



THE ELECTRIC COMPANY

KANSAS GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

GLENN L. KOESTER
VICE PRESIDENT-OPERATIONS

September 11, 1979

Mr. Argil Toalston, Chief
Power Supply Analysis Section
Antitrust and Indemnity Group
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Re: Docket No. STN 50-482
Kansas Gas and Electric Company
Wolf Creek Generating Station,
Unit No. 1

Dear Mr. Toalston:

In connection with the Application for Amendment of Construction Permit No. CPPR-147 filed with the Commission on July 30, 1979, we submit the enclosed information concerning Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. pursuant to Appendix L of 10 CFR, Part 50.

Yours very truly,

Glenn L. Koester

GLK:bb
Attach 5 Cys

2999
SE
1/1
ADD: L E
OELD 1 1

952102

790 9170214

Question No. 1:

State separately for hydroelectric and thermal generating resources applicant's most recent peak load and dependable capacity for the same time period. State applicant's dependable capacity at time of system peak for each of the next 10 years for which information is available. Identify each new unit or resource. For hydroelectric generating capacity, indicate the number of kilowatt-hours of use associated with each kilowatt of capacity during the "adverse water year" upon which dependable capacity is based. Indicate average annual kilowatt-hour loads per kilowatt, associated with each system peak shown (exclusive of interchange arrangements).

Answer No. 1:

At the present time, KEPCo has no hydroelectric or thermal generating resources. However, KEPCo has contracted to purchase 90 megawatts of hydroelectric peaking power from the Southwestern Power Administration (SPA). Thirty megawatts of this power will become available to KEPCo on July 1, 1980, while 60 megawatts are contingent on the date of commercial operation of power production of the Truman Dam in Missouri. This hydro-electric power resource is guaranteed to provide 1200 kilowatt hours per kilowatt annually and reserves for this resource will be supplied by the SPA. In addition, KEPCo has negotiated for the purchase of 17%, or 195.5 megawatts of power capacity in the Wolf Creek Nuclear Plant near Burlington, Kansas. KEPCo is in the process of completing arrangements for the purchase of reserve power and energy when the Wolf Creek unit is out of service or if it should become derated. Consequently, the 195.5 megawatts of nuclear power capacity will be firm power. At this date, KEPCo has not made a commitment for ownership of additional capacity in the next 10 years. Supplemental power and energy that KEPCo will require to supply its members needs will be purchased by KEPCo from the overlying investor owned utilities that currently sell power to KEPCo's Members. These companies include: Kansas City Power and Light Company (KCPL), headquartered in Kansas City, Missouri; Kansas Gas and Electric Company (KG&E, headquartered in Wichita, Kansas; Kansas Power and Light Company (KPL), headquartered in

Topeka, Kansas; Western Power Division of Central Telephone and Utilities (CTU), headquartered in Great Bend, Kansas; and the Empire District Electric Company (Empire), headquartered in Joplin, Missouri.

Information on KEPCo's projected peak loads is contained in the response to Question 2.

Question No. 2:

State applicant's estimated annual load growth for each of the next 20 years or for the period applicant utilizes in system planning. Indicate growth both in kilowatt requirements and kilowatt-hour requirements.

Answer No. 2:

Applicant's system planning currently extends through the year 1995.

Estimated peak loads and kilowatt-hour requirements through that date are:

Peak Loads

<u>Year</u>	<u>Peak Load</u>	<u>Annual Increase</u>	
	<u>MW</u>	<u>MW</u>	<u>%</u>
1980	484.2		
1981	515.4	31.2	6.4
1982	548.4	33.0	6.4
1983	583.8	35.4	6.5
1984	621.3	37.5	6.4
1985	661.5	40.2	6.5
1986	702.4	40.9	6.2
1987	745.9	43.5	6.2
1988	792.1	46.2	6.2
1989	841.4	49.3	6.2
1990	893.8	52.4	6.2
1991	949.7	55.9	6.3
1992	1,009.7	60.0	6.3
1993	1,072.3	62.6	6.2
1994	1,139.6	67.3	6.3
1995	1,211.3	71.7	6.3

