR-2020-00258, it does not currently have an
environmental justice policy.<sup>24</sup> In Case No. PUR-2020-00251, the Company explained
that it had not established a timeline for the development of an environmental justice
policy.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> The Company's response to Staff Interrogatory 05-016. See Appendix B of this testimony.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> The Company's response to Staff Interrogatory 05-018. See Appendix B of this testimony.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> See Appendix B to this testimony for the Company's response to Staff Interrogatory 02-012. See also Petition of Appalachian Power Company, For approval to continue a rate adjustment clause, the E-RAC, for costs to comply with state and federal environmental regulations pursuant to § 56-585.1 A 5 e of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUR-2020-00258, Doc. Con. Cen. No. 210510104, Pre-filed Testimony of Staff witness Clayton (May 7, 2021).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> See Appendix B to this testimony for the Company's response to Staff Interrogatories 03-017. See Petition of Appalachian Power Company, For approval to continue a rate adjustment clause, the EE-RAC, and for approval of new energy efficiency programs pursuant to §§ 56-585.1 A 5 c and 56-596.2 of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUR-2020-00251, Doc. Con. Cen. No. 210340041, Pre-filed Testimony of Staff witness Mangalam (March 31, 2021).

## **Conclusion**

1	Q.	PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS INCLUDED IN
2		YOUR TESTIMONY.
3	А.	My testimony includes the following findings and conclusions:
4 5		<ol> <li>A total Projected Cost Recovery Factor of \$4,834,562 for the rate year beginning December 1, 2021, and ending November 30, 2022, should be approved.</li> </ol>
6 7 8 9		2) Staff recommends that the Commission direct the Company to remove the capital investment and operations and maintenance expense associated with AMI and DACR as non-incremental costs from the Projected Cost Recovery Factor.
10 11 12 13		<ol> <li>Staff recommends that the Commission direct the Company to recalculate the lifetime revenue requirement excluding the AMI and DACR costs as non- incremental costs in its next BC-RAC filing.</li> </ol>
14	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

15 A. Yes, it does.

Appalachian Power Company Case No. PUR-2020-00259 Broadband RAC (BC-RAC) For the Year Beginning December 1, 2021 (in the 000s)

Grayson County Project	Projected Revenue Factor \$ 4,835	Actual Cost True-Up Factor \$	\$ 4,835
Line No.	1 Projected Reve	2 Actual Cost Tru	3 Total
Ē			

•

> Appalachian Power Company Case No. PUR-2020-00259 Broadband RAC (BC-RAC) Revenue Requirement For the Year Beginning December 1, 2021 (in the 000s)

Line No.		Grayson County Project
Ţ	Rate Base	21,518
7	Weighted Average Cost of Capital	7.074%
m	NOI	1,522
4	Less Interest Expense on Debt Total Weighted Average Cost of Debt	2.445%
e v	Rate Base Revenue Requirement - Interest Expense on Debt	21,518 526
7	Net income	966
œ	Income Tax Gross-Up Factor	75.61%
6	Revenue Requirement - Net Income Including Income Taxes	1,318
10	Revenue Requirement - Financing Costs	1,844
:	Operating Expenses (Annualized)	
11 21	Uperating Expenses ISP Revenue	3,125 (134)
13	Revenue Requirement - Operating Expenses	2,991
14	Revenue Requirement Per Projected Cost Recovery Factor	4,835

210560066

.

.

# APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY VIRGINIA JURISDICTIONAL ALLOCATION FACTORS FOR THE 12 MONTHS ENDED 12/31/2019

	0
	1.(
Virginia Jurisdictional	0.943308
Virginia <mark>Virginia</mark> Non-Jurisdictional Jurisdictional	0.056692
DESCRIPTION	Virginia Only Distribution Plant

Clayton	
---------	--

Appalachian Power Company Case No. PUR-2020-00259 Broadband RAC (BC-RAC) Gross Up Factor

tine No.		Tax Rates	Percentage of Incremental Gross Revenues
1	Operating Revenues	• • •	100.00%
2	Less: Factoring Expense		0.0000%
m	Income Before Income Taxes and VA Min Tax		100.00%
4	Less: VA Min Tax (VA Retail 1.45% x .483905)		0.7017%
Ŋ	Income Before Income Taxes		%08.99
Q	Less: State Income Taxes (Line 3 x State Tax Rate)	3.5876%	3.5876%
۲ ,	Income Before Federal Income Taxes		95.71%
œ	Less: Federal Income Taxes (Line 5 x Federal Tax Rate)	21.00%	20.093%
თ	Operating Income Percentage		75.6114%
10	Gross Revenue Conversion Factor (100%/Line 7)		1.3226

.

(Ine Ro	Description	Mary-20	92-49Y	02-101	Aug-20	Sep-20	QC1-20	Nov-20	Dec-20	Lar-21	Feb-21	Mar-21	Apr.2	May-23 A	Jun-21 h	M-21 Au	Aug-21 545	Sep-21 Oct-21		Kov-23
	Pre-Rate Those																			
-	Capital Expenditures	• •	•	\$ 51	2 2 2	5 121 5	â	5 1112	2 MICL	2 446.5	4,144 5	S MCS	6,744 5	8.244 S					16,644 \$	18,144
~	Accumutated Deprectation												•	•	5 9	S (52)	ŝ	5 (ys)	\$ (M)	5
m	Accumulated Deferred (nonne Tar													s					(III) \$	(213)
			•	5 V		\$ 127 \$		2 447		2.444		\$ 102.5	6744 5	8.244 5	\$ (11.6			2 (57.14	16.275 5	17,614
	Demand Alberta ion Sector	265.20		1				mr a		1.17		1111	Net 1	112.00	1.1.1			ALC: NO	A and	100
• • •	Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base	5	s	s	s	5 83	5	ž.	1.834 5	2.777 \$	3,908,5	5 1105	300	\$ 111.1	9,214 5	NDB44 S	12,469 5	5 168751	2 216,21	16,616
		Dec-21	Jen-22	feb-12	Mar-22	Apr-22	May:22	km-22	11-11	Aug-22	54P-23	Oct-22	Nov-22							
	Rais Year																			
•	Capital Expenditures	19,61 8	5 71,144	5 72.44	~		27,044 5	27,500 \$	2 005/12	\$ 005'12	27,500 \$	27,500 \$	005'12							
•0	Baselino Captal Expenditures	( <u>8</u> )		~			5 (105)	\$ (205)	5 (105)	S (105)	5 (105)	\$ (LDS)	(695)							
÷	Accumulated Depreciation	5 (22)		~	\$		\$ (029)	\$ (624)	\$ (6EB)	\$ (996)	(1.057) S	5 (1977)	(1,276)							
9	Accumutated Deferced income Tax	\$ (929) \$		\$ (633)	\$ (EE2) \$	\$ [zea) \$	\$ (166)	\$ (00071)	\$ (00111)	\$ (525'1)	\$ (805'1)	\$ (124/1)	(12571)							
=	Subtotal	5 1B,477	018,01 2	\$ 21,143	•	\$ 237,252 \$	24,985 5	\$ 562,22	\$ 500,21	2 312.05	24,608 5	\$ 662"17	24,190							
2	Demand Aflocation Factor	MET VG			B4.33K	MARY NO	94.23%	SYLE NO	34,33%	MET NG	MART NO.	XCENS	MEE'16							
n	Virginia hubdictional Rate Base	\$ DEM/TL 8	\$ 18,687	\$ 5H6'EI \$		\$ 1421'22 \$	\$ 69577	\$ 109'67	23,606 \$	\$ 60°T	23,213 \$	\$ 910'EZ	619722							
	13 Month Avg Rate Base VA Juris	\$ 21,518																		
	In-Service Rate Base																			
4	1	02-Arry	102-uni	Q-14	9. <sup>3</sup> 7	97-day	Oct-30	Nov-20	Det-X	larr21	12-4-2	Mar-21	Apr-21 5	2,584 5	<u>am-21 5 Ju</u> 3,611 5	<u>3611 5</u>	AUE-21 54	4-9-21 Del 4,676 \$	Det-21 Mr 14,613 S	17,040
51		Dec-21 5 17.040 5	1m-22 17.040 5	Feb-22 5 19.474 5	Mar-22 S 21.539 S	Apr-22 5 24423 5	Mury-22 27,400 5	hin-22 27.500 5	14-22 27-202 5	Aug-22 27:500 5	Sep-22 27.500 5	0et-22 27.500 5	Nov-22							
1								1												

