BEFORE THE

GEORGIA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re:	)	
Georgia Power Company's	)	
RTP Revenue Credit	)	**Docket No. 57171**
And Allocation Methodology	)	

REDACTED – PUBLIC VERSION

Testimony

of

Jonathan Ly

On Behalf of

Georgia Association of Manufacturers

September 23, 2026

J. POLLOCK
INCORPORATED

BEFORE THE

GEORGIA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In Re:	)	
Georgia Power Company's	)	
RTP Revenue Credit	)	**Docket No. 57171**
And Allocation Methodology	)	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS iii

TESTIMONY OF JONATHAN LY 1

Introduction, Qualifications and Summary 1

Overview of Real Time Pricing 4

RTP Fuel Credit 10

APPENDIX A 15

APPENDIX B 17

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

Term	Definition
CBL	Customer Baseline Load
Commission	Georgia Public Service Commission
FCR	Fuel Cost Recovery
FT	Firm Transportation
GAM	Georgia Association of Manufacturers
GPC	Georgia Power Company
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
PIA Staff	Commission Public Interest Advocacy Staff
PPA	Power Purchase Agreement
RTP	Real Time Pricing
RTP-DA	Real Time Pricing – Day Ahead
RTP-HA	Real Time Pricing – Hour Ahead

TESTIMONY OF JONATHAN LY

Introduction, Qualifications and Summary

Q PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A Jonathan Ly; 14323 South Outer 40 Rd., Suite 206N, St. Louis, MO 63017.

Q WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION AND BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED?

A I am an Associate Consultant at J. Pollock, Incorporated.

Q PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.

A I have a Bachelor of Arts degree in Integrative Biology from the University of California, Berkeley and a Master's degree in Energy and Earth Resources from the University of Texas at Austin. Since joining J. Pollock, Incorporated in 2018, I have participated in numerous regulatory proceedings regarding the ratemaking process, resource planning, certificates of convenience and necessity, and assessments of planned new resources in Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin. My qualifications are documented in **Appendix A**. A list of my appearances in utility regulatory proceedings is provided in **Appendix B**.

Q HAVE YOU PREVIOUSLY TESTIFIED BEFORE THE GEORGIA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION?

A No. Although I have supported testimony submitted by my colleague, Jeffry Pollock, in past proceedings, this is my first opportunity to sponsor testimony before the Georgia Public Service Commission (Commission).

Q ON WHOSE BEHALF ARE YOU TESTIFYING IN THIS PROCEEDING?

A I am testifying on behalf of the Georgia Association of Manufacturers (GAM). The members of GAM are customers of Georgia Power Company (GPC). They consume large quantities of electricity, primarily for manufacturing, under a variety of rate schedules.

Q WHAT ISSUES ARE YOU ADDRESSING IN YOUR TESTIMONY?

A I address two concerns raised in the recent Fuel Cost Recovery (FCR-27) proceeding by the Commission Public Interest Advocacy Staff (PIA Staff) and certain intervenors about the amount of real time pricing (RTP) revenues that are credited to the fuel account. The first concern is whether RTP fuel credit should also include an explicit amount for incremental firm transportation (FT) costs that GPC expects to incur in connection with the capacity resources for which GPC was granted certification in Docket Nos. 56298 and 56310. The second concern is whether the RTP fuel credit appropriately recognizes the costs incurred under certain non-dispatchable power purchase agreements (PPAs).[1] In responding to these concerns, I will also provide an overview of RTP, including a recent history of RTP prices and the benefits of RTP to GPC's customers.

Q DOES THE FACT THAT YOU ARE NOT ADDRESSING ALL ISSUES IN THIS PROCEEDING CONSTITUTE AN ENDORSEMENT OF THE POSITIONS OF GEORGIA POWER COMPANY OR OTHER PARTIES ON THESE ISSUES?

A No. The fact that I am not addressing every issue should not be interpreted as an endorsement of any proposals by GPC or any other party in this proceeding.

[1] *Georgia Power Company's Fuel Cost Recovery (FCR-27) Application,* Docket No. 56765, Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Tom Newsome, Philip M. Hayet, Anthony Sandonato, and Leah J. Wellborn at 60-63 (Apr. 9, 2026).

