

**BEFORE THE
ARKANSAS PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF)
OKLAHOMA GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY)
FOR APPROVAL OF A GENERAL CHANGE IN)
RATES AND TARIFFS)

DOCKET NO. 08-103-U

Direct Testimony

of

Jesse B. Langston

On behalf of

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company

August 29, 2008

Jesse B. Langston
Direct Testimony

1 Q. **Please state your name, your employer, and your business address.**

2 A. My name is Jesse B. Langston. I am employed by Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company
3 ("OG&E" or "Company") and my business address is 321 N. Harvey, P. O. Box 321,
4 Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101.

5

6 Q. **What position do you hold with OG&E?**

7 A. I hold the position of Vice President of Utility Commercial Operations. I have served in
8 this capacity for over 2 years. Prior to assuming my current duties, I served as Director
9 of Corporate Planning for OGE Energy Corporation for approximately four years where
10 my primary duties were to lead the Company's corporate and business strategy
11 development. My current responsibilities include the Company's resource planning
12 efforts. The resource planning team assesses OG&E's power supply requirements and
13 evaluates the resources needed to meet these requirements at the lowest reasonable cost,
14 with due consideration of risk factors.

15

16 Q. **Please summarize your professional experience and educational background.**

17 A. I have been employed by OG&E since 1985. I have over 20 years of experience in the
18 electric utility industry in various areas including corporate planning, business planning,
19 engineering, transmission, distribution, metering, end-use forecasting, load forecasting,
20 telecommunications, corporate marketing, demand-side management and generation
21 planning. Over the past few years, I have led a number of significant initiatives within
22 the Company including the acquisition of McClain and the development of Centennial, a
23 state-of-the-art 400MW natural gas combined cycle plant and a 120MW wind farm,
24 respectively.

25 I hold an MBA from Oklahoma City University (May 2002) and a Bachelor of Science
26 degree in Electrical Engineering from Oklahoma State University (1985).

1 Q. **Have you testified previously before the Arkansas Public Service Commission**
2 **("Commission")?**

3 A. I have appeared before the Commission on a number of occasions to provide oral
4 testimony regarding various issues related to industry restructuring and to address
5 OG&E's activities regarding electric deregulation and resource planning. Additionally, I
6 filed written testimony in Docket No. 06-070-U¹ supporting the Company's acquisition
7 of McClain and in Docket No. 06-079-U² supporting the Company's acquisition of
8 Centennial.

9
10 Q. **What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?**

11 A. As OG&E is requesting that the Commission approve inclusion of the Redbud generating
12 plant ("Redbud") in OG&E's generation fleet, with the concomitant inclusion of its cost
13 in rate base in the pro forma test year, my testimony provides an overview of the
14 transaction in which OG&E has agreed to purchase a 51% interest in Redbud and will
15 address the following four major areas. First, I will describe the Redbud plant, key
16 commercial terms and the Oklahoma Corporation Commission ("OCC") regulatory
17 approvals that OG&E requires to close the transaction. Second, I will review the
18 business rationale and decision-making process utilized by OG&E during the bid and
19 negotiation process. Third, I will identify and describe benefits that will accrue to
20 OG&E's customers from acquiring a controlling interest in the Redbud. Fourth, I will
21 summarize the Joint Stipulation and Settlement Agreement executed in the OCC Redbud
22 preapproval application.

23
24 Q. **Please describe the Redbud transaction.**

25 A. On January 21, 2008 OG&E, with two partners, Grand River Dam Authority ("GRDA")
26 and the Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority ("OMPA") entered into agreements to
27 acquire the 1,230 MW Redbud generating plant from Kelson Holdings, LLC ("Kelson")

¹ In the Matter of the Application of Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company for Approval of a General Change in Rates and Tariffs

² Application of Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company for a Declaratory Ruling Authorizing the Jurisdictional Allocation of Energy and Costs related to the Construction, Ownership and Operation of the Centennial Wind Facility Project

1 for \$852 million. These agreements ("the transaction") were the end-products of a
2 competitive sales process conducted by Kelson's investment bank, Goldman Sachs.
3

4 Q. **What was your role in this transaction?**

5 A. I was responsible for the overall Redbud transaction and my involvement included
6 participation in the bid, due diligence and negotiation phases of the process.
7