210560066

## Appalachian Power Company Case No. PUR-2020-00259 Broadband RAC (BC-RAC) Projected O&M For the Period December 2021 through November 2022 (in the 0005)

Line No.	Cost	Dec-21	Jan-22	Feb-22	Mar-22	Apr-22	May-22	Jun-22	Jul-22	Aug-22	Sep-22	0ct-22	Nov-22	Total	Dec-21 Jan-22 Feb-22 Mar-22 Apr-22 May-22 Jun-22 Jul-22 Aug-22 Sep-22 Oct-22 Nov-22 Total Allocation Factor VA Juris Total	VA Juris Total	1
Ч	Maintenance & Repair	\$ 37		\$ 43	\$ 47	\$ 54	s 8	5 5	8	ې ع	2 23	2 8	ې 8	\$ 641			
2	Property Taxes	\$		\$	\$ 10	\$ 11	\$ 12	8 \$ 9 \$ 10 \$ 11 \$ 12 \$ 12 \$ 12 \$ 12 \$ 12 \$ 12	12	\$ 12	\$ 12	\$ 12	\$ 12	\$ 130			
£	Subtotal Rate Year O&M	\$ 45 \$		\$ 51	\$ 57	2	s 72	\$ 73 \$	EZ S	\$ 73	\$ 73	\$ 73	\$ 73	\$ 771	94.33%	\$ 727	2
4	ISP Revenues	(27)	ı		(31)	،	۰	(42)	•	•	(42)	•	•	(142)	94.33%	(134)	4
ŝ	Deferred Cost Amortization (VA Jurisdiction)	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	1,378		1,378	80
9	Depreciation Expense	83	83	89	11	8	16	109	109	109	109	109	109	109 \$ 1,119	94.33%	\$ 1,055	Ś
7	To Remove Baseline O&M															\$ (35)	5)
80	Total Rate Year O&M															\$ 2,991	Ħ

219569966

•

> Appalachian Power Company Case No. PUR-2020-00259 Broadband RAC (BC-RAC) Actual and Projected Costs For the Period May 2020 through November 2021 (in the 0005)

Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base       -       4         Average Jurisdictional Rate Base       -       -       2         Average Jurisdictional Rate Base       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%         Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital       0.77%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%         Financing Costs on Q&M Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Financing Costs on Rate Base       -       -       -       -       -       0         Total 2020 Deferred Financing Costs       -       -       -       -       0       0         Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       -       0         Poperty Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       1         Depreciation Expense       -       -       -       -       -       1       1         Poperty Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       1       1         Depreciation Expense       -       -       -       -       -       1       1         Depreciation Expense       -       -<	Apr-20 May-20 Jun-20	Jul-20	Aug-20	Sep-20	Oct-20	Nov-20	Dec-20	Total
Average Jurisdictional Rate Base       -       2         Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%         Financing Costs on O&M Costs       -       -       -       -       -       2         Financing Costs on O&M Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Financing Costs on Rate Base       -       -       -       -       -       0         Total 2020 Deferred Financing Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       0       0         Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       -       0         Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       -       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       10         SP Revenue       -       -       -       -       -       -       10         SP Revenue       -       -       -       -       -       -       10         SP Revenue       -       -		4 48	78	120	379	702	1,834	
Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%       0.72%         Financing Costs on Q&M Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Financing Costs on Q&M Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Total 2020 Deferred Financing Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       -       0         Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       -       0         Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       -       0         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       1       -       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       1       -       1       -       1       -       1       -       1       -       1       -       1       -       1       -       1       -       1	•	2 26	63	66	250	541	1,268	
Financing Costs on O&M Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Total 2020 Deferred Financing Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Total 2020 Deferred Financing Costs       -       -       -       -       -       0         Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       -       0         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       1       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       1       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       1       1         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       -       1       1         Ital       -       -       -       -       -       -       -	0.72%	.72% 0.72%	0.72%	0.72%	0.72%	0.71%	0.71%	
Financing Costs on Rate Base         -         -         -         -         -         -         0           Total 2020 Deferred Financing Costs         -         -         -         -         -         -         0           Total 2020 Deferred Financing Costs         -         -         -         -         -         -         0           Maintenance & Repair         -         -         -         -         -         -         0           Property Taxes         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         0           Property Taxes         -         -         -         -         -         -         1           Property Taxes         -         -         -         -         -         -         1           Depreciation Expense         -         -         -         -         -         10           SP Revenue         -         -         -         -         -         -         10           Ital         -         -         -         -         -         -         10           Ital         -         -         -         -         -         -								
Total 2020 Deferred Financing Costs         -         -         -         -         -         -         0           Maintenance & Repair         Jan-21         Feb-21         Mar-21         Apr-21         May-21         Jun-21           Maintenance & Repair         -         -         -         -         -         -         6           Property Taxes         -         -         -         -         -         -         6           Property Taxes         -         -         -         -         -         -         6           Property Taxes         -         -         -         -         -         -         1           Depreciation Expense         -         -         -         -         -         1           Depreciation Expense         -         -         -         -         1         1           Total         -         -         -         -         -         1         1           Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%           Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base         2,777         3,909         5,041         7,069	1	0	0	ч	2	4	6	
Jan-21         Feb-21         Mar-21         Apr-21         May-21         Jun-21           Maintenance & Repair         -         -         -         -         -         6           Property Taxes         -         -         -         -         -         1           Depreciation Expense         -         -         -         -         1           Depreciation Expense         -         -         -         -         10           SP Revenue         -         -         -         -         10           Total         -         -         -         -         10           Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%           Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%           Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base         2,777         3,909         5,041         6,362         7,777         9,218           Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base         2,305         3,343         4,475         5,701         7,069         8,497           Pre-fax Weighted Cost of Capital         0,714%         0,713%         0,714%         0,71	•	0	0	-1	2	4	6	16
Maintenance & Repair       -       -       -       -       -       6         Property Taxes       -       -       -       -       -       1         Depreciation Expense       -       -       -       -       1         Depreciation Expense       -       -       -       -       10         ISP Revenue       -       -       -       -       10         ISP Revenue       -       -       -       -       10         If gina Jurisdictional Allocation Factor       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%         Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%         Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%         Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,777       3,909       5,041       6,362       7,777       9,218         Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,303       3,343       4,475       5,701       7,069       8,497         Per-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital       0.714%       0.714%       0.714%       0.714%       0.714%         Inancing Costs on Rate Base       16       2	May-21	in-21 Jul-21	Aug-21	Sep-21	Oct-21	Nov-21		
Property Taxes         -         -         -         -         1           Depreciation Expense         -         -         -         -         -         10           SP Revenue         -         -         -         -         -         -         10           SP Revenue         -         -         -         -         -         10           Total         -         -         -         -         -         -         11           Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%           Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%         94.33%           Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base         2,777         3,909         5,041         6,362         7,777         9,218           Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base         2,305         3,343         4,475         5,701         7,069         8,497           Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital         0.714%         0.714%         0.714%         0.714%         0.714%           Financing Costs on Rate Base         16         24         32         40         50	1 1	6 8	8	14	19	33		
Depreciation Expense         -         -         -         -         10           ISP Revenue         -         -         -         -         -         -         10           ISP Revenue         -         -         -         -         -         -         -         10           ISP Revenue         -         -         -         -         -         -         11           Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor         94.33%         94.37%         9.218         94.75%         9.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%         0.71%	•	1 2	2	'n	4	7		
ISP Revenue       -       -       -       -       -       6)         Total       -       -       -       -       -       11         Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%         Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%         Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%       94.33%         Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation       -       -       -       -       10         Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,777       3,909       5,041       6,362       7,777       9,218         Average Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,305       3,343       4,475       5,701       7,069       8,497         Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital       0.714%       0.714%       0.714%       0.714%       0.714%         Financing Costs on Rate Base       16       24       32       40       50       60	•	10 35	64	103	162	255		
Total         Total         11           Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor         94.33%         94.37%<	,	- (9)	,	(12)	ı	•		
Virginia Jurisdictional Allocation Factor         94.33%         94.35%	•	11 44	73	107	185	294		
Virginia Jurisdictional Total       -       -       -       10         Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,777       3,909       5,041       6,362       7,777       9,218       1         Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,305       3,343       4,475       5,701       7,069       8,497       1         Average Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,305       3,343       4,475       5,701       7,069       8,497       1         Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital       0,713%       0,713%       0,713%       0,713%       0,713%       0,713%         Financing Costs on Rate Base       16       24       32       40       50       60	94.33%	.33% 94.33%	94.33%	94.33%	94.33%	94.33%		
Virginia Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,777       3,909       5,041       6,362       7,777       9,218       1         Average Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,305       3,343       4,475       5,701       7,069       8,497       1         Average Jurisdictional Rate Base       2,305       3,343       4,475       5,701       7,069       8,497       1         Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital       0,71%       0,71%       0,71%       0,71%       0,71%       0,71%         Financing Costs on Rate Base       16       24       32       40       50       60	,	10 42	69	101	174	278		
Average Jurisdictional Rate Base         2,305         3,343         4,475         5,701         7,069         8,497         1           Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital         0.71% <td< td=""><td>רדר,ד</td><td></td><td>12,469</td><td>13,897</td><td>15,315</td><td>16,616</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	רדר,ד		12,469	13,897	15,315	16,616		
Pre-Tax Weighted Cost of Capital         0.71%	7,069	•••	11,656	13,183	14,605	15,965		
Financing Costs on Rate Base 16 24 32 40 50 60	0.71%			0.71%	0.71%	0.71%		
		60 71	83	94	104	113		
32 40 50 70		70 113	152	195	278	391		1,362

1,378

Total 2020 & 2021

> Appalachian Power Company Case No. PUR-2020-00259 Broadband RAC (BC-RAC) Estimated Yearly Revenue Requirements by Class (In the 0005)

			Residential	Small	Medium	General	Large	Sanctuary	Outdoor
Line No.	Year	Total	Service	General Service	General Service	Service	Power Service	Worship Service	Lighting Service
			S	SGS	MGS	GS	LPS	SWS	ы
1	2023	3,894	2,626	227	129	521	281	14	97
2	2024	3,745	2,525	218	124	501	270	13	63
m	2025	3,618	2,439	210	120	484	261	13	96
4	2026	3,499	2,360	204	116	468	253	12	87
5	2027	3,372	2,274	196	112	451	243	12	84
9	2028	3,265	2,202	190	108	437	236	12	81
7	2029	3,181	2,145	185	105	425	230	11	62
80	2030	3,108	2,096	181	103	416	224	11	11
6	2031	3,036	2,047	171	100	406	219	11	76
10	2032	2,953	1,991	172	98	395	213	11	74
11	2033	2,881	1,943	168	95	385	208	10	72
12	2034	2,810	1,895	163	63	376	203	10	70
13	2035	2,739	1,847	159	91	366	198	10	68
14	2036	2,668	1,799	155	88	357	193	10	67
15	2037	2,586	1,744	150	86	346	187	6	64
16	2038	2,516	1,697	146	83	336	182	9	63
17	2039	2,447	1,650	142	81	327	177	6	61
18	2040	2,378	1,603	138	6/	318	172	80	59
19	2041	2,309	1,557	134	76	309	167	89	58
20	2042	2,228	1,502	130	74	298	161	80	56
21	2043	2,160	1,457	126	11	289	156	Ø	54
		COE 13	11 200	3 571	נבת נ	0UC 0	151 1	210	1 630
		さいいてい	000174	4 1710	4,004	0,400	1.1.1	3	>

•

# **Clayton Appendix A**

## Appalachian Power Company Case No. PUR-2020-00259 BC-RAC

## Appendix A

## **Description of the Revenue Requirement Factors**

## **Introduction**

Both Appalachian Power Company's ("Company" or "APCo") and Staff's rate adjustment clause ("BC-RAC") revenue requirements consist of a Projected Cost Recovery Factor ("Projected Factor") and an Actual Cost True-Up Factor ("True-Up Factor").