<u>Year</u>	<u>Input to System</u>	<u>Annual Increase</u>	
	<u>(million kWh)</u>	<u>(millions kWh)</u>	<u>%</u>
1980	2,020.3		
1981	2,157.6	137.3	6.8
1982	2,305.1	147.5	6.8
1983	2,463.0	157.9	6.8
1984	2,632.8	169.8	6.9
1985	2,814.8	182.0	6.9
1986	2,983.4	168.6	6.0
1987	3,162.3	178.9	6.0
1988	3,352.1	189.8	6.0
1989	3,553.5	201.4	6.0
1990	3,767.5	214.0	6.0
1991	3,994.7	227.2	6.0
1992	4,235.7	241.0	6.0
1993	4,491.6	255.9	6.0
1994	4,763.3	271.7	6.0
1995	5,052.0	288.7	6.0

352195

State estimated annual load growth in kilowatts and kilowatt-hours of companies or pools upon which the economic justification of the subject unit is based for each of the next 20 years or for the period applicant utilizes in system planning. Identify each company or pool member.

Answer No. 3:

Economic justification of the Wolf Creek Generating Station No. 1 is based on the load growth of KG&E, KCPL, Sunflower Electric Cooperative and KEPCo. KEPCo's estimated annual peak loads and load growth throughout the current planning period are tabulated in the response to Question 2.

KG&E's system planning currently extends through the year 1995. Estimated peak loads and annual energy production for KG&E, based on 1978 MOKAN Pool projections, are listed below. It should be understood that these projections include loads and energy for KG&E's wholesale municipal and REC customers.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Peak Load MW</u>	<u>Peak Loads</u>	
		<u>Annual Increase MW</u>	<u>%</u>
1979	1,605		
1980	1,675	70	4.4
1981	1,750	75	4.5
1982	1,825	75	4.3
1983	1,905	80	4.4
1984	1,985	80	4.2
1985	2,075	90	4.5
1986	2,160	85	4.1
1987	2,245	85	3.9
1988	2,337	92	4.1
1989	2,432	95	4.1
1990	2,531	99	4.1
1991	2,634	103	4.1
1992	2,742	108	4.1
1993	2,854	112	4.1
1994	2,970	116	4.1
1995	3,091	121	4.1

<u>Year</u>	<u>Energy Production (millions kWh)</u>	<u>Annual Increase</u>	
		<u>(millions kWh)</u>	<u>%</u>
1979	7,556		
1980	7,927	371	4.9
1981	8,358	431	5.4
1982	8,713	355	4.2
1983	9,095	382	4.4
1984	9,477	382	4.2
1985	9,906	429	4.5
1986	10,312	406	4.1
1987	10,718	406	3.9
1988	11,157	439	4.1
1989	11,611	454	4.1

952106

Year	Energy Production (millions kWh)	Annual Increase	
		(millions kWh)	%
1990	12,084	473	4.1
1991	12,575	491	4.1
1992	13,091	516	4.1
1993	13,626	535	4.1
1994	14,179	553	4.1
1995	14,757	578	4.1

KCPL's sytem planning currently extends through 1987 for system peak loads and 1984 for energy production. However, a 20-year load and energy forecast to be used for system planning purposes is presently being prepared by KCPL. This report should be completed by the fall of 1979. Present estimated peak loads and annual energy production are:

Peak Loads

Year	Peak Load MW	Annual Increase	
		MW	%
1979	2,116		
1980	2,197	81	3.8
1981	2,283	86	3.9
1982	2,383	100	4.4
1983	2,507	124	5.2
1984	2,638	131	5.2
1985	2,775	137	5.2
1986	2,918	143	5.2
1987	3,069	151	5.2

Year	Energy Production (millions kWh)	Annual Increase	
		(millions kWh)	%
1980	9,697		
1981	10,066	369	3.8
1982	10,431	365	3.6
1983	10,836	405	3.9
1984	11,245	409	3.8