Summary

Q PLEASE SUMMARIZE YOUR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

A My findings and recommendations are as follows:

- RTP is a pricing mechanism which allows customers who are willing to take considerable price risk to blend higher cost electricity purchased under a standard tariff with lower cost energy purchased at "market" prices. Although RTP energy is not procured through actual market purchases, it reflects GPC's expected cost to generate electricity and is, thus, a "proxy" for market pricing.
- RTP prices vary hourly to reflect the *marginal* costs to serve incremental load and, therefore, send effective price signals to RTP customers to minimize consumption during high-load hours and maximize consumption during low-load hours. Under this construct, all customers benefit from the more efficient use of GPC's generation fleet.
- Over the past seven years prices under both RTP-DA and RTP-DA have increased, and the hourly prices have become significantly more volatile. The higher volatility demonstrates how RTP customers are taking much greater price risk than in the past.
- Despite the concerns of PIA Staff and certain intervenors, incremental FT costs associated with new very large load customers are not necessarily related to the issue of how RTP revenues are credited to offset FCR costs. The only overlap between these two issues is that new very large load customers may elect to have all or a portion of their load served through RTP.
- No specific portion of RTP revenues should be credited against FT costs because FT costs are fully fixed costs that affect GPC's *average* cost of service. In contrast, RTP is a *marginal* cost-based rate.
- However, RTP sales can contribute to the recovery of these costs when the system lambda charge, an RTP component which reflects the replacement cost of fuel, exceeds GPC's average fuel costs. In addition, other components of RTP contribute to the recovery of fixed production operation and maintenance (O&M) expenses.
- PIA Staff and certain intervenors also have concerns with the treatment of non-dispatchable PPAs in the RTP fuel credit calculation. To address these concerns, GPC has proposed two possible modifications to the calculation methodology. First, GPC proposes to exclude both the generation and costs of these PPAs from the calculation. The second option would include both the generation and costs of these PPAs in the calculation.

- The revenues derived from RTP sales place downward price pressure on non-RTP rates. Thus, any increase in the amount of RTP revenues credited to GPC's fuel account will necessarily reduce the RTP revenues currently used to offset GPC's base revenue requirements.
- Should the Commission find that GPC's RTP fuel credit calculation methodology should be modified, either of GPC's proposed changes would adequately address PIA Staff and intervenors' concerns.

Overview of Real Time Pricing

Q WHAT IS REAL TIME PRICING?

A RTP is provided on two Commission-approved rate schedules – RTP Day-Ahead (RTP-DA) and RTP Hour-Ahead (RTP-HA). These rates allow customers who are willing to take considerable price risk to blend higher cost electricity purchased under a standard tariff with lower cost energy purchased at "market" prices. Thus, RTP provides an opportunity to purchase more competitively priced electricity. This is an important tool for manufacturers and other energy-intensive customers who face ever-increasing domestic and global competition.

Q HOW LONG HAVE THE RTP RATES BEEN IN EFFECT?

A RTP rates have been in effect since 1992.

Q HOW DOES RTP WORK?

A Customers taking service on either RTP-DA or RTP-HA are subject to two sets of prices. First, each RTP customer has a defined customer baseline load (CBL), which represents the load that the customer has demonstrated an ability to operate during an economic curtailment. The CBL is priced under a standard Power and Light tariff (*i.e.,* PLS, PLM, PLL, PLH). Second, incremental load (that is, load above the CBL) is subject to hourly prices under the RTP tariff. These prices are communicated to

customers either on a day-ahead basis under RTP-DA (for all 24 hours) or on an hour-ahead basis under RTP-HA.

Q HOW ARE REAL TIME PRICES DETERMINED?

A Real time prices change hourly to reflect the *marginal* costs to serve incremental load. The hourly marginal costs include:

- Incremental energy (fuel, variable O&M, and emission) costs (*i.e.,* system lambda);
- Incremental losses;
- Marginal production costs (*i.e.*, reliability adder) which apply during periods of tight reserves;
- Marginal transmission costs (*i.e.*, transmission adder) which apply when system demand approaches and exceeds the projected annual system peak; and
- A risk adder to compensate for price forecast errors.