## **Projected Factor**

The Projected Factor is a forward-looking mechanism that allows the Company to earn a current return on its projected capital investment and rate year operating expenses including amortization expense related to any deferred BC-RAC.

The current return is calculated by multiplying the rate year 13-month average rate base by the overall weighted cost of capital grossed-up for income taxes. The cumulative rate base includes capital expenditures, accumulated depreciation and accumulated deferred income tax.

## True-Up Factor

The True-Up Factor is a mechanism designed to credit to or recover from customers any over/under collection of costs from the most recently completed year. Actual revenues recovered during this period are compared to actual costs incurred during the same period and any difference is credited to or recovered from customers through the True-Up Factor revenue requirement.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The actual costs incurred can include all the costs mentioned in the Projected Factor section above. This proceeding is the first request for recovery of these costs. For that reason, there are no amounts to reconcile, thus no True-Up Factor is being requested in this proceeding.

# **Clayton Appendix B**

## **Clayton Appendix B Table of Contents**

PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatory Responses	
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 03-006	1
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 05-015	2
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 05-016	3
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 05-017	4
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 05-018	5
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 09-029	6
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 09-030	7
PUR-2019-00145 Interrogatory Responses	
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 04-085	8
	8
	8
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 04-085	8 9
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 04-085 PUR-2020-00258 Interrogatory Responses	
Company Response to Staff Interrogatory 04-085 PUR-2020-00258 Interrogatory Responses	

## COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 3 To Appalachian Power Company

## Interrogatory Staff 3-006:

Please refer to the Hearing Examiner's report in Case No. PUR-2019-00145, page 14 and Company witness Perdew's Schedule 46, Section 1, Statement i. Please provide a detailed narrative explaining why the capital investment for the approved pilot scenario (Scenario 1) was estimated to be \$16.7 million in Case No. PUR-2019-00145 and is estimated to be \$27.5 million in the current Application. In addition, please provide a detailed reconciliation between the two estimates along with any relevant supporting documentation.

## Response Staff 3-006:

Please see Staff 3-006 Attachment 1 for a reconciliation between the direct cost estimate provided in Case No. PUR-2019-00145 and the fully loaded cost estimate provided in this case. The original estimate was without contingency and overheads and was based on conceptual estimates such as \$50,000 per mile, electronics at 15% of the total project and pole replacement costs of \$10,000 per mile. The original estimate was also based on a minimum broadband definition of 10/1. The updated estimate, which is based on the recent statutory minimum broadband definition of 25/3, is derived from a more detailed engineering estimate and scope of work and includes contingency and all overheads.

Although each line item varied between the original conceptual estimate and the updated detail estimate, there are three primary contributors to the increase from \$16.7M to \$27.5M:

1) Additional customer terminals required to meet the change in the Unserved definition from 10/1 to 25/3.

2) A revised per-mile pole replacement cost of \$10,000 to \$15,000.

3) Inclusion of contingency and overheads

The foregoing response is made by Kenneth L. Perdew, Dir Broadband Communications, on behalf of Appalachian Power Company.

## COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 5 To Appalachian Power Company

## Interrogatory Staff 5-015:

How does the Company's application, and the projects, rates, and other proposals contained therein, address environmental justice (as defined in the Code of Virginia § 2.2-234)?

## Response Staff 5-015:

The Company's proposed broadband rate adjustment clause would not, if approved, result in negative environmental consequences or perceptible changes to viewshed.

## COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 5 To Appalachian Power Company

## Interrogatory Staff 5-016:

Explain how the Company's capital project authorization processes consider the impacts of its projects on environmental justice.

## Response Staff 5-016:

The Company's capital project authorization processes do not explicitly address environmental justice.

## COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 5 To Appalachian Power Company

## Interrogatory Staff 5-017:

When siting and planning infrastructure work and projects, how does the Company consider the environmental justice ramifications of its decisions?

## Response Staff 5-017:

The Company recognizes the importance of this issue and has convened a working group to review its processes and practices for project siting and outreach as it relates to potential environmental justice impacts. The working group is developing guidance to ensure projects do not disproportionately negatively affect low income and/or underrepresented communities.

#### Clayton Appendix B

## COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 5 To Appalachian Power Company

## Interrogatory Staff 5-018:

Does the Company maintain a database or other repository of information identifying lowincome communities, fenceline communities, and/or communities of color (all as defined in the Code of Virginia § 2.2-234) in its service territory?

Response Staff 5-018:

No.

# COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 9 To Appalachian Power Company

Interrogatory Staff 9-029:

Please refer to the Pre-filed testimony of Company witness Perdew in Case No. PUR-2019-00145, pages 13 and 14. Specifically the following language: "[A]PCo estimates that installing a wireless-based platform that would support the eventual deployment of DACR schemes and AMI meters to all Grayson County customers would require an initial capital investment of \$416,000... In addition to that investment, the Company estimates annual ongoing cellular costs of \$26,400 and annual operation and maintenance (O&M) costs of \$10,400."

Response Staff 9-029:

Yes.

The foregoing response is made by Kenneth L. Perdew, Title: Dir Broadband Communications, on behalf of Appalachian Power Company.

# COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 9 To Appalachian Power Company

# Interrogatory Staff 9-030:

Do the above figures remain the Company's most current estimates for the installation of a wireless-based platform to support Grayson County? If not, please provide updated estimates for the initial capital investment, ongoing cellular costs, and annual operation and maintenance costs.

# Response Staff 9-030:

No, the figures are not current. The installation of a wireless-based platform that would support the eventual deployment of DACR schemes and AMI meters to all Grayson County would require an initial capital investment of approximately \$507,000. The on-going O&M would be approximately \$11,150 per year. The annual cellular cost has not changed.

The foregoing response is made by Kenneth L. Perdew, Title: Dir Broadband Communications, on behalf of Appalachian Power Company.

