Review of Power Supply Studies
Definitions

• MISO – Mid-Continent Independent System Operator
• Capacity Cost – Fixed cost associated with ownership of a generating asset. (Like a car payment.)
• Energy Cost – Fuel and variable operation and maintenance associated with the generation plant. (Like gasoline, oil, etc.)
• Heat rate – fuel efficiency metric measured in BTU/kWh (British Thermal Units per kilo-Watthour...Like miles/gallon).
• Balancing Authority (BA) – the entity responsible for matching the electrical demand with generation in real-time.
• Pseudo Transmission Tie – a transmission connection point that is not physically tied to the generating area source (Like an indirect MLGW connection to MISO through TVA’s transmission system).
ICF – Nuclear Development Study

• Looks at Power Purchase Agreement for output of Bellefonte Nuclear Plant with MISO Integration
• Partial transmission analysis included
• Best scenario: MLGW joins MISO and purchases Bellefonte 1 power using Physical Hedging to cover incremental power needs
• Net Savings: $7.9 Billion over 20 years (2024-2043)
ICF – Nuclear Development Study (cont.)

• Why? The study was written for the FLH Company as noted on cover of the study.

• Study primarily centered around a “mothballed” nuclear site.

• The Bellefonte nuclear units site is located in Hollywood, Alabama.
• Background information on Bellefonte
  – TVA began construction on two units began around 1975 with initial plans for up to four units.
  – Units 1 and 2 were designed to be approximately 1350 MW (MLGW’s peak load is around 3200 MW) and were partially constructed.
  – Meaningful construction was halted around 1988 after more than $6 billion of investment.

“The agency's decision was noteworthy mostly for coming so late; in the mid-1980’s, investor-owned utilities and government power agencies abandoned about 100 nuclear reactors in various stages of construction after spending about $30 billion on their construction. Most acted in response to pressure from shareholders or state regulators, but the T.V.A., as a Federal agency, is answerable to neither.”

Snippet from a NY Times Article December 13, 1994
Nuclear Resurrection???

• Nuclear power plants have very high initial capital costs
  – Most recent Lazard capital cost estimate range is $6,500 to $12,250 per kW.
  – So in today’s dollars, 1 Bellefonte unit would cost $16.5 billion on the high end

• Nuclear power plants have very low fuel costs
  – Uranium 235 cost is around $0.85 per MMBTU which at a heat rate of 10,250 BTU/kWh is $0.0089/kWh

• Currently the Levelized Cost of Energy (LCOE) of nuclear is much higher than alternatives.

• The price used for the study is $39/MWh (or 3.9 cents/kwh).

• Lazard LCOE 12.0, nuclear all-in range is $112 to $189/MWh (or 11.2 to 18.9 cents/kwh) if built overnight today.
In November 2016, FLH Company won a TVA bid auction for the Bellefonte nuclear plant and had two years to consummate the sale.

The actual sales transaction is currently in court proceedings.

If the sale is finalized FLH Company would finish out Unit 1 within 5 to 6 years and Unit 2 sometime in the future.

The plant has been sitting idle for about 45 years.
Scenarios Presented

- Option 1 - TVA BA, Bellefonte + PartReq
- Option 2A - MISO BA, Hedge
- Option 2B - MISO BA, Spot (or Market Price)
- Option 3A MLGW BA, Hedge
- Option 3B - MLGW BA, Spot

Each option was priced out 20 years and then compared to a “Business As Usual” case.

The “Business As Usual” case represented TVA’s wholesale rate level increased at about 2% per year for the 20 year period beginning in 2024.
## Savings Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Levelized Annual Savings in Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: TVA BA, Bellefonte + PartReq</td>
<td>$374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2A: MISO BA, Hedge</td>
<td>$384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2B: MISO BA, Spot</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3A: MLGW BA, Hedge</td>
<td>$254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3B: MLGW BA, Spot</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Option 2A includes:**
  - a PPA with Bellefonte for 20 years,
  - Transmission service with TVA for Bellefonte,
  - MLGW builds transmission lines to interconnect with MISO and secures transmission rights through MISO,
  - Buys or Contracts with existing power plants in MISO for the incremental power needs (physical hedge against buying in spot market)
Transmission line construction

Nevertheless, MLGW may still want to build its own physical connections with MISO for various reasons. For example, as will be discussed further in Chapter 10, it is more economic than paying the transmission charges that TVA and MISO can impose on MLGW for using their transmission lines. Moreover, the capacity of the existing TVA-MISO may be less sufficient for meeting MLGW’s load growth from a long-run perspective. In this case, MLGW can consider building a single-circuit loop in parallel to the existing one as shown in Exhibit 36 below.