Together, these components provide real-time price signals that encourage customers to minimize their electric power and energy consumption during high-price hours and to maximize their electricity consumption during low-price hours. The adders paid by RTP customers lower the remaining costs that GPC must recover from non-RTP customers. As discussed later, RTP revenues reduced GPC's system revenue requirements by $[redacted] in 2025.

Importantly, RTP is not an *embedded* (or *average*) cost rate, nor is it a discounted rate. All of the components reflect the *marginal* cost to provide incremental energy. Accordingly, RTP is a fully cost-based rate.

Q HOW DOES RTP BENEFIT GEORGIA POWER COMPANY AND ITS CUSTOMERS?

A RTP is a "win-win-win" proposition. GPC benefits from the demand response provided

by RTP customers and the ability to use its generation fleet more efficiently. RTP customers benefit directly by their ability to use RTP to lower their average cost of electricity, which is important to remaining cost competitive and, thus, providing more sustainable contributions to the state and local economy. Non-RTP customers benefit from lower rates because a portion of RTP revenues is credited to base rates, thereby offsetting costs to all customer classes. In addition, they also benefit from increased reliability through price signals sent to RTP customers and by having a more vibrant and sustainable economy.

Q IS RTP A DIFFERENT QUALITY OF SERVICE THAN THAT PROVIDED UNDER OTHER TARIFFS?

A Yes. RTP is a more risky type of service for two reasons. First, customers do not have a set hourly price — the prices vary each hour, and customers do not know the hourly prices until either the day before (RTP-DA) or the hour before (RTP-HA). Second, RTP prices can be extremely volatile. For example, during 2025, hourly prices ranged from less than [redacted]¢ to over [redacted]¢ per kilowatt-hour. In contrast, GPC's standard tariffs have fixed prices that do not change each hour.

Thus, customers with RTP experience ever changing and volatile prices that non-RTP customers do not. For these reasons, RTP is a more risky type of service than the service provided under GPC's standard tariffs.

Q HOW HAVE REAL TIME PRICES CHANGED OVER TIME?

A Over the past seven years, real time prices have not only steadily increased, they have also become much more volatile. The increase in RTP-DA prices is shown in **Chart 1,** while the corresponding increase in RTP-HA prices is shown on **Chart 2**.

Chart 1



Chart 2



The steady increases in real time prices can be attributed to higher replacement fuel costs (particularly natural gas), higher marginal transmission and generation capacity costs, and hotter than normal weather.

Q WHAT HAS BEEN THE IMPACT OF THE HIGH REAL TIME PRICES?

A Higher real time prices have resulted in much higher contributions to fixed costs by RTP customers. The fixed cost contributions consist of:

- A reliability adder that reflects the marginal cost of generation capacity;
- A transmission adder that reflects the marginal cost of transmission capacity; and
- Risk adders ranging from $2 to $3 per megawatt-hour for Day Ahead (DA) and Hour Ahead (HA) pricing.

The Reliability and Transmission adders apply when demand approaches and exceeds the projected Southern Company system peak, and the Risk adder applies to all hours. As a result of the higher prices, RTP customers have paid $[redacted] in fixed cost contributions from 2019 through 2025.

Q PLEASE ELABORATE ON THE VOLATILITY OF REAL TIME PRICES.

A **Chart 3** and **Chart 4** show the quarterly standard deviation of RTP-DA and RTP-HA prices, respectively, over the last seven years. These charts demonstrate that real time prices have become significantly more volatile, particularly over the last four years. Thus, it is clear that a large segment of GPC's retail customers is assuming growing and significant price risk. In exchange for assuming price risk, GPC's non-RTP customers have — and will continue to — benefit from the fixed costs paid by RTP customers.

Chart 3



Chart 4



RTP Fuel Credit

Q HAVE PARTIES IDENTIFIED POTENTIAL ISSUES WITH GEORGIA POWER COMPANY'S ACCOUNTING OF RTP REVENUES?