Sunflower Electric Cooperative's system planning currently extends through the year 1995. Estimated peak loads and annual energy production through that date are:

952107

Peak Loads

<u>Year</u>	<u>Peak Load MW</u>	<u>Annual Increase</u>	
		<u>MW</u>	<u>%</u>
1979	286		
1980	309	23	8.0
1981	335	26	8.4
1982	362	27	8.1
1983	377	15	4.1
1984	392	15	4.0
1985	408	16	4.1
1986	425	17	4.1
1987	442	17	4.0
1988	461	19	4.2
1989	480	19	4.1
1990	499	19	4.0
1991	520	21	4.2
1992	541	21	4.0
1993	563	22	4.1
1994	586	23	4.1
1995	610	24	4.1

<u>Year</u>	<u>Energy Production (millions kWh)</u>	<u>Annual Increase</u>	
		<u>(millions kWh)</u>	<u>%</u>
1979	1,138		
1980	1,247	109	9.6
1981	1,368	121	9.7
1982	1,500	132	9.6
1983	1,570	70	4.7
1984	1,643	73	4.5
1985	1,719	76	4.6
1986	1,798	79	4.6
1987	1,883	85	4.7
1988	1,988	105	5.6
1989	2,100	112	5.6
1990	2,217	117	5.6
1991	2,342	125	5.6
1992	2,473	131	5.6
1993	2,612	139	5.6
1994	2,758	146	5.6
1995	2,913	155	5.6

952108

Question No. 4:

For the year the subject unit would first come on line, state estimated annual load growth in kilowatts and kilowatt hours of any coordinating group or pool of which the applicant is a member (other than the coordinating group or pool referred to in the applicant's response to Item 3) which has generating and/or transmission planning functions. Identify each company or pool member whose loads are indicated in the response thereto.

Answer No. 4:

At present, KEPCo is not a member of a planning group. However, in the near future, KEPCo intends to participate in the MOKAN Pool and the Southwest Power Pool. All of the members of the MOKAN Pool are member systems in the Southwest Power Pool.

As projected in the latest report of the MOKAN Pool dated April 25, 1979, the 1983 peak load growth is expected to be 690 MW or 6.0% greater than the peak load estimated for 1982. Energy projections by the MOKAN Pool are not available.

As estimated in the latest report of the Southwest Power Pool, dated April 1, 1979, 1983 peak load growth will be 3,009 MW or 6.1% above the estimated 1982 peak. This report also projects a 1983 growth of 15,250,000 MWH, 6.2% greater than the estimate for 1982.

The companies included in this report are:

Alexandria Light & Power Department
Arkansas Electric Cooperative Corporation
Cajun Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.
Central Louisiana Electric Company, Inc.
Gulf States Utilities Company

LaFayette, Louisiana Utility System
Middle South Utilities, Inc.
Grand River Dam Authority
Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company
Public Service Company of Oklahoma

952109

Southwestern Electric Power Company
Southwestern Power Administration
Southwestern Public Service Company
Western Farmers Electric Cooperative
Board of Public Utilities, Kansas City, Kansas

Central Kansas Power Company, Inc.*
City Power & Light, Independence, Missouri
The Empire District Electric Company*
Kansas City Power and Light Company*
Kansas Gas and Electric Company*

The Kansas Power and Light Company*
Missouri Public Service Company*
St. Joseph Light and Power Company
Sunflower Electric Cooperative*
Western Power Division, Central Telephone and Utilities Corporation*

City Utilities, Springfield, Missouri
City of Houma, Louisiana
Jonesboro (AR) City of Water and Light
Ponca City (OK) Water and Light
Ottawa (KS) Water and Light
City of Ruston, Louisiana

Winfield, Kansas, Municipal Light and Water
Chanute Municipal Utilities
Coffeyville Municipal Water and Light Department

* Indicates member systems of the MOKAN Pool

Question No. 5:

State applicant's minimum installed reserve criterion (as a percentage of load)¹ for the period when the subject unit will first come on line. If the applicant shares reserves with other systems, identify the other systems and provide minimum installed reserve criterion (as a percentage of load)¹ by contracting parties or pool for the period when the proposed unit will first come on line.