8 Q. **Please summarize the factors that led to OG&E's decision to acquire an interest in
9 Redbud.**

10 A. OG&E's decision to acquire a 51% interest in Redbud was based on the following
11 factors:

- 12 (1) The Redbud transaction price represents the lowest reasonable cost to our
13 customers, as supported by our resource planning analyses, extensive due diligence,
14 and third-party plant valuations. The Redbud transaction price of \$852 million
15 (\$693/kW) was approximately 24% less than the cost of new construction at the
16 time with estimates for combined cycle plants exceeding \$900/kW. Moreover,
17 current estimates exceed \$1000/kW. In addition, Redbud represents "iron-in-the-
18 ground" capacity that is not subject to development and construction cost risks.
- 19 (2) The purchase allows the Company to acquire a relatively new, highly efficient gas
20 fired generation plant that will enable us to meet our growing load obligations. Due
21 in part to the Oklahoma Corporation Commission ("OCC") Red Rock decision,
22 Order No. 545240, dated October 7, 2007, and the uncertainties attributable to
23 future environmental regulation, it became apparent that our next capacity addition
24 would be a gas-fired option, whether it be the result of a new build, acquisition or
25 purchase power agreement ("PPA").
- 26 (3) The facility is ideally located within our service area with adequate transmission
27 capability to deliver into the OG&E system.
- 28 (4) The acquisition of Redbud will enhance reliability of supply for our customers and
29 lower our production costs by allowing dispatch of this facility ahead of older, less

1 efficient units. It also complements our planned expansion of wind energy and
2 DSM programs.

3
4 I. TRANSACTION SUMMARY

5 Q. **Please summarize the Redbud transaction.**

6 A. On January 21, 2008, the Company entered into a Purchase and Sale Agreement ("PSA")
7 to acquire 100% of Redbud Energy LP, from three entities controlled by Kelson. Redbud
8 Energy LP's principal asset is the Redbud generating facility located near Luther,
9 Oklahoma.

10 Immediately upon closing the purchase, OG&E will dissolve Redbud Energy LP and sell
11 a 49% undivided interest of the plant through an Asset Purchase Agreement ("APA") to
12 OMPA and GRDA, which will own a 13% and 36% undivided interest in the plant. The
13 purchase from Kelson will not close unless OMPA and GRDA have each deposited their
14 respective purchase price amounts in an escrow account. After these two transactions are
15 completed, OG&E will retain a 51% undivided interest in Redbud or 627 MW based on
16 the nameplate capacity.

17 The new owners have agreed to pay Kelson \$852 Million or \$693/kW, subject to a net
18 working capital adjustment. OG&E's portion of the unadjusted purchase price is \$434.5
19 million. The APA mirrors the PSA in all material respects with the exception of Article
20 IV, which provides that OMPA and GRDA must rely on the representations and
21 warranties made by Kelson to OG&E and they cannot look to OG&E to enforce those
22 commitments on their behalf. A third agreement, the Ownership & Operating Agreement
23 ("O&O Agreement"), governs the ownership and operation of Redbud following the
24 consummation of the transaction.

25
26 Q. **Please describe the Redbud generating facility.**

27 A. Redbud is a 1,230 MW gas-fired combined-cycle plant located near Luther, Oklahoma
28 and situated on 320 acres of land. The plant uses four GE 7FA combustion turbines with
29 a heat recovery system comprised of four additional steam turbines. These eight turbines
30 are supplemented with four duct burners that boost the output of the plant to meet peak
31 demand conditions. Accordingly, this configuration allows Redbud to serve base-load,

1 mid-merit and peaking needs based on the dispatch needs of our portfolio. Redbud
2 completed operational testing in 2003 and began commercial operations in May 2004.
3 Redbud is interconnected to OG&E's transmission system and relies on transmission
4 services arranged by the Southwest Power Pool ("SPP") and is governed by the FERC.
5 Redbud is also interconnected to ONEOK Partners, LP's interstate gas transmission
6 system. Energy management services are currently provided by Westar Energy, Inc. and
7 plant operations are performed by North American Energy Services Company. Redbud
8 has long-term agreements with General Electric International, Inc.

9
10 **Q. Does OG&E have experience with Redbud?**

11 **A.** Yes. As noted above, Redbud is located within our operating control area and is a
12 transmission service customer of OG&E. In 2003, before Redbud began commercial
13 operations, OG&E discussed a potential acquisition of the Redbud plant with Interger,
14 the previous owner, before ultimately acquiring the McClain plant. Finally, OG&E has
15 purchased energy and capacity from Redbud since 2005, most recently under a Purchase
16 Power Agreement ("PPA") for 300 MW to meet OG&E's 2008 and 2009 load
17 requirements.