A Yes. As previously stated, PIA Staff and certain intervenors have asserted that GPC is understating the amount of RTP revenues that are credited to GPC's fuel balance. Specifically, PIA Staff is particularly concerned that no RTP revenues are being credited to offset FT costs that are recoverable in the FCR rate. Additionally, PIA Staff is concerned that the costs incurred under certain non-dispatchable "must-run" PPAs are also not reflected in the calculation of RTP fuel credit.

Q IS THE RTP FUEL CREDIT METHODOLOGY THAT GEORGIA POWER COMPANY IS CURRENTLY USING APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION?

A Yes. The current RTP fuel credit methodology was approved by the Commission in GPC's 2010 rate case, Docket No. 31958.

Q IS THE TREATMENT OF FIRM TRANSMISSION COSTS RELEVANT TO THIS PROCEEDING?

A No. The discussion surrounding FT costs in this proceeding appears to conflate RTP and the pricing for service applicable to new very large load (*i.e.,* 100 megawatts and larger) customers. However, the only overlap is that these customers may elect to have all or a portion of their load served through RTP. In addition to RTP, new very large load customers will pay access charges that reflect GPC's incremental costs. Except for the fact that RTP is a component of the overall cost to serve new very large load customers, the allocation and recovery of FT costs are entirely unrelated to RTP.

Q HAS GEORGIA POWER COMPANY ADDRESSED THE FIRM TRANSPORTATION COST ISSUE?

A Yes. GPC is proposing that the costs of the new FT capacity be allocated to new very large load customers based upon their contribution to the winter coincident peak load relative to organic load growth.[2] This proposal would ensure that incremental FT costs attributable to new very large load customers are fully recovered from these customers.

Q SHOULD ANY SPECIFIC PORTION OF RTP REVENUES BE CREDITED AGAINST FIRM TRANSPORTATION COSTS?

A No. FT costs represent the costs GPC must pay monthly to reserve capacity on natural gas pipelines to ensure sufficient gas supplies are available when necessary.[3] They are a fully fixed cost that affects GPC's average cost of service. Thus, FT is an *embedded* cost that is most appropriately addressed and allocated through a full cost-of-service study. This is in stark contrast to RTP which, as previously discussed, is a *marginal* cost-based rate.

Q DOES THIS MEAN THAT RTP SALES CONTRIBUTE NO REVENUES TO RECOVER FIRM TRANSPORTATION COSTS?

A No. As previously discussed, and as stated in GPC's direct testimony, among the components of the hourly real time price is a system lambda charge which reflects the replacement cost of fuel.[4] In the hours when system lambda exceeds GPC's average

[2] Direct Testimony of Dr. Ross Beppler, Lee Evans, and Brandon Looney at 17.

[3] *Id*. at 14.

[4] *Id.* at 8.

fuel costs, RTP sales provide a contribution to the recovery of fixed production O&M expense, which also includes FT. Thus, although RTP incremental load is not served through a fully embedded rate, it contributes to GPC's fixed costs.[5]

Q PLEASE QUANTIFY THE AMOUNT OF FIXED COSTS OFFSET BY INCREMENTAL REVENUES IN 2025.

A According to GPC, system lambda contributed $264 million to the recovery of fixed production O&M expenses in 2025.[6] This is in addition to the $[redacted] of fixed cost contributions from the other RTP pricing components in 2025, resulting in a total contribution of $[redacted] to base rates. This amount represents a significant increase from the RTP revenues that reduced non-RTP base revenues in GPC's 2022 rate case, Docket No. 44280, which totaled $214 million.[7]

Q TURNING TO THE SECOND IDENTIFIED ISSUE, HAS GEORGIA POWER COMPANY RESPONDED TO PIA STAFF'S CONCERN ABOUT THE TREATMENT OF NON-DISPATCHABLE PURCHASED POWER EXPENSES?

A Yes. GPC proposes two options to address this concern. First, GPC proposes excluding both the generation and costs of these PPAs from the RTP fuel credit calculation. In the alternative, GPC proposes to include both the generation and costs of these PPAs in the calculation.

[5] GPC Response to STF-JKA-4-3.

[6] Direct Testimony of Dr. Ross Beppler, Lee Evans, and Brandon Looney at 15.

