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Madam Chair, members of the Commission, I look forward to an opportunity to examine the witnesses and to speak further on these matters, but I submit to you that, on the basis of the evidence of this case, you should reject the Application that's been submitted to you, for the reasons I've stated. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you, Mr. Guild.

Okay. Now, Mr. Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: SCE&G calls Kevin Marsh to the stand.

[Twitness affirmed]

THEREUPON came, KEVIN B. MARSH, called as a witness on behalf of the Petitioner, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, who, having been first duly affirmed, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BURGESS:

Q Mr. Marsh, would you please state your name for the record?

A My name is Kevin Marsh.

Q By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A I'm employed by SCANA Corporation. I'm the chief
Q And did you prepare or cause to be prepared under your direct supervision 49 pages of direct testimony that's been prefiled in this docket?
A I have.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Burgess, could you pull that microphone closer? I don't think everybody can hear you.

BY MR. BURGESS:
Q Mr. Marsh, were there any changes or corrections required of your testimony?
A I have three small changes, and I'll be glad to highlight those.
Q Would you please indicate the page number and line number for those corrections that are required?
A The first one would be on page 17 at the bottom of the page. On line seven, there's a parenthetical there that starts "Approximately one-half of the Alternative Resources..." Right after the opening parenthetical should be inserted "In 2019-2021." So it should read "In 2019-2021 approximately one-half of the Alternative Resources..." on that line seven.

The next change is on page 25. On line three, after the word "does" the word "the" should be inserted between "does" and "company's." And on line four, the
The word "stands" should be "stand"; eliminate the "s" from "stands."

The final change is on page 46, line nine. The words "as the" should be replaced with the word "for."
So that line would read "schedules for BLRA purposes."

That would be all the changes I have.

Q Mr. Marsh, subject to those edits in your prefiled direct testimony, if I asked you all the questions contained in your testimony, would your answers be the same?

A Yes, they would.

MR. BURGESS: Madam Chairman, at this time, we would move into the record the prefiled direct testimony of Kevin Marsh as if given orally from the stand.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Mr. Marsh's testimony will be entered into the record as if given orally.

[See pgs 52-100]

MR. BURGESS: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

BY MR. BURGESS:

Q Mr. Marsh, have you prepared a summary of your direct testimony?

A Yes, I have.

Q Would you please deliver that, at this time?
A I will.

Good morning, Madam Chairman and Commissioners. SCE&G comes before the Commission today to request approval of a revised construction milestone schedule and revised cash flow forecast for the two new nuclear units it is building in Jenkinsville, South Carolina.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Excuse me, Mr. Marsh. I'm sorry. Could you pull that microphone a little bit closer? I think the people in the back are having some trouble hearing.

WITNESS: [Indicating.] Is that better?

CHAIRMAN HALL: Do we have — okay, we're going to switch the mics out.

[Brief pause]

WITNESS: Is that better?

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. For the people in the back, is that better?

VOICE: He hasn't said anything.

WITNESS: Is that better?

VOICE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

VOICE: Not much.

WITNESS: Not much? It sounded like it was better with this one [indicating]. Can you hear me with this one at all?
SCE&G comes before the Commission today to request approval of a revised construction milestone schedule and a revised cash flow forecast for the two new nuclear units it is building in Jenkinsville, South Carolina. This is the third BLRA update proceeding since the Commission initially approved the project in 2008. At that time, SCE&G provided the Commission with a detailed overview of the risks and challenges of building a nuclear plant. We showed that the benefits to our customers from new nuclear capacity far outweighed the risk and challenges.

We are currently approximately seven years into the project, and the benefits from this project still far outweigh the risk. Capital costs have increased by approximately $712 million, or about 15 percent, since 2008. At the same time, based on current schedules and forecasts, escalation on the project has declined by $214 million, the financing costs on the debt to construct the units has declined by approximately $1.2 billion, and the projected benefit for federal
production tax credits, which we will pass directly to customers, has increased by approximately $1.2 billion. The impact of these savings can be expected to offset the impact to customers of the initial – excuse me – of the increase in capital costs since 2008.

In addition, the benefits to our customers from new nuclear capacity still far outweigh the risks. There is no other source of non-emitting, dispatchable base-load power that can replace the generation represented by the units. With both units in service, SCE&G will have reduced its carbon emissions by 54 percent, compared to 2005 levels. At that time, 61 percent of SCE&G's generation will come from non-emitting sources, compared to 23 percent in 2014. The units will be an important part of SCE&G's plan to meet CO₂ emissions limitations that will be required under the EPA's proposed Clean Power Plan.

As Dr. Lynch testifies, even with today's low natural-gas prices, which I believe are not sustainable over the long run, completing the units remains the lowest-cost alternative for meeting customers' need for additional base-load generating capacity.
Completing the units will give SCE&G a well-balanced generation system with roughly equal amounts of coal, gas, and nuclear capacity. If SCE&G were to meet its base-load generation needs by adding new natural gas generation, then fossil fuels would account for approximately 75 percent of SCE&G’s generation in 2021, with gas alone representing 48 percent of that generation. This would be an unbalanced generation portfolio that would also be overly subject to environmental and price risks from fossil fuels.

Concerning the financing of the units, as of March 2015, SCE&G has successfully raised approximately 46 percent of the capital needed for the units, or $3.1 billion. This includes $1.5 billion in first mortgage bonds issued at an average interest rate of only 4.99 percent. Interest rates have been locked in on approximately $1.3 billion anticipated 2015-2016 borrowings at an estimated effective rate of 5.09 percent. These rates have been possible because the financial community has become comfortable with the careful and consistent approach the Commission and ORS have used in applying the Base Load Review Act.

We are now entering a critical period in
executing the financial plan. At the 36 months beginning with calendar year 2015, we will need to finance approximately $2.8 billion of investment in the units. During this time, SCE&G will not have the option of waiting out unfavorable market conditions or postponing financing if markets have become skeptical of investing in the company due to unfavorable financial or regulatory results. During this period, it will be vitally important that SCE&G maintain access to capital markets on favorable terms.

The BLRA addresses the two principal concerns of the financial markets. One is the risk of regulatory disallowances for events outside the company's control. Write-downs resulting from disallowances have disproportionate impact on investors' risks and return calculations. Under the BLRA, disallowance is permitted only if changes in costs or scheduled forecasts are the result of imprudence by the utility. Markets are comfortable with that risk.

The second concern is the need for revenues to pay financing costs and support debt coverage and other measures of creditworthiness while the project is being built. The BLRA provides for
regular rate adjustments during construction to pay financing costs. This maintains SCE&G's creditworthiness while raising the necessary funds.

Nothing is more important to SCE&G's financial plan than maintaining market confidence and the continued application of the BLRA in a fair and consistent way. Loss of this confidence would put the financial plan for completing the units at risk. In this regard, markets see the settlement agreement we've entered into with ORS and the Energy Users as a positive example of how the regulatory process is working in a fair and rational way in South Carolina. As is always the case under the BLRA, revised rates are based on actual payments only, not projections or forecasts, or speculative costs. ORS carefully audits all amounts proposed for revised rates recovery. Only actual costs are included.

My senior management team and I are directly involved in the management and oversight of the new nuclear project. We deal with the issues that arise with Westinghouse aggressively and at the highest levels. If we stay the course with construction and with regulation, the units will provide reliable, non-emitting, base-load power to
our customers for 60 years or more.

It is my opinion, based on 38 years' experience in this industry, that the value of the new nuclear capacity under construction today remains much greater than any challenges we have encountered or are likely to encounter during construction of the project.

On behalf of SCE&G, I ask the Commission to approve the updated cost forecast and construction schedule for the units as presented here.

That concludes my summary.
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Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND POSITION.

A. My name is Kevin Marsh and my business address is 220 Operation Way, Cayce, South Carolina. I am the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of SCANA Corporation and South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (“SCE&G” or the “Company”).

Q. DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND BUSINESS EXPERIENCE.

A. I am a graduate, magna cum laude, of the University of Georgia, with a Bachelor of Business Administration degree with a major in accounting. Prior to joining SCE&G, I was employed by the public accounting firm of Deloitte, Haskins & Sells, now known as Deloitte & Touche, L.L.P. I joined SCE&G in 1984 and, since that time, have served as Controller, Vice President of Corporate Planning, Vice President of Finance, and Treasurer. From 1996 to 2006, I served as Senior Vice
President and Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") of SCE&G and SCANA. From 2001-2003, while serving as CFO of SCE&G and SCANA, I also served as President and Chief Operating Officer of PSNC Energy in North Carolina. In May 2006, I was named President and Chief Operating Officer of SCE&G. In early 2011, I was elected President and Chief Operating Officer of SCANA and I became Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of SCANA on December 1, 2011.

Q. HAVE YOU TESTIFIED BEFORE THIS COMMISSION BEFORE?
A. Yes. I have testified in a number of different proceedings.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?
A. In the Petition (the "Petition"), the Company requests that the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the "Commission") approve an updated construction schedule and schedule of forecasted capital costs for the project to construct V.C. Summer Units 2 & 3 (the "Units"). My testimony explains the requests contained in the Petition and the value the Units represent to SCE&G’s customers, to its partner, Santee Cooper, and to the State of South Carolina. I discuss the importance of this proceeding to SCE&G’s plan for financing the Units and how this proceeding fits within the structure of the Base Load Review Act ("BLRA.")

Q. WHAT OTHER WITNESSES ARE PRESENTING DIRECT TESTIMONY ON BEHALF OF THE COMPANY?
A. The other witnesses presenting direct testimony on behalf of the Company are Mr. Stephen A. Byrne, Mr. Ronald A. Jones, Ms. Carlette L. Walker and Dr. Joseph M. Lynch.

1. Mr. Byrne is the President for Generation and Transmission and Chief Operating Officer of SCE&G. His testimony reviews the current status of the construction of the Units and presents the updated construction schedule provided by the contractors, Westinghouse Electric Company, LLC (“WEC”) and Chicago Bridge & Iron (“CB&I”) (collectively “WEC/CB&I”). Mr. Byrne also testifies concerning the commercial issues with WEC/CB&I related to the project.

2. Mr. Jones is the Vice President for New Nuclear Operations for SCE&G. Mr. Jones will testify concerning change orders related to the project that SCE&G has agreed to with WEC/CB&I, changes in the Estimated at Completion (“EAC”) costs and changes in Owner’s cost arising from the new project schedule and other matters.

3. Ms. Walker is Vice President for Nuclear Finance Administration at SCANA. She sponsors the current cost schedule for the project and presents accounting, budgeting and forecasting information supporting the reasonableness and prudence of the adjustments in cost forecasts. Ms. Walker also testifies in further detail concerning key drivers of the changes in the Owner’s cost forecast.
4. Dr. Lynch is Manager of Resource Planning at SCANA. He will testify concerning updated studies showing that even considering historically low natural gas prices, completing the Units remains the lowest cost option for meeting the generation needs of SCE&G’s customers.

All Company witnesses testify in support of the reasonableness and prudence of the updated construction schedule and the costs it represents. From my knowledge of the project and my perspective as SCE&G’s Chief Executive Officer, I can affirmatively testify that SCE&G is performing its role as project owner in a manner that is reasonable, prudent, cost-effective and responsible. The other witnesses are providing similar testimony about the project from their particular areas of expertise.

Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE REGULATORY HISTORY OF THE PROJECT.

A. In 2005, SCE&G began to evaluate alternatives to meet its customers’ need for additional base load capacity in the coming decades. In this evaluation, the Company took account of its aging fleet of coal-fired units, the volatility in global fossil-fuel markets, and the increasingly stringent environmental regulations being imposed on fossil-fuel generation. In its evaluation, the Company sought proposals from three suppliers of nuclear generation units. The evaluation of all alternatives resulted in the Company signing an Engineering, Procurement, and Construction Agreement (the “EPC Contract”) with what is now
WEC/CB&I on May 23, 2008, after two and one-half years of negotiations. On May 30, 2008, the Company filed a Combined Application under the BLRA seeking review by the Commission and ORS of the prudence of the project and the reasonableness of the EPC Contract. The cost schedule presented to the Commission in 2008 also included a reasonable forecast of owner’s contingency for the project. SCE&G’s share of the total anticipated cost was $4.5 billion.¹ In December 2008, the Commission held nearly three weeks of hearings and took evidence from 22 expert witnesses about the project, the contractors, the EPC Contract and risks of construction.

Q. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OF THOSE PROCEEDINGS?

A. On March 2, 2009, the Commission issued Order No. 2009-104(A) approving the prudence of the project and the schedules presented by the Company. The South Carolina Supreme Court reviewed the Commission’s determinations and ruled that “based on the overwhelming amount of evidence in the record, the Commission’s determination that SCE&G considered all forms of viable energy generation, and concluded that nuclear energy was the least costly alternative source, is supported by substantial evidence.” Friends of Earth v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n, 387 S.C. 360, 369, 692 S.E.2d 910, 915 (2010). In a related case, S.C. Energy Users Comm. v. S.C. Pub. Serv. Comm’n, 388 S.C. 486, 697 S.E.2d 587 (2010),

¹ Unless otherwise specified, all cost figures in this testimony are stated in 2007 dollars and reflect SCE&G’s share of the cost of the Units.
the Court ruled that costs which were not identified and itemized to specific expense items—specifically, owner’s contingency costs—could not be included in the Commission-approved cost schedule for the Units. In denying contingencies, the Court recognized that the BLRA allows the Company to return to the Commission to seek approval of updates in cost and construction schedules as the Company is doing here.

Q. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE COST AND SCHEDULE UPDATES SINCE ORDER NO. 2009-104(A) WAS ISSUED.

A. Since 2009, SCE&G has appeared before the Commission three times to update the cost and construction schedules for the Units.

1. In 2009, the Commission updated the construction schedule to reflect a site-specific integrated construction schedule for the project which WEC/CB&I had recently completed. The 2009 update changed the timing of cash flows for the project, but the total forecasted cost for the Units of $4.5 billion did not change.

2. A 2010 update removed un-itemized owner’s contingency from the cost schedule in response to the decision in *S.C. Energy Users Comm. v. S.C. Pub. Serv. Comm’n*, supra. The Company also identified approximately $174 million in costs that previously would have been covered by the owner’s contingency. The approved cost of the project dropped from $4.5 to $4.3 billion.
3. In 2012, the Commission updated the capital cost forecasts and
construction schedule. The cost forecasts were based on a
settlement between SCE&G and WEC/CB&I for cost increases
associated with:

a. The delay in the Combined Operating License (“COL”)
   issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the
   “NRC”);

b. WEC’s redesign of the AP1000 Shield Building;

c. The redesign by WEC/CB&I of certain structural modules
to be used in the Units; and

d. The discovery of unanticipated rock conditions in the Unit
   2 Nuclear Island (“NI”) foundation area.

The Commission also updated the anticipated schedule of Owner’s
cost to reflect more detailed operations and maintenance planning; new
safety standards issued after the Fukushima event; and other matters. The
2012 update also involved several specific EPC Contract change orders. It
increased the anticipated cost for the Units from $4.3 billion to $4.5 billion.
The Commission adopted these new schedules in Order No. 2012-884.
South Carolina Supreme Court affirmed that order in S.C. Energy Users

Q. PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THIS PETITION.
A. In this proceeding, SCE&G seeks approval of the revised milestone schedule (the “Revised Milestone Schedule”) attached to Company Witness Byrne’s direct testimony as Exhibit ___ (SAB-2). The updated schedule is based on information recently provided to SCE&G by WEC/CB&I. It shows new substantial completion dates for Units 2 and 3 of June 19, 2019, and June 16, 2020, respectively (the “Substantial Completion Dates”).

SCE&G has also submitted a revised cash flow forecast for the project (the “Revised Cash Flow Forecast”). That schedule is attached to Company Witness Walker’s direct testimony as Exhibit No. ___ (CLW-1). It shows an updated cost forecast for the Units dollars of $5.2 billion, which is an increase of approximately $698 million, or 15%, from the costs approved in Order No. 2012-884. Chart A, below, summarizes these adjustments.

---

2 SCE&G has not, however, accepted WEC/CB&I’s contention that the new Substantial Completion Dates are made necessary by excusable delays. Nothing in this testimony should be taken as a waiver or abandonment of any claims SCE&G may have against WEC/CB&I. Explanations of the reasons for certain delay or cost increases should not be taken as an indication that SCE&G agrees that the associated delays or cost increases are excusable under the EPC Contract or that WEC/CB&I is not liable to SCE&G for the resulting costs and other potential damages.

3 This $698 million is net of approximately $86 million in liquidated damages that SCE&G intends to seek from WEC/CB&I for the delays. While WEC/CB&I disputes this claim, SCE&G does not believe that WEC/CB&I’s counter position should be recognized in determining anticipated payments to complete the project.
### CHART A

**SUMMARY OF COST ADJUSTMENTS**

(millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Delay Cost</th>
<th>Non-Delay Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATE AT COMPLETION (EAC) COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with Delay</td>
<td>$228.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Liquidated Damages</td>
<td>(85.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Associated with Delay</td>
<td></td>
<td>$142.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Associated with Delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EAC Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity and Staffing Ratios</td>
<td></td>
<td>$154.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEC T&amp;M Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Other EAC Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$182.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Finalization</td>
<td></td>
<td>$71.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Not Associated with Delay</td>
<td></td>
<td>$254.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EAC COST ADJUSTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$396.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER EPC ADJUSTMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Change Orders</td>
<td>$56.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Switchyard Reallocation</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EPC COST ADJUSTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$453.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OWNER'S COST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated with Delay</td>
<td>$214.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Associated with Delay</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OWNER'S COST ADJUSTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$245.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADJUSTMENT</strong></td>
<td>$356.9</td>
<td>$341.3</td>
<td>$698.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADJUSTMENT</strong></td>
<td>$442.4</td>
<td>$341.3</td>
<td>$783.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Without Liquidated Damages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals may vary due to rounding.

* Delay and Other EAC Costs as reported in the Petition is $411 million. It includes (a) EAC Costs Associated with Delay ($228.1 million), and (b) Other EAC Cost ($182.2 million).
Q. HOW DOES THE CURRENT ANTICIPATED COST OF THE
PROJECT TO CUSTOMERS COMPARE TO THE ORIGINAL
PROJECTIONS?

A. While the base capital cost of the project has increased, several components of the ultimate cost of the project to customers are projected to offset this increase:

a. **Capital cost.** Capital costs are increasing by $712 million in 2007 dollars compared to the amount approved in Docket 2008-196-E. The $712 million increase reference here is different than $698 million increase referenced in the Petition but both are correct. The total cost approved in Order No. 2012-884 was more than that approved in Order No. 2009-104(A) by approximately $14 million. As a result the increase in anticipated costs is approximately $698 million when compared to Order No. 2012-884 and $712 million when compared to Order No. 2009-104(A).

b. **Escalation.** The forecasted cost of escalation on the project has declined by $214 million compared to 2008. This is true even taking into account the increased cost of the project, and the effect of extending the project by two years.
c. **Financing.** Since 2008, SCE&G has been able to obtain low-cost borrowing for the project based on support from the BLRA, SCE&G’s favorable bond ratings, and the low cost of financing available in debt markets. Compared to the projections presented in 2008, customers are anticipated to save approximately $1.2 billion in interest costs (in future dollars) over the life of the debt that has been issued to date to finance the project and on future issuances where interest rates have been hedged.

d. **Production Tax Credits.** The 2005 Energy Policy Act provides a production tax credit to qualifying new nuclear units of 1.8 cents per kWh during the first eight years of operation. The credits are limited to 6,000 MW of nuclear capacity built during a specified period with qualifying units sharing the credits pro rata. In 2008, SCE&G anticipated its total benefit would be $1.06 billion gross of tax. Now it appears that there will be a smaller number of competing utilities so that SCE&G will receive a larger amount of credits. Assuming that the current completion dates can be maintained, SCE&G’s forecasted benefit has increased by approximately $1.2 billion in future dollars since 2008. SCE&G intends to pass all of the savings from the tax credits directly to its customers as fuel cost credits.