Clayton Appendix B

### COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2019-00145 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff's Fourth Set To Appalachian Power Company

#### Interrogatory Staff 4-085:

Please reference response to Staff Interrogatory 1-2 which states that the category "Additional Electronics for APCo fiber operations" consists of electronics used to communicate with the Company's AMI/DACR equipment. Please answer the following questions:

- a. Please describe how this equipment is essential toward the goal of providing broadband capacity to underserved areas of the Commonwealth.
- b. Can these electronics be installed at a later date without impacting the Pilot goal?
- c. Please describe equipment to be installed at DACR locations under the Pilot.

#### Response Staff 4-085:

a. While the "Additional Electronics for APCo fiber operations" are not essential to the primary goal of providing middle-mile broadband capacity that will enable GigaBeam to provide Internet service at speeds greater than 10/1 Mbps in unserved areas of Grayson County, it is essential to the secondary goal of using fiber optic cable as the communications platform for the Company's AMI meters and DACR equipment, which will help improve electric reliability in the County. b. Yes, these electronics can be installed at a later date. However, AMI and DACR cannot be installed using fiber optic cable as the communications platform without these additional electronics, and installing them later will likely result in additional costs.

c. While detailed engineering and design has not been completed, the equipment to be installed at DACR locations will likely include carrier Ethernet, fiber based switches, and PON (Passive Optical Network).

The foregoing response is made by Kenneth L. Perdew Jr., Director Broadband Communications, and Thomas J. Johnson, Director Distribution Engineering, on behalf of Appalachian Power Company.

# COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00258 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 2 To Appalachian Power Company

# Interrogatory Staff 2-012:

Please provide a copy of the Company's Environmental Justice policy if such a policy has been adopted.

# Response Staff 2-012:

A policy has not been adopted.

The foregoing response is made by Christian T. Beam, President & COO - Appalachian, on behalf of Appalachian Power Company.

#### Clayton Appendix B

# COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00251 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 3 To Appalachian Power Company

#### Interrogatory Staff 3-017:

When does APCo and/or AEP anticipate having corporate policies regarding environmental justice in place?

# Response Staff 3-017:

The Company has not established a timeline for the development of an environmental justice policy.

The foregoing response is made by William K. Castle, Dir Regulatory Svcs, on behalf of Appalachian Power Company.

PART B

.

# Summary of the Testimony of Turner L. LaBrie

1 My testimony includes the following findings and recommendations regarding the 2021 2 Application of Appalachian Power Company ("APCo" or "Company") for the rate adjustment 3 clause to recover the incremental costs of providing broadband capacity under the Company's 4 broadband capacity pilot project in Grayson County, Virginia ("BC-RAC"): 5

- Staff proposes a 7.183% cost of capital for the period January through November 23, 2020. Staff's proposal incorporates the methodology for the calculation of the cost of long-term debt approved by the Commission in APCo's 2014 biennial review, Case No. PUE-2014-00026.
- 9 10

6

7

8

11

14

15 16

- 12 13
- Staff proposes a 7.074% cost of capital after November 23, 2020. Staff's proposal includes updates to the Company's unamortized balance of the loss on reacquired debt, therefore decreasing the net amount of long-term debt outstanding and increasing the cost of long-term debt. The 7.074% cost of capital is based on the methodology approved by the Commission in the Company's 2020 triennial review, Case No. PUR-2020-00015.

# PREFILED STAFF TESTIMONY OF TURNER L. LABRIE

# APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259

# May 28, 2021

1	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND THE POSITION YOU HOLD WITH THE
2		STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION ("COMMISSION").
3	A.	My name is Turner L. LaBrie. I am a Utility Specialist with the Commission's Division of
4		Utility Accounting and Finance.
5	Q.	PLEASE STATE THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS CASE.
6	А.	My testimony addresses the appropriate December 31, 2019 Appalachian Power Company
7		("APCo" or "Company") capital structure and overall weighted cost of capital for the rate
8		adjustment clause to recover the incremental costs of providing broadband capacity under
9		the Company's broadband capacity pilot project in Grayson County, Virginia ("BC-RAC").
•	~	

10 Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE CAPITAL STRUCTURES AND OVERALL
11 WEIGHTED COSTS OF CAPITAL REFLECTED IN THE COMPANY'S
12 APPLICATION TO SUPPORT ITS REVENUE REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE
13 BC-RAC.

1

- 1 A. As shown in Schedule 8 of the Company's Application, the Company is proposing to use a
  - three-part APCo December 31, 2019 end-of-period capital structure and overall weighted
- 3 cost of capital.

2

8

13

- The first part is used to calculate the cost of capital in 2020 through October. It utilizes the 5.161% cost of long-term debt filed by the Company in Case No. PUR-2020-00015<sup>1</sup>
  ("Triennial Review") and the 9.420% return on equity approved by the Commission in Case No. PUR-2018-00048, resulting in an overall weighted cost of capital of 7.272%.
- The second part is used to calculate the cost of capital in 2020 for November. It utilizes a 4.978% cost of long-term debt based upon Staff's methodology approved in the Triennial Review. Additionally, it utilizes a 9.369% return on equity.<sup>2</sup> The resulting overall weighted overall cost of capital is 7.157%.
- The third part is used to calculate the cost of capital in 2020 for December. It utilizes a
   4.978% cost of long-term debt and the 9.200% return on equity approved by the
   Commission in the Triennial Review.<sup>3</sup> The resulting overall weighted overall cost of
   capital is 7.073%.

# 18 Q. DOES STAFF SUPPORT THE CAPITAL STRUCTURES AND OVERALL

# 19 WEIGHTED COSTS OF CAPITAL PROPOSED BY THE COMPANY?

- 20 A. No. Staff disagrees with the cost of long-term debt that the Company employs in its
- 21 proposed capital structure. In calculating the cost of capital in 2020 through October, the
- 22 Company proposes utilizing the 5.161% cost of long-term debt it proposed in the Triennial
- 23 Review. The Company arrives at its cost of long-term debt by applying each debt series'
- 24 effective interest rate to the corresponding <u>face</u> amount outstanding. This methodology

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Application of Appalachian Power Company, For a 2020 triennial review of its base rates, terms and conditions pursuant to § 56-585.1 of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUR-2020-00015, Doc. Con. Cen. No. 201140127, Final Order (Nov. 24, 2020).

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  This return on equity represents a pro-rated average of the 9.420% return on equity approved by the Commission in Case No. PUR-2018-00048 and the 9.200% return on equity approved by the Commission in the Triennial Review.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Company utilizes the 2.122% cost of short-term debt approved by the Commission in the Triennial Review in all three parts of the capital structure and overall weighted cost of capital.

conflicts with the methodology approved by the Commission in Case No.
 PUE-2014-00026 ("2014 Biennial Review"),<sup>4</sup> by which each debt series' effective interest
 rate is applied to the corresponding <u>net</u> amount outstanding. This same methodology was
 also adopted in APCo's Triennial Review.