[7] *Georgia Power Company's 2022 Rate Case*, Docket No. 44280, Direct Testimony of Lee Evans, Exhibit___(LPE-1) (Jun. 24, 2022).

Q HOW WOULD THE PROPOSED CHANGES IMPACT THE RTP FUEL CREDIT CALCULATION?

A Either of these changes would increase the amount of RTP revenues that are credited to fuel. However, I would note that any increase in the amount of RTP revenues credited to the fuel account will necessarily reduce the RTP revenues currently used to offset GPC's non-fuel base revenue requirements. Thus, increasing the RTP fuel credit would put upward pressure on base rates.

Q WOULD THE SHIFT IN RTP CREDITS FROM OFFSETTING BASE REVENUE REQUIREMENTS TO FUEL COSTS AFFECT ALL CUSTOMER CLASSES EQUALLY?

A No. Because base revenues and fuel revenues are allocated to customer classes in different proportions, the impacts of the RTP revenues in offsetting these costs would also vary, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Percentage of Base Revenues vs.
Fuel Revenues By Customer Class

Customer Class	Base Revenues	Fuel Revenues
Domestic	58.07%	55.36%
Small Business	12.93%	9.76%
Medium Business	19.71%	22.46%
Large Business	4.29%	6.82%
Agricultural	0.28%	0.37%
Government/Institution	2.33%	3.78%
Lighting	2.39%	1.44%
Total Retail	100.00%	100.00%

Source: Docket No. 44820, Georgia Power Company Cost-of-Service Study for Test Year Ending July 31, 2023, Schedule 2.10, lines 1 and 2.

As can be seen, crediting additional RTP revenues to the fuel account would provide a greater benefit to Medium Business, Large Business, Agricultural, and Government/Institution customers than to Domestic, Small Business, and Lighting customers.

Q DO YOU HAVE AN OPINION REGARDING GEORGIA POWER COMPANY'S PROPOSALS?

A Yes. Should the Commission find that GPC's RTP fuel credit calculation methodology should be modified, either of GPC's proposed changes would adequately address the issue identified by PIA Staff and intervenors.

Q DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

A Yes.

APPENDIX A

Qualifications of Jonathan Ly

Q PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.

A Jonathan Ly. My business mailing address is 14323 S. Outer 40 Rd., Town and Country, Missouri 63017.

Q WHAT IS YOUR OCCUPATION AND BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED?

A I am an Associate of J. Pollock, Incorporated.

Q PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE.

A I received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Integrative Biology from the University of California, Berkeley in 2013 and a Master's degree in Energy and Earth Resources from the University of Texas at Austin in 2017. In addition, I have completed a course in utility accounting and finance.

I joined J. Pollock, Incorporated in 2018 as an energy analyst assisting consultants in the preparation of financial and economic studies of investor-owned, cooperative, and municipal utilities on revenue requirements, cost of service and rate design, tariff review and analysis, integrated resource planning, and certificates of convenience and necessity. I began working as an Associate in 2021, expanding upon my responsibilities and assignments in matters I had previously worked on as an energy analyst. I have been involved in various projects in multiple states including Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Q PLEASE DESCRIBE J. POLLOCK, INCORPORATED.

A J. Pollock assists clients to procure and manage energy in both regulated and competitive markets. The J. Pollock team also advises clients on energy and regulatory issues. Our clients include commercial, industrial and institutional energy consumers. J. Pollock is a registered broker and Class I aggregator in the State of Texas.