Answer No. 5:

Wolf Creek Nuclear Unit No. 1 is scheduled for commercial operation on April 1, 1983. KEPCo is in the process of completing arrangements to purchase its reserve requirements for its ownership capacity in that unit from the Kansas Gas and Electric Company (KG&E). Pursuant to such arrangements, KEPCo will maintain a reserve capacity in a range of 15 to 20 percent of its projected peak load requirements.

¹ Indicate whether loads other than peak loads are considered.

Question No. 6:

Describe methods used as a guide in establishing the criteria for applicant's and/or applicant's pool's minimum amount of installed reserves. (E.g., (a) single largest unit down, (b) probability methods such as loss of load 1 day in 20 years, loss of capacity once in 5 years, (c) other methods and/or (d) judgment. List contingencies other than risk of forced outage that enter into the determination.)

Answer No. 6:

KEPCo plans on becoming a participant in the MOKAN Pool which is a group within the Southwest Power Pool.

The following is an excerpt from the Southwest Power Pool Report to the Economic Regulatory Administration, Department of Energy, April, 1978, page 6-D-4.

"Planning of capacity additions must provide that the total generating capacity available to the Southwest Power Pool system shall be such that the capacity available shall exceed the predicted annual peak load obligation by a margin of 15%, or as an alternative, a probability study made so as to insure that the probability of load exceeding capacity available shall not be greater than one occurrence in ten years provided that in no case shall the reserve be less than the peak load obligation by 12%."

The report goes on to state:

"The method of calculating the probability of load exceeding available capacity shall include consideration of uncertainty in prediction of load and shall employ the best available statistical data on generator forced outage rates. The method will also consider hour-by-hour characteristics of the load, availability of quick-start generation with neighboring companies. There shall be no greater dependence upon interconnections with adjacent areas than is agreed to by said areas

or is deemed prudent by good engineering judgment. The maximum capability assigned to any generating unit shall be that which has been demonstrated by actual test under the most adverse conditions that might exist during the loading period being considered."

The MOKAN Pool requires each of its members to carry a reserve margin of at least 15% of their peak load.

Question No. 7:

Indicate whether applicant's system interconnections are credited explicitly or implicitly in establishing applicant's installed reserves.

Answer No. 7:

Currently, applicant has no interconnection with other companies. However, when interconnections are established they will not be explicitly credited in establishing applicant's installed reserves. As a general rule, each individual member of the MOKAN Pool and the Southwest Power Pool does not carry reserves sufficient to cover the outage of the such individual member's largest unit on its system. Consequently, these individual members rely upon the neighboring utilities for emergency and maintenance support when necessary. Since this emergency and maintenance support is imported into each individual system over its interconnections, the interconnections are implicitly credited with establishing applicant's reserve levels. Through transmission load flow studies coordinated through the Southwest Power Pool, individual companies establish the maximum import capacity through their system interconnections. These maximum capacity studies aid each system in determining the actual amount of generating capacity reserves to maintain; they also aid in determining the location and capacity of interconnections with other systems.

Question No. 8:

List rights to receive emergency power and obligations to deliver deficiency power or unit power, or other coordinating arrangements, by reference to applicant's Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) rate schedules (i.e., ABC Power & Light Co., FERC Rate Schedule No. 15 including supplement 1-5),² and also by reference to applicant's state commission filings. Where documents are not on file with the FERC, supply copies, or where not reduced to writing describe arrangements. Identify for each such arrangement the participating parties other than applicant. Provide one line electrical and geographic diagrams of coordinating groups or power pools (with generation or transmission planning functions) of which applicant's generation and transmission facilities constitute a part.