Staff proposes a 4.978% cost of long-term debt through November 23, 2020, which
is the day before the Commission issued its Final Order in the Triennial Review. For this
period of time, Staff's position is that the methodology approved by the Commission in the
2014 Biennial Review should be used. Incorporating Staff's cost of long-term debt, Staff
proposes an overall weighted cost of capital of 7.183% through November 23, 2020.

# 10 Q. IS THIS STAFF'S ONLY ISSUE WITH THE COMPANY'S PROPOSED COST OF 11 LONG-TERM DEBT?

A. No, it is not. In its Final Order in the Triennial Review, the Commission approved
 including the unamortized balance of the loss on reacquired debt not refunded in balance
 and cost of long-term debt calculations. The Company included the unamortized balance
 of the loss on reacquired debt not refunded in its proposed balance and cost of long-term
 debt for calculating its cost of capital in 2020 for November and December. However, in
 response to a Staff interrogatory, the Company provided an update to its unamortized
 balance of the loss on reacquired debt not refunded.<sup>5</sup> Staff proposes including the updated

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Application of Appalachian Power Company, For a 2014 biennial review of the rates, terms and conditions for the provision of generation, distribution and transmission services pursuant to § 56-585.1 A of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUE-2014-00026, 2014 S.C.C. Ann. Rept. 392, Final Order (Nov. 26, 2014).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See the Company's response to Staff Interrogatory No. 1-004, attached as Appendix A.

1	balance to calculate the cost of long-term debt after November 23, 2020, which decreases
2	the net amount of long-term debt outstanding and increases the cost of long-term debt
3	slightly from 4.978% to 4.981%. <sup>6</sup> Staff emphasizes that it is only proposing this balance
4	and cost of long-term debt for dates in November including and subsequent to the
5	Commission's Final Order in the Triennial Review. As a result of this update to the balance
6	and cost of long-term debt, Staff proposes an overall weighted cost of capital of 7.074%
7	after November 23, 2020. <sup>7</sup>

# 8 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

9 A. Yes, it does.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> A detailed breakdown of Staff's proposed balances and costs of long-term debt can be found attached as Schedule 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> A detailed breakdown of Staff's proposed capital structure and overall weighted cost of capital can be found in Schedule 1.

#### Appalachian Power Company Capital Structure and Cost of Capital December 31, 2019 Used to Calculate Cost of Capital through November 23, 2020

Component	Amount Outstanding	Weight	Cost Rate	Weighted Cost
Short-Term Debt	\$86,057,727	1.038%	2.122%	0.022%
Long-Term Debt	\$4,033,000,612	48.651%	4.978%	2.422%
Common Equity	\$4,170,633,836	50.311%	9.420% <sup>1</sup>	4.739%
Investment Tax Credits	\$0_	0.000%	N/A	0.000%
Total Capitalization	\$ 8,289,692,175	100.000%		7.183%

# Appalachian Power Company Capital Structure and Cost of Capital December 31, 2019 Used to Calculate Cost of Capital after November 23, 2020

Component	Amount Outstanding	Weight	Cost Rate	Weighted Cost
Short-Term Debt	\$86,057,727	1.038%	2.122%	0.022%
Long-Term Debt	\$4,031,177,250	48.639%	4.981%	2.423%
Common Equity	\$4,170,633,836	50.322%	9.200% <sup>2</sup>	4.630%
Investment Tax Credits	\$0_	0.000%	N/A	0.000%
Total Capitalization	\$ 8,287,868,813	100.000%		7.074%