The impact of these savings will more than offset the impact to customers of the forecasted $712 million increase in 2007 capital cost. For
that reason, the combined capital and related cost to customers today does not exceed the estimate provided to the Commission in 2008.

Q. **HOW HAS THE VALUE OF THE UNITS TO SCE&G’S SYSTEM CHANGED IN RECENT YEARS?**

A. When SCE&G and Santee Cooper made the decision to construct these Units, they did so to capture the value of adding 2,234 MW of efficient and non-emitting, base-load generation to their generation portfolios to serve the people of South Carolina. In large part because of the Units, SCE&G projects that by 2021 it will have reduced its carbon emissions by 54% compared to their 2005 levels, and 34% compared to 1995 levels. Chart B shows the forecasted reduction in CO₂ emissions in millions of tons:

**Chart B**

**SCE&G’s Forecasted CO₂ Emissions**
There have also been immediate environmental benefits from the Units. In 2008, the Company committed to evaluate whether building the Units might support retiring smaller coal units. The Company has followed through on this commitment. Since 2008, SCE&G put in place plans to retire 730 MW of smaller coal generating facilities. Canadys Units 1, 2 and 3 have been taken out of service. Urquhart Unit 3 has been converted to gas generation only. For reliability purposes, SCE&G must maintain McMeekin Units 1 and 2 in service pending the completion of the new nuclear Units. But the current plan is to fuel the McMeekin units with natural gas after April 15, 2016. They may be taken out of service altogether when the Units come on line. SCE&G plans to bridge the gap between these retirements and the completion of the new nuclear Units through interim capacity purchases.

Q. HOW DOES THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY’S (“EPA”) PROPOSED CLEAN POWER PLAN AFFECT THE VALUE OF THE UNITS?

A. EPA’s proposed Clean Power Plan was issued in June 2014. The accompanying Clean Power Plan regulations are not yet in final form. But they will require substantial cuts in CO₂ emissions from most state’s electric generation fleets. Planning for these reductions underscores the value and importance of nuclear generation.

Q. HOW DOES THE CLEAN POWER PLAN WORK?
A. The Clean Power Plan is based on Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act which governs existing generating units. In that plan, EPA has computed a target carbon intensity rate for each state’s fleet of existing large power plants. That target carbon intensity rate is expressed in pounds of carbon per megawatt hour of electricity generated (lb/MWh). The Plan leaves it to the states to decide how to achieve mandated reductions and how to allocate those reductions among plant operators.

In computing the target for South Carolina, EPA treats the Units as existing units and assumes that they were operating at a 90% capacity factor in 2012. The plan then mandates reductions in carbon intensity rate from that artificially reduced baseline.

Q. WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC LIMITS BEING PROPOSED FOR SOUTH CAROLINA?

A. EPA is proposing that South Carolina reduce its discharges from its actual 2012 carbon intensity of 1,587 lb/MWh to 772 lb/MWh, a 51% reduction. Compliance will be phased-in beginning in 2020. In its comments to EPA, SCE&G has proposed that the Units not be included in the 2012 baseline calculation. If that is done, South Carolina’s carbon intensity target goes to 990 lb/MWh which would mean a reduction in carbon emissions of 38% compared to actual 2012 emissions.

Q. HOW DOES THIS AFFECT THE VALUE OF THE UNITS TO SCE&G’S CUSTOMERS?
A. It is not clear how the proposed EPA regulations will change, or how
the State will allocate the required reductions among affected power plant
owners. However, for South Carolina to meet its targets efficiently, it will
be critically important to complete the Units. There is no other source of
non-emitting, dispatchable, base load power available to replace the
generation represented by the Units. Generation sources that produce any
air emissions are now under intense regulatory pressure. There is no reason
to assume that this trend will not continue over the long term. Adding non-
emitting nuclear generation has tremendous value in the current
environmental context.

Q. WHAT ABOUT OTHER NON-EMITTING TECHNOLOGIES?

A. Solar and renewable resources and energy efficiency will play an
increasingly important role in SCE&G’s generation mix going forward.
SCE&G was an active participant in the group that formulated and
advocated the adoption of the South Carolina Distributed Energy Resources
Act found in Act No. 236 of 2014. SCE&G is currently working to achieve
the renewable resources goals established by the South Carolina General
Assembly in that Act. The achievement of those goals is fully reflected in
all of our capacity and generation forecasts. The same is true of the energy
efficiency goals established in SCE&G Demand Side Management (DSM)
program as approved by this Commission. However, with current
technologies, renewable resources and energy efficiency cannot displace the need for reliable, dispatchable base load generation.

Because of EPA regulations limiting carbon discharges, it is extremely difficult to permit new coal generation. For that reason, the only dispatchable, base load alternative to nuclear generation today is combined-cycle natural gas generation. Natural gas generation involves lower levels of CO₂, NOₓ, and SOₓ emissions than coal. However, natural gas generation does entail some emissions of CO₂ and the six criteria air pollutants. Nuclear generation remains the only base load resource that is entirely non-emitting with respect to these air pollutants.

Q. WHAT IS SCE&G’S PLAN TO REDUCE ITS CO₂ EMISSIONS?

A. As the Company’s witnesses testified in 2008, one of SCE&G’s long-term goals in choosing to use new nuclear generation was to create a system with a majority of its energy being supplied from non-emitting sources. Chart C on the following shows how that plan stands today.

[Chart C begins on the following page]
In 2014, 23% of SCE&G generation of energy was from non-emitting facilities. (Approximately one-half of the Alternative Resources...
listed in Chart C are non-emitting. The remainder is biomass). In 2021, which is the first full year that both Units 2 and 3 will be on line, we estimate that 61% of the energy serving SCE&G’s customers will come from non-emitting sources. SCE&G is on track to achieve its goal to create a generating system with markedly reduced levels of CO₂ emissions and reduced exposure to the risk and costs associated with them.

Q. IN 2008, DIVERSIFICATION OF FUEL SOURCES WAS AN IMPORTANT GOAL FOR SCE&G. IS THAT TRUE TODAY?

A. The Company testified in 2008 that diversification of fuel sources was an important reason why adding nuclear generation would provide value to SCE&G’s customers. That continues to be the case today.

SCE&G’s current capacity mix is weighted 72% towards fossil fuel, with coal representing 38% of that capacity, and natural gas representing 34%. In large part because of the addition of nuclear generation, SCE&G will have a well-balanced generation system in 2021 with 28% of its capacity in coal units, 26% of its capacity in natural gas units, 32% of its capacity nuclear units and 14% of its capacity in hydro/biomass/solar facilities. In 2021, the three principal fuel sources, nuclear, coal and natural gas, will each represent a significant and balanced component of capacity.

Chart D shows this capacity mix in a graphic form:
Creating this balanced mix of capacity will give SCE&G operating flexibility to respond to changing market conditions and environmental regulations. I am not aware of a cost effective way today to create this
flexibility other than by adding new nuclear capacity. This is particularly true now that for environmental reasons adding new coal capacity is no longer feasible. If SCE&G were to meet its 2020-2021 base load generation needs by adding new natural gas generation, then fossil fuels (natural gas, oil, and coal) would account for approximately 75% of SCE&G’s generation in 2021, with gas alone representing 48% of its generation.

Given the increasing environmental pressures on coal and the technological limitations on relying on renewables for base load capacity, under any reasonable scenario the system’s reliance on natural gas is likely to go up steadily in the years following 2021. Without the new nuclear capacity represented by the Units, SCE&G’s system would likely be locked into a significantly unbalanced generation portfolio with increasing reliance on natural gas generation today and in the decades to come.

On the other hand, adding nuclear capacity creates a balanced generation portfolio. As was the case in 2008, this continues to be an important reason that building these Units provides value to our customers.

Q. DO CURRENT LOW NATURAL GAS PRICES CHANGE THE VALUE THAT THE UNITS WILL PROVIDE TO CUSTOMERS?

A. Hydraulic fracturing, or “fracking,” has reduced the cost and increased the supply of natural gas at this time and for some years in the future. However, predictions of future natural gas prices are notoriously unreliable over the long-term. The planning horizon for determining the
value of a nuclear unit is 60 years or more. Prices for fuels are historically volatile as natural gas will change over that time. The lesson of history is that fossil fuel prices will change dramatically and unexpectedly over that long a time. Therefore, prudent utility generation plans seek to create balanced systems that can respond as prices fluctuate over time and are not overly dependent on any one fuel source. As discussed above, that is what SCE&G’s generation plan seeks to do.

In the case of natural gas supplies and fracking, there are efforts underway to limit fracking based on environmental concerns. But the issues go beyond fracking. The Sierra Club indicates on its current website that it is committed to “putting natural gas back in the dirty box with its fossil fuel brethren.” In its “Beyond Natural Gas” campaign, the Sierra Club tells readers of its website that “[t]otal life-cycle emissions for coal and gas are nearly equivalent,” and that “[t]he Sierra Club continues to legally challenge new natural gas plants and demand requirements that limit their emissions of greenhouse gases.” According to the Sierra Club, “[n]atural gas is not part of a clean energy future.”

It is only reasonable to assume that once coal plants are closed, restricting natural gas generation will become the principal focus of entities like the Sierra Club.

In addition, domestic United States natural gas prices are still out of line with global prices:

---

How long the current price disparities can remain is difficult to determine. But there is every reason to expect that in the coming years U.S. natural gas prices may begin to respond to global markets and the global hunger for energy. Major energy companies are moving to expand their infrastructure to export natural gas produced in the United States as liquefied natural gas (“LNG”). A review of the reported 2015 data indicate that 24 new LNG export facilities have been approved or proposed to be permitted in the United States. Another 26 sites are listed as potential export sites in North America.
North American LNG Import /Export Terminals

Import Terminal

- **Approved - Under Construction**
  1. Corpus Christi, TX: 0.4 Bcfd (Cheniere - Corpus Christi LNG) (CP12-507)
  2. Gulf of Mexico: 1.0 Bcfd (Main Pass McMoRan Exp.)
  3. Offshore Florida: 1.2 Bcfd (Energy LNG - Port Everglade Energy)
  4. Gulf of Mexico: 1.4 Bcfd (TORP Technology-Beverly)

- **Approved - Not Under Construction**
  1. U.S. - MARAD/Gulf Coast
  2. Offshore Florida: 0.7 Bcfd (Marathoni LNG - Port Everglade)

Export Terminal

- **Approved - Under Construction**
  2. Hackberry, LA: 1.7 Bcfid (Gulf - Cameron LNG) (CP11-126)
  3. Freeport, TX: 1.1 Bcfid (Freeport LNG Deepwater LNG Expansion/LNG Liquification) (CP10-599)

- **Approved - Not Under Construction**
  1. E&P, GA: 0.35 Bcfid (Gulf - Cameron LNG)

Office of Energy Projects

North American LNG Export Terminals

Proposed

- Proposed to FERC
  1. Coso Bay, OR: 0.3 Bcfid (Jordan Cove Energy Project) (CP15-823)
  2. Lake Charles, LA: 2.2 Bcfid (Southern Union - Twinline LNG) (CP15-123)
  3. Astoria, OR: 1.25 Bcfid (Columbia LNG) (CP15-109)
  4. Lavaca Bay, TX: 1.38 Bcfid (Encore LNG) (CP15-11)

- Proposed Canadian Sites Identified by Project
  19. Kitimat, BC: 1.2 Bcfid (Apache Canada Ltd.)
  20. Douglas Island, BC: 0.23 Bcfid (BC LNG Export Cooperative)
Furthermore, there are questions about how to make sufficient pipeline capacity available to transport natural gas to consumers if the greater part of the nation’s future energy needs will be supplied by natural gas indefinitely. A number of new pipelines are under construction or have been proposed such as the new Atlantic Coast Pipeline being constructed from West Virginia to North Carolina. Capacity in these pipelines will be significantly more expensive than existing pipeline capacity.

SCE&G continues to believe that over the long planning horizon that is involved when procuring base load generation units, the unbalanced reliance on any single fuel source is dangerous from both a cost and a reliability standpoint. Over the long-term, prices will change unpredictably.
I have testified to that fact before this Commission in past proceedings. It continues to be my firm belief.

Q. WHERE DOES COMPANY’S FINANCIAL PLAN REGARDING THE UNITS PLAN STANDS TODAY?

A. As of March 2015, SCE&G had successfully raised the capital necessary to support $3.1 billion of the $6.8 billion cost of the Units in future dollars (which is comparable to $5.2 billion in 2007 dollars). This represents approximately 46% of the value of the Units when completed. SCE&G has supported this investment through issuance of debt in the form of first mortgage bonds of SCE&G and equity from SCE&G’s retained earnings, and sales of common stock by SCANA and retained earnings of SCANA, the proceeds of which have been contributed to SCE&G. Where possible, SCE&G has locked in favorable interest rates for future borrowings. As of March 2015, interest rates on approximately $1.3 billion in anticipated 2015-2016 borrowings have been locked in at an estimated effective rate of 5.09%.

Q. HOW HAS THE FINANCIAL COMMUNITY RESPONDED TO SCE&G’S BORROWING TO SUPPORT THE UNITS?

A. As evidenced by SCE&G’s recent debt offerings, the financial community has been supportive of SCE&G’s plan to finance the construction of these Units. The financial community is comfortable with the careful and consistent approach to applying the BLRA that has been
followed by the ORS and Commission since its adoption. Since 2009,
SCE&G has issued approximately $1.5 billion in first mortgage bonds
through eight separate issues that are directly related to the nuclear project.
The weighted average interest rate of these bonds is only 4.99%.

Q. COULD YOU PROVIDE EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL
MARKETING OF BONDS IN RECENT YEARS?
A. SCE&G’s $250 million bond issue in February 2011 was
oversubscribed by a factor of eight and was ultimately priced at the lowest
end of the indicated interest rate range. SCE&G’s $250 million bond issue
in January 2012 was oversubscribed by a factor of six and, when issued,
bore “one of the lowest 30-year coupons of all time,” as reported at the time
by Credit Suisse. Nevertheless, the next issue, which was SCE&G’s $250
million issue in July 2012, bore a yield which “represent[ed] the lowest 30-
year utility yield on record,” as reported at that time by Well Fargo.
SCE&G’s $300 million May 2014 bond issue represented the first 50-year
bond issued in the utility and power sector and only the sixth such bond
ever issued in the United States. It was oversubscribed by a factor of 13 and
was issued at a rate estimated to be only 35 basis points higher than a 30-
year bond would have borne.

Q. HOW DID THE MARKET RESPOND TO SCE&G’S MOST
RECENT BOND ISSUE?
A. In May of this year, SCE&G issued $500 million in 50-year first mortgage bonds. The interest rate was favorable at 5.1%. However, on the day of the issuance the subscriptions for this issue were slow in coming. At one point, it appeared that the entire $500 million might not be sold. In the closing hours of the offering, it required a slight nudge upward in the interest rate to bring the book of potential buyers from $400 million to the expected $500 million. While the interest rate on the bonds was still very good, it was the first time in recent years that the issuance was not oversubscribed. In most other cases, the bonds were quickly oversubscribed.

Q. DO YOU KNOW WHY THESE BONDS WERE MORE DIFFICULT TO SELL?

A. We polled several investment banking firms involved in the transaction. They reported that an important factor for many potential buyers was their concern over regulatory risk related to the current filing. Bond buyers have options. If bond buyers have concerns about SCE&G’s risk profile, it is often just as easy for them to buy bonds of companies that do not face such risks as to buy SCE&G’s bonds.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR CONCLUSION FROM THESE FACTS?

A. The market is becoming increasingly sensitive to SCE&G’s regulatory risk in the nuclear context. The ‘overhang’ of the current proceeding has brought that risk into focus for the market. We were able to
complete the transaction successfully and at a good interest rate, but what
we learned is that the risk of losing market support for our financing plan is
real. That could happen if the market loses confidence in the consistent
application of the BLRA.

Q. WHAT IS THE FINANCIAL PLAN FOR COMPLETING THE
UNITS GOING FORWARD?

A. In mid-2015, we are entering a critical time in the execution of our
financial plan. We anticipate spending approximately $940 million on the
Units in 2015, approximately $1 billion in 2016, and approximately $900
million in 2017. After that time, annual capital expenditures are anticipated
to drop quickly. During this three year period, SCE&G will not have the
option of waiting out unfavorable conditions in the capital markets or
postponing issues during periods where it has achieved unfavorable
financial or regulatory results as a company. During this time, it will be
vitally important that SCE&G maintain access to capital markets on
favorable terms. If SCE&G can maintain access on such terms, the
Company may be able to continue to reduce debt costs and the costs to
customers from financing the Units as compared to the 2008 projections.
However, if access to capital markets on favorable terms is lost, the reverse
is true. Financing costs will go up, and in some circumstances, it could
prove impossible to finance the completion of the Units.
Q. WHAT ROLE DOES THIS PROCEEDING PLAY IN SCE&G EXECUTING ITS FINANCIAL PLAN?

A. Nothing is more important to SCE&G’s financial plan than that we sustain the market’s understanding that ORS and the Commission will continue to apply the BLRA in a fair and consistent way. The financial markets understand that the Commission and ORS may come under pressure to deviate from the terms of BLRA as challenges appear in the construction project. The decision here will provide the financial markets with an important signal concerning how the markets should expect that the BLRA will be applied over the remaining five years of the project. That will greatly impact how the financial community assesses the financial and regulatory risks of the project and the rates and terms on which SCE&G will be able to finance the approximately $3.4 billion of debt and equity that remains to be raised.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY YOU BELIEVE THAT THE BLRA IS SO IMPORTANT TO THE FINANCING PLAN FOR THE UNITS.

A. The BLRA was adopted to make it possible for electric utilities like SCE&G to consider building new nuclear units. Before the BLRA was adopted, building a new nuclear plant was not a viable option for SCE&G. For SCE&G to seriously consider adding new nuclear capacity, legislative action was needed to overcome two major challenges. These are the two challenges which the BLRA sought to address:
The Financing Challenge. Recovering the financing costs of a project during construction was the first challenge. During construction of a base load plant, a company must raise hundreds of millions of dollars of new capital each year to finance construction costs. Each time bonds are issued to pay for construction, debt service increases. Unless there is a corresponding increase in revenues, debt service coverage ratios decline as do other financial ratios. Bond ratings are based on these ratios. As these ratios decline, the creditworthiness of the company suffers. In time, bond ratings are downgraded. At that point, raising capital on favorable terms can be extremely difficult or potentially impossible. Capital to complete the plant may not be available.

On the equity side, each time additional common stock is issued to support construction, there are more shares outstanding. Additional dividends must be paid. Without new revenues, earnings are diluted. As earnings are diluted, the attractiveness of the stock and its value decline. To finance the next round of construction, a higher number of lower-priced shares must be issued to generate the same amount of capital. This causes yet more dilution and further weakens the value of the stock going into the next financing cycle.

The only solution is for the company to generate revenues sufficient to pay debt service, meet coverage ratios and provide reasonable levels of earnings per share as the new plant is built. Some years ago the
Commission recognized this fact and began to authorize utilities to include the financing costs of plants in rates before they were completed. This was done in general rate cases by recognizing the financing costs associated with construction work in progress (“CWIP”) as an expense for ratemaking purposes. The Commission has historically allowed a company to apply its weighted average cost of capital to its CWIP to determine the amount of revenue needed to support the common stock and bonds issued to finance construction. The weighted average cost of capital is the amount of revenue that the Commission has determined to be necessary to support investment of capital in the utility, specifically, to pay debt service on bonds and allow a reasonable level of earning to support common stock.