18
19 **Q. Did OG&E perform any tests on the Redbud units?**

20 **A.** Yes. As part of OG&E's due diligence process, OG&E retained the services of
21 Mechanical Dynamics and Analysis, LTD to perform an operational test on January 8,
22 2008. The operational test results indicate that the Redbud plant meets or exceeds
23 performance design.

24
25 **Q. Is the closing of the transaction subject to any regulatory conditions?**

26 **A.** Yes. In addition to several customary commercial closing conditions detailed in Article
27 VII of the PSA and certain conditions imposed on GRDA and OMPA by law, the closing
28 is subject to (1) receipt of an order from FERC authorizing the transactions contemplated
29 by the PSA and APA pursuant to Section 203 of the Federal Power Act and (2) an order
30 from the OCC recognizing the prudence of the transaction and approval of a cost
31 recovery mechanism.

1 Q. **Can the agreement to acquire Redbud be terminated?**

2 A. Yes. The PSA can be terminated by mutual written consent of the purchaser and seller.
3 The agreement also allows either party to terminate if the closing has not occurred on or
4 before 300 days after the execution of the PSA. The termination date can be extended
5 beyond 300 days in the seller's sole discretion not to exceed 180 days if the conditions
6 that I have just described are not satisfied.

7
8 Q. **How will Redbud be operated between the execution of the transaction agreements
9 and the closing date?**

10 A. The current owners of Redbud will continue to operate the plant until the transaction
11 closes and ownership changes hands. However, the buyers have negotiated terms in the
12 PSA that ensure that the value of the asset is maintained during this period. For example,
13 the seller cannot sell any material assets materially change the level of inventory, enter
14 into power or fuel contracts for terms longer than one year from the signing date, except
15 if contracts are with any of the three purchasers (and then, only up to their pro rata share
16 of the output of the facility).

17
18 Q. **How will major capital investments and operating decisions be made by the new
19 owners?**

20 A. The O&O agreement governs the ownership and operation of the Redbud facility
21 including, but not limited to Governance, Defaults, Dispute Resolution, Operations,
22 Limits on Liability and Fuel Procurement. OG&E will be Operations Manager with
23 oversight from an Executive Committee with representation by each owner of the plant in
24 accordance with each owner's respective ownership share. However, major issues, such
25 as material changes to the Operations & Maintenance Agreement or other material
26 contracts, require a "supermajority" (+60%) approval. This effectively requires that
27 OG&E and at least one other owner to approve these supermajority decisions.

1 II. OG&E DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

2 Q. **When did OG&E learn of the opportunity to acquire Redbud?**

3 A. In late October 2007, OG&E was contacted by UBS Investment Bank (“UBS”) who
4 informed OG&E of an ongoing auction process to sell a package of Kelson assets that
5 included Redbud. The process was being conducted by Goldman Sachs. OG&E
6 subsequently executed a confidentiality agreement with Kelson and was provided with
7 the offering memorandum and limited access to the transaction data room. Kelson's
8 offering memorandum described a plan to sell four natural gas combined cycle plants as a
9 package. However, OG&E expressed an interest in Redbud on a stand-alone basis and
10 Kelson agreed to consider a bid for Redbud separately from the rest of the portfolio.

11
12 Q. **What factors contributed to OG&E's decision to pursue making a bid for Redbud?**

13 A. Redbud's location within OG&E's control area, the age of Redbud and OG&E's reliance
14 on Redbud for energy through the years was reason enough to spark our interest in the
15 sale process. OG&E's analysis indicated that we had a need for capacity in a time frame
16 that could be met by an acquisition of Redbud. OG&E had been counting on its proposed
17 Red Rock plant to meet this need until the OCC decision in Cause No. PUD 200700012.
18 OG&E concluded, after the Red Rock decision, that natural gas-fired capacity, through a
19 PPA, a new build or acquisition, was the most viable capacity option within the next five
20 years. We were aware that Redbud has the operational flexibility to serve a range of
21 needs throughout the year including base load, peaking and mid-merit needs. In
22 particular, we recognized that Redbud's operational capabilities would complement our
23 prospective investments in wind energy.