1. This is the return on equity authorized by the Commission in Case No. PUR-2018-00048.

2. This is the return on equity authorized by the Commission in the Triennial Review, Case No. PUR-2020-00015.

210569966

							December 31, 2019	£							
								NETBALANCE	NETBALANCE	ļ	ļ				
SERUS Serus	BSUE DATE	DUE DATE	AMOUNT	PREMULIOR COMPANY NETBALANCE (DISCOUNT)AT ISSUANCE UNAMORTIZED ISSUANCE EXPENSE OLISOUNTS	COMPANY NETBALANCE ISSUANCE UNAMORTIZED EXPENSE DISCOUNTS		URANDRINGO IBSUANCE EXPERTSE	UNANCH IZZED LOSS ON REACOURED I	UNALIZATIOLO NEI PEI ACCERSE FRETTINE CURRENTO UNTRANCOUNI HEDGE EXPENSES PROCEEDES FRETTINE CURRENTO UNTRANCOG NULLIZED GUNILIZZES ESUMAE ARTIDO COSTINIE CURRENDOLO TATVICADE CONTINIZED	PROCEEDS AT I ISSUANCE	PROCEEDS RATIO	EFFECTIVE COSTRATE	EFFECTIVE CURRENTLY OUTSTANDUNG EFFECTIVE CURRENTLY OUTSTANDUNG COBTRATE OUTSTANDUNG 1227V2019	NET ANOUNT OUTS TANDARS	UNNUALDED COGT
			-			-	-	-	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			*	-	-	-
Serie Nors															
3,400%	SHAZONS	81/202	00000000	(1001980/1)	2,312,703		1,220,622,1			200,000,200	20103	NST		800, 100, 100	107,002,001
4,400%	56/2014	MOSSUS	300,000,000	0072302	211,078,2	(1555,751)	2,410,005			COLUMN NO.	15.00	5	000/000/000	205,601,154	005/CZ/T1
4.460K	5102/91/5	61/2045	000/000/095	005'025'2	67, <u>1</u> 72, 163	0,136,074	780,146,5	79,705,749		10710500	н.н.	6.674	000'000'095	266,215,660	12,700,257
4.600%	1102/52/6	1002/06/C	000'000'000	(DOC SUB)	(209'195'Q	(528(11)	247,560		1,782,662	2021/1239/2500	102.15	Ą	100/000/091	300,036	15, 134, 055
XU075	9002-62-6	1011203	2000000	0000051)	(111,400)	(802,538)	1,218,568			245-11-465	QV'00	292	2000000	247,786,723	19 HE
NUSIT	222200	SYSTOC	000000	(C) (C)	8,720,506	(000°201)	001'000	2,004,578	(1977)	190,847,002	<b>8</b> .42	1927	200,000,000	100,000,178	99670272
1315×1	\$00E.01/7	900747	000/000/082	005/20	(172,632,0	212,013	1,228,013		3,155,755	252,802,071	101.12	5	000'000'032	00/212192	15,000,015
6,70%	1000/11-8	0002514	200,000,022	(05'39	10,000		102,812,1			247,500,159	<b>X</b> 99	5778	2000000	248,587,105	18,843,110
N0071	902VS/A	11/2028	20010000	0000001	9/1/22/0	(1,568,310)	2,001,157		(NOC.708/2)	400 400 KD4	64°18	87.2	00000000	<b>60, 60 (16</b>	36.477,609
2004	211/2017		325(00)000	(1/867,500)	2,648,080	(1,218,150)	907/061			320,554,440	19 FB	5975	000000	510'009'120	11 12 50
4.500% Budding	SIDZAK			(T) (T)	3,558,701		4,047,248			SIL'EST'ON'S	28	Į	00010001547FE	3,261 228,702	150,161,151
Lord Bart Term Lots															
20005	<b>GHUCHB</b>	and an	110000 ST							THE SOUTH A	88	ant 1	100 mm Mrs	LAC SON FCI	1000
Subtract			12,000,000				1000		••	124,488,164		1	15.00.00	124,566,961	3620,463
Sated essenanck of Property.															
136%	9001/24	SUCCES	2,559,040							2,558,040	0000	13,670	2,070,5	795,070,5	E10,832
BIOTH		••	2,469,040							2,558,040			14CTOVOTZ	20/0347	250,013
instalment Pur citose Corte acta															
Mason Courty WV =5 other L															
2.722%	810271-01	1011202			229 800		045,095			802,100,68	67.08	2,912	100,000,001	03/609/60	2200025
WV EDA SWDFRRB Mortainoe Project - Señse 2008A															
1,600%	SHOCKELA	21/200	0001000152		92219-2		8	347.242		10/152714	10 98	1,000	1000000	14,400,004	24/1521
WV EDA SWDFRRB Mourtaineer Prejoct - Series 20088											1	ļ			1
1.//% WV EDA PCRRB Anna Praject - 8 adras 2010A		0177A.P	meric		5		192	120,054				8			
*4005	0102481/5	12/1/2008	2010001000		197,000		100			01/02/05	8	5,405	007000705	1111150	2,708,170
Russell Courty Va&erics K															
	0:07/71/2	10000			22/122		500°	90 A		2// 438591	5	19		17,410,200	2201 1222
WV EDA PCRRB Anna Project - Schen 2014															
uni Fila DCBBB Anna Brilini - Radon 2014					8/2/914		8778				1				
	011010	and the	www.							111 TT 11	8	3000	m mm m	at as w	7.000 ET
WV EDA PCRRB Anton Parject - Socies 2008A															
2.60%	81025149	6112022	51,375,000		245,007		26,794	277,485		101,000,000	99798	1001	000507165	51/1000/05	1,000,188
WV EDA PCRRB Amos Padject - Series 2008															
2.ECM	215/2018	2027/149	201000000 201000000		NZNEL		000 <b>%22</b>	80) <b>,</b> 02	••	BAT YOR OF	5	591	0000000 00000000	101101508	200700-11
Builar cold multiplion of Costs A succipited with UnitArticled Detk R externitions	Rodenspillers														1903
TOTAL LONG-TE RM DE 87 E Rinchen Cost of Long-Term Debt									••	125120101		••	/reforences/	4,000,000,512	201/14.025 401814
														n	

Eutrit Ha.\_\_\_\_ Wittens Laikin Schenilo 2

Apptication Power Company Cost of Lang-Term Decisi & aught Howam Dar 73, 2029 December 31, 2019

							NETBALANCE	NETBALANCE	NETBALANCE						
			PRINCIPAL	PRENCUM OR	COUPANY	COMPANY NETBALANCE	•	UNA NORTIZED LOSS	UNAMORTIZE D	NET	KET			NETAMOUNT	
010000		100	ANDUNT	PECOUNTAT ISSUANCE	EVDENCE	UNAMORTIZED	ISSUANCE EVDENCE	ON REACOURED	CH REACOURED HEDGE EXPENSES PROCEEDS AT PROCEEDS EFECTIVE CURRENTLY DEAT DAILINGERS RESIDENCE BATTO FORTPATE DIRECTION	PROCEEDS AT	PROCEEDS	EFECTIVE		OUTSTANDING ANNUAUZED	ANNUALIZED
04000			-			-			-				-		
Series Nates			•	•	,	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	,
14004	SILVAUS	5002749	000000000	(1,005,000	02/21/22	CONTROL	120.002			708,522,287	1980	355	200,000,000	206,100,325	10,558,701
1,400	10205	STISTOM	200/000/000	0002000	2.972,672	(152,200,1)	2410,005			224,140,142	15,89	5	200,000,000	200,001,104	900(200'01
(100)	2102015	Bruzbes	300,000,000	00500512	87,572,163	0,139,674)	797, 149.5	79,745,749		702,702,002	57	6.674	350,000,000	266,715,960	182,007,11
4.0004	11005276	LZZCOCK	350,000,000	(US SUB	005/05/0	(10011211)	31,50		2017061	00°143190	102,18	Ŗ	200(000)035	300,651,245	15,104,000
5,800%	8125528	SUDEVICE	2000000	000/00511	(038-1117)	(a)X <sup>2</sup> 009	1,219,508			248,511,465	9 8	5.842	2000000	201,000,005	14,478,452
6.600%	55/203	5157200	200/000/002	(0007224)	A.720,006	(107,187)	844,400	2,004,538	(A) (A)	100,847,092	0-79 99	629	200/000/00X	100,520,170	12,300,606
0.277K	2002/01/2	11/2008	20,000,000		(125,002,0)	(216,011)	1,228,013		3155,725	10000022	JUL 12	5	250,000,000	00//15/152	15,623,615
6.700%	1002/11/8	Bris 200	20000000	005721	2,346,344	(100) 100)	1,376,207			247,509,156	<b>M</b> 088	679	2001000/052	201,102,001	16,843,110
%0007L	225/202	800E/N#	200/000/005	0,0000	8/11/122/6	(01519951J	2,001,157		(n02'008'0	NC31708/102	87/16	9927.1	000'000'005	001 'COV'200	35,477,558
2.00%	21122112	1002749	125,000,000	(1,007,700)	2,648,080	(1,218,150)	1,947,628			017 HOLOZE	50° 50	192	125,000,000	2010000120	11,125,504
4 500% Sutering	6102/345	31/200	3475,000,000	0,736,033	102,000,00	(000)000)Z	4,047,248		• -	STI MOLOFIC	8	ŝ,	400,000,000 3,475,000,000	30,200,732 3,361,228,700	18,082,240 180,887,467
Local Back Term Local															
2000%	845/2018	85/2022	125,000,000		201,015		10,01			124,468,184	09780	3.106	125,000,000	124,586,289	3,620,163
Subtract		••	125(000,000							124,400,184			125,000,000	124,566,383	3,520,163
A MARIA SAMANANI A PLANELA 13 A Mari	RUTHOOR	BUTTAR	10000							19000	um.	13 620	712-11211 C	2 (12)1 14.7	
													Turn mine	The mark	CHU UAL
		•	a company	_								•	a when service		
testilment Purchne Contracts															
Mason Courty WV & S aries L															
2.750N	BIOZULOI	CONZULA	100,000,001		608,623		300,370			25710733	9	21912	100(000)001	003/803/33	2800825
WV EDA SWORRB Mountainner Pageci - Settes 2008							1				200				
1.0005 WV E.DA B.WDFRRB Mourtainner Project - Series 2008											i				
	3102016	201208	202772,000		1001115		ER OZ	180,054		6051017.GA	99799	9091	50,275,000	49,052,140	216,555
WV EDA PCRRB Arros Project - Series 2010A															
	0102.61.5	10070421	200000		50,000		53 ES			52/02F0	8	8		121112/08	2,709,170
	0102/11/6	10000111	17,500,000				41,000	21,020		16,966,776	99198	197	17,500,000	17,416,205	100
WV EDA PCRRB Arros Preject - Series 2011A															
1,700%,1	81/2016	0002/148	65,350,000		418,278		82,23			22/02519	90'78	1,000	000/090/199	100,787,774	1,218,275
WV EDA PCRRB Arros Parjast - Sadas 2015A															
2.500% MAY BY BY DEDDB Amme Device - Carles 2000	6LCD14	NOTICI VA	0001000198		195,352		477,828			529'HTH'523	8798	2,000	66,000,000	211,222,38	228,000
WV EUA FUIRIG AIRE FRIGA - 0000 0000								ł							- 100
2.000% WV EDA PCRRB Arros Project - Series 20088	8107/SL/6		00057746					117			2			er/mane	
2.KD%	8102515	647202	autorius autorius		nznei		228/020	20,100		82,868,786 S40,868,259	592	eg.	201000000 248,500,000	48,516,874 545,105,092	1, 402,002 15,200,402
فشعادها استشتناها ماركمته فعمرتكم سلته للتعليا ماملا لأمطا ولملا وطعارتهم	Redenzácia													(255°52°1)	12,014
TOTAL LONG-TERN DEBT									-	4010201280		•	112022031.1	027/11/1001	20,774,925
Ethective Cost of Long-Term Dool									-			•			4,981%