Answer No. 8:

At the present time, KEPCo has no such rate schedules. However, KEPCo is in the process of completing arrangements for emergency power and other coordinating provisions with other utilities.

²List separately and identify certificates of concurrence.

Question No. 9:

List Non-affiliated³ electric utility systems with peak loads smaller than applicant's which serve either at wholesale or at retail adjacent to areas served by applicant. Provide a geographic one line diagram of applicant's generating and transmission facilities (including subtransmission), indicating the location of adjacent systems and as to such systems indicate (if available) their load, their annual load growth, their generating capacity, their largest thermal generating unit size, and their minimum reserve criteria.

Answer No. 9:

Since KEPCo does not presently have any transmission facilities, a one line diagram would not be applicable. However, the attached schedule gives information on non-affiliated utility systems. KEPCo has no interconnections with the utilities on the attached schedule.

³Systems not in the same holding company system.

Answer No. 9:

Adjacent non-affiliated electric utility systems with peak loads less than KEPCo's:

Utility	Estimated 1978 Peak Load (kW)	Estimated Load Growth (kW)	Generating Capacity (kW)	Largest Generating (kW)	Minimum Reserve Criteria
<u>Private Utility</u>					
Central Kansas Power Co.	158,000	5,000	83,460	35,000	15%
<u>Cooperatives</u>					
Doniphan Electric Coop.	3,740	200	None	None	None
Law Valley Electric Coop.	15,750	500	None	None	None
Remaha-Marshall Elec. Coop.	9,840	400	None	None	None
<u>Kansas Municipal Utilities</u>					
Board of Public Utilities,					
Kansas City, KS	430,000	35,000	589,000	160,000	15%
City of Anthony	8,700	300	12,500	NA	NA
City of Attica	1,900	100	5,000	NA	NA
City of Augusta	12,980	630	16,235	NA	NA
City of Beloit	11,900	1,400	12,700	NA	NA
City of Burlington	5,000	800	3,600	1,290	25%
City of Chanute	25,255	2,380	21,832	9,825	25%
City of Clay Center	12,000	200	17,605	NA	NA
City of Coffeyville	41,500	4,500	73,000	40,000	25%
City of Erie	2,500	100	NA	NA	NA
City of Fredonia	8,400	200	NA	1,250	Largest Unit
City of Garnett	5,900	200	8,080	3,700	Largest Unit
City of Girard	6,300	310	NA	3,250	Largest Unit
City of Herington	5,850	200	9,000	NA	NA
City of Hoisington	7,200	300	13,980	NA	NA
City of Holton	6,600	200	13,540	NA	NA
City of Horton	3,800	400	5,865	NA	NA
City of Iola	17,800	1,254	23,750	6,100	Largest Unit
City of Kingman	9,000	1,000	10,920	NA	NA
City of Larned	11,700	900	20,450	NA	NA
City of Lindsborg	5,800	500	6,750	NA	NA
City of McPherson	60,000	7,500	160,400	NA	NA
City of Minneapolis	4,400	200	8,174	NA	NA
City of Mulvane	7,000	500	NA	NA	NA
City of Neodesha	8,000	100	NA	NA	15%
City of Osawatimie	7,600	300	8,100	2,600	NA
City of Osborne	4,600	250	7,540	NA	NA
City of Ottawa	20,400	1,350	24,070	10,300	NA
City of Pratt	18,300	1,500	25,250	NA	Largest Unit
City of Russell	15,000	300	16,500	NA	NA
City of Sabetha	6,000	250	7,500	NA	NA
City of St. John	2,700	90	3,628	NA	NA
City of Stafford	3,350	250	3,800	NA	NA
City of Sterling	4,450	270	5,380	NA	NA
City of Wamego	6,450	700	5,910	NA	NA
City of Washington	2,950	50	5,000	NA	NA
City of Wellington	22,600	500	34,500	22,000	25%
City of Winfield	33,600	600	58,000	26,725	25%

Question No. 10:

List separately those systems in item 9 which purchase from applicant (a) all bulk power supply and (b) systems which purchase partial bulk power supply requirements. Where information is available to applicant, identify those item 9 systems purchasing part or all of their bulk power supply requirements from suppliers other than applicant.