Exhibit 36. Representation of 500kV Network with Additional Single Circuit

ICF estimated the cost to build and operate such single-circuit loop using NREL’s JEDI Transmission Line Model as listed in Exhibit 37.

Exhibit 37. New Lines to be constructed for Single-Circuit Direct MLGW Connectivity with MISO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From Bus</th>
<th>To Bus</th>
<th>Voltage (kV)</th>
<th>Length (mile)</th>
<th># of Circuits</th>
<th>Capital Cost (million 2018$)</th>
<th>Annual O&amp;M Costs (million 2018$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>West Memphis</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeport</td>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>78.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>400.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1.28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ICF using data from PowerWorld and Ventyx
Issues for Consideration

• Significant risk of having a significant portion of supply tied up in 1 unit.
• Economics of $39/MWh seem too good to be valid for 20 years.
• Timing of giving notice to TVA and having a plant ready and transmission lines constructed.
• Securing transmission rights with TVA.
• No risk and sensitivity analysis performed around PPA prices, financial parameters, unit availability, load forecast.
• The entire focus of study assumes Bellefonte is resurrected, always works and the price is $39/MWh (and it assumes TVA’s price increases 2%/year every year).
• Analysis of Power Purchase Agreement for output of Bellefonte Nuclear Plant with and without MLGW – MISO integration
• Assumption of Bellefonte Unit at $39/MWh for 20 years.
• 4 scenarios analyzed
• No detailed transmission deliverability analysis
• Most economic scenario: MLGW is its own Balancing Authority pseudo-tied to MISO with MISO Purchases Only
• Identified Savings: $417.8 MM for 1 year (2022)
• Recommendations: MLGW develops a complete Integrated Resource Plan (IRP)
Evaluation of Power Supply Alternatives

• Study Objective: Evaluate long-term power supply alternatives including Nuclear Development – Bellefonte Project Power Purchase Agreement
• Cost of Energy-only modeled
• Evaluate MLGW as both stand-alone and integrated into MISO
• 2022 Study Year
• Include 15% renewable (wind) portfolio
• Compare to current TVA wholesale power agreement – NOTE THAT STUDY DID NOT INCLUDE VALUE/COST OF CAPACITY OR COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ANY NEW DEBT SERVICE
Energy Methodology & Assumptions

• Utilized a large footprint (excludes Florida, New England, NE Canada, and Saskatchewan) containing load, generation, and nodal modeling (substation level analysis)

• The analysis used PROMOD IV (program used for modeling) production cost software and the latest MISO database for the Calendar Year of 2022

• Captures unit generation, transmission congestion, and load costs. Does not include capacity costs/value

• TVA Business-As-Usual Case represents continuation of current wholesale power agreement that includes capacity costs. PROMOD results for TVA fleet include production costs only (fuel + operations & maintenance)
Energy Methodology & Assumptions (cont.)

- **Scenario A: MLGW as its own Balancing Authority (BA) w/ Bellefonte**
  - Bellefonte is delivered to MLGW via Firm Point-to-Point (PtP) Transmission
  - MLGW holds Firm PtP to MISO for peak load (loss of Bellefonte)

- **Scenario B: MLGW as its own BA w/ Bellefonte and MLGW self-build resources**
  - Bellefonte is delivered to MLGW via Firm PtP Transmission
  - MLGW holds hourly non-Firm service to and from MISO for sales and purchases

- **Scenario C: MLGW in MISO w/ Bellefonte**
  - Bellefonte is delivered to MISO via Firm Point to Point (PtP) Transmission
  - MLGW holds Firm PtP to MISO for peak load (Pseudo-Tie and loss of Bellefonte)