24 In addition, Redbud represents “iron-in-the-ground” capacity that is not subject to
25 development and construction cost risks. It also has interconnections to natural gas and
26 electric transmission facilities that can be costly infrastructure for new plants. More
27 importantly, we expect purchase power costs to increase substantially and become
28 volatile due to the tightening of the SPP market, a situation has been aggravated by the
29 cancellation of planned coal plants. Finally, capacity needs vary within the SPP and we
30 believe the market in OG&E's service territory is much tighter than the SPP as a whole.

1 Q. **OG&E has an agreement to purchase power from Redbud through 2009. Why did**
2 **OG&E feel it was important to pursue purchasing the plant in this auction process?**

3 A. If another entity purchased Redbud or the present owners refinanced their debt, it is not
4 clear when, if ever, OG&E would have another opportunity to acquire Redbud. The
5 Kelson sales process represents a potential one-time opportunity for OG&E to lock in
6 value for its customers. In short, I believe it would have been irresponsible for OG&E not
7 to participate in this process given the capacity shortage in our service territory and other
8 factors that I have described.

9
10 Q. **Please describe in detail the timeline of the Kelson process.**

11 A. OG&E's involvement in Kelson's auction process began in late October 2007. The
12 timing communicated by Goldman Sachs, the seller's financial advisor, required OG&E
13 to move quickly. We executed a Confidentiality Agreement on November 9th and were
14 provided with the Offering Memorandum documents at that time. OG&E submitted a
15 first round bid on November 15, 2007. The Company's transaction team was granted
16 expanded on-line access to the data room on November 26, 2007 and received a briefing
17 from Kelson's top management two days after that. We conducted an official site visit on
18 December 6, 2007.

19 Simultaneously, OG&E was evaluating potential partners in the transaction. This led to
20 the December 7, 2007 Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") with GRDA and
21 OMPA. On behalf of the newly formed partnership arrangement, OG&E submitted a
22 second bid (along with a marked-up draft of the proposed PSA) on December 18, 2007.
23 Due diligence took place throughout this timeframe and continued through the month of
24 negotiations that ultimately resulted in executed transaction agreements on January 21,
25 2008.

26
27 Q. **Why did OG&E begin discussions with potential partners?**

28 A. OG&E understood that it could not purchase 100% of the plant. We also knew that other
29 load serving entities in Oklahoma were likely in a similar situation. OG&E contacted
30 OMPA who is currently our partner in the McClain plant. We have had an outstanding
31 business relationship OMPA and believed that they would have an interest in partnering

1 again on this opportunity. OG&E then contacted GRDA whom we saw as a logical
2 partner on this project. This is our first opportunity to enter into a business arrangement
3 with GRDA and I am confident they will be good partners as well.
4

5 **Q. What types of customers are served by GRDA and OMPA?**

6 A The GRDA serves 21 cities, 1 distribution cooperative, 2 public power joint action
7 agencies representing approximately 105 municipalities and approximately 80 industrial
8 customers located primarily in the Mid America Industrial Park. OMPA serves 35 cities
9 or about 230,000 electric consumers throughout the State of Oklahoma.
10

11 **Q. Did the partners retain the services of any outside advisors?**

12 A. Yes. UBS was retained by OG&E, OMPA and GRDA due to the market knowledge and
13 experience of its Power and Utilities team. The UBS team also had direct experience
14 working with Kelson and a keen understanding of Kelson's transactional needs. The
15 partners retained Sargent & Lundy LLC to conduct an independent engineering
16 assessment of the facility as part of the operational plant due diligence. Sargent & Lundy
17 is a leading provider of services to the fossil fuel industry and expert in the design,
18 construction and operation of gas-fired power plants. The partners also retained
19 Mechanical Dynamics and Analysis LTD to perform an operational test to confirm the
20 operational characteristics of the plant.

21 In addition, OG&E retained Concentric Energy Advisors, Inc. ("CEA") to perform an
22 independent external market valuation of the Redbud plant that was completed before we
23 executed the transaction agreements. CEA is a leading energy consulting firm and has
24 been identified by SNL Financial as among the top ten financial advisors in energy
25 transactions over the past four years.
26

27 **Q. What did OG&E bid in the first round?**

28 A. OG&E submitted a price range of \$680/kW to \$740/kW in the first round.

1 Q. **How was this range determined?**

2 A. The Company elected to submit its bid in the form of a range that would allow us to
3 adjust our final bid as we learned more through the due diligence process and our
4 ongoing resource planning analyses. We utilized several sources of information in
5 establishing our initial bid range. The data points included an internal analysis calculated
6 by OG&E based on information provided by Kelson (\$675/kW), a valuation performed
7 by ICF on behalf of Kelson (\$688/kW), a portfolio valuation analysis prepared by
8 OG&E's resource planning group (\$723/kW-\$848/kW, including risk); a comparable
9 sales analysis provided by UBS (\$799/kW in the most recent period), and an internal
10 OG&E estimated new build construction cost based on Burns & McDonnell estimates
11 (\$904/kW).