# ApptAction Power Company Cost of Long-Term Data dates November 23, 2020 Decomber 31, 2019

# COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION APPLICATION OF APPALACHIAN POWER COMPANY SCC CASE NO. PUR-2020-00259 Interrogatories and Requests for the Production of Documents by the STAFF OF THE STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION Staff Set 1 To Appalachian Power Company

# Interrogatory Staff 1-004:

Please provide the unamortized balance of the loss on reacquired debt associated with unrefunded debt redemptions as of December 31, 2019, and the annual amortization amount as of December 31, 2019. Include supporting dollar amounts by issue.

# Response Staff 1-004:

Please see attached Staff 1-004 Attachment 1, which contains the balance of the loss on reacquired debt associated with unrefunded debt redemptions as of December 31, 2019, and the annual amortization amount as of December 31, 2019.

The foregoing response is made by Jason M. Yoder, Dir Regulatory Acctg Svcs, on behalf of Appalachian Power Company.

Case No.: PUR-2020-00259 Question Staff 1 - 004 Attachment 1 Page: 1 of 1		16,434.00 71,214.00	84,865.50 367,750.50		1,162.00	257.22 235.78	497.22 455.78					27,930.00 51,205.00	16,802.00	34,769.88 170,952.12	44,658.36 122,810.64		24,687.48 67,890.52	26,301.00 129,313.00	21,789.60 59,921.40	13,061.88 35,920.12		725.88 1,996.12	3,623.76 9,965.24	6,458.43	27,782.00	28,278.00 454,804.91	16,748.64 269,373.36			
Ca Q	2018 Y/E Balance 2019 Amortization	87,648.00 16,	452,616.00 84,		1,162.00 1,	493.00	953.00					79,135.00 27,	16,802.00 16,	205,722.00 34,	-		92,578.00 24,	155,614.00 26,	81,711.00 21,			2,722.00		6,458.43 6,	27,782.00 27,	483,082.91 28,	286,122.00 16,			
	Date/Maturity Date Call Date 7 FMB 1890001	2003-07-01 1993-11-29	2024-05-01 2004-05-03	2017-02-01 1994-03-25	2019-11-01 1993-05-01	2020-12-01 1994-03-25	2020-12-01 1996-03-31	1997-09-01 1987-03-01	1990-04-01 1987-04-01	1991-04-01 1987-04-01	IPC_1890002	2021-11-01 2012-02-13	2019-06-01 2004-01-12	2024-12-01 2013-02-13	2022-10-01 2003-06-07		2022-06-01 2003-06-07	2014-01-01 2000-01-13	2009-06-01 1992-12-01	2008-07-01 1992-08-01		1993-02-01 1991-02-01	2001-02-01 1991-02-01	2019-05-01 2008-09-18	2019-06-01 2008-09-18	2037-05-01 2008-06-06	2036-02-01 2008-06-10			
	Date Issued Date	1973-07-01	1993-11-09	1987-02-01	1989-11-01	1990-12-01	1990-12-01	1987-09-01	1982-04-01	1987-09-01		1998-10-22	1993-09-01	1899-12-01	1992-09-15	1977-10-01	1992-05-15	1990-01-01	1979-06-01	1978-07-01	1990-10-15	1981-02-01	1981-02-01	2003-11-25	2003-12-11	2007-05-23	2006-02-14			
	Bond Interest Rate	8.125%	7.125%	8.750%	9.125%	9.875%	9.875%	12.500%	16.250%	16.250%		5.000%	5.450%	6.050%	6.600%	6.750%	6.850%	7.400%	7.500%	7.750%	7.875%	11.000%	11.500%	Auction Mode	Auction Mode	Auction Mode	Auction Mode		Annual Amortization	
	Series											Sarles H	Sortes D	Series K	Series J	Serics B	Sories I	Series G	Series B	Sertes A	Serles H	Serias C	Series C	Series E	Series F	Series 2007A	Series 2008A		Annal	

Į,

210560066