Answer No. 10:

Presently there are no non-affiliated electric utility systems which purchase any portion of their bulk power supply requirements from KEPCo. Furthermore, it is not anticipated that there will be any systems which will purchase a portion of their bulk power supply requirements from KEPCo in the future; however, it is a possibility that Sunflower Electric Cooperative, Inc., headquartered in Hays, Kansas, may be a non-affiliated electric utility that purchases some of its bulk power supply requirements from KEPCo. It is now anticipated, however, that Sunflower Electric Cooperative will become a member of KEPCo in the relatively near future. With the exception of Sunflower Electric Cooperative, all of the systems listed in item 9 qualify as those purchasing part or all of their bulk power supply requirements from suppliers other than KEPCo.

Question No. 11:

State as to all power generated and sold by applicant the most recent average cost of bulk power supply experienced by applicant (a) at site of generating facilities, (b) at the delivery points from the primary transmission (backbone) system, (c) at delivery points from the secondary transmission system, and (d) at delivery points from the distribution system, in terms of dollars per kilowatt per year, in mills per kilowatt hour, and in both the kilowatt costs and kilowatt hour costs divided by the kilowatt hours. If wholesale sales are made at varying voltages, indicate average costs at each voltage.

Answer No. 11:

Since KEPCo does not presently own any generation or transmission facilities, this question is not applicable.

Question No. 12:

State (a) for generating facilities and (b) for transmission subdivided by voltage classes the most recent estimated cost of applicant's bulk power supply expansion program of which the subject unit is a part, in terms of dollars per kilowatt/per year, in mills per kilowatt hours. Also state separately the most recently estimated cost of the subject unit(s).

Answer No. 12:

Current projections of KEPCo power cost estimates do not include plans for ownership of transmission facilities, consequently, the only power cost estimates available are at the member delivery point level which is in general as delivered into the subtransmission system. At that level, 1983 cost of power from KEPCo, which includes 90 megawatts of hydro peaking energy purchased from the Southwestern Power Administration, 195.5 megawatts of ownership capacity in the Wolf Creek Nuclear Plant, and supplemental purchases from investor owned utilities, is projected as follows:

\$89.16 per kilowatt/per year, for demand costs
17.55 mills per kilowatt hour for energy costs
for a total of 37.35 mills per kilowatt hour in the aggregate

The estimated total cost of the Wolf Creek Nuclear Unit is itemized below:

Direct Construction Costs	\$813,103,200
Taxes Accrued During Construction	25,688,500
Allowance for Funds Used During Construction	250,303,700
	<hr/>
	\$1,089,095,400

Question No. 13:

List and describe all requests for, or indications of interest in, interconnection and/or coordination and purchases or sales of coordinating power and energy from adjacent utilities listed in item 9 since 1960 and state applicant's response of full or partial requirements or bulk power for the same period and state applicant's response thereto.

Answer No. 13:

KEPCo was incorporated on February 13, 1975. Since that time, KEPCo has not received any formal requests for interconnecting with other utilities. However, three distribution electric cooperatives that are not presently members of KEPCo have expressed interest in KEPCo and KEPCo has offered membership to them. These cooperatives are: Doniphan Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., Kaw Valley Electric Cooperative Company, Inc., and Nemaha-Marshall Electric Cooperative Association, Inc. Sunflower Electric Cooperative, Inc., a generation and transmission cooperative in Western Kansas, is currently negotiating a coordination and sales agreement with KEPCo that will benefit both organizations and may result in Sunflower becoming a member of KEPCo.