12
13 Q. **Please describe the due diligence effort conducted by OG&E?**

14 A. After our initial bid was accepted, OG&E formed an extensive due diligence team that
15 produced a report detailing its findings. The team examined several areas including, but
16 not limited to organizational structure, material contracts, credit agreements, fuel supply,
17 electric transmission, operations and maintenance, insurance, tax, regulatory, information
18 technology, real estate, environmental and human resources issues.

19
20 Q. **Did the Company also review potential new transmission costs?**

21 A. Yes. There are two potential sources of new transmission costs throughout the bid
22 process. First, additional transmission investments may be required to allow the owners
23 to receive 100% of their pro-rata output of the plant. The actual investment, if any, will
24 be determined by the SPP as part of their review of the partners' requests for transmission
25 service. The SPP will also determine the allocation of these costs to the partners based on
26 its transmission analysis. Second, additional transmission costs may result from the
27 FERC Section 203 filing. OG&E expects that its share of any transmission investment
28 required by the SPP will not be a significant factor in the transaction.

1 Q. **How did OG&E arrive at the final price that it was willing to pay for Redbud?**

2 A. OG&E based its decision on the results of due diligence, our assessment of the fair
3 market value of the plant, OG&E's internal resource planning analyses and comparable
4 market sales. Based on the above factors and advice from our advisor, UBS, the owners
5 elected to remain at the low end of our initial indicative bid range, at \$852 million or
6 \$693/kW, subject to a working capital adjustment. Before executing the transaction
7 agreements, CEA completed a market valuation that provided an independent
8 confirmation of the reasonableness of the final price offered to acquire Redbud.

9
10 III. CUSTOMER BENEFITS

11 1. *Excellent Plant and Relatively New*

12 Q. **Why is Redbud an excellent plant to own and operate?**

13 A. During its less than four-year operating life, Redbud has been primarily serving the mid-
14 merit and peak load requirements of its contract customers, including OG&E. More
15 importantly, our due diligence revealed that Redbud has not experienced any operating or
16 maintenance issues that were not correctly addressed and that periodic maintenance has
17 been performed in accordance with "prudent operator practices" as recommended by
18 Redbud's equipment suppliers and manufacturers. Therefore, we are acquiring a plant
19 that we have every reason to expect to perform well and serve our customers reliably
20 throughout its remaining life. In addition, the recent McClain acquisition has significantly
21 improved our operational knowledge of GE 7FA technology, and has provided valuable
22 experience operating this technology.

23
24 2. *Ideal Location*

25 Q. **Why is Redbud's location ideal?**

26 A. Redbud is located near OG&E's Oklahoma City load center. Because the developers of
27 Redbud have already paid for the transmission facilities necessary to interconnect with
28 the SPP and deliver capacity to their customers, OG&E will have minimal investment in
29 additional transmission facilities to serve our load requirements. In the event OG&E
30 acquired an existing asset outside of its service area or executed a PPA or constructed a
31 new asset, OG&E customers would likely pay more for associated new transmission

1 investments than any increase in transmission costs associated with the Redbud
2 acquisition. As evidenced by our 2007 short-term capacity RFP, it is either physically
3 impossible or costly for many potential sellers to deliver capacity to OG&E without
4 additional transmission investment.

5
6 *3. Improves Reliability and Meets Capacity Needs*

7 **Q. How does Redbud improve OG&E's reliability?**

8 A. The addition of a relatively new plant to an aging portfolio improves the reliability of
9 supply. Due to its "1x1x1" configuration, OG&E will be able to operate the plant as four
10 units and continue to provide power when a one or more of the turbine are shut down.
11 The fact that Redbud is located within OG&E's service area and proximate to our largest
12 load center also contributes to an increase in the reliability of supply as it provides some
13 protection against transmission outages in other parts of SPP and in neighboring regions.