But this CWIP based approach required the utility to file general rate cases during plant construction. This produced rate adjustments that were stair stepped in one or two-year intervals. SCE&G successfully used this approach when building its last coal plant, Cope Station (1995), and its most recent combined cycle natural gas plant, Jasper Station (2004). During construction, there were a total of six separate rate adjustments which placed some part of the financial costs of the capital spent on those plants into rates.

Cope and Jasper, however, took three to five years to build, not twelve as is the case for nuclear. Outlays for those plants were in the hundreds of millions of dollars, not billions. If this approach were to be
used to support a nuclear construction project, it would require SCE&G to litigate full electric rate cases every year or two for approximately 12 years. Neither SCE&G nor its investors considered this to be practical.

**Disallowances.** The second challenge utilities like SCE&G faced in base load construction was the threat of construction cost disallowances. Investors are sensitive to very small changes in returns. Even ‘minor’ construction cost disallowances can hit investor returns with crippling force. For example, it takes only a five percent disallowance of principal in a given year—$50 million on a $1 billion investment—to cut a ten percent return in half. Even a small disallowance today indicates the potential for future disallowances as construction progresses. Therefore, even small disallowances can drive investors away and make it impossible for a utility to complete a construction project due to lack of financing.

These financial realities are facts that opponents of nuclear power used to great effect in the last nuclear construction cycle. They underscore why SCE&G believes that even a small departure from the terms of the BLRA could cause the investment community to fundamentally change its assessment of SCE&G’s future regulatory risk.

**The BLRA.** In response, the South Carolina General Assembly adopted the BLRA. It allows for annual rate adjustments through revised rates filings to cover the financing costs of approved nuclear construction projects pending their completion. Financing costs are based on the same
weighted average cost of capital that applies under the CWIP method. As
with the CWIP method, before a plant goes into service, only financing
costs may be recovered under the BLRA, not the cost of the plant itself.
The BLRA carries forward the key concepts of the CWIP method but does
so without requiring full rate cases each year which would not be practical.

As to disallowances, the BLRA provides an opportunity for the
Commission to review the prudency of constructing the plant in detail
before construction begins. Once the prudency decision is made,
disallowances are permitted if (a) the construction does not proceed within
the originally approved cost and construction schedules and (b) schedule
amendments such as the updates that are requested here are not made. As
to the second point, the BLRA states that the Commission will grant
requests for amendment as long as “the evidence of record justifies a
finding that the changes are not the result of imprudence on the part of the

Under the BLRA, prudency reviews are made based on plans and
forecasts before construction begins. The Commission determines whether
or not it is prudent to proceed with the project under the construction plan
and with the contractors and EPC contract proposed by the Company. The
initial plans and forecasts can then be updated so long as the updates are not
the result of imprudence by the utility. This assures the financial
community that disallowances based on after-the-fact prudency challenges
will not impair their ability to recover the capital they invest in the project unless there is imprudence by the utility in administering the project.

Q. WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE TO BE THE POLICY BEHIND LIMITING THE PRUDENCY REVIEW IN UPDATE DOCKETS TO THE PRUDENCY OF THE OWNER IN MANAGING THE PROJECT?

A. In considering disallowances, the BLRA properly focuses on the utility as owner of the project and those cases where the utility has caused additional cost to be incurred through imprudence in its role as owner. More specifically, in this project, the Commission properly looks to SCE&G as owner for prudence in

- construction oversight;
- obtaining licenses and permits for the Units including NRC licenses, and complying with those licenses and permits;
- administering the EPC Contract and enforcing its terms;
- resolving disputes with the EPC contractors;
- constructing transmission facilities to support the Units;
- recruiting, hiring and training of operating staff for the Units;
- deploying information technology ("IT") systems to support the Units;
• drafting and obtaining approval of the operating, maintenance and safety plans for the Units; and

• performing all the tasks that fall under the heading of operational readiness for the Units.

The BLRA provisions as to cost and construction schedule updates properly focus on those aspects of the project that the Company can control, specifically its own prudence as owner in administering the EPC contract, overseeing the contractor’s work and performing the work that is the owner’s direct responsibility. Other risks related to construction are reviewed in the initial BLRA proceeding when the EPC contract, EPC contractor, and other aspects of the project are being approved. The decision to approve a project under the BLRA is a decision that it is reasonable and prudent to assume the risks of proceeding given the terms of the EPC contract, the review of the EPC contractor, and the other matters considered.

Q. IS THIS POSITION CONSISTENT WITH THE COMMISSION’S PRIOR RULINGS UNDER THE BLRA?

A. In the 2008 proceedings, the Commission and the parties reviewed the risk factors associated with this project and concluded that the project should proceed under the terms of the BLRA in spite of those risks. Based on its review of that information, the Commission ruled as follows:
The Commission’s approval of the reasonableness and prudence of the Company's decision to proceed with construction of the Units rests on a thorough record and detailed investigation of the information known to the Company and the parties at this time. Once an order is issued, the Base Load Review Act provides that the Company may adjust the approved construction schedule and schedules of capital cost if circumstances require, so long as the adjustments are not necessitated by the imprudence of the Company. S.C. Code Ann. § 58-27-270(E). The statute does not allow the Commission to shift risks back to the Company. ... In addition, risk shifting could jeopardize investors' willingness to provide capital for the project on reasonable terms which, in turn, could result in higher costs to customers.

Order No. 2009-104(A), p. 92. On appeal, the South Carolina Supreme Court described that order as “a very thorough and reasoned order.”


**Q. WHAT INFORMATION ABOUT RISKS DID SCE&G PLACE BEFORE THE COMMISSION IN 2008?**

**A.** When SCE&G filed for BLRA approval in 2008, it placed before the Commission an extensive assessment of the risks and uncertainties of this project. SCE&G also placed before the Commission its choice of EPC contractors, its plan for construction of the Units, and the terms of the EPC Contract under which subcontractors would be selected and the Units would be constructed. SCE&G explained:

SCE&G has reviewed the risks related to constructing the Units carefully and over an extended period of time. It has compared those risks to the risks of the other alternatives that are available to meet
the energy needs of its customers and the State of South Carolina. . .

SCE&G has concluded that constructing the Units is the most prudent and responsible course it can take at this time to meet the base-load generation needs of its Customers. . . .

...In the end, this project’s ability to meet its current schedule and cost projections will depend on the cumulative effect of those risk events that do occur on the schedule and cost projections contained in this Application.


SCE&G’s 2008 BLRA application acknowledged that, “[f]or a project of the scope and complexity of the licensing and constructing of the Units, any list of potential risk factors compiled at this stage of the process will not be exhaustive.” Petition, Docket No. 2008-196-E, Exhibit J, p. 12.

With that caveat, SCE&G listed the specific risks that seemed most important at the time. Among the risks specifically enumerated at that time were many, if not all, of the risks that have resulted in the current update filing:

- Module production: “It is possible that manufacturers of unique components (e.g., steam generators and pump assemblies or other large components or modules used in the Units) and manufacturers of other sensitive components may encounter problems with their manufacturing processes or in meeting quality control standards. . . . Any difficulties that these foundries or other facilities encounter in meeting fabrication schedules or
quality standards may cause schedule or price issues for the Units.”

- Construction Efficiencies: “The project schedule and costs are based on efficiencies and economies anticipated from the use of [standardized designed and advanced modular construction processes]. . . . However, standardized design and advanced modular construction has not been used to build a nuclear facility in the United States to date. The construction process and schedule is subject to the risk that the benefits from standardized design and advanced modular construction may not prove as great as anticipated.”

- Rework: “[N]o AP1000 units have yet been built. Accordingly, problems may arise during construction that are not anticipated at this time. These problems may require repairs and rework to be corrected. Repairs and rework pose schedule and cost risks resulting both from the repairs and the rework itself, and from the time and expense required to diagnose the cause of the problem, and to plan, review and approve the work plan before implementation.”

- Scope Changes: “[S]cope increases can result from changes in regulation, design changes, changes in the design and characteristics of components of equipment, and other similar
factors. . . . Scope changes represent an important category of risk to which the project is susceptible.”

- Design Finalization: “[T]here is engineering work related to the Units that will not be completed until after the COL [Combined Operating License] is issued. Any engineering or design changes that arise out of that work . . . could impact cost schedules or construction schedules for the Units.”


In light of these risks, SCE&G expressly acknowledged in 2008 that cost and schedule updates might be required. The Commission agreed that under the BLRA these updates would be allowed so long as they were not due to the imprudence of the utility.

Q. WHAT DO THE OUTSTANDING COMMISSION ORDERS SAY ABOUT THE EPC CONTRACT?

A. In Order No. 2009-104(A), the Commission ruled that “[a] key component of the prudence review envisioned by the Base Load Review Act is a review of the reasonableness and prudence of the contract under which the new units will be built.” Order No. 2009-104(A) at p. 70. The Commission pointed out that in the 2008 proceedings “[a] number of intervenors have raised questions concerning the degree of price certainty provided by the EPC Contract.” Id. at p. 73. However, the Commission noted that this issue has been addressed in the testimony of the Company’s
witnesses who “testified that in the EPC Contract the Company sought to obtain the greatest degree of price assurance possible, with due consideration to the cost that [WEC/CB&I] would charge for accepting additional price risk.” *Id.* The Commission concluded that “the EPC Contract contains reasonable and prudent pricing provisions, as well as reasonable assurances of price certainty for a project of this scope.” *Id.* at 74.

Mr. Byrne and I were involved in the negotiation of the EPC contract, which took over two years after WEC/CB&I was selected as the preferred vendor. During those negotiations, we gave serious consideration to obtaining fixed or firm pricing for Craft Labor, Non-Labor Costs and some or all of the potential scopes of work falling in the Time & Materials (“T&M”) categories. The EAC cost adjustments presented for review in this proceeding, apart from change orders, are all found in these categories.

As indicated in Order No. 2009-104(A), we determined that the price SCE&G and SCE&G customers would have paid for price certainty for these items was prohibitive. In 2008, we did negotiate fixed or firm pricing for more than 50% of the EPC Contract. Since that time, we have extended price assurance to approximately two-thirds of the contact through subsequent negotiations with WEC/CB&I. Our conclusion in 2008 was that the premium to fix the prices for the remaining EPC cost categories was too
high. The Commission expressly approved that decision as reasonable and
prudent in Order No. 2009-104(A).

In spite of the increased costs we are considering today, the decision
to forego price certainty in 2008 was the correct decision. I have
participated in the EPC Contract negotiations and can affirm that the cost
increases we are facing today do not exceed the cost that would have been
paid for additional fixed price assurances under the EPC Contract.

Q. SHOULD THE COMPANY POSTPONE UPDATES TO THE
SCHEDULES UNTIL ISSUES RELATED TO SCHEDULE AND
COST DISPUTES WITH THE CONTRACTORS ARE RESOLVED?

A. No. It would not be prudent for the Company to defer updating its
cost and construction schedules until a later time:

1. We do not know when a more appropriate time would be. While we
would hope that our disputes with the contractors can be resolved by
negotiations, there is no timetable for those negotiations. If litigation
is required, the court proceedings in a matter this complex could last
five years or more. The final resolution might come well after the
project was completed.

2. The most important years for financing the Units will be 2015-2017.
Delivering a decision on these costs will inject significant uncertainty
in the financing plan at the exact wrong time.
3. If SCE&G foregoes adjusting its cost and construction schedules, it foregoes including these costs in revised rates filings. Without revised rates, SCE&G loses revenue that is required to support the debt the Company plans to issue in the coming years and to support common stock. Our financial plan for completing these Units is based on regular, annual revised rates filings. Without the revenue from revised rates, our debt service ratios, and other financial ratios begin to erode immediately resulting in a financial plan that rapidly becomes unworkable.

4. The financial community expects us to update our schedules and proceed with revised rates as we have every year since 2009. If we are not able to proceed consistently with past practice and current expectations, the financial community will swiftly reassess its support for this project and the confidence it has in the Company’s financial plan. This is the most important point of all. The consequences of the Company not proceeding with updates and revised rates filings as the BLRA envisions could result in an immediate withdrawal of financial support for this project.

5. Not to proceed with this filing would also be contrary to our long-standing commitment to this Commission and the public to come forward publically for approval of changes in our cost and construction schedules as we identify them.
Without approval of the cost and construction schedules proposed here, the
Company’s ability to finance the completion of the Units on reasonable
financial terms may be placed in great jeopardy.

Q. IF THESE DISPUTES ARE UNRESOLVED, HOW CAN COST AND
CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE UPDATES BE APPROVED?

A. The cost and construction schedules presented for approval here are
no different from those approved in 2008 and in each update docket
thereafter. In each case, the Company came before the Commission with
the best information available concerning the anticipated construction
schedule for completing the Units and the anticipated costs associated with
that schedule. In every case, both the cost and the construction schedules
presented and approved have been anticipated schedules for completing the
Units. As anticipated schedules they are subject to risks, uncertainties,
potential changes and possible revisions. That is true of the cost schedule
here just as it has been true of all cost schedules the Commission has
approved to date.

The current schedules reflect the best information available about the
anticipated costs and construction timetables for completing the project.
The anticipated capital costs presented here are not speculative. As Mr.
Byrne testifies, they are based on a careful review of construction plans and
the costs of the tasks required to complete them. No speculative or un-
itemized costs are included in this cost schedule. There is no question that
these costs on this schedule will be paid. They only question is whether
SCE&G can recover some of these costs from WEC/CB&I. It is appropriate
that this cost schedule be approved under the BLRA as the updated
schedule for the project.

Q. SHOULD WE WAIT FOR CHANGE ORDERS?
A. No. A change order is not needed to properly consider these updates.
The Construction Labor, and Non-Labor Costs, which constitute the Target
Cost categories under the EPC Contract, are not fixed or firm. T&M costs
are also not fixed or firm. Change orders to the EPC Contract are not
required for WEC/CB&I to bill SCE&G for amounts above the target or
estimated levels.

Q. HOW WILL REGULATORS ENSURE THAT IMPROPER
CHARGES ARE NOT INCLUDED IN REVISED RATES?
A. As is always the case under the BLRA, revised rates are based on
actual payments only, not projections. They never reflect costs that have
not been paid. In all cases when SCE&G files for revised rates, the
Company presents ORS with the actual invoices and other cost data
establishing the project costs that have been paid to date and information
justifying those costs. ORS has full audit authority over this data. ORS
carefully audits all amounts SCE&G seeks to include in revised rates
recovery.
SCE&G has no interest in including any improper amounts in revised rates recovery. If anything improper is found in these amounts through ORS’s audits or otherwise, we will thank the party that points that out and remove those amounts from revised rates filings immediately. If those amounts were improperly invoiced to us by WEC/CB&I, we will take appropriate action with WEC/CB&I to have their invoices corrected and proper credits applied.

Q. HAS SCE&G APPROVED THESE UPDATED SCHEDULES?

A. SCE&G has “approved” the updated schedules in the sense that it recognizes them to be the most accurate and dependable statements available of the anticipated construction schedule for completing the Units and the anticipated schedule of capital costs for completing the Units. As a practical matter, these schedules are in fact the schedules under which work on the project is proceeding. Insofar as they reflect data from WEC/CB&I, that data has been endorsed by WEC/CB&I as contractor under the EPC Contract. SCE&G has carefully reviewed the data provided by WEC/CB&I and verified its reasonableness. SCE&G has also provided certain data of its own that is included in the cost schedule, specifically data as to Owner’s cost and payments it intends to withhold from WEC/CB&I. SCE&G stands behind its data completely.

For these reasons, SCE&G has determined that the anticipated cost schedule presented by Ms. Walker (Exhibit No. ____ (CLW-1)) and the
anticipated construction schedule presented by Mr. Byrne (Exhibit No. __
(SAB-2)) are reasonable and prudent basis on which the Commission may
update the approved BLRA schedules for this project. The schedules
presented here in every way meet the definition of the anticipated
construction schedule and the anticipated capital cost schedule for the
project. They are appropriate schedules for the Company to bring forward
to the Commission for review and approval under BLRA. In that regard
SCE&G has approved these schedules for filing as updated project
schedules as the BLRA purposes.

However, for purposes of the EPC Contract, we are concerned that
WEC/CB&I may seek to take the term “approved” as applied to these
schedules to mean that SCE&G has approved substituting these schedules
for the schedules previously approved in the EPC Contract, thereby
excusing WEC/CB&I from contractual obligations, penalties, claims and
possible damages from failing to meet those schedules. SCE&G has not
approved those schedules in that sense whatsoever. In its role as Owner of
the project, SCE&G intends to maintain all claims and exert all possible
leverage over WEC/CB&I related to its obligations under the EPC
Contract.

Q. WHAT IS YOUR CONCLUSION AS TO THE VALUE THAT NEW
NUCLEAR GENERATION BRINGS TO YOUR CUSTOMERS AND
TO THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA?
A. SCE&G continues to pursue the generation plan that it presented to this Commission in 2008. That strategy remains fundamentally sound. When SCE&G came before the Commission in 2008, we presented a detailed overview of the risks and challenges of building a nuclear plant. We showed then that the benefits to our customers from new nuclear capacity far outweighed these risks and challenges.

We are now seven years into a twelve year construction project. As Mr. Byrne testifies, the project team has overcome many of the one-of-a-kind challenges presented by this project. The financial information I have provided shows that the impact of lower inflation, lower debt costs and increased production tax credits will offset the impact of capital cost increases. Because of these off-sets, the costs of the project to customers is no greater today that it was in 2008 when SCE&G first came to the Commission for its approval.

Furthermore, the environmental imperatives of reducing CO₂ emissions are greater than ever. The risks of building a system with an imbalanced reliance on fossil fuels for dispatchable base load capacity is certainly no less than it was in 2008.

As Dr. Lynch testifies, the Company has updated its modeling of the cost of completing the Units compared to other alternatives. That modeling demonstrates that even with today’s low natural gas prices—which I believe are not sustainable over the long run—completing the Units remains the
lowest cost alternative for meeting the pressing need of SCE&G’s customers for base load generating capacity. The financial benefits of completing the Units are clear even when the risk of future natural gas volatility is ignored.

In light of these facts, we believe that the logical and prudent choice is to proceed with the construction plan and apply the BLRA as written. The BLRA is the basis on which the project has been successfully financed to date. It will be the basis for all future financings. The BLRA is the basis on which SCE&G maintains the creditworthiness necessary to continue this project. Deviating from the consistent application of the BLRA would put the financial plan for completing the Units at grave risk. That could increase the costs of the project to customers dramatically and could well result in the financial community denying SCE&G access to capital on reasonable terms. That could make completing the Units financially impossible which would be a great loss to our customers, to our partner Santee Cooper, and to our state.

My senior management team and I are directly involved in the management and oversight of the project and in interacting with WEC/CB&I and its senior leadership team. We are dealing with the issues with WEC/CB&I aggressively and at the highest levels. The challenges we are facing are consistent with the risk we identified in our filings in 2008.
The important point is that these challenges do not in any way outweigh the long-term benefits of adding this new nuclear capacity to our system.

The construction phase we are in today is temporary. If we stay the course with construction and with regulation, the Units will be built and will provide reliable, non-emitting base load power to our customers for 60 years or more. It is my opinion based on thirty-eight years’ experience in this industry that the value of the new nuclear capacity under construction today remains much greater than any challenges we have encountered or are likely to encounter during construction of the project.

Q. WHAT ARE YOU ASKING THE COMMISSION TO DO?

A. SCE&G is asking the Commission to approve the updated cost forecast and construction schedule for the Units as presented in the Petition in this matter and in the testimony of Mr. Byrne, Mr. Jones, and Ms. Walker. SCE&G requests that the Commission find that the changes in cost and construction schedules are the result of risks that have long been identified as pertaining to a project of this size and complexity. Moreover, SCE&G requests the Commission to find that SCE&G’s management and development of the project continues to be reasonable and prudent in all respects.

Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY?