- **Scenario D: MLGW in MISO w/o Bellefonte**
  - MLGW holds Firm PtP to MISO for peak load (Pseudo-Tie)
  - Procures all energy from MISO
  - No hedging
Summary of Scenarios

Scenario Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>No Wind</th>
<th>Wind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TVA WPA (2017)</td>
<td>[VALUE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario D</td>
<td>[CELLRANGE]</td>
<td>[CELLRANGE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>[CELLRANGE]</td>
<td>[CELLRANGE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>[CELLRANGE]</td>
<td>[CELLRANGE]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>[CELLRANGE]</td>
<td>[CELLRANGE]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TVA’s “All-In” cost to serve MLGW...Scenarios do not include all costs to serve MLGW. These costs would be higher if all costs were included.
Summary

• Bellefonte costs are well above market energy prices under modeled gas prices. Comparison of MISO scenarios (D minus C) shows a (\$200MM) differential owning Bellefonte in MISO vs MISO-only. Bellefonte and TVA provide a capacity benefit.

• New, efficient thermal generation provides hedges against market prices, and should provide energy margins to offset load costs, but requires capital.

• Purchasing strictly from the market provides opportunities for low-cost power, but provides no protection from scarcity energy pricing. Capacity can be procured from the MISO market but prices fluctuate annually.
Bellefonte Project Risks

Issues associated with Bellefonte Project viability

• Framatome’s (French nuclear reactor construction engineering company) technical expertise with this reactor design

• Many original equipment vendors no longer in existence requiring reverse engineering of components

• Lack of a detailed engineering analysis of the existing plant systems and equipment

• Use of Maximum Guaranteed Price (MGP) contracts with penalties assessed to the contractors for schedule delays may be unrealistic

• Progressing from fuel load to commercial operation in three months may be unrealistic

• Ability to hire and train operators and development of a plant simulator may be problematic
GDS Recommendations

• Obtain data from TVA on the incremental cost of capacity, energy, transmission, and ancillary services required to serve MLGW

• Conduct a “discovery session” with MISO

• Identify transmission transfer limitations with TVA and MISO

• Page 45: “It is GDS’ recommendation that MLGW proceed with developing a complete Integrated Resource Plan which would enumerate cost of owning and operating various resource portfolios over a 20 year study period. MLGW, on a net present value basis, would identify the most cost effective resource portfolio to meet its total capacity and energy requirements on a reliable basis.”
The Brattle Group (Friends of the Earth)

• Analysis of MLGW purchasing renewable portfolio with MISO Integration

• 6 alternatives analyzed – 3 short-term, 3 long-term

• No transmission analysis

• Most economic alternative: “Cost-Minimizing Local” – development of gas-fired combined-cycle and combustion turbine units, and development of locally available utility-scale and distributed solar PV resources

• Identified Savings: $333 MM per year (2024)

• Recommendations: MLGW ends contract with TVA and constructs a portfolio of renewables, battery storage, and natural gas powered energy

6/6/2019

Power Supply Advisory Team
Background

• Study was performed for the organization named Friends of the Earth.

• Friends of the Earth U.S. is a non-governmental environmental organization headquartered in Washington, D.C.
Scenarios modeled

• Essentially six portfolios were modeled

• The portfolios focused on construction of local generation comprised of natural gas fueled generation, significant solar generation combined with battery storage technology and energy efficiency and demand response.

• None of the options modeled included construction of new transmission to MISO and continuously cited transmission access as a significant issue throughout the study.

• MLGW as an “island” scenario.
Portfolio modeled in 2024

2024

(a): Capacity in 2024 Alternative Supply Portfolios
(b): Costs for 2024 Alternative Supply Portfolios

• These 3 nearer term portfolios have lower renewables proposed.
Portfolio modeled in 2050

- These 2 longer term portfolios have a high concentration of renewables proposed in a movement away from natural gas.
Summary

• The Brattle study identifies a range of savings between $240 to $333 million per year relative to TVA.

• The portfolios modeled are heavily dependent on local generation build which generates significant stand-alone risk.