14
15 **Q. How does Redbud meet OG&E's capacity needs?**

16 A. OG&E has a need for capacity beginning in 2010 after the expiration of the current
17 Redbud PPA. Our estimate of the need to exactly meet SPP's minimum capacity
18 requirement is 424 MW in 2010 and grows by approximately 100 MW per year,
19 assuming that OG&E does not retire any of its aging plants. As described in OG&E's
20 2006 IRP submittal to the OCC, the Company's intent was to rely on PPAs as a bridge
21 strategy until a coal plant (i.e. Red Rock) was placed in service. The Redbud acquisition
22 will satisfy OG&E's capacity needs through approximately 2012, at which time our
23 resource planning analysis indicates that we will need to add more capacity. These short-
24 term capacity needs will be served by natural gas-fired capacity whether OG&E
25 continues a PPA-based strategy, builds a combination of CC and CT plants, or acquires
26 an asset.

27
28 *4. Lowest Reasonable Cost*

29 **Q. Please explain why OG&E believes that it has acquired Redbud at the lowest**
30 **reasonable cost.**

1 A. Our resource planning analyses indicate that Redbud is part of the optimal resource plan
2 when considering both cost and risk factors. The price also reflects a significant discount
3 off of the cost of a new CC plant. The Redbud transaction price of \$852 million
4 (\$693/kw) was approximately 24% less than the cost of new construction at the time with
5 estimates for combined cycle plants exceeding \$900/kw. However, current estimates
6 exceed \$1000/kW.

7 The price paid is fair from other perspectives as well. It is supported by extensive due
8 diligence and third-party valuations. CEA's independent valuation of Redbud concluded
9 that the price was slightly below the low range of Redbud's value as a merchant plant.

10 OG&E further believes that the price compares favorably to what could materialize if the
11 Company were to continue to rely on PPAs to meet this portion of its requirements over
12 the next several years. OG&E's resource planning analysis that compares a PPA-based
13 strategy to the Redbud acquisition indicates that the Redbud and PPA-based strategy are
14 virtually identical, before consideration of any debt imputation. Redbud is also
15 advantaged due to the fact that it is already built and has known costs as compared to the
16 PPA strategy that is subject to potentially adverse swings in market conditions.

17
18 **Q. Is OG&E's purchase price of \$852 million (or \$692.7/kW) well within the**
19 **reasonable range of value for the plant?**

20 A. Yes. First, pursuant to a present value analysis a reasonable range of value for Redbud
21 was between \$941.9 million (or \$765.80/kW) to \$812.6 million (or \$660.70/kW) with a
22 base deterministic valuation of \$875.6 million (or \$711.90/kW). Second, at the time, new
23 build cost per kW was \$953 in 2009 dollars. However, current estimates exceed
24 \$1000/kW. Third, after considering the impact of depreciation and an adjustment to
25 reflect the fact that Redbud is five years old, the effective cost to construct was only
26 reduced to \$817/kW, or slightly over \$1billion. Lastly, an examination of other recent
27 transactions for gas fired generating plants reflected that 2007 combined cycle
28 transactions ranged from \$297/kW to \$880/kW with a mean of \$491/kW.

1 5. *Provides Protection Against the Risks of Tightening SPP Market Conditions,*
2 *New Carbon Regulations and Increasing Natural Gas Prices*

3 Q. **How does the Redbud acquisition provide protection against tightening market**
4 **conditions?**

5 A. The acquisition of Redbud serves as protection against the potential that prices will be
6 higher than we have projected in our analyses as a result of a number of factors that could
7 drive capacity costs higher. Those factors include tightening regional market conditions,
8 higher new construction costs that influence market prices, and the installation of
9 equipment to meet stricter emissions requirements. Should these factors contribute to
10 capacity prices rising at a more accelerated pace, then OG&E will have locked in a better
11 price for Redbud, deferred the need for the next portfolio addition (including potentially a
12 higher priced asset or PPA acquisition), and avoided paying higher PPA prices over the
13 interim period.

14 Q. **How does an additional 627 MW of natural gas-fired capacity provide protection**
15 **against future CO2 regulations?**

16 A. Natural gas emits CO2 but at a much lower rate than coal-fired plants. While DSM and
17 wind provide a greater protection against CO2 prices being higher than expected after
18 new regulations are passed, natural gas-fired capacity serves this same objective when
19 compared to coal-fired capacity.