APPENDIX B
Testimony Filed in Regulatory Proceedings
by Jonathan Ly

UTILITY	ON BEHALF OF	DOCKET	TYPE	STATE / PROVINCE	SUBJECT	DATE
WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY	Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group	6690-UR-129	Surrebuttal	WI	Class Cost-of-Service Study	9/18/2026
WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY	Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group	5-UR-112	Surrebuttal	WI	Class Cost-of-Service Study	9/11/2026
WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY	Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group	6690-UR-129	Rebuttal	WI	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	9/3/2026
WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY	Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group	5-UR-112	Rebuttal	WI	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	8-28-026
WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY	Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group	6690-UR-129	Direct	WI	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	8/14/2026
WISCONSIN GAS LLC	Wisconsin Industrial Energy Group	5-UR-112	Direct	WI	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	8/10/2026
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Texas Industrial Energy Consumers	59133	Direct	TX	Minimum Protection Guarantee; Net Capacity Factor; PTC Transaction Costs	7/16/2026
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	25-00079-UT	Stipulation Support	NM	Support of Stipulation resolving revenue requirement, class cost allocation and rate design.	6/30/2026
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	25-00079-UT	Direct	NM	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation; Rate Design	5/1/2026
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	25-00085-UT	Direct	NM	Long-Term Purchased Power Agreements	3/20/2026
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	25-00066-UT	Direct	NM	CT versus CCGT; Resource Mismatch; Customer Protections; Ratemaking Requests	12/23/2025
NEW YORK STATE ELECTRIC & GAS CORPORATION and ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION	Multiple Intervenors	25-E-0375 25-G-0378 25-E-0379 25-G-0380	Rebuttal	NY	Embedded Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation; Rate Design	12/5/2025
NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY	Xcel Large Industrials	E002/GR-24-320	Surrebuttal	MN	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation; Large Load Tariff	11/25/2025
NEW YORK STATE ELECTRIC & GAS CORPORATION and ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION	Multiple Intervenors	25-E-0375 25-G-0378 25-E-0379 25-G-0380	Direct	NY	Embedded Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation; Rate Design	11/7/2025
NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY	Xcel Large Industrials	E002/GR-24-320	Rebuttal	MN	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	10/10/2025
PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NORTH CAROLINA, INC.	Carolina Utility Customers Association, Inc.	G-5, SUB 686	Direct	NC	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation; Rate Design	8/25/2025

APPENDIX B
Testimony Filed in Regulatory Proceedings
by Jonathan Ly

UTILITY	ON BEHALF OF	DOCKET	TYPE	STATE / PROVINCE	SUBJECT	DATE
NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY	Xcel Large Industrials	E002/GR-24-320	Direct	MN	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	8/22/2025
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY	Florida Industrial Power Users Group	20250011-EI	Direct	FL	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Interruptible Credits	6/9/2025
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	24-00270-UT	Stipulation Support	NM	Stipulation Support regarding ratemaking treatment of solar/battery projects through the FPPCAC; off-system sales margins	5/27/2025
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	25-00027-UT	Direct	NM	Renewable Portfolio Standard Cost Rider	5/21/2025
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	24-00270-UT	Direct	NM	Recovery of Tax Credits, Transfer Costs; Return on Deferred Tax Asset; Off-System Sales Margins	5/5/2025
SOUTHWESTERN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY	Texas Industrial Energy Consumers	56643	Direct	TX	Impact of Pirkey Retirement; Self-Commitment of Generating Units	1/13/2025
CENTRAL HUDSON GAS & ELECTRIC CORPORATION	Multiple Intervenors	24-E-0461 / 24-G-0462	Rebuttal	NY	Embedded Class Cost-of-Service Studies (Electric/Gas); Electric Rate Design (Customer Charge)	12/18/2024
CENTRAL HUDSON GAS & ELECTRIC CORPORATION	Multiple Intervenors	24-E-0461 / 24-G-0462	Direct	NY	System Control, Load Dispatching, and Other Power Supply; Historic Test-Year; Electric Rate Design (Customer Charge)	11/22/2024
NIAGRA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION D/B/A NATIONAL GRID	Multiple Intervenors	24-E-0322 / 24-G-0323	Rebuttal	NY	Class Cost-of-Service Study (Electric/Gas); Class Revenue Allocation (Electric/Gas); Rate Design (Customer Charge)	10/18/2024
NIAGRA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION D/B/A NATIONAL GRID	Multiple Intervenors	24-E-0322 / 24-G-0323	Direct	NY	Class Cost-of-Service Study (Electric/Gas); Class Revenue Allocation (Electric/Gas); Terms and Conditions	9/26/2024
PIEDMONT NATURAL GAS COMPANY, INC	Carolina Utility Customers Association, Inc.	G-9, Sub 837	Direct	NC	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	8/13/2024
MICHIGAN GAS UTILITIES CORPORATION	Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity	21540	Rebuttal	MI	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	7/22/2024
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	24-00120-UT	Direct	NM	Transportation Electrification Plan	7/12/2024
SUMMIT UTILITIES ARKANSAS, INC.	Arkansas Gas Consumers, Inc.	23-079-U	Direct	AR	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation	7/10/2024
DUKE ENERGY FLORIDA, LLC	Florida Industrial Power Users Group	20240025-EI	Direct	FL	Solar Projects; Cost-Effectiveness Analysis; Consumer Protections	6/11/2024
TAMPA ELECTRIC COMPANY	Florida Industrial Power Users Group	20240026-EI	Direct	FL	Solar Projects; Cost-Effectiveness Analysis; Consumer Protections	6/6/2024