A. Yes. It does.
MR. BURGESS: Madam Chairman, Mr. Marsh is available for cross-examination by Mr. Guild and questions from Commissioners, if any.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. We'll take a short break before we begin. Five minutes.

[WHEREUPON, a recess was taken from 11:35 to 11:50 a.m.]

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you. Be seated.

Mr. Guild, if you will go over to that mic, and never leave that mic, please.

[Laughter]

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. GUILD:

Q Good morning, Mr. Marsh.
A Good morning.

Q I'd like to confirm some numbers for you as we try to examine the Application you have before us. The company has just recently filed for a Base Load Review Act annual increase based on the capital costs of the proposed plants; is that right?
A It's based on the revised schedule we received from the consortium, that's correct.

Q Okay. And I have an Exhibit G to that Application that's identified as a red-lined amended Exhibit G — corrects a couple of errors, I think. I just wanted
you, if I could get you to confirm, subject to check, 
the figures that appear on that sheet that I've been 
relying on. First, there's a line that's entitled 
"Incremental Revenue Requirements-BLRA," and are those 
the incremental requirements that are associated with 
financing the Units 2 and 3?

MR. BURGESS: Madam Chairman, would Mr. Guild 
be so kind as to show Mr. Marsh what he's reading 
from?

MR. GUILD: I just have one copy, but if 
perhaps counsel has available the document, they 
could share with him. I'd be happy to show it to 
him; it just has my handwriting on it, my 
scratching.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Can you tell us what document 
you're referring to?

MR. GUILD: Yes. It's Exhibit G to the 
pending rate increase request by SCE&G. It's their 
pending request.

BY MR. GUILD:

Q You filed one in June, did you not, Mr. Marsh?

A I believe that's correct. I'll get a copy of it from 
the attorneys.

Q Perhaps I could just ask –

MR. BURGESS: You don't have a copy, Mr.
Guild, to show him?

MR. GUILD: I have just one copy.

MR. BURGESS: Okay.

VOICE: It's your document.

MR. BURGESS: I think you have to show your copy to the witness.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Mr. Guild, we're going to get a copy of that, so that he can review it, as well. You don't have a clean copy, Mr. Guild?

MR. GUILD: No, ma'am, I do not. I assumed the company would know about their own exhibits.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Zeigler, have you found a copy?

MR. ZEIGLER: [Indicating.]

WITNESS: [Indicating.] I've got a copy of the exhibit. We are ready.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you.

BY MR. GUILD:

Q  Mr. Marsh, you have that before you?
A  Yes, I do.
Q  And make sure you have the amended red-lined version. Do you have that one, sir?
A  Mine says, "Amended Exhibit G."
Q  That's right. "Red-Lined version" under that?
A  I don't see "red-lined version."
MR. BURGESS: I think his version is a clean version that he has there.

MR. GUILD: Well, let's just see —

MR. BURGESS: There is a clean version and a red-line version. I think Mr. Guild is reading from the red-line version. We have a copy of the clean version. If you would prefer that he read from a red-line version, we'll try to find a red-line version.

MR. GUILD: It's just the copy I have, Mr. Burgess.

BY MR. GUILD:

Q But let me just see if I can get you to confirm the numbers. If they're different, just tell me, please.

A That's fine.

Q But, again, there's a horizontal line that reads "Incremental Revenue Requirements-BLRA." You see that? Left-hand column?

A Yes, I do.

Q All right. And it has a series of entries by year, running across from left to right, on the page, correct?

A That is correct.

Q Does that indeed represent the annual increase associated with financing Units 2 and 3 under the BLRA?

A It would represent through 2014 the revenue requirement
that I believe we've already applied under the Base Load
Review Act, and from '15 forward I believe those numbers
would represent the estimated amounts of revenue
increase that will be required, based on the information
we provided in this docket to the Commission.

Q  Indeed, that's what I'm driving at, all right? So, just
subject to check — and if you have the document, confirm
these numbers appear — for 2015, and that's the pending
application, you show an incremental BLRA revenue
requirement of $70 million, correct?

A  That is correct.

Q  All right. And 2016, $135 million?

A  That's correct.

Q  2017, $111 million?

A  That's —

MR. BURGESS:  Madam —

WITNESS:  — correct.

MR. BURGESS:  — Chair, if I may. I'm not
really sure where Mr. Guild is going with this.
He's referring to an Application in another docket
that's not germane to this proceeding. We would
object to this line of questioning on the ground
it's irrelevant.

MR. GUILD:  Madam Chair, it seems to me that
VOICE: If he can --

MR. GUILD: -- BLRA revenue --

VOICE: -- stand up, I can stand up.

CHAIRMAN HALL: I'm sorry.

VOICE: I want to --

CHAIRMAN HALL: No, ma'am, you cannot stand up. You will sit down and behave with some decorum. The only parties -- only parties will address the Commission.

Go ahead, Mr. Guild.

MR. GUILD: Madam Chair, the revenue requirements anticipated to complete the plant couldn't be any more relevant. This is a document from the company. It represents an admission by the company. I can't imagine that the Commission wouldn't be interested in hearing what the expected total revenue -- incremental revenue requirements are going to be, associated with these cost overruns and project delays. That's precisely what I'm driving at.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Mr. Burgess's objection is sustained, Mr. Guild, so move on, please.

BY MR. GUILD:

Q Would you accept, subject to check, that the total
incremental revenue requirements through the in-service
dates of 2020 amount to $677 million under the Base Load
Review Act, as you project them?

A Not just as a number added up, because those numbers
represent potential future increases. Those are derived
based on the estimates we have in the calculation we
provided the Commission in this case on the revised and
updated schedule. As we have provided in our testimony,
a significant portion of those dollars are still under
dispute and we continue to pursue that dispute with the
consortium. So these are estimates for BLRA purposes;
they would not represent the actual dollars that would
be filed. The only thing that could be filed with the
Commission are actual dollars that are spent when they
are actually spent. These are future dollars and, so,
until they're actually expended by the company, they
would not be included in a rate proceeding.

Q Would you accept, subject to check, that my math is
correct, $677 million, and, with that explanation, is
the total future revenue requirement, 2015 through 2020?

A Yes.

MR. GUILD: Madam Chair, I ask that this be
marked as an exhibit and travel with the record as
an offer of proof, please.

CHAIRMAN HALL: It will be Hearing Exhibit
No. 3.

[WHEREUPON, Hearing Exhibit No. 3 was marked for identification.]

MR. BURGESS: Madam Chairman, may I see that?

CHAIRMAN HALL: Go ahead, Mr. Burgess.

MR. BURGESS: [Indicating.] Madam Chairman, I would object to the handwriting on this document. I'm not sure whose handwriting that is. It's certainly no witness of ours. So, if Mr. Guild wants to include this in the record, he certainly has that right to do so, but I would object to the writing that's on here.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Guild, do you have a clean copy?

MR. GUILD: I don't. It's my copy. I submit it's my handwriting. You sustained an objection to my questioning. I submit that I should be able to ask those questions. I'd like the company's own document, from which I was questioning, marked as an offer of proof to travel with the record. I believe, under the Rules of Evidence, I'm entitled to have it marked as an offer of proof, whether it has my handwriting or not, whether Mr. Burgess likes my handwriting or not. I simply ask that the record contain a document from which you did not
allow me to examine the witness. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, certain things, Mr. Guild. Number one, we prefer a clean copy. I mean, I don't know if you want your work product involved or included in the record —

MR. GUILD: I have no problem with that, Madam Chair. You can have my handwriting. I just want to have the record clear that the Commission would not allow this line of questioning, and that is an offer of proof to support any evidentiary objections that I might want to preserve for appeal. So, I'd ask that it be marked in the form in which —

CHAIRMAN HALL: In which —

MR. GUILD: — I was using it.

CHAIRMAN HALL: — case, a clean copy would suffice.

MR. GUILD: Ma'am?

CHAIRMAN HALL: I mean, a clean copy would suffice, would you agree?

MR. GUILD: I can't under- — I can't hear you.

CHAIRMAN HALL: A clean copy. Would you not agree a clean copy would suffice?

MR. GUILD: Would suffice?

CHAIRMAN HALL: As an offer of proof?
MR. GUILD: If I wanted to make it an offer of proof. But I want that document made an offer of proof, Madam Chair. It's the document that I was questioning from, so I would like to have that one marked as an offer of proof. If the Chair would like to include a clean copy, as well, I certainly have no objection to that. My only point is I'm trying to examine the witness from the company's own document. You wouldn't let me do it. I'd like it made an offer of proof.

CHAIRMAN HALL: We've already sustained that objection.

MR. GUILD: What objection is that, Madam Chair?

CHAIRMAN HALL: About not going down that line of questioning. So I'm — we'll include the clean copy. We'll include a clean copy that you provide.

MR. GUILD: Madam Chair, I'd like the copy with my notes on it included as an offer of proof.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MR. GUILD: If the Chair would like a clean copy included, as well, as a Commission exhibit —

CHAIRMAN HALL: No —

MR. GUILD: — of course, I have no objection.

CHAIRMAN HALL: The clear copy will be Hearing
MR. GUILD: Madam Chair, I don't know how to preserve an objection if you won't allow me to put an offer of proof in, so, if the record would just reflect the fact that I would like my document in, regardless of whether it has handwriting on it, as an offer of proof, I would appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Well, that's certainly included in the record, and a clean copy will be Hearing Exhibit No. 3.
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BY MR. GUILD:

Q Mr. Marsh, let's talk about the estimates of delay. Would you accept that the company now proposes 38 months and 18 days' additional delay in the completion of construction for Unit 2, as compared to the initial proposed substantial completion date approved by the Commission in the initial Base Load Application?

A Yes, the original date for the new Unit 2 was 2016. We have been back to the Commission with updates to that schedule that currently had it, I believe, before this hearing, as being due in 2017.

Q Thirty-eight months, 18 days?

A I'll take your math, subject to check.

Q You need to get a little closer to the mic. I'm having
a hard time with the speakers.

CHAIRMAN HALL: I'm sorry, Mr. Marsh. Yeah, again, we can't hear you.

WITNESS: [Indicating.] Can you hear me now? I can't get much closer.

[Laughter]

CHAIRMAN HALL: Yeah. I'm sorry.

BY MR. GUILD:

Q All right. And at the time the Commission approved the initial Base Load Order in March 2009, Order 2009-104(A), there were 85 months until the initial substantial completion date for Unit 2. Would you accept that?

A Subject to check.

Q Okay. So the 38-month delay — and 18 days — that you propose now, represents a 45 percent extension of that initial substantial completion of the construction schedule, correct?

A I've not done the math. It's a simple calculation, so subject to check.

Q Subject to check. I believe you stated that you estimate that the additional cost to complete represents a 15.8 percent increase over the initial capital costs approved in the initial BLRA Application, correct?

A I believe I said 15 percent in my testimony.
All right, I'll accept that. Now, SCE&G already proposes to sell an additional 5 percent of both units to Santee Cooper, do they not?

No, that's not correct.

What's the planned relationship with Santee Cooper in terms of proportional ownership of the units expected to be after in-service?

Santee Cooper approached us with a discussion about selling part of their ownership. They currently own 45 percent of the new units. And after discussions with Santee, we entered into an agreement with Santee — subject to this Commission's approval — that we would purchase an additional 5 percent of Unit 1 — Unit 2, the first new unit, when it came on-line. That purchase would take place over a two-year period.

I see. So, not both units, just Unit 2?

Just Unit 1.

I'm sorry, Unit 2?

The new unit, which is Unit 2.

But not Unit 3?

That's correct.

Okay. So with the addition, then, of an additional fractional ownership by SCE&G, what impact would that have on SCE&G's share of the capital costs to complete the units?
A It has no change on the capital costs we presented here. These capital costs in this filing represent only our 55 percent share. We have not approached the Commission about the additional 5 percent, so there's nothing reflected in these numbers for the additional 5 percent, if we move forward with that.

Q Right, I get that. But if you know already that you're going to sell 5 percent at least of one unit to SCE&G's co-owner, Santee Cooper, then South Carolina ratepayers are going to bear a proportional increased share of the cost of completing the plant, won't they?

A We're not going to sell any of our interest to Santee Cooper.

Q No, Santee Cooper is going to sell it to you.

A That's correct. I'm just correcting what you said.

Q And so, we, collectively, are going to own more of the units than we would before you sell that fraction – before you buy that fraction from Santee Cooper, correct?

A Subject to this Commission's approval.

Q Right. So how much additional cost will South Carolina Electric & Gas Company ratepayers bear of the cost of the two units after that proposed acquisition is complete?

A The purchase is intended to take place at Santee
Cooper's book cost. Those numbers are being negotiated
now, but it will be slightly different from SCE&G's
numbers because their accounting is a little bit
different. They follow different procedures than we do,
as a governmental entity. It would be at their book
cost.

MR. GUILD: Madam Chair, I just apologize but
I'm having a hard time hearing the witness. I
think it's the sound system in some way. It's just
a little garbled and I apologize for pressing him,
but I just don't understand some of his answers.
I'm sure Mr. Marsh is speaking clearly enough; it's
just the system.

WITNESS: Let me try it again. Is that
better? The 5 percent we would propose to purchase
from Santee Cooper, when the first new unit comes
on-line, would be at Santee Cooper's cost. That
cost would be a little bit different from ours
because they follow different accounting policies
than we do, because they're a governmental entity.
But the intent is to purchase that 5 percent at
their cost, subject to this Commission's approval,
and the payments for that and the related
megawatts, the output, would transfer to SCE&G over
a two-year period.
BY MR. GUILD:

Q  All right, understood. So the question that I had for you, that I don't think you responded to, is, what additional costs do you expect South Carolina Electric & Gas ratepayers to bear, of the cost of the total project, after that contemplated acquisition from Santee Cooper is complete?

A  If you make the assumption that the Commission approves the transfer, then we would assume an additional 5 percent in cost of the total project, based on Santee Cooper's share of the cost.

Q  Of Unit 2?

A  Of Unit 2.

Q  Not Unit 3?

A  Not Unit 3.

Q  Understood. Thank you. Now, you propose a settlement to the Commission involving an agreed reduction on the return-on-equity component under the BLRA, from 11 percent to 10.5 percent, correct?

A  That was part of the settlement agreement.

Q  [Indicating.]

A  That was part of the settlement agreement, that's correct.

Q  Now, can you confirm ORS's estimate that that has an approximate $15 million total-project-lifetime revenue
effect for ratepayers?

A That is correct.

Q Now, you follow — apparently, as you said in your testimony — the ratings and commentary by the financial community on the effects of this project on the company's finances?

A Yes, I do.

Q You're familiar with Moody's Investors Services, their commentary on the company?

A They do have commentary from time to time, yes.

Q You familiar with the piece that they offered that compared the effects of the nuclear project by SCE&G on the other AP1000 under construction, the Vogtle project being built by Georgia Power?

A I don't recall that particular piece. I may have read it. I see a lot of information from Wall Street. I don't recall that particular piece at this time.

Q They characterized the project for you as a transforming event for SCE&G. You agree with that?

A I don't know how they used that "transforming," you know, word, in context. To me, it's a transforming aspect of what we'll be able to provide to the State of South Carolina with the clean energy that will come from the project over 60 years. I think that will transform what South Carolina is able to do by providing clean,
non-emitting, reliable power to its customers.

Q Here's what they said that meant —

MR. BURGESS: Objection. That's hearsay.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Sustained.

MR. GUILD: Madam Chair, I'm not testifying; this is cross-examination. I believe I'm entitled to put a question to the witness. I'm not offering evidence; I'm asking the question, and I can quote from anything I want to, I thought, under the Rules of Evidence, Madam.

MR. BURGESS: Madam Chairman, if I may, Mr. Marsh indicated he was not familiar with that particular writing Mr. Guild's referring to.

MR. GUILD: Whether or not, Madam Chair — this is open cross-examination in South Carolina, and I have never been restrained in a court of law from asking a question based on any supposition. I am proposing to him a premise. He doesn't have to agree with it. He can think I'm making it up, for that matter. But the fact remains, I'm entitled to frame a question under the Rules of Evidence.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Finish your question, Mr. Guild.

BY MR. GUILD:

Q Transforming event for SCE&G. Would you accept that
adding these units alters SCE&G's nuclear generation dispatch from 24 to 80 percent?

A  I've got that information. Just bear with me for a minute [indicating]. From a dispatch perspective, in 2014, the dispatch for nuclear is around 19 percent; in 2021, when both units are expected to be on-line, it would go to 56 percent.

Q  All right. Would you accept, subject to check, that Georgia Power, which is building Vogtle, will go from only 23 percent nuclear generation dispatch to 30 percent, adding the two Vogtle units?

A  I don't know about their generation mix.

Q  Would you accept that the nuclear units will represent 26 percent of your total capacity once they're on-line?

A  I have 32 percent, including our current unit.

Q  Georgia Power/Southern Company, the Vogtle unit is only 2 percent of their total generation. You accept that?

A  That sounds very low, but I don't have the details of their generation mix.

Q  SCE&G proposes to – is expected to seek annual rate hikes under the Base Load Review Act that approximate 3 percent per year, to finance the Summer units. Would you accept that?

A  I think the average has been about 2.3, 2.4.

Q  But in Georgia, it's only 1 percent to finance Vogtle.
Would you accept that?

**A** I don't have the details of their financing plan or their generation mix, so I just can't verify those numbers.

**Q** March 16, 2015, Moody's says, quote, "'SCANA and SCE&G are completely exposed to and dependent on the BLRA,' said Susana Vivares, vice president/senior analyst."

Are you familiar with that comment by Moody's?

**A** I've had a number of conversations with Moody's about the impact of the Base Load Review Act and the importance of its application in the building of our units. That comment would not surprise me. When we came to the Commission in 2008 and put the idea in front of the Commission of building these new plants because we felt like they were the best opportunity for us to serve the base-load needs of our customers for years to come, we produced that — we filed that case under the Base Load Review Act.

I was here in the '70s and the '80s when nuclear plants were built initially; there were a number of challenges that were met by utilities. One of those was the compounding of interest rates on top of expenditures while the plants were being built, before they came online. We felt like, under the Base Load Review Act — or we knew under the Act, if we were able to recover the
financing costs of the plants on a current basis, that
would save us approximately $1 billion in financing
costs, which in turn would save the customers $4 billion
over the life of the plant.

So I've told this Commission before, without that
Base Load Review Act, I don't know that we would have
proceeded with construction, because that's the
construct under which the plants are financed; that is
the way we presented the plants to the financial
community. They understand how that works. They
understand the benefits of building the plants that way.
We had done that on several smaller projects prior to
bringing the new nuclear project to the Commission. The
BLRA just really codified the existing procedures that
minimize the need for extended rate cases during the
process, as long as the company was proceeding in
accordance with its schedule or updates to that schedule
it presented and were approved at the Commission.

So for Moody's or any other investor on Wall Street
to say they find a very close link between our project
and the Base Load Review Act is really no surprise. I
would expect them to say that, because the two are very
closely tied hand-in-hand and one of the foundational
reasons we're able to build this project on favorable
financing terms from Wall Street.
Q Does that complete your answer?
A Yes, it does.
Q "The utility has exhausted its financial cushion, is overbudget, and still years away from commercial operation. We," Moody's, "think the risk that South Carolina's electric consumers become less willing to absorb these cost increases is going to rise. In turn, the filing will...turn up the heat on...regulators."
You familiar with that comment by Moody's?
A I have not read that comment.
Q Do you dispute the notion that you've exhausted your financial cushion?
A I'm not sure exactly what they are referring to in terms of the financial cushion. We don't have money on reserve on Wall Street. Every time we go to Wall Street to raise funds, whether it's to sell equity or sell bonds, each issuance stands on its own. They may be talking about the original contingency that was put in place in the initial Base Load Review order, that we discussed with this Commission at length in several proceedings. That may be what they were referring to.
Q You certainly don't dispute the notion that you're overbudget and still years away from commercial operation, do you?
A I don't agree with the term "overbudget." When we
brought this project to the Commission in 2008, we talked about the way we laid out the contract with the consortium at the time between Westinghouse and Shaw, and there were three major components. One of those is a firm category — one was firm, one was firm with fixed escalation, and the third was a final bucket of targeted dollars, which essentially were dollars that were at risk because to fix those amounts would have been excessively expensive to the company and for our customers, and those costs will be paid by SCE&G and Santee Cooper at their actual rates. The majority of that is labor and costs related to labor.