20
21 Q. **How does the Redbud acquisition protect OG&E against higher natural gas prices?**

22 A. Although Redbud is fueled by natural gas, it is much more efficient than OG&E's older
23 gas plants and therefore helps moderate the impact of higher natural gas prices on our
24 customers. Redbud also complements our planned expansion of wind energy and DSM
25 programs which, in turn, moderates the effect of higher natural gas prices.

26
27 6. *Preferred to a PPA-Based Strategy*

28 Q. **How did OG&E evaluate the Redbud acquisition as compared to a PPA-strategy?**

29 A. OG&E performed an analysis that compares the price paid today for Redbud to a series
30 of short-term PPAs with prices that increase every year to reflect the expected tightening

1 of the market. OG&E's 2007 RFP for capacity in the 2008-2010 timeframe resulted in
2 prices that exhibited this trend. This comparison essentially measures the tradeoff
3 between a slightly higher price of Redbud in the first few years (necessary to complete
4 the long-term transaction) against a stream of PPA prices that exceed the Redbud sales
5 price when demand and supply are in balance. This analysis indicates that the Redbud
6 and PPA-based strategy are virtually identical, before consideration of any debt
7 imputation and capacity price risk.

8 9 *7. No Construction Cost Risk*

10 **Q. Does "iron-in-the-ground" have an advantage over new build generation?**

11 A. Yes, at least based on the present environment. New power plant construction costs have
12 risen dramatically over the past two to three years. The landscape for building new
13 power plants has shifted in a way that gives a preference to an acquisition of an operating
14 asset. By acquiring Redbud, our customers will be shielded from risks associated with
15 often unpredictable cost escalations, scheduling delays, and other uncertainties of new
16 generation construction projects.

17 As an existing plant, OG&E will not have to develop new transmission facilities. The
18 transmission review and approval process, siting, and development can take as long as or
19 longer than constructing the plant. Acquisition of an existing asset also avoids the need
20 for siting, permitting and other land-use development issues.

21
22 **Q. What factors are contributing to the rapid escalation in construction costs?**

23 A. Power plant construction cost escalation is being driven largely by global demands for
24 raw materials (e.g., steel), fabricated equipment, and EPC services.

25 26 *8. Improves Generation Portfolio*

27 **Q. How did OG&E analyze Redbud's fit into its portfolio?**

28 A. OG&E performed an assessment of Redbud's fit into our existing portfolio as well as its
29 fit into a potential future portfolio with additional wind generation. Natural gas plants
30 that are able to ramp capacity contributions up and down are particularly valuable as a

1 complement to wind energy which is subject to varying and difficult to predict operating
2 conditions.

3
4 **Q. What benefits will accrue to OG&E's customers from adding a more efficient
5 resource to the portfolio?**

6 A. OG&E dispatches its portfolio on a least cost basis. The addition of Redbud, a plant that
7 is significantly more efficient than many of OG&E's existing natural-gas fired plants, will
8 provide savings to customers. Redbud is comparable to the new build and PPA options
9 on a cost basis and also with respect to natural gas price risk and carbon policy risk.
10 However, it avoids the cost risk associated with new construction and the market risk
11 associated with a PPA.

12
13 *9. Control of Redbud Provides Additional Benefits*

14 **Q. How does OG&E's control of Redbud provide value to customers?**

15 A. Ownership and control of Redbud's operations has another advantage over continuing as
16 a contract purchaser under a PPA. As an owner and operator, OG&E will be able to
17 dispatch the plant as part of its entire supply portfolio to maximize benefits. More
18 specifically, OG&E will be able to dispatch this plant, along with its other plants and
19 contracts, to improve the overall efficiency of the portfolio. As an owner of the plant, and
20 unlike a PPA, OG&E's customers will continue to receive benefits if the plant continues
21 to operate after it is fully depreciated.