• The portfolios are geared toward renewable sources
  – 3 to 26% in the near-term portfolios
  – 89 to 100% in the long-term portfolios
“The purpose of this analysis is to determine if MLGW should consider self-supplying its electricity needs or stay with its all-requirements deal with TVA”

22 power supply portfolios were analyzed

No transmission analysis included

Most economic portfolio:
- 7% MISO
- 51% 1,000 MW Market Purchase
- 13% 900 MW Combined Cycle
- 25% 1,000 MW Solar + 500 MW Wind
- 4% 650 MW Quick Start Peaking

Identified savings: $9.2 Billion over 15 years (2024-2038)

Recommendations: obtain a full cost-benefit analysis from MISO, and conduct a formal RFP for developers to provide baseload power to MLGW
Self Supply Rate vs Expected TVA Rate

Self-Supply Rate Vs. Expected TVA Rate

Total Expected Savings = $9.2 Billion

- Expected Self-Supply Rate
- Forecasted TVA Rate
- TVA Rate at 1% Increase
- TVA Rate at 5% Increase
ACES modeled 22 portfolios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Number</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Renewable Goal</th>
<th>Market Exposure/Risk</th>
<th>15-Year NPV of Costs</th>
<th>NPV Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TVA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$10,427,871,355</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>All Market</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$5,748,866,025</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>First Take - Baseload + Intermediate + Solar Scenario</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$5,849,428,187</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low Fixed Cost Scenario</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$5,377,285,452</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>All Combined Cycle Scenario</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$6,145,174,272</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Distressed Asset Scenario</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$5,567,146,480</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>High Capacity Exposure Scenario</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$5,810,001,439</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Iteration 1 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + Renewables</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>$5,699,249,229</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Iteration 2 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + Renewables</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,972,168,718</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Iteration 3 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + Renewables</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,948,199,037</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Iteration 4 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + Renewables</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,906,058,122</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Combined Cycle + Renewables</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$6,035,756,402</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Combined Cycle + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$5,950,879,522</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Iteration 1 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,944,543,048</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Iteration 2 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,935,484,964</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Iteration 3 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,952,162,537</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Iteration 4 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,946,840,460</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Iteration 5 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,220,012,858</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Iteration 6 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$5,831,855,159</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Iteration 7 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$5,899,413,757</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Iteration 8 - Combined Cycle + Peaking + High Renewables</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$5,901,439,780</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Final Sample Portfolio</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$5,900,030,101</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example Self-Supply Scenario

- This was portfolio #22 and was used as the focus of the majority of the report.
- The report walked through the building of the portfolio and elaborated on each step.
- In this example, MLGW would build about 1550 MW of generation assets.
Summary

• Strategy of focus involved joining the MISO market along with layered hedges through purchases and building of resources.

• A step by step outline of each portfolio layer is discussed in detail in the study.

• This portfolio projected to save $9.2 billion over a 15 year period, an average of $613 million per year.

• Many “if needed” comments in scenario.
ACES Recommendations

• Contact MISO to assist the process by completing an assessment of the impact of joining the market, including details regarding transmission (if any??) to integrate into MISO.

• Conduct an RFP to determine the availability and cost of the baseload of 1,000 MW supply.

• Determine the skills MLGW needs to acquire or outsource, and how MLGW’s business would change when joining MISO.
## Review of Studies Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>ICF</th>
<th>ACES</th>
<th>Brattle</th>
<th>GDS</th>
<th>IRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 year load forecasting</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission analysis</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 year Present Value (PV) of revenue requirements</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk evaluation (i.e. fuel price volatility, carbon taxes, electric demand)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public involvement throughout process</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate current and future staffing requirements</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business or special interest led analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario and sensitivity analysis to ensure least-cost supply option</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review of Studies Conclusions (cont.)

• None of the studies were a comprehensive analysis of all the issues related to MLGW’s power supply.

• All of the studies are indicative that potential savings may be possible (by generally assuming annual TVA price increases).

• The IRP process is intended to identify potential power supply options and to comprehensively examine the associated opportunities and risks.