As we've gone through the project, we've made estimates of the work that needs to be done. Some of those estimates have been challenged by the company, which we included — details about that is included in this filing. So the fact that those target dollars have gone up, in my mind, doesn't mean we're overbudget; that means we've refined those costs. And as we have refined those, we've come back to the Commission and explained those in every case we've been before the Commission for approval.

Q I guess I just don't understand what the concept of "budget," then, is. If budget is what the Commission relied on when they gave you your initial BLRA approval,
then what do you have in front of them right now that's $698 million on top of that initial proposal? Which is the budget?

A  We've provided projections to the Commission of the costs, based on the best information available at the time. We told the Commission those dollars would be subject to change as additional information was available. There were certain risks that may arise on the project. We've had a number of those risks that have identified themselves. We've addressed those. There have been costs associated with those and we've been back to the Commission to raise our estimates, as appropriate.

Q  So, in effect, the Commission accepted your initial Base Load Review with those risks in mind, and we made you build nuclear plants. We put a gun to your head to build these nuclear plants at whatever cost they were going to amount to, because there is no budget. Is that your testimony?

A  That's not my testimony, and I want to make it clear on the record that no one from the Commission has put a gun to my head and asked me to do anything. We simply put our proposal to build the nuclear plants before the Commission. We believed then, and we believe now, that that was a good-faith estimate of what we expected the
costs to be. We have updated that, as appropriate. And I would offer the Commission that the costs we presented to the Commission back in 2008, when you look at the ultimate costs to be paid by customers, have not changed. While some of the construction costs have gone up, we've saved $1.2 billion in interest costs because we've been able to take advantage of lower interest rates. We believe we'll receive an additional $1 billion dollars in production tax credits because there are fewer new nuclear plants being built in the United States, and we'll qualify for more incentives available from the federal government. When you roll that together with the cost adjustments we presented to you today, the cost is the same as it was in 2008 for customers over the life of the project. There's been no change.

So to say we are overbudget, I don't accept that connotation, because you're only looking at one aspect of the project, and that's project cost. And, certainly, project costs will ultimately be passed on to consumers, but that's only one part of what customers pay. You have to look at production tax credits, financing costs, operating costs. It's all those factors that impact the customer's bill; it's not just the estimated construction cost.
So let's focus on those estimated construction costs, because that's why we're here. Page 37 and following of your testimony identifies those risks that you put before this Commission, risks that have turned out adversely and to which you attribute the substantial portion of the increased costs to complete the project; is that right?

Yes, I identify a number of risks in my testimony.

These are the risks that did not pan out as you hoped and expected they would when you talked about them as efficiencies that would limit the costs of completing the project in the initial Application, correct?

I don't recall that we used the word "efficiencies." We certainly were open and honest about the modular construction efforts and how we thought that would help us build the project the way it was presented.

Okay. Page 37, enumerating these by topic, "modular production," that was one of the expected construction efficiencies that you initially projected.

It is one of the risks we identified.

Well, it's a risk you identified, but you identified it initially as a positive that was going to save money on construction of the units, correct?

That was our initial expectation, associated with the risk that goes with that.
Q And that expectation has not been borne out, has it?

A In some cases, it has not. Module production goes through a number of phases. It starts with the submodule fabrication, a lot of which is coming from Lake Charles, Louisiana. That was a subcontractor on the job that was hired by Shaw and, ultimately, CB&I. The challenge has been in producing those submodules in a way that met the design applications. Many cases, some of the designs changed, as they were building the modules — the submodules, because of constructibility concerns. They needed to make sure they were in compliance with all the quality-control assurances that we needed for a nuclear project.

What I can tell you is, once those parts and pieces had been delivered on site and we put together the complete module, which was then placed into the reactor vessel or elsewhere on site, we've had a pretty good track record of putting those pieces together once they arrive on site. The challenge has been in the initial fabrication of those submodules, before they are sent to the site for assembly.

Q I look forward to talking to your witness, Mr. Byrne, about those efficiencies or lack thereof, at the plant and at those subcontractors, but suffice it to say, the assumption that you made at the time of the initial
Application is that the modular approach to construction would provide cost savings in the construction of these new AP1000-design units, correct?

A  I don't think you can put forth the assumption without the underlying risk we identified with that assumption. I think you have to take it as a whole.

Q  All right. Page 38, the second risk you identify as having disclosed to the Commission when they approved this Application was "construction efficiencies," correct?

A  That's correct.

Q  Again, citing advanced modular construction and standardized design as being the source of expected construction efficiencies, correct?

A  That's what we laid out as the plan, along with the risk that was associated with it.

Q  Third, you identified "rework" as a risk — correct?

A  That's correct.

Q  — but note that since AP1000 units have not yet been built, problems may arise during construction requiring rework, correct?

A  That's what we identified in our filing, that's correct.

Q  And "scope changes," again, page 38, that there can be changes in design, changes in regulatory requirements, midstream during construction, correct?
A We discussed that with the Commission at the initial filing, that these plants to be built at the Jenkinsville site, as well as the ones built at Vogtle by Georgia Power, are the only ones being built in the United States. However, there are four AP1000s under construction in China that started several years before our project started, and we expected and have received some design changes from that process. Mr. Byrne can address that in more detail. But we've tried to incorporate design changes that were considered necessary, that refined the original design, into our process. Of course, it takes time and effort to do that, and that has contributed to some of the delays we have encountered. Mr. Byrne can go into more detail, but there could be constructibility issues by the fabricator as they take the design drawings and try to actually produce the work that's in the design drawings, and they have to go back to the designers to try to work through those issues.

Q Those Chinese AP1000s, are they up and running now?

A The Sanmen – first unit at Sanmen is physically complete. Mr. Byrne can give you more details. If you were to look at a picture of the plant, you would think it complete. It's beginning to go through some of the testing processes that would need to be completed before
they load fuel. I believe the latest estimate is they
would look to be operational in 2016.

Q All right. Short answer is, none of those AP1000s are
on-line yet, producing electricity, are they, in China?
A At this point, no.
Q I'm sorry. You were garbled on that answer.
A No.
Q Of course, as I think we established in an earlier
proceeding, Chinese Communists run the regulatory system
in China, don't they?
A That's not the way we refer to the process. They do
have an oversight process in China. They have an
oversight group that looks at the work that's done by
the utilities that are building those projects. I
wouldn't offer it's equivalent to the South Carolina
Public Service Commission or the Nuclear Regulatory
Commission, but they do have oversight of those
projects. Westinghouse has been on site as the designer
of that facility, to make sure it's built to the same
standards that we would expect. CB&I, or Shaw, the
initial contractor, has been involved in the
construction of the units to make sure they're
constructed in accordance with the design efforts that
are also being followed here in the United States.
Q Well, to be clear, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is
not licensing the Chinese AP1000s, are they?

A We have never represented that the NRC was overseeing the construction of the plants in China.

Q And do you know whether or not they've imposed, in the Chinese reactors, standards that are equivalent to the quality-assurance standards required of our Nuclear Regulatory Commission?

A I'll let you ask Mr. Byrne that. He's involved in the detailed design and construction more so than I am. He'll be happy to address that question.

Q I'll do that, but as you sit here today, do you know whether or not the Chinese designs meet the stringent quality-assurance standards imposed by the US NRC on domestic US reactors?

A I believe I said earlier they're not under the jurisdiction of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The exact design, I would let Mr. Byrne address that question.

Q And on page 39, lastly, of the risks that you say this Commission forced you to take, you identify "design finalization" as a risk that you assumed would work out to your advantage, and has imposed additional cost, correct?

A I don't agree with your assessment that the Commission forced us to take these risks. We presented this
project as a whole, for the good of South Carolina, to
make sure we could provide clean, base-load energy for
60 years. We believed then that was the best option,
and we believe that today. We were not forced by the
Commission to do this. They agreed with our assessment.
We spent probably almost two weeks in here. You were
involved with that proceeding. We heard a lot of
testimony; there were probably thousands of pages of
testimony filed. We heard from a lot of witnesses. And
at the end of the day, an agreement was reached that
that was the best alternative for the State of South
Carolina because of the benefits associated with nuclear
power. We were not forced to do that.

On a project of this size, you know, design
finalization is rarely completed when a project starts.
We built our Cope generating facility, our coal-fired
plant, back in 1996. The design was not completed when
that plant started construction. It's typically
completed along the way and finishes in time to make
sure the components are available and the design is
available to finish the project. So there's design that
takes place throughout the process.

We never represented to the Commission that the
design was completed. We offered that this was a new
design; a conceptual design had been done. The design
had been certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. There were several dockets that were heard before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to certify that design. And there were a number of dockets — if I recall, it was probably 18 or 19. I think the design certification was probably docket 19, if I remember my numbers correctly. But there was a lot of work on the initial design, but the detailed design of the individual components had to be done as the project was under construction.

Certainly, a large percentage of that is done now. There remains a percentage that will still need to be completed as we move forward. I'll ask you to get Mr. Byrne to give some more detail on that, but we have never represented that the design was completed from the day we started the project. That's not customarily the way large projects of any kind are done, whether it's a large power plant or a large project for any other type facility.

Q Well, you did represent to the Commission that under the now current, existing regulatory process, the NRC uses a combined operating license. You don't go through a construction permit and then an operating license; they have one proceeding, and that's the COL, or combined operating license. And that was an efficiency you expected, correct?
That was a new process that was offered by the Commission for building new nuclear facilities. It was the first time it had been offered. We expected there would be challenges to work through that. We've encountered some challenges and we've been working through that with the NRC. And it's working as designed.

So when you came to this Commission, you told them you had a streamlined or a new one-step NRC licensing process, but you also told them that you didn't have a complete design yet for the reactor, and you were going to have to complete that design while construction was underway. You told the Commission that, you're saying?

We had the design that was certified by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The plants could not move forward with nuclear construction until that design was completed and the company issued an operating license. At the time we came to the Commission in 2008, we did not have that license in hand. We were in the process of making application to the NRC to obtain that license. We obtained that license in, I believe it was, March of 2012, which meant, from an NRC perspective, the design was certified for the plant as meeting its regulatory safety requirements.

Page 39 of your testimony, "In light of these risks,
SCE&G...acknowledged in 2008 that cost and schedule updates might be required." Quote, "The Commission agreed that under the BLRA these updates would be allowed so long as they were not due to the imprudence of the utility." That's what your testimony is, right?

A I believe that comes from the Base Load Review Act itself. As we told the Commission, I told the Commission myself, we are presenting the schedules as our best estimate of our informed judgment of what these plants will cost. We talked about the fixed costs, we talked about the firm with fixed escalation, and we talked about the targeted categories. At that time, about 50 percent was fixed; that's now moved to 66-2/3.

I committed to the Commission that, as information changed or the cost information needed to be revised, that we would be back before the Commission to explain the reasons behind it and give them a chance to ask us questions. ORS is on site on a daily basis. They review this information; they sit in our meetings; they have access to all the documents. Our commitment was we would inform the Commission, as the Base Load Review Act requires us to, from a full transparency perspective, and make them aware of the changes. We've been back several times to do that and presented that information with the Commission, under the Act, and to this point
they have found nothing that's been done that was 
imprudent by the company.

We believe the information we provided in this case 
supports the evidence that these costs are justified to 
be added to the estimate of construction and the change 
in the schedule, and the company has acted prudently in 
bringing that information and managing the project.

Q All right.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Guild, we're going to 
break for lunch now. We will come back at 1:15 — 
1:45.

[WHEREUPON, the witness stood aside.]
[WHEREUPON, a recess was taken from 12:35 
to 2:10 p.m.]
AFTERNOON SESSION

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you. Be seated.

[Witness recalled]

THEREUPON came,

KEVIN B. MARSH,

recalled as a witness on behalf of the Petitioner, South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, who, having been previously affirmed, was examined and testified further as follows:

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Before we resume Mr. Guild's questioning of Mr. Marsh, I think there was something we need to take up? Mr. Burgess?

MR. BURGESS: Thank you, Madam Chairman. One preliminary matter before we begin. Before we took a break, there was an objection lodged by SCE&G as to the relevance of the document that Mr. Guild was cross-examining Mr. Marsh on. So, we hereby withdraw that objection. So if Mr. Guild wishes to cross-examine Mr. Marsh on what I believe to be Exhibit G, the red-line version, which is from the revised rates docket, we have no objection to that line of questioning.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. The document is Exhibit G to what docket?

MR. GUILD: Madam Chair, it's 2015-160-E.

CHAIRMAN HALL: -160-E.
MR. GUILD: The revised rates docket.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. All right, thank you. All right. And Mr. Guild, the objection has been withdrawn, and we've now identified the document. So, before, I ruled that the clean copy would come into evidence, but for what purpose do you want it entered at this time?

MR. GUILD: So, Madam Chair, I would move that a clean copy of that document, Amended Exhibit G from the docket we just referred to, be marked for identification and received in evidence. I've got just a question or two about it. But I would like it, now, received as an exhibit.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay, the clean copy.

MR. GUILD: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Because we were – the dispute was about the handwritten copy.

MR. GUILD: The clean copy in as an exhibit, please.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay, so the clean copy –

MR. BURGESS: Madam Chairman, just so as not to confuse, there is a red-line version of that document –

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MR. BURGESS: – and there's a clean version of
that document. I believe the document Mr. Guild had was the red-line version that had his handwritten notes on it. So we certainly have no objection to the red-line version coming in, absent any handwritten notes, or, if you would prefer to put the clean version in, absent any handwritten notes – I know it's a little confusing.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MR. BURGESS: — I think that would be sufficient for us.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. So right now, we've made Hearing Exhibit 3 the clean red-line copy? Is that correct, Mr. Butler?

MR. BUTLER: I think that was correct.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Guild was just getting ready to, I think, identify —

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay, go ahead, Mr. Guild. I'm sorry.

MR. GUILD: It's immaterial. Either one – the contents are the same with the exception of the corrections. But if it's the company's preference, we'll have the clean copy of the final non-red-line version of that Exhibit G. I'd ask that be received in evidence, please.
CHAIRMAN HALL: All right.

MR. BURGESS: That's perfectly acceptable with us.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Well, it's already in as evidence. Hearing Exhibit No. 3.

[See Vol. 3, Pg 398]

FURTHER CROSS EXAMINATION

BY MR. GUILD:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Marsh. Thank you for your patience.

A Good afternoon. Is the microphone working better?

MR. BUTLER: Much. Much better.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay, yeah, and I do apologize for that. Apparently, an amplifier wasn't on. And so, we do apologize. And, yes, now all the Commissioners can hear.

MR. GUILD: Everybody sounds like themselves, Madam Chair, and also Mr. Marsh I hear loud and clear.

BY MR. GUILD:

Q Would you just accept, subject to check, Mr. Marsh, again from that document — the company's Amended Exhibit G — that if you total the entries for "Incremental Revenue Requirement-BLRA" from years 2015 through 2020, recognizing that those latter years are estimates, as you said, that the total of those values would be $677
Q Now, Mr. Marsh, as you relayed in your testimony, the company is currently in a dispute with the consortium — the Westinghouse Consortium — with regard to who bears the costs for a number of elements in the capital costs of the proposed Unit 2 and Unit 3 reactors, correct?

A That's right. The numbers that we presented in the filing before the Commission today represent the best estimate of the costs to complete the plants at this time, but do reflect — we have noted in my testimony, and others' — that there are disputes related to certain costs included in those amounts.

Q And what's the form, currently, of those disputes, Mr. Marsh?

A We have been in discussions with the consortium on numerous occasions since we got the revised integrated schedule. I believe it was in August of last year, and the cost data that went with that schedule followed shortly thereafter. Once we got the cost information, we put a team together on the site, at the project, to review the schedule, to understand the assumptions they'd made, and to challenge the costs and the data that was in that schedule to determine, one, if we thought it was a reasonable estimate to reflect what it
would take to complete the plants, based on the timeline they had given us. Our team on site agreed with the costs as the best estimate we had at the time and what it would take to complete the plants by June of '19 – Unit 2 in June of '19 and Unit 3 in June of 2020. And based on that, we then began to negotiate over who would be responsible for the costs. So we didn't have a dispute over what the costs were and whether or not they were reasonable; it was a question of accountability or who would be actually the one to pay the costs.

Q Yeah, precisely. So with regard to that latter point, the amounts of the costs in dispute with respect to who pays, what is the company's current claim against the consortium? How much money are you asking for?

A Well, there are amounts identified in the testimony, if you'll bear with me just a second.

Q Sure.

A There are total delay EAC costs of about $324,803,000. That's net of liquidated damages. Then there's the total owner's costs associated with the delay of $214,000,307. The combination of those, I believe, if I've added my numbers correctly, reflects the part that we would dispute as part of the additional costs associated with the project.

Q So that's roughly $538 million, if I'm adding correctly?
A It's 538, 539, somewhere in there, that's correct.

Q All right. And have you made a formal claim against the consortium in that amount?

A We have talked with the consortium about our disagreement with those costs, and the reasons giving rise to those costs, principally — the delay in the structural submodules that have been delivered to us, and some productivity factors based on the work that's being performed at the plant — and do not believe that we are responsible for paying these costs. We have identified those costs to them. We have, you know, not gone to a legal proceeding at this point, but, certainly, that's an option we will have at some point down the road if we can't find a fair resolution.

But the challenge we've got is to work to defend these claims on behalf of the company and, ultimately, our customers, but at the same time, maintain a reasonable working relationship with the consortium so they'll continue to work on the project. If we just stopped work on the project until we resolved the claims, that would severely limit our ability to finish these units in a timely fashion. So we're in discussions; we've had numerous discussions with the senior level management team at CB&I and Westinghouse. Mr. Byrne and I, along with other representatives from
Santee – Lonnie Carter, their president – we've been to Toshiba to talk to them about the costs, some of the disagreements we've got.

So it's an ongoing discussion. We've sent a number of letters that have outlined our concerns of why we think these costs are not appropriate, but, in terms of filing a claim, you know, we have not filed a claim – specifically, a claim in court – because we've not gotten to the point where we feel like it's necessary to file litigation at this point.

Q Well, we'll get to that. The question really is, is there a number? Is there a number in a document or a writing that you have presented to the consortium that represents the demand by SCE&G, on behalf of your stockholders, us ratepayers, for how much you want them to write you a check for, or pay?

A We presented these numbers in discussions with the consortium at a variety of levels. I'm sure they've been discussed at the plant site level, with the people on site there that are involved in the day-to-day construction activities and the finances related to that. We've had them at Mr. Byrne's level. Our chief nuclear officer has had discussions with the consortium about these costs. I've been involved in discussions. So we presented these numbers and discussed them on
numerous occasions.

Q You're not quite getting my question, I don't think. My question is, if I were to look for a document, would I find a document from SCE&G to the consortium saying, "You owe us 538, give or take, dollars, because of your responsibility for the delay, et cetera, in completing this project"?

A I don't know that there's one document that includes that amount. The schedule we have filed as part of our testimony here outlines the specific amounts that we have disputed. I can attest to the Commission that we have discussed these items directly with the consortium, Westinghouse and CB&I, as part of our negotiation process.

Q Now, does the EPC contract contemplate some other dispute resolution mechanism — arbitration or mediation, for example?

A There are opportunities for arbitration and mediation as part of the dispute resolution process.