22
23 **IV. REQUESTED RELIEF IN THE OKLAHOMA JURISDICTION**

24 **Q. What relief did OG&E request in the Oklahoma jurisdiction?**

25 A. On March 20, 2008, OG&E filed Cause No. PUD 200800086 with the OCC requesting
26 preapproval to purchase Redbud. The application specifically requested the OCC to issue
27 an order that includes the following findings: (i) OG&E's decision to purchase a 51%
28 interest in Redbud is prudent; (ii) the generation facility is used and useful upon closing
29 the transaction; (iii) authorization of a rider to recover Redbud's annual revenue
30 requirement until OG&E's next rate case is completed and new rates implemented; and
31 (iv) the full investment or purchase price, return on and amortization for transaction

1 costs, operation and maintenance expenses, depreciation and ad valorem taxes related to
2 Redbud shall be included in the Company's cost of service in its next rate case.
3

4 Q. **Please identify the parties to the Oklahoma case.**

5 A. Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company; the Oklahoma Corporation Commission; Oklahoma
6 Office of the Attorney General; Redbud Energy, LP; OG&E Shareholders Association;
7 AES Shady Point, LLC and the Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers are the parties of
8 record.
9

10 Q. **Has a settlement been reached in Cause No. PUD 200800086?**

11 A. Yes. On July 30, 2008, a Joint Stipulation and Settlement Agreement ("Settlement
12 Agreement") was executed. The Settlement Agreement is provided as Exhibit JBL-1 to
13 my testimony.
14

15 Q. **Please summarize the Settlement Agreement reached by the parties.**

16 A. There are six areas of agreement that are addressed by the Settlement Agreement:

17 (1) Redbud Purchase: The parties agree that OG&E's acquisition of a 51% interest in
18 Redbud at a cost which includes the sum of (a) \$434,520,000, (b) the adjustment to
19 the sale price, and (c) actual transaction costs is prudent and that a 51% ownership
20 share of the facility is used and useful when OG&E begins operation of the plant.
21 The parties further agree that if OG&E's share of the adjustment to the sale price
22 exceeds 51% of \$4,000,000, any party may challenge the prudence of that excess
23 amount in OG&E's next rate case proceeding. The parties also agree that the costs
24 of acquiring and operating the Redbud plant will be recoverable through a "Redbud
25 Acquisition Recovery Rider" until such time as new base rates are implemented as a
26 result of OG&E's next base rate proceeding.

27 (2) Potential FERC Transmission Costs: The acquisition of Redbud is contingent upon
28 FERC approval. It is possible that FERC approval of the Redbud acquisition may
29 include a requirement that OG&E construct or cause the construction of new
30 transmission facilities. Although recovery of costs attributable to these investments
31 will not occur until after the expenditures are made, the parties agree that

1 expenditures up to OG&E's estimate of \$17 million are prudent. The parties also
2 agree that should OG&E be required to expend more than \$17 million and OG&E
3 seeks to recover in a rate case costs that exceed this estimate, the parties have the
4 right to challenge the prudence of an expenditure in excess of \$17 million.

5 (3) Cost Allocation and Cost Recovery: The parties agree to a specific methodology
6 that governs the recovery of costs through the "Redbud Acquisition Recovery
7 Rider".

8 (4) Off-System Sales: The current Off-System Sales of Electricity rider ("OSSE"),
9 splits the profits from certain off-system sales by flowing 80% of those profits to
10 customers and 20% to OG&E. The parties agree that OG&E will flow through to
11 customers 100% of Oklahoma's share of the net of credits and charges resulting
12 from its participation in the SPP's Energy Imbalance Services market until the
13 earlier of December 31, 2011 or the effective date of a subsequent Commission
14 Order revising or rescinding this provision. Similarly, OG&E will flow through to
15 customers 90% of the profits from other sales covered by the OSSE until the earlier
16 of December 31, 2011 or the effective day of a Commission Order changing this
17 arrangement.

18 (5) Integrated Resource Plan Update: OG&E agrees to file an interim, updated
19 integrated resource plan (IRP) within 120 days of the issuance of a final
20 Commission order in this proceeding.

21 (6) Competitive Procurement Rules: Within 60 days of the issuance of a final order
22 approving the Settlement Agreement, OG&E will file a petition seeking initiation of
23 an NOI process intended to resolve any conflict between the Commission's
24 competitive procurement rules (Subchapter 34, Section 3(e)) and the rules
25 governing pre-approval of costs (Subchapter 38, section 5). In particular, the
26 Stipulating Parties agree to support a position that, at a minimum, requires use of
27 the waiver provisions of the competitive procurement rules when a utility seeks pre-
28 approval of costs for a facility or long-term contract that was not the winning bidder
29 in a competitive procurement process.

1 Q. **When is the Oklahoma settlement hearing scheduled?**

2 A. On September 19, 2008, a hearing is scheduled before an Administrative Law Judge for
3 consideration of the Settlement Agreement.

4

5 Q. **Does this conclude your testimony?**

6 A. Yes.