| 1 | STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|
| 2 | SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE | |
| 3 | Lenkapianta and soa | |
| 4 | June 2, 2016 - 9:19 a.m. Public Utilities Commission | |
| 5 | 21 South Fruit Street Suite 10 Concord, New Hampshire NHPUC JUN30'16 AM 9:35 | |
| 6 | James Andrews Company (1997) | |
| 7 | IN RE: SEC DOCKET NO. 2016-02 | |
| 8 | Joint Petition of IFM Global Infrastructure Fund and | |
| 9 | Nautilus Generation, LLC, for Approval of the Transfer | |
| 10 | of Membership Interests in Essential Power Newington, LLC. | |
| 11 | (Adjudicative Hearing) | |
| 12 | PRESENT: SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE: | |
| 13 | Patricia Weathersby, Esq. Public member (Presiding as Presiding Officer) | |
| 14 15 | Dir. Elizabeth Muzzey Dept. of Cultural Resources/Division of Historical Resources | |
| 1617 | John Duclos, Designee Dept. of Environmental Services | |
| 18 | ALSO PRESENT FOR THE SEC: | |
| 19 | Michael J. Iacopino, Esq. (Brennan Lenehan) | |
| 20 | Pamela G. Monroe, SEC Administrator | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | (Manualling) | |
| 23 | COURT REPORTER: Steven E. Patnaude, LCR No. 52 | |



```
1
 2
    APPEARANCES:
    FOR THE APPLICANTS:
    Reptg. Nautilus Generation, LLC:
 4
    G. Dana Bisbee, Esq. (Devine Millimet)
 5
    Benjamin Hanna, Esq. (Devine Millimet)
 6
 7
    Reptg. IFM Global Infrastructure Fund:
8
    Barry Needleman, Esq. (McLane Middleton)
9
10
11
    REPTG. COUNSEL FOR THE PUBLIC:
12
    K. Allen Brooks, Esq.
    Senior Assistant Attorney General
13
    N.H. Dept. of Justice
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

| 1 | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 2 | INDEX | |
| 3 | PAGE | NO. |
| 4 | WITNESS PANEL: WILLIAM FELTS | |
| 5 | MATTHEW O'CONNOR | |
| 6 | Direct examination by Mr. Bisbee | 11 |
| 7 | Cross-examination by Mr. Brooks 20, | 33 |
| 8 | Redirect examination by Mr. Bisbee | 32 |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | QUESTIONS FROM THE SUBCOMMITTEE AND SEC COUNSEL BY: | |
| 11 | AND SEC COUNSEL BI: | |
| 12 | Mr. Duclos 42, 44, | 66 |
| 13 | Mr. Iacopino 43, 47, | 57 |
| 14 | Dir. Muzzey 46, 47, | 64 |
| 15 | Presiding Ofcr. Weathersby | 52 |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | QUESTIONS TO COUNSEL BY: | |
| 18 | Dir. Muzzey | 69 |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | CLOSING STATEMENTS BY: | |
| 21 | Mr. Brooks | 72 |
| 22 | Mr. Bisbee | 73 |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |

| 1 | | |
|------------------|---|----------|
| 2 | I N D E X (continued) | |
| 3 | I | PAGE NO. |
| 4 | COMMENCEMENT OF DELIBERATIONS | 74 |
| 5 6 7 8 | MOTION BY DIR. MUZZEY that following acquisition by Nautilus, EP Newington will continue to have the adequate financial, managerial, and technical capabilities in order to ensure its continued compliance with all the terms and conditions of its original Certificate issued under Docket Number 98-01 and to | 77 |
| 9 | grant the relief requested SECONDED BY MR. DUCLOS VOTE ON THE MOTION | 78 79 |
| 11 12 | DISCUSSION REGARDING THE JOINTLY PROPOSED DECISION AND ORDER | 80 |
| 13 14 15 | MOTION BY DIR. MUZZEY that, with the minor changes discussed by Atty. Iacopino, for the Committee to adopt this Jointly Proposed Decision and Order as our language | 81 |
| 16 17 | DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSED MOTION | 82 |
| 18 19 20 | SECOND BY MR. DUCLOS VOTE ON THE MOTION | 85 86 |
| 21 22 23 | | |
| 24 | | |

| 1 | | | |
|----|-------------|---|----------|
| 2 | | EXHIBITS | |
| 3 | EXHIBIT NO. | DESCRIPTION | PAGE NO. |
| 4 | 1 | Pre-filed Direct Testimony of William Felts | 15 |
| 5 | 2 | Pre-filed Direct Testimony | 17 |
| 6 | 2 | of Matthew O'Connor | 1 / |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | | | |
| 9 | | | |
| 10 | | | |
| 11 | | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 13 | | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | | | |
| 16 | | | |
| 17 | | | |
| 18 | | | |
| 19