Q And has South Carolina Electric & Gas Company invoked formal arbitration processes to resolve the cost dispute with the consortium?

A We've not gone to the formal level of doing that. We've certainly made it clear to the consortium that we reserve the right to do that. History tells us — my
history tells me, from my years of being in business, if you can resolve the issues without having to go through the legal steps, you're likely to get, potentially, a better decision.

Q Don't say bad things about us lawyers, now, Mr. Marsh. [Laughter] Might need one every once in a while.

A And I've had plenty of them work for me in the past. You know, we certainly want to keep the lines of communication open. I don't think there's any question we've raised the disputes to the consortium. We've leaned on them extremely hard, and made sure they understand their position. The consortium — I need to be honest with the Commission — they have a position that's very different from ours, which is why we're in negotiations. We intend to, you know, push hard on our side and look for a resolution that's beneficial to us and, ultimately, our customers, but at the same time trying to keep the work on the plants underway.

Q So, you've not initiated formal litigation. Your testimony is clear about that.

A That's correct.

Q Although, you contemplate that as a potential, possible remedy.

A It is a remedy — a potential remedy down the road.
Q: All right. You've not invoked any alternative dispute resolution mechanisms that are contemplated in the EPC contract, such as binding arbitration or mediation, up to date, have you?

A: That's correct.

Q: You've had discussions with them, but there's no specific dollar that you've put forward – the 538 which you offered as the estimated total of the costs associated with their responsibility, you haven't put that number to them yet, have you?

A: I think what I said earlier was I don't know that that's in one single document, but we have certainly discussed these amounts with the consortium. I mean, we wouldn't have put information in this schedule under oath to the Commission unless we had documented that and made it clear that's what we thought the amount in dispute was.

Q: All right. Now, if the matter required litigation to be resolved, what would be the determinative basis for costs being required of the consortium? What kind of acts or omissions on their part would trigger liability or responsibility for those additional costs, Mr. Marsh?

A: I'm not sure I understand the question. The costs that we have identified are costs that they have outlined in the rebaselined integrated scheduled to complete the project. We have not disagreed with those costs. We
believe those costs are known today; they're the best estimate available today, and that's why we included it in this updated filing. The question is, who's responsible for the costs?

Q That's right. So my question to you is, what is the basis for determining responsibility for those costs? Do you have to establish that the consortium was in violation of some contract term for them to be responsible, that they breached a contract term? Is that one?

A Certainly, we've identified in our testimony that we don't think the consortium is in compliance with the contract, specifically in the areas of the submodules that are delivered to the plant site, to comprise the modules that are put together there, and in their productivity on the site.

Q Let's take those — sorry. Did you finish your answer?

A I'm through.

Q Let's take those two. So, with regard to the delivery of the submodules at the site, what is it — what's the company's contention with regard to the dereliction or failures by the consortium in that regard?

A We don't believe the submodules have been delivered to the plant in a timely fashion to be in compliance with the schedules included in the agreement with the
consortium in the EPC contract. Their contention is, there have been regulatory changes that have principally caused the changes in delivery dates on those submodules, and we simply have a disagreement.

Q All right. So it's their contention that the rules of the game changed and that's why they're slow in delivering the submodules? Is that the essence of it?

A That's their primary concern.

Q All right. Your contention is to the contrary, that they just didn't meet quality standards in producing those submodules, and they had to take longer to get them right to deliver them in the form in which the NRC would allow you to use them, right?

A We believe the contract is very clear on the responsibility for delivering the modules at specific times at a specific cost, and they have not done that.

Q With an appropriate level of quality that meets regulatory requirements for inclusion in a nuclear plant.

A Well, that goes without saying, because we would not accept the parts on site for inclusion in the project unless they passed the quality test before we accept delivery of the submodules.

Q Right, and nor would the NRC allow you to.

A The NRC would find us in violation of the license, if we
Q: Did that?
A: Yes. So when will you decide whether or not the resolution of this dispute about $538 million necessitates you invoking one of these more formal dispute resolution mechanisms: arbitration or mediation?

A: I can't give the Commission a specific date on that today. The discussions are ongoing. What I can tell the Commission is, in the past, we've been able to find resolutions to our disagreements to this point. So we're certainly going to exhaust every opportunity to find a resolution that we think is good for the company and good for the customers over the long term, and we will push on that effort until we decide it's no longer fruitful. Then we'll decide what our options are at that point, whether it's some sort of dispute resolution or a move to a legal avenue.

Q: Okay. Page 41 of your testimony, line 15, I quote, "If litigation is required, the court proceedings in a matter this complex could last five years or more. The final resolution might come well after the project was completed." That's your testimony?
A: I believe that's what it says, yes.

Q: Well, Mr. Marsh, if it could take five years or more, why didn't you start last year? Or today? Why wait longer to initiate a process that you say might take
five years?

A  I'm not convinced today that the legal route would produce a result that would be in the best interests of our customers. You know, going through a legal proceeding does not guarantee a result. There's certainly risk associated with those proceedings. My experience has been for something this complex and this large, it could take a considerable amount of time. And before we embark on that process, I want to make sure we've exhausted all other avenues to us.

I'm very concerned, if we were to file a lawsuit immediately, that it would have an impact on our ability to work closely with our consortium partners on completing this project. My number one priority is to complete these projects safely, on time, so they can deliver the benefits they are expected to deliver to customers over the next 60 years. Just to jump into a lawsuit today and say, "Well, I need to start now so I can finish up, you know, by 2020," I don't think that would be prudent at this point, based on my knowledge of the disagreements and where we are in discussions with the consortium. I believe they have a vested interest in looking for a solution to this process without having to go through litigation.

Q  Well, you're aware, aren't you, that Georgia Power
Company has been, for some time, in litigation with a consortium about very similar claims with regard to noncompliance by the consortium and their obligations under their EPC?

You know, first, their contract is very different from ours. It's a sealed contract, so I've not had the ability to go through it. My understanding, and I believe they've talked publicly, is that primarily their contract is fixed. So the disagreements they might have in their contract over the same issues in our contract would be evaluated very differently, I believe, from the potential of litigation. I know they have a large number of legal personnel working on those projects, trying to resolve issues. They have not been resolved yet. I think it'll be many years as they continue down the same road before they get resolved. And we're trying not to put ourselves in that position.

Our contract is not fully fixed, which I said earlier we didn't do to preserve ourselves the right to try to protect the lower cost of the project. Their project is significantly higher, and I believe part of that reason is because it was fixed from day one, which we elected not to do, on the total contract. So I can't really compare their decision to move down a legal avenue on an issue — while the issue may be the same in
terms of the construction project, probably a very
different evaluation from a legal perspective. I'll
trust them to make the decisions that are right for
their project.

Q But you haven't reviewed their EPC contract, which is
confidential, so you're really speculating about what
the content of that agreement is.

A I believe that's what I said. I have not reviewed the
contract. I can only rely on what I've heard their
personnel say publicly and what the general
understanding is in the marketplace.

Q So you say that Westinghouse owes you, or the consortium
owes you, or your stockholders, $538 million. Are you
aware that Georgia Power's claims in their initial
complaint against the consortium were for $928 million
for damages due to noncompliance?

A That number sounds correct, but, again, I don't think
you're looking at apples-to-apples. I believe some of
the costs that are in their initial claim, we resolved
early on in our project, so we didn't have to go to
litigation. We brought the results of that settlement
to this Commission, I believe it was in 2012.

Q So Georgia Power has chosen a different route. They've
been in court for some time. They're asking for, you
know, close to twice as much from the consortium as you
say you're going to try to get from them. You've not tried anything other than talking to them. No negotiation — no arbitration, no litigation. And you say you're not litigating or using the other means because you don't want to interfere with your working relationship. Well, what harm has the litigation done that's discernible to the efficacy of construction at the Vogtle site? They're following the same pattern you are.

A I can't speak for the impact it's had on them. I'm just telling you, from my business experience, with a project this large, if you become embroiled in significant litigation before the project is completed — and sometimes you have to do that, but at this point we don't believe we're at that point — I believe it will have an impact on our working relationship, the conversations we have on a day-to-day basis at the plant site about work that needs to be done, to the point that it could — not saying it will, but it could — potentially damage the relationship that would put our ability to complete these projects on time at great risk.

Q What adverse impact has choosing the litigation route had on the progress in completing the Vogtle units?

A I can't speak to where they are with the litigation and
the direct impact it's had on their project.

Q  Can you identify any material difference in the progress towards completion of the Vogtle units as compared to the Summer units?

A  They have not provided me with an analysis or a discussion around that. I can only assume it has made their discussions with field personnel different than I believe they would be if you were not in litigation.

Q  We're just nicer around here, in South Carolina, than those Georgia boys are. I mean, really, is there any material impact of them having asserted their rights for their ratepayers in court, in Georgia, as compared to the route that you've taken of being nice and just talking about it?

A  Well, being nice is not the term I would use in the negotiating room we've had with the consortium. Despite our calm demeanor in South Carolina, we've been pretty firm when we needed to be. You know, we've had some very frank discussions with the consortium, and I believe that is the most appropriate way for us to do it at this point. I think it's great that we've gotten this far along in the project and we don't have significant litigation. As I told you earlier, I'm giving you my experience as a businessman in South Carolina for almost 38 years now that, when you get
embroiled in litigation, it changes your relationship. I mean, it just does. I mean, you can go to a divorce and I'd hasten to say your relationship with someone you're going through a divorce on is probably not the same while you're going through that divorce as it was before you filed the divorce papers. I just think it's human nature, given the challenges you would have in discussions of that nature.

Q And you think that if this Commission approves, as you've requested, this $538 million as an increment of the total $698 million in additional costs to complete, you think that will enhance your bargaining position with the consortium; you'll be able to come out swinging harder in getting them to come to the table to write you that check. Is that your position?

A We're going to swing hard under all conditions. I mean, just because the Commission would approve these additional costs to be added to the capital costs of this project is not going to change our position at all. We're going to work extremely hard to recover these costs, to keep these costs to a minimum as we resolve these issues with the consortium. We're not going to take a decision by this Commission as something we've got in the back pocket so we don't have to negotiate very hard. We've made those very statements to the
consortium; I told them I was disappointed that we did
not have some resolution prior to having to come to this
Commission, but I was obligated to keep my Commission
informed and we were going ahead with the discussion
we'd made with the filing with the Commission to update
these schedules. I made it very clear to the
consortium; we've got language in our testimony before
this Commission to commit to this Commission that we'll
not change our negotiating efforts and the zeal with
which we will look to look out for our company and our
customers.

Q So you told us — or the Commission, or the public — last
fall, that you would resolve these issues with the
consortium, the schedule and the cost issues, and then
you'd come to the Commission once you had known-and-
measurable evidentiary basis for final costs and a final
schedule, then you'd come to the Commission. But you
don't have that yet, do you? You don't have the costs,
because you've got $538 million up for grabs, in
dispute. And yet, you're still here asking the
Commission to give you a prudency judgment that that
$538 million is freely chargeable to ratepayers. That's
your position now?

A I don't agree with the way you stated that. I believe
we've done exactly what we told the Commission we were
going to do. We were starting the discussions last fall. I was optimistic at that point that we would have a reasonable chance of resolving the responsibility decision over who would be accountable for the costs. But the numbers we have put in front of the Commission, they are known, they are measurable. We've been through the evaluation of the dollars that were included in the fully integrated schedule that was given us. The costs associated with that have been reviewed in detail by our expert team on site. They've been reviewed by the Office of Regulatory Staff. And we concluded that these costs are prudent, in our opinion.

You know, just because we haven't assigned responsibility for the costs doesn't mean you can't determine what the costs to finish the plant would be, at this point, and that's what we presented to the Commission. And I think our testimony spells that out very carefully. We've only included in this capital cost schedule what we are required to pay under the contract. The risk we've got is, if we don't pay the 90 percent that was in dispute, we could find ourselves in breach of the contract. And if that happens, the contractor could slow down work or potentially walk off the job, and we'll never have the opportunity to finish these plants on time.
So the numbers are known. They've been gone through with experts internally and externally, and are considered to be prudent. The only remaining question at this point is who will be responsible for paying the costs. The way the Base Load Review Act is employed by the Commission, only actual costs incurred will be billed to customers through revised rates, the carrying costs on that. None of these costs will be billed to consumers until plants come on-line and go into commercial operation. They won't pay a single dollar for the cost of the plants until the plants come on-line.

Q No, they'll pay the financing costs for whatever you ask the Commission and they, in turn, deem prudent as part of the capital costs of the plant.

A They will only pay the financing costs if the actual costs are incurred. They could approve this schedule today as part of this proceeding, and we could resolve the issue — if life would be so nice — in the next couple of weeks, and we could find out — if you take the extreme example — where we wouldn't have to pay any of the additional costs. What caused those costs would not be incurred; they would never be charged to customers. No financing costs, nor the actual costs. That's the way the Base Load Review Act functions.
Q: Well, I see it differently, Mr. Marsh. I'd say there are two other alternatives. One is you could wait those couple of weeks, hold this Application in abeyance. Wait those couple of weeks. Once you've worked out either zero dollars, because you've persuaded — with all that good South Carolina sweet talk — persuaded the consortium to bear the $538 million, then you come in here and it's a much smaller pie we're talking about. Or, or, you could ask your stockholders to pay the $538 million, or the 90 percent, carry the load that they are responsible for because you made these management decisions, and complete the plant just as you described. Pay the 90 percent, keep the consortium happy, but write the check out of your stockholders' pocket instead of the ratepayers'. You could do that, couldn't you?

A: I think that option would be the most imprudent step we could take with respect to completing this project on time. I gave the extreme example of if we could complete negotiations in a couple of weeks. We're not going to complete negotiations in a couple of weeks. I don't know the exact timeframe, but it's not going to be in the next couple of weeks.

If we don't include these capital costs in the schedule — because they are known, we've estimated those to be reasonable and in accordance with the work that
needs to be done — the financial community will be very concerned about our ability to recover the costs we spend on this project. The shareholders — the shareholders you talk about having to eat this cost until we come back to the Commission, we have to raise capital. We don't have those shareholders today. We'd have to sell new stock, eventually, to pay for the cost of this plant, along with bond sales we have to make up about 50-50. So if this Commission were not to allow these capital costs to go forward as approved, subject to the actual costs to be paid over the long term, I think we're going to have a very difficult time, if not an impossible time finding the shareholders you talk about to step up to the plate and make an investment, because they're not concerned about just receiving a return on their investment; they ultimately want to receive a return of their investment when these plants come on-line and depreciation starts. So I think that would be the worst alternative that could be imagined for this project, and put our ability to finish these plants on time in tremendous jeopardy.

Q All right. But the standard the Commission is going to weigh is not whether or not Wall Street or your stockholders are put in a bind by these cost overruns; they're the standard of whether these additional capital
costs that you propose to incur are imprudent. That's the standard under the Base Load Review Act, isn't it?

A There has been no evidence provided in this case to support the fact or the contention that these costs could be imprudent. We—

Q That's not my question. Sorry for interrupting, but my question really is, the standard is imprudence — that's what you've testified to — under the Base Load Review Act. That's the standard, isn't it?

A My understanding of the Base Load Review Act is, once the initial capital cost schedule has been provided, which we did in 2008, the company would be authorized to return to the Commission to make updates to that schedule, which we have done on a couple of occasions, and based on the evidence presented in those hearings and the information provided by the company, those amounts are deemed to be prudent unless there's evidence provided about their imprudence.

I know of no evidence in this case where someone has challenged the costs and said they're imprudent. This schedule has been reviewed by our team, it's been reviewed by ORS, and the Office of Regulatory Staff concluded that these costs were prudent and the company's filing was appropriate.

Q We look forward to you listening to the rest of the case
that's being presented here, on that score, Mr. Marsh, but the standard of prudence is what this Commission is going to have to weigh. Are you aware of the position that your company has taken on, with regard what the definition of "prudence" is that should be employed by this Commission?

A I've talked to the Commission on numerous occasions about my definition of "prudence." I don't know if our company has written one. You may have one you want to present to me, but I —

Q I want to share with you the final brief of Respondent South Carolina Electric & Gas Company, in the appeal of South Carolina Energy Users Commissionsic at the State Supreme Court. And it's a document that I think you'll recognize, signed by Mr. Chad Burgess, January 21, 2014. I'm going to direct your attention to page 22 of that document [indicating].

A [Indicating.]

MR. BURGESS: [Indicating.]

BY MR. GUILD:

Q And I'll ask you, if you would, please, Mr. Marsh — I made an asterisk by a line with some quotation marks that begin with the word, "'Prudence' is universally understood..." Would you read that quote, please?

A Yes. It says, "'Prudence' is universally understood
under a prudency test, a standard by which management action is to be judged, as that of reasonableness under the circumstances, given what was known or should have been known at the time the decision was made or action was taken."

Q It cites a case, Georgia –
A It cites the case of Georgia Power Company versus Georgia Public Service Commission.

Q You don't need to read the citation, but, thank you. And you'd acknowledge that that is the position that the company took in that filing with the Supreme Court [indicating]?
A You know, I'm not a lawyer. I will certainly acknowledge that's what it says, but I think to get the feel for the whole decision that was reached by the Supreme Court, you'd have to read that whole document. I just read a –

Q And I want to –
A – piece of it.

Q – show you the whole decision. This is the Georgia Power decision that your lawyer cited as the appropriate prudence standard. I'll put that before you [indicating].

A [Indicating.]

Q And the language that you just read is the underlying
language, but would you read the rest of that text that follows after the underlined language, about the definition of prudence, that your lawyers argued, please?

A [Indicating.]

MR. BURGESS: [Indicating.]

WITNESS: Did you say you want me to read the underlined part, or you want me to start reading after that?

BY MR. GUILD:

Q Start reading after it, please, Mr. Marsh.

A "The concept of prudence implies a standard or duty of care owed to others. In building a nuclear power plant, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission requires the utility to exercise a high standard of care in order to protect the public health and safety. Similarly, given the costs involved and the rate impact of those costs on monopoly customers, this Commission finds that the utility should be held to a high standard of care in making decisions and taking actions in its planning and constructing such a project. Thus, while the standard to be applied is reasonableness under the circumstances, where the risk of harm to the public and ratepayer is greater, the standard of care expected from the reasonable person is higher. Given this standard, a
reasonable person is one who is qualified by education, training, and experience to make the decision or take the action, using information available and applying logical reasoning processes."

Q All right. Thank you. Mr. Marsh, I take it that you would accept that language, description, by the Georgia Court, aptly captures what you believe to be your competence in making judgments about the terms on which this nuclear project is going forward?

A It sounds like a reasonable explanation of the activities we've undertaken to identify these additional costs and evaluate those costs prior to presenting them to the Commission as an amendment to the capital cost schedule.

MR. GUILD: Thank you, Mr. Marsh. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Commissioners, questions for Mr. Marsh? Commissioner Randall.

COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you, Madam Chair.

EXAMINATION

BY COMMISSIONER RANDALL:

Q I've just got one question. We've had several, sort of, thoughts and reactions to the proposed reduction on the return on common equity from 11 to 10½ in the settlement agreement. Have you had any reaction from the financial
community regarding this reduction, and how do you see that the financial community actually views this proposed reduction?

A I don't think they've reviewed the 10½ by itself. I think they've taken that as part of the comprehensive settlement agreement that was reached with the ORS and Energy Users. I believe, in my experience, they believe it was a good decision on the company to try to settle these issues because it limits or could mitigate potential, you know, appeal of the decision by the Commission. It certainly shows that one of our significant intervenors, that's been involved in all of our cases since we started in 2008, has come to an agreement with the company on what we believe is a reasonable and fair decision on the issues that were involved in this case. I think they've reacted positively. It would certainly be a sign to the financial community that the Commission — if the Commission were to adopt the settlement — that it has continued its fair and reasonable approach of applying the Base Load Review Act, upon which we depend heavily for our future financing.

COMMISSIONER RANDALL: Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Thank you.
Commissioner Elam.

EXAMINATION

BY COMMISSIONER ELAM:

Q  Good afternoon, Mr. Marsh.
A  Good afternoon.

Q  The reduction — let's see if I can clear up something that I heard earlier. The reduction in the ROE from 11 to 10.5 —
A  Right.

Q  — represented, according to ORS, a $15 million savings, over what time period? Is it the construction schedule, or is it the entire anticipated life of the plant?
A  No, it would just be during the construction schedule. While these plants are under construction, under the Base Load Review Act, they would have applied the rate of return that's been agreed to. So the 10½ percent would apply until Unit 2 and Unit 3 come on-line. So at the time those units come on-line, you will transition to the then-effective ROE for the core business, and that would be the ROE that would be there into the future.

Q  Okay. You've been asked some questions about some comparisons to Georgia Power. Do you know, off the top of your head, a comparison of the number of electric retail customers SCE&G has, as opposed to how many
Georgia Power has?

A I don't know that number, specifically. I can confirm that it's a lot more than we have in South Carolina.

Q Is it on an order of double, or triple?

A I'm confident it's at least double. It may be three times, just for Georgia Power.

Q Okay. And as to Georgia Power versus SCE&G, just the total megawatts of generation, the difference between the two companies, do you know that?

A I don't know the specific amount that's owned directly by Georgia Power Company. They are part of a holding company known as the Southern Company, and there may be generation that is co-owned and some of those megawatts are allocated between companies. I just don't know that, specifically, but I would expect their generation megawatts that either they own or have been assigned to them from the corporate entity would be of a magnitude consistent with the number of customers.

Q Okay. Following up on your discussion with Mr. Guild about negotiations with the consortium, when did those start?

A We started, I believe it was last September. We received the updated schedule from them in August, and that followed shortly thereafter with the costs associated with that schedule.
Q  Okay.

A  So when they decided to make an effort to bill that additional cost to us, we started challenging them on the costs. That's not to say there weren't some preliminary discussions, because we expected it to be coming. But we certainly didn't get into direct negotiation of that, probably until September of 2014.

Q  Okay. At September 2014, were you in agreement with the consortium about what the dollar figure value of that was, or was that later?

A  I don't know exactly when the dollar amounts were presented to them in the various discussions. I don't think that occurred at one particular time. As I told Mr. Guild, as we got into the schedule and had a chance to evaluate the numbers and, you know, go through and identify what we specifically thought was not appropriate — I mean, this is a schedule that's thousands of lines long and has thousands of pages of detail behind it. So we didn't get the schedule on a Monday and we were through with it on a Wednesday. It took us weeks and probably several months to get all the way through the detail on that schedule, because we wanted to determine first if we thought it was achievable, and then we looked behind the hours and the costs behind that to determine what we thought was
applicable and not consistent with the EPC contract.

**Q** Okay. Thousands of lines. Without getting into a
dollar figure, has there been any agreement about any of
those sub-lines, as far as whose responsibility
something or the other is, and you're just trying to get
through to the end? Or is there no agreement on
anything to this point?

**A** No, there were some dollars in there that we did agree
that were appropriate, and I believe Mr. Jones is going
to present some change orders in connection with that.
We identified a couple of other costs that we believe
are appropriate in the revised schedule they gave us.
The ones we pointed out in the filing here and we've
indicated we're only going to pay 90 percent of are the
ones we dispute under the contract.

**Q** Can you give the Commission a rough idea of when you
would expect some finality to that process?

**A** I wish I could give you a specific date. The consortium
is not in agreement with our position, so we continue to
negotiate it extremely hard. We've had a number of
discussions. There are some areas I believe we're
starting to find some common ground. I wish I could
give you more detail, but those are confidential
discussions and, you know, we certainly haven't signed
anything that would say we think we're on the right path.
on these three and upset on those five. We're still continuing to work through that process very hard.

Q So no idea whether it would be this year or not?

A I would like to think we could complete it this year. That would certainly be a goal of mine. I believe the consortium would certainly like to resolve it by the end of the year. But I can't commit to an exact date. That's certainly a reasonable target, though.

Q Okay. Tell me what the procedure will be if, in fact, you convince the consortium to take responsibility for half of it, as —

A Right.

Q — an example, and these have already been approved as capital costs. Will there be some mechanism for anything that perhaps ratepayers have paid, to that point, to be credited?

A Well, assume we pay the 90 percent — I'm just going to give an extreme example. Let's assume we paid all of the 90 percent, and we reach a resolution where we recover all of the 90 percent. Certainly, we would immediately credit that back to the cost of the project, and in the next revised rate filing, that would be reflected in the customers' rates because they're paying for the carrying costs on that amount.

Q How will that come back? Just in the cost of the
project, or – there's no other rate mechanism as far as any change in the capital costs?

A Well, if we were to recover monies from the consortium that we had paid, we would immediately credit those dollars to the project. So the capital costs we've eventually paid for the project would go down immediately. Those actual dollars paid are what we use to file our revised rates adjustment on an annual basis, so your next revised rate adjustment would be on a lower capital cost, which would give you the credit on that carrying cost for customers in bills going forward.

Q Okay. On page 11 of your prefilled testimony, you talk about the increase in the forecasted benefit of production tax credits, due to a smaller number of competing utilities. Do you have any concerns about having both units meet the required placed-in-service date of prior to January 1, 2021? And, I guess, the first unit.

A Yeah. Well, the first unit – the first new unit, Unit 2, I don't believe is under as much risk as the second unit, because if it's completed on time in 2019 it will be well within the limits established by the Treasury for the production tax credits. Certainly, unit two is close to the deadline, which is why we're so concerned about keeping progress moving forward on these units and
not doing anything to delay that progress. That's really why the 90 percent mechanism was put into the contract, so if we found ourselves in a situation where there was a dispute, that work could continue while we made the effort to resolve the dispute.

Q Is the substantial completion date usually the same as the placed-in-service date?

A There are probably a variety of opinions on that. We have assumed, for our purposes, it's the commercial operation dates. There are some out there that may be of the opinion—I've heard discussions that that could be when the fuel is actually loaded into the reactor and you're producing fuel—I mean, producing electricity. The credit is linked to the production of electricity, so that's a position that we certainly might make some valid effort down the road to evaluate that.

Q In your testimony there on page 11, I guess starting at line four going to the end of line five, you talk about $1.2 billion in interest costs, in future dollars. We've been—throughout these proceedings, there's been a lot of discussion of money in terms of 2007 dollars.

A Right.

Q Why are you talking about future dollars now, here?

A These are debt issuances that have already been sold to the public, and this is interest that will be paid in
the future, over the life of those bonds — in some cases, 30-year bonds, and in a couple of cases, 50-year bonds. So we've taken the actual amount of interest that would be paid over that period.

Q So, does that necessarily make projections about interest — or, that's a fixed rate on the bonds?

A Those are fixed rates on the bonds. All the bonds that have been issued at this point have been fixed-rate bonds.

Q On page 46 of your prefiled, at line 16, you talk about SCE&G's role as owner of the project. Can you explain a little bit what "owner of the project" means? Does that have something to do with your relationship vis-a-vis Santee Cooper? Or what is special about "owner of the project"?

A There's nothing special there, other than we are an owner of the project, with Santee Cooper, our partner. What I was trying to say was, as an owner, we're going to make sure we maintain all of our claims, to try to keep as much leverage on Westinghouse and CB&I as we can, to eliminate these costs that we believe are not appropriately charged to us.

Q Okay. So Santee Cooper is not involved in negotiating with the contractors.

A Oh, no, they're actively involved with us.
Q Okay.

A Lonnie Carter sits with me on many occasions, as well as other people on his construction team at the plant site. They are in every conversation with us; they're in every negotiation meeting with us. There's nothing we don't do, from a negotiating perspective, that's not discussed and agreed to with Santee.

Q Okay. Maybe I phrased it a little badly.

A All we're trying to say —

Q They're not in separate negotiations with the consortium.

A Oh, absolutely not.

Q Okay. So whatever applies to SCE&G will apply to Santee Cooper, as well?

A If we reach an agreement, I think it's comfortable to say that it will be an agreement that all the parties sign onto, SCE&G and SCANA — SCE&G and Santee Cooper.

COMMISSIONER ELAM: Nothing further. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Commissioner Hamilton.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Thank you, Madam Chair.
EXAMINATION

BY COMMISSIONER HAMILTON:

Q  How are you, Mr. Marsh?

A  Doing fine.

Q  Mr. Marsh, on page 29, line 13, of your prefiled direct testimony, you state that the company has approximately $3.4 billion of debt and equity that remains to be raised.

A  That's correct.

Q  Okay. Could you tell us, or provide us with the approximate amounts and types of the instruments to be used, and the dates?

A  The timing of those issuances would be consistent with the additional construction expenditures as they occur. So we would look to raise debt or sell equity to finance the project to support the dollars that are being expended in any particular calendar year. It's not a perfect match, but you're not going to sell an odd number of bonds. You're going to sell 100 million or 300 million; you're not going to sell 123 million. It'll be an even amount.

             We look at the actual construction expenditures that we expect to spend in a particular year, and we divide that 50-50, because we think about 50 percent of that should be debt and 50 percent should be equity, in
order to maintain our bond ratings. Those are the amounts that we'd sell in those particular years, so it would follow the construction schedule.

Q All right. Are you following, or does the company continue to utilize its original financing plan for the project?

A We have. We made it clear, as we started out, that we didn't feel the need to take the government-guaranteed—the government-subsidized loan guarantees that were offered. We've been able to approach the marketplace on extremely favorable terms. We're in a very low-interest-rate environment, and that's evidenced by the $1.2 billion we expect to save— that we will save on the issues we've issued to this point. I believe it's reasonable to expect that that number will grow, because, as we continue to issue debt, we've got debt—I think it's about $1½ billion hedged today, which means we've locked in the interest rates for just slightly over 5 percent. Well, that's less than the 6.4 we estimated originally, so that'll produce additional savings that aren't included here, that will go directly to customers. The company does not keep those savings; that's passed on directly to customers. So we'll continue to do that and continue to use those instruments. I've been asked in the past, and I believe
the Commission has asked us in the past, if we were considering the federal loan guarantees.

Q Yes, sir.

A That's a program we have watched since its inception. We have tried to understand as much about that program as we can. The type of debt that's issued on that program is principally amortizing debt, which means, if you sold a bond issue today, you would pay back a portion — you would pay the interest and a portion of the principal back, over the life of that bond. That's very different from what we have in place where we issue a 30-year bond, and you don't have to pay any principal until the end of the 30 years. So if we were to go into the debt — the federal loan guarantees, we would be refinancing capital costs throughout the life of those bonds, which exposes us to great interest-rate risk. I can't predict the future, but I think it's more likely that interest rates are going to go up than they're going to go down, from where they are today. So we've been locking in these low rates and have not felt the need to do the loan guarantees. We also don't know the terms and conditions that come with those loan guarantees. We know there are always terms and conditions and covenants with any deal you would do like that, and we've not been provided those. If we are ever
provided those, we will certainly do the evaluation, but I think it would be a stretch for me, at this point, to say they would be favorable to what we've been able to secure in the marketplace at this point.

COMMISSIONER HAMILTON: Thank you, very much, Mr. Marsh.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Commissioner Howard.

EXAMINATION

BY COMMISSIONER HOWARD:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Marsh.

A Good afternoon.

Q Mr. Marsh, one of the reasons, I guess I'll just say, I'm asking you the questions is because you're the first person up. That gives you the right to pass them on down, if you feel someone else is more qualified.

A I've been on both sides of that test.

[Laughter]

Q I just wanted to make sure. On page 26 – 27 and 28 of your testimony, you said the market is becoming extremely sensitive to SCE&G's regulatory risk in the nuclear context, and you raise the possibility of not being able to finance completion of the units. What plan, if any, do you have, if the financing becomes
A: We have in place lines of credit that we've extended, that apply to SCE&G, where, if we had a short-term period where credit were not available, we could call on those lines of credit, which I believe would transfer into long-term debt – subject to check, on that piece. So we have a backup plan with lines of credit if we had a point in the marketplace where we couldn't sell bonds. I think the biggest concern on my part would be if the Commission were not to support the project as it had in the past in allowing our adjustments, when they were deemed to be prudent, would send a message to the marketplace that there's a greater risk on the recovery of your investment if you make that in SCE&G. That doesn't mean we couldn't sell bonds. There's certainly a possibility you couldn't sell bonds. But they would be a higher interest rate. Just like we're going to benefit from higher interest rates over the next 30 and 50 years on the debt issues we put out today, likewise, we would be penalized if we sold debt today at a rate that was higher than what we anticipated when we forecast the project for the Commission.

So the risk is not just that you couldn't finance, but that, if you could finance, it would be at significantly higher rates. That's where the BLRA has
been so important to us, because that's the mechanism that the financial community is relying upon to give them a reasonable level of comfort that they will be able to recover their financing costs.

Q Well, do you plan on utilizing any equity financing?

A We do have plans to do equity financing, as the need arises. Since about 50 percent of the construction would come from equity, you know, whatever remains to be spent, you could take half of that and we'd plan to, you know, put equity into this project or sell additional stock as necessary to raise the equity to support the project. So we will be doing both.

Q What is your debt-equity ratio today, and what would it be if you had to undergo one of these plans? I know that it – the last part of that question is strictly speculative.

A You know, basically, today, for the project itself, it's about 50-50, because that's our plan. It may not be exactly that, because you can't equal an – issue an exact amount. So from a project perspective, on a consolidated SCE&G, I think it's about 54 percent equity – 53 to 54. So that's just a little bit higher.

If we had a negative decision on the project, we may have to sell more equity to support the bond ratings, which would drive costs up on the project,
because the return-on-equity cost is generally higher than the interest rate you pay on bonds. So it's hard to say exactly what it would be. If we had an adverse decision from the Commission, I think we'd have to analyze that carefully and respond to the financial community. But their response would be negative; it's just a matter of how negative it would be in terms of our ability to raise the capital.

Q The last two bond issues, if I'm not mistaken, both of them were for 50 years?

A They were.

Q One of them was oversold, and the last one was — I hate to use the word "undersold," but you didn't sell it in the first —

A You know, we were many times oversubscribed on the bond issue for the first 50-year bond issue. I believe it was only the sixth 50-year bond that had been sold, and the lowest that had ever been done by a utility, so we set a record with that sale. The second 50-year sale was a little more difficult. We had to raise the interest rate just a little bit, in order to have enough investors come into the deal to make the sale. We still got a favorable rate. It was 5.1 percent, compared to what we originally estimated at 6.4.

But I think, in my professional opinion, the
concern in the marketplace, you know, had to do with this proceeding we're in today and the risks associated with changing your capital cost schedule and maintaining the support at the Commission. They watch those issues. They're closely watching this examination to understand, you know, where the Commission will land at the end of the day. As I mentioned earlier, I think the settlement agreement was a positive sign to the marketplace that the regulation is working well with respect to the Base Load Review Act, and the Commission will be making its decision accordingly.

Q Why did you use a 50-year instead of a 30-year, which would probably have been more attractive to some investors, I would think? Why — how did you come up with the 50-year?

A We don't like to have all of our issues mature at the same time. We also like to try to match up the lives of our assets with the lives of our bonds, trying to match that up as closely as possible. Since this project is a 60-year-life project, once these plants come on-line, we believed it was appropriate to include a reasonable amount of 50-year bonds in the project. Otherwise, whoever's in charge of financing this company 30 years from now is going to wonder why Mr. Addison sold all those bonds that come due at one time —
[Laughter]

— and they'll have to be there financing those, you know, back-to-back-to-back, without a new project being on board. We know that's the case now, because we're building the project. So we've done 30-years and 50-years; I wouldn't be surprised, before we're done, to do some 10-year bonds mixed in with those, so we can spread those maturity dates out and not have all that risk come due at once.

Q The license is 40 years, plus a 20 renewable?

A It's a 40-year license. Once you've been operating for 20 years, and Mr. Byrne can confirm this, at that point you have the right to do the evaluation study to have an additional 20 years added to your license.

Q I guess my first thought was, a 40-year bond because theoretically that's the life of the asset, as we know it now.

A I've not seen any 40-year bonds in the marketplace. That would be an unusual term. Generally, the 30 has been the most popular — 10s, 20s, and 30s. The 50 is a new bond for the marketplace, but for the right type of asset and for the right companies and support, it's receiving some good attention.

Q Since the — just talking about the Base Load Review Act, since the Base Load Review Act, how much has it
increased residential rates just for the nuclear plants?

How much have residential rates increased from the beginning till today?

CHAIRMAN HALL: Mr. Marsh, will you pull your microphone closer, please?

WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry [indicating]. I got comfortable because it was working.

[Laughter]

I believe that number is around, I'm going to say, 17 to 20 percent. I don't have the exact calculation here in front of me. Based on what we've seen since we started the plants in 2008, adding up the increments that have been applied in those years, I believe it's between 17 and 20 percent.

BY COMMISSIONER HOWARD:

Q And what do you anticipate between now and the completion date, estimated?

A From a total retail perspective, I believe that number goes to around 35 percent, in total, since you have another number on top of that between now and that time.

Q Okay.

A But I want to point out — I know we're focused a lot on rates, and we should be, but the amount that impacts customers is not just the rate increases; it's the
impact of fuel costs and the production tax credits. And our current forecast actually shows, when these plants come on-line, based on the costs we've got today, and you apply first the lower cost of nuclear fuel – because it is cheaper than the coal or natural gas – and when you combine that with the production tax credits, you're going to see a leveling of rates or a decrease in rates at that time.

So I understand your question, and I want to respond to that, but that's one piece of what customers see. That's just the base-rate side that's impacted by fuel and production tax credits. And that's the challenge that I think we've missed sometimes in these proceedings is, we're just focused on the capital costs – which is important. We need to focus on that. It's very important, because it's the largest cost of the impact to customers. But we can't discount fuel and production tax credits.

Q I feel comfortable in asking you about one milestone, and I'm sure you know what the milestone is. It's 146. Are you familiar with an Milestone 146?

A Well, it's got to be the last one, because there are 146 of them. I don't know –

[Laughter]

Q I figured you would remember. My question's on
production tax credit.

A  Yes, sir.

Q  One forty-six says the completion date is June '19? June 2019?

A  Right.

Q  Production tax credit runs out in December of that year.

A  Well, to qualify for the credits you have to have your — you have to do three things. You have you file your license, which we did. You have to pour your basemat for the reactor, which we've done for both reactors, so we've met both of those two requirements. And the third is, your plant needs to be in operation by the beginning of 2021. So if we finish Unit 2, the first unit, in 2019, it will clearly qualify for the credits. If we finish Unit 3 in June of 2020, it will qualify for the credits. And once you qualify for the credit, you're eligible to receive those for an eight-year period, once you become eligible to qualify for the credits.

Q  Well, my question is a confusing thing in my mind, and I hope you can clear me. We have a boundary of 18 months on each of the milestones.

A  That correct.

Q  That milestone, 18 months, would take it beyond 2021. It would take that — it would have — I don't want to say flexibility, but according to milestones, they would
have another year to do the project over there. So my question to you is, what is involved in changing that boundary to six months, so the boundary would be in line with the production tax credit deadline? Can you change the boundary? I don't know; I'm asking the question of somebody. It just seems like, if that boundary was the same as the production credit deadline, there would be more of an incentive to get the project finished within that boundary?

A Right. Certainly, we want to achieve the deadline so we make the deadline of 2020. There does remain an opportunity, we believe, for us, if we find ourselves up against that deadline, potentially to go to Treasury or to go to Congress and have those deadlines extended. That certainly is not an absolute. It's something we have already begun to evaluate and try to define what a strategy might look like to accomplish that.

I would hate to spend the 12 years we've invested in completing these plants and miss a deadline by a very short period of time and not qualify for the credits. So it's something I can't guarantee, but we would make every effort to ensure we would qualify for the credits.

You know, the Commission certainly has the authority to move that deadline back, if it wants to. You know, we had originally asked for 30 months. That
was adjusted to 18 in the original hearing, and I think that's been reasonable. That's worked well for us. It has made us pay attention. I can assure you, without that deadline being moved back to 2020, it's got our full attention. So, certainly, the Commission could do that. I would think, as we approach that 2020 date, if we have issues, my commitment is we would be back before the – back and forth – back in front of the Commission to explain the exact situation and what our strategy has been to resolve it, so our customers do qualify for the credits.

Q This is, for lack of a better word, I'll say a cliché. There's a cliché that's going around right now of, what keeps you awake at night? With all the moving parts of this nuclear power plant, which is one that would keep you awake the most at night?

A You know, certainly, it's staying on the schedule. I don't have nearly as many concerns as I did when we started the project about being able to build the facility. As we told the Commission, this was a new plant, it was a new design. We knew they were under construction in China. As we have monitored their construction in China, we've become more and more comfortable with the constructibility of the plants, and physically their plants are almost complete. The first
unit is complete. I will anxiously watch as they load fuel and they heat the plant up and it produces electricity for the first time.

I think making sure we finish these plants on time is my biggest concern. I want to make sure we do what it takes to bring these plants in on time and capture the production tax credits for the benefit of our customers.

Q Thank you, very much.

A Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Commissioner Whitfield.

VICE CHAIRMAN WHITFIELD: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

EXAMINATION

BY VICE CHAIRMAN WHITFIELD:

Q Good afternoon, Mr. Marsh.

A Good afternoon.

Q I've only got about four questions for you, and two of them you've already practically answered or at least touched on. The first one has to do – you kind of answered it in a response you gave to Commissioner Hamilton about the federal loan guarantees, and you explained that real, real well. I guess my only remaining question about that is – and, again, not to Monday-morning quarterback that. I know Georgia sought
them out for Vogtle years ago, and you did not. But I thought there was a — was there not a deadline as to what point you could still get those if you chose to? Or is that still an option? You've still got $3.4 billion worth of capital to raise. Is that something that —  

Q There have been deadlines along the way to stay in the pack that would qualify for the loan guarantees. You had to pay certain fees to go to the next level. We were paying these fees to the federal government to stay in the game.  

Q Or negotiate the fee, yes.  

A So we paid our fees to a certain point. I may need to verify this, but my understanding is we're no longer paying fees because they've not provided us the information we need to continue the evaluation. So, to put it in simple terms, the ball is in their court. If they want us to consider the loan guarantees and their options, they're going to have to provide us with the details we need to complete the evaluation. I'm not concerned if they never provide it to us, because I think our financing we've got in place is going to be extremely tough to beat, with the locked-in interest rates we've got, with none of the covenants and restrictions that come with that.
So I'm comfortable with what we've done, and I don't regret — even looking back today. And Georgia has done that. I'm comfortable they've got a lot of new requirements they're going to have to meet in connection with those loans, to satisfy the federal government, that we won't be subject to.

Q I think y'all stated that years ago, that —
A We did.
Q — there were a lot of strings attached, if you will, with —
A Yes.
Q — those loan guarantees. And you've certainly explained it in your answer to Commissioner Hamilton as to why you haven't done it up to this point, and it looks like the possibility of you doing it is getting slimmer and slimmer by the day, I guess.
A Where we sit now, we're not moving forward unless they provide us additional information to do the evaluations.
Q Another question I had that you kind of touched on a little bit with Commissioner Elam: We were talking about any monies that might come back as a result of your ongoing negotiations with CB&I and, of course, Commissioner Elam I think used the example of what if — of course, presently, we are still operating under the old schedule and costs, but if this were approved and if
some costs had been put in place and then, somewhere down the road — and we hope for the ratepayers' sake that you do get all of this that you can. Actually, we hope that you get 100 percent of it, but if you were to get a quick resolution or a resolution down the road, and some of the costs were already in place, and I think you said here on the stand that you would return these funds through a revised rate proceeding. But somewhere in somebody's testimony, I thought I read the mention of it being under a fuel proceeding. And this may be a legal question, but the way I read the Base Load Review Act, it possibly could be allowable in a fuel proceeding. But we've got so much else packed into a fuel proceeding now, do you think it would be best to do it in a revised rate proceeding where you educate the public, if you will, and get good press, whatever you want to say, by showing that you have recouped these costs?

A If you wanted to give the dollars back as quickly as possible and put it in consumers' hands, the reduction to fuel would probably be the quickest way to do that. Through the idea I put in front of you earlier, if we received a refund, it would be credited to the capital costs of the project. Consumers would continue to pay the carrying costs on that project, but that would be a
lower rate than an immediate refund through a fuel cost. That would typically be what's done, is to lower the capital costs, because it is a return of the capital costs. But I think the Commission would be within its bounds to evaluate the best way to handle that when it came back in, which is why I said we would be back in front of the Commission to make sure it was clear how it was to be treated.

Q Well, that's certainly something that we would have to — and that would be a good problem to have, and we hope you have that problem.

A I anticipate having that problem and being back before you, and certainly any options that would be available to us, the Office of Regulatory Staff would be able to fully vet for the Commission and also give you a recommendation.

Q Another question — and it certainly looks like, you know, what Commissioner Howard asked you, what was your greatest worry at night. And certainly I see — I think we all do — that meeting these deadlines to still receive the federal production tax credits is a huge, huge goal, and it's going to be a delicate walk, obviously, to do this. But I think you said earlier on the stand, maybe when you were answering Mr. Guild's questions, you mentioned it would be about $1 billion on
one, but if I'm doing the math right, it's going to be
about $2.1 or .2 billion for both units — that is, if
Unit 3 makes the deadline, as well.

A You talking about production tax credits?

Q Yes, sir.

A Yes, it's about $2.2 billion in total.

Q Yes, sir. And we're talking full-blown dollar for
dollar. We're not talking about a deduction; we're
talking about full-blown dollar-for-dollar federal tax
production tax credits.

A That 2.2 would be what I call the grossed-up amount;
that's taking the actual amount of the credit and
grossing it up so you could see what the customers would
receive. They would receive the $2.2 billion benefit.

Q That's where I was headed.

A Yes.

Q Yes, sir. And, lastly, one of the things that ORS is
charged with in representing the public interest, one of
the three legs is the financial health of all of our
utilities. And one question that I seem to understand
that Wall Street has a concern about is possibly the
financial health of our contractors — of CB&I or
Westinghouse — and I have kind of, in my mind, said,
"Well, when we started this project, they weren't called
CB&I; they were Shaw Group." I've kind of mentally
thought these same people that -- the high-level engineers and people on the consortium's management team and top engineers are going to be with them whether it's Shaw, CB&I, whoever — mergers and acquisitions happen. This is a changing world; we know that. But then — and I'm asking you this because I know you've got an accounting background, but if you want to punt to Mr. Byrne, because I read in his testimony I think where he has some concern about being able to — about the turnover in personnel at the consortium. And could you address that, or if you want to punt to him, I would certainly —

A: I'll let Mr. Byrne address it too, but, you know, we have been concerned about some of the turnover at the higher levels within the organization. We expected to see some turnover when it changed from Shaw to CB&I. That is not unusual. I will say, even though they've had turnover, they generally do a pretty good job of communicating with us and we get the right to interview people they've got coming in, to give them feedback on whether or not we think that person will fit with the team and meets the qualifications. In certain positions, we have an absolute right for that; in others, it's their right, but the relationship is such that they usually involve us at some point during that
process. It'd be nice if they had the consistency that we've had on the project. All our senior leadership team that was here in 2008 is still in place, and you should expect to see them all the way through the completion of these projects. We're working hard to find that level of commitment on the other side.

There are people, especially on the Westinghouse side, that have been there from day one, and those relationships have been good, even though there's been turnover in other positions.

Q I guess, separate from that, from the turnover in personnel, how about the financial health of CB&I? Do you have any concerns there, or could you share any insight there?

A We watch it carefully. We have a credit metrics team within our financial organization that evaluates their creditworthiness. We watch their activities on Wall Street, to understand what they're up to and if we have any concerns we need to put forth in front of them.

VICE CHAIRMAN WHITFIELD: Well, thank you, Mr. Marsh.

That's all I have, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Thank you.

Commissioner Fleming.

COMMISSIONER FLEMING: All right.
BY COMMISSIONER FLEMING:

Q Good afternoon.
A Good afternoon.

Q I didn't expect you to be here this time of day, sitting where you are. I thought we'd be finished with you long ago. But I just wanted to touch on one particular area that you mentioned in your testimony and Mr. Guild brought out. But the EPA's Clean Power Plan –
A Yes.

Q – I know the final plan is not out yet, so we're all waiting anxiously to see what it has to say. But could you talk a little bit about the benefits of these nuclear units that can prove to be beneficial not only to the company but to the customers and to the State, as we look toward meeting the standards that they may potentially define?
A I'll do my best to do that. The proposed rule that came out, I believe it was last summer, was very complicated, very detailed in terms of how they apply the application of the formulas in there that derive the targets the companies have to achieve. As we dug into the determination of the targets, what we learned was, in terms of the base-load capacity or generating capacity that was in place today, based on which they set the
targets, they had already assumed that the nuclear plants were in operation and running at a 90 percent capacity factor. So that has an impact on setting our target. In essence, that would put us in a position where we would not receive the full benefit that we will achieve when these plants come on-line and start to displace coal and certainly some of our gas-fired generation, which is, while it's a lower producer of carbon, it still does have carbon emissions.

We've already seen the benefit of bringing these new plants on-line because when I sat before you in 2008, I think it might've been you that asked me the question, "Well, what impact will this have on some of your older coal-fired generation?" And what I told you at the time was these plants gave us flexibility to retire some of those older plants, should that situation arise. And because we had the turndown in the economy and we've seen load growth a little bit slower than we anticipated, we were able to retire or have plans to retire 730 megawatts of older coal-fired facilities that will have a tremendous impact on our future carbon production. It will reduce that significantly.

So these plants put us in a position where we can do other things that will help us to respond. The new Clean Power Plan as it's designed today really forces
you to take a look at finding additional efficiencies in
the heat rate of your existing power plants, which may
be hard to do because we've been working hard on
improving those heat rates for years. It forces you to
look more at natural-gas-fired generation. We're
fortunate because we brought our Jasper Plant on-line
back in 2004, and we've already got about 30 percent of
natural gas. Many utilities don't have that, as they
try to find that balanced portfolio. And they also
encourage you to look for additional megawatts from
renewables. And we've been very active with the
Legislature and the environmentalists and others around
the State, helping to find ways to define how we move
forward successfully with solar power, so we don't find
our State embroiled in all the awful discussions and
some of the hateful things I've seen go on in other
states as they try to figure out what does that solar
plan look like. So, we've worked with the other
utilities in the State and the environmentalists and
people that are focused on solar power, to pass the
Distributed Energy Resources Act last year, which has
allowed us to come back to the Commission twice now —
one to set net-metering rates and one to set distributed
energy resource incentive plans in place to help us
promote solar energy. So we're well on our way to
fulfilling that piece of the pie.

So we believe we need that nuclear to help us achieve those targets. It will not get us all the way there, and Mr. Guild pointed that out in his cross-examination of me. We've got more to do. But without the foundation of the nuclear plants, if we don't have this nuclear energy to serve as a foundation and to put us at a 62 percent non-emitting level of production on our system, I think it's going to be very difficult to accomplish.

You know, we told the EPA — I've been to the EPA twice and met with individuals there to talk about the way nuclear is being treated in the Clean Power Plan. The example I gave them was if I hired a group of employees and I was standing up in front of them and said, "Everybody here has to pay the Family Plan for health insurance," and when a young lady in the back stands up and says, "Well, I'm not married and I don't have any kids," I would say, "Well, you're thinking about it, so you have to pay for it." That's what the EPA has done in the Clean Power Plan. So we're trying to get fair treatment for the nuclear plants so they'll serve as the foundation. If we don't get that, it's going to be a very big challenge for us to meet the requirements of that plan.
But we don't know the final results yet, and once the final results are known, it does come back to the State and the State has to actually define its implementation plan. So even though it would come back to the State of South Carolina, they've got to decide between SCE&G and Duke Energy and Santee and all the others that have some sort of production, how they're going to allocate those targets. So there are a lot of unknowns, but what is known is, without the nuclear plants, we won't be able to achieve the 62 percent goal of non-emitting, clean, base-load — and that's key — base-load energy that's there all the time.

Q And could that be — well, I guess, if they do let you do it once it comes on-line rather than counting it down, is that a financial benefit? Will that be a savings to the company and the customer?

A It will. I don't have my notes in front of me that I took to the EPA, but the number I recall is, if we don't get the benefits of the nuclear plant, it could be an additional $8-$9 billion in costs for the consumers in South Carolina. That's not just SCE&G; that's the State of South Carolina, us and Santee and others, would have —

Q Trying to — that would be —

A Trying to meet the new requirements of the Clean Power
Plan, as it's drafted today. Now, we don't have the final rule, so I hope they fix some of the points we've made to them as they go forward.

Q But that could be just the reversal, if they do — I mean, there could be a financial benefit, if — depending on how the plan is written?

A I believe the financial benefit is there today in our making the investment in the nuclear plants.

Q So they'll already be there.

A Yes.

Q And would there be — could there be the potential of a carbon tax that would add —

A You know, President Obama has made it very clear that he believes carbon is a significant issue for our country going forward. Many others support that position. I'm not here to argue with the science. I firmly believe, you know, carbon emissions are going to be attacked in the future. I believe the writing is on the wall. You know, based on what we said in 2008 about the additional restrictions that would come out from an environmental perspective, that has all come true. And had we not been building these new nuclear plants, I'm not sure how we would've complied with those.

So we believe a carbon tax is going to be a reality at some point. There is a value that we believe can be
reasonably assigned to carbon for purposes of evaluating the impacts, and the nuclear power construction – continuing with these new plants and completing these plants is, in my mind, just critical to be able to address the challenges. To put the company in a position or make a decision that we were going to stop these plants and build something else at this point, that's a $3 billion decision based on our analysis, for customers. I don't know that that even takes in the impacts of trying to solve the carbon issues.

So I believe the State is on the right path. Not just us, but with Santee Cooper and all the customers that are served throughout the State through the electric cooperatives that they serve, this plant is going to impact most customers in the State of South Carolina.

**Q** So these units – it sounds like you're looking at these units kind of as an insurance against – or working towards meeting those standards?

**A** Yes, that's exactly what we believed in 2008, and I believe that more firmly today than I did in 2008.

**Q** And with this plant, with the complexity and scope of it, I'm sure there is great interest in the building of it not only in our State but across the country. And I was just wondering, are you doing any outreach or
educational sessions to various groups about the plant as it's under construction?

A We have a lot of individuals involved directly in the project that do presentations on a regular basis around town and around the State. We certainly have extensive information on our website about the project, not just pictures but just discussion about what's going on, and there's a lot more informal efforts to help people understand the value of the plants and the impact they can have on the State. So we could probably do more of that. It's certainly something we believe in completely and probably couldn't do too much of that to make people aware of the benefits.

Q Are you getting — what types of groups are particularly interested?

A It could be anything from a Rotary club — we've worked with educational organizations; we've had groups of teachers on a regular basis up to the plant. We brought students to the plant, student groups, to help them understand the benefits of nuclear power and how it is used in the State of South Carolina. You know, any group that wants us to come and make a presentation, generally, we are available to do that.

We have groups within our organization where we bring in groups of customers on advisory boards in
different areas around the State and we talk to them about nuclear. We ask them, "What are you hearing from a nuclear perspective," if there are concerns we need to try to address in the State or with particular groups. We've run a number of television ads, at stockholder expense or shareholder expense – not paid for by customers – to help provide more information about nuclear power.

I would expect those activities to increase as we move forward. I probably lost count of the number of tours we've been through at the nuclear plant. We've had commissioners from different states come; we had Nuclear Regulatory Commissioners come all the time. We encourage people to come to the plant site. We are proud of it. I think it definitely leaves an impression on you, when you can go from the dollars on a page to physically looking at the investments that are being made and the complexity of the project and the activity that is taking place on site.

Q Okay. So it's serving as an educational opportunity for others across the country?

A I believe it is, and in the conversations I have with CEOs and in private, in different industry meetings I go to, they're pulling for us. They want our plant, they want the Vogtle plants to be built, because they want to
build plants. I hear comments about the lack of a nuclear renaissance, and there may not be enough plants being built in the United States to convince me there's a renaissance here yet, but there are 65 plants being built around the world, new nuclear plants, so the renaissance is occurring, and I think the United States could benefit from joining the party.

COMMISSIONER FLEMING: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Thank you.

EXAMINATION

BY CHAIRMAN HALL:

Q Mr. Marsh, I just have a couple of questions. The first is, why is the company requesting Commission approval of a revised schedule when the company hasn't agreed yet to the revised milestones? The new milestones aren't in the EPC contract or an addendum, so –

A The schedule we have put before the Commission is a schedule we are working to, on site, now, to complete the units. So we have agreed this is the working schedule to complete the units, as we presented to the Commission. When we say we haven't agreed to the schedule, we're talking about agreeing in terms of who's going to pay for the costs that are under dispute. There is no dispute that this is the schedule upon which the plants are being built. The costs have been
evaluated, the costs are known, the derivation of the costs have been fully reviewed by our team on site and the Office of Regulatory Staff.

Q Okay. Now, I want to go back to Mr. Guild's question about the litigation. And I don't want to jeopardize your position, so don't go far enough to do that, but as far as the negotiations are concerned, when would they tip where you would think that the negotiations were no longer productive and you might have to pursue litigation?

A If the consortium were to basically quit listening to us, I'd say that's the time to do something else. We have not gotten to that point. We have had very frank discussions. We've had some exchanges of potential opportunities to settle some of the outstanding issues. We've just not reached any final agreements. As long as I believe there's an opportunity for us to do it through a settlement, as I said earlier, I would prefer that to litigation, if it looks like that's a reasonable number or reasonable amounts for our company and our customers.

Q Okay. And if you had to file litigation – I understand Georgia filed theirs in New York – where does the contract dictate, or where does your contract dictate that it would be filed?

A We would also file in New York.
Okay. And I imagine that would be costly, as well. One more question about the difference between Georgia Power's contract and your all's contract, as far as the litigation is concerned. I think you—I can't remember. Their contract is sealed and so you don't know as much, but why was litigation a better option for them?

I don't know all the details in their contract, but the general understanding is, and their company officials have made comments to this effect, it is a fixed-price contract. Our contract is fixed for certain items; we have firm pricing with fixed escalation on others, and there's about a third of the project that is targeted, where it's to be determined on actual amounts spent. That's where our disagreement is, on the actual amounts spent in that targeted category. We don't have any disputes over the fixed or the firm with fixed escalation.

Okay.

If their project is all fixed, even though they had the same issues we had, I can see how they would have a different position on, you know, whether they should be paying at that time.

Okay.

And that might have led them to a decision to start
litigation earlier than later.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. All right. Thank you, so much.

Commissioners, any other questions for Mr. Marsh?

[No response]

Okay. Mr. Burgess?

MR. BURGESS: I have one question on redirect.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BURGESS:

Q Mr. Marsh, before the lunch hour, Mr. Guild was questioning you about the future transaction between SCE&G and Santee Cooper, and I believe I heard you testify that SCE&G would be purchasing an interest in Unit 2. Would you please explain to the Commission exactly what transaction is required of the two companies?

A Yes. I need to correct my statement on that. The triggering event for the purchase of the 5 percent would be the commercial operation date of Unit 2, but the actual 5 percent purchase would be of Units 2 and 3.

MR. BURGESS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Marsh. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right, thank you.
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