APPENDIX B
Testimony Filed in Regulatory Proceedings
by Jonathan Ly

UTILITY	ON BEHALF OF	DOCKET	TYPE	STATE / PROVINCE	SUBJECT	DATE
DUKE ENERGY CAROLINAS, LLC	Carolina Utility Customers Association, Inc.	E-7. SUB 1304	Direct	NC	Fuel and Fuel-Related Cost Factors	5/23/2024
CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY	Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity	U-21490	Rebuttal	MI	Uncollectible Expense Allocation; Economic Breakeven Points	5/17/2024
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	23-00384-UT	Stipulation Support	NM	Stipulation Support regarding Long-Term Purchased Power Agreement and Ratemaking Treatment	5/10/2024
CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY	Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity	U-21490	Direct	MI	Class Cost-of-Service Study; Revenue Allocation; Rate Design	4/22/2024
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	23-00384-UT	Direct	NM	Long-Term Purchased Power Agreement; Ratemaking Requests	4/1/2024
LCRA TRANSMISSION SERVICES CORPORATION	Texas Industrial Energy Consumers	55867	Direct	TX	Wholesale Transmsision Rate	3/18/2024
MINNESOTA POWER	Large Power Intervenors	E-015/GR-23-155	Direct	MN	Advanced Metering Infrastructure; Class Revenue Allocation; Rider for Voluntary Renewable Energy	3/18/2024
NATIONAL FUEL GAS DISTRIBUTION CORPORATION	Multiple Intervenors	23-G-0627	Direct	NY	Class Revenue Allocation; Rate Design	3/1/2024
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Occidental Permian Ltd.	23-00252-UT	Direct	NM	Certificate of Convenience and Necessity	12/1/2023
EL PASO ELECTRIC COMPANY	Texas Industrial Energy Consumers	54929	Direct	TX	Certificate of Convenience and Necessity	10/24/2023
SOUTHWESTERN PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY	Texas Industrial Energy Consumers	54634	Direct	TX	Revised Class Cost-of-Service Study; Class Revenue Allocation; Energy Assistance Program	8/4/2023
ENTERGY ARKANSAS, LLC	Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers, Inc.	22-082-U	Surrebuttal	AR	Additional Sum associated with Power Purchase Agreements	7/20/2023
ENTERGY ARKANSAS, LLC	Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers, Inc.	22-082-U	Direct	AR	Additional Sum associated with Power Purchase Agreements	6/8/2023
CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY	Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity	U-21308	Rebuttal	MI	Uncollectible Expense Allocator	5/8/2023
CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY	Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity	U-21308	Direct	MI	Class Cost-of-Service Study, Allocation of Other Distribution Plant; Average & Peak Versus Average & Excess Methods	4/17/2023
ENTERGY ARKANSAS, LLC	Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers, Inc.	20-049-U	Surrebuttal	AR	Capacity Need and Capacity Value; Risk to Non-Participants; Negative Impacts on Competition; Best Practices	8/1/2022
ENTERGY ARKANSAS, LLC	Arkansas Electric Energy Consumers, Inc.	20-049-U	Direct	AR	Capacity Need and Capacity Value; Risk to Non-Participants; Negative Impacts on Competition; Best Practices	6/22/2022