Question No. 14:

List (a) agreements to which applicant is a party (reproducing relevant paragraphs) and (b) State laws (supply citations only), which restrict or preclude coordination by, with, between, or among any electric utilities or systems identified in applicant's response to items 8 and 9. List (a) agreements to which the applicant is a party (reproducing relevant paragraphs) and (b) State laws (supply citations only) which restrict or preclude substitution of service or establishment of service of full or partial bulk power supply requirements by an electric utility other than applicant to systems identified in items 8 and 9. Where the contract provision appears in contracts or rate schedules on file with a Federal agency, identify each in the same form as in previous responses. Where the contract has not been filed with a Federal agency, a copy should be supplied unless it has been supplied pursuant to another item hereto. Where it is not in writing, it should be described.

Answer No. 14:

KEPCo has no such agreements which restrict coordination by, with, between, or among any electric utilities or systems.

Question No. 15:

State, at point of delivery, average future costs of power purchased from applicant to adjacent systems identified in applicant's response to item 9 in terms of dollars/month/kW for capacity, mills/kWh for energy and mills/kWh for both power and energy at purchaser's present load factor (a) at present load, (b) at 50 percent increase over present load, (c) at 100 percent increase over present load, and (d) at 200 percent increase over present load. (All costs should be determined under present rate schedules.) Where sales are made under contracts or rate schedules on file with a Federal agency and not included in the response to item 9, identify each in the same form as in previous responses. Where the contract has not been filed with a Federal agency, a copy should be supplied.

Answer No. 15:

As previously mentioned in item 9, KEPCo is not interconnected with the adjacent systems mentioned in the schedule accompanying Answer No. 9. At the present time, KEPCo has no existing rate schedules and does not plan to sell power to those systems listed. Therefore, the information requested is not applicable.

Question No. 16:

State whether applicant has prepared, caused to be prepared, or received engineering studies for generation and transmission expansion programs which include loads of each system in item 9.

Answer No. 16:

A study, dated January 18, 1979, was prepared by the KEPCo staff called "The Statewide Transmission Line Power Flow Study". The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of KEPCo's intended power transfers on the state's transmission network in the future time frames of 1980, 1983 and 1986. The study was conducted through the use of the computer facilities available to the Southwest Power Pool and its load flow program and associated data base which was compiled in early 1978. In addition, the study included a determination of overloaded facilities, high and low voltage conditions and possible solutions to these problems. The study also included the loads of those systems mentioned in item 9.

Question No. 17:

List adjacent systems to which applicant has offered to sponsor or to conduct system surveys in contemplation of an offer by applicant to purchase, merge, or consolidate with said adjacent system, subsequent to January 1, 1960.

Answer No. 17:

Applicant has not made any such offer to purchase, merge or consolidate with an adjacent system since its date of incorporation.

Question No. 18:

List applicant's offers or proposals to purchase, merge or consolidate with electric utilities, subsequent to January 1, 1960.

Answer No. 18:

No offer or proposal to purchase, merge or consolidate with electric utilities has been made by KEPCo.

Question No. 19:

List all acquisitions of or mergers or consolidations with electric utilities by applicant, subsequent to January 1, 1960, including:

- (a) The name and principal place of business of the system prior to the acquisition, merger, or consolidation;
- (b) The date the acquisition, merger or consolidation was consummated;
- (c) Gross annual revenue and most recent peak load, dependable capacity and the largest thermal generating unit of the system, prior to the dates of consummation.

Answer No. 19:

No such acquisitions, mergers or consolidations have been proposed or carried out by KEPCo.

Question No. 20:

State applicant's six (or fewer if there are not six) lowest industrial or large commercial rates for firm electric power supply in terms of cost for power and energy in mills per kilowatt hour (and separately, the demand and energy components) and indicate the portion of the charge attributed to bulk power supply. State the rates or rate blocks applicant utilizes for its six (or fewer if there are not six) promotional services such as electric space heating, electric hot water heating, and the like, in terms of mills per kilowatt hour for power and energy and indicate the portion of the rate or rate blocks attributed to bulk power supply.

Answer No. 20:

At the present time, KEPCo does not supply power and has no filed rates; therefore, the above question is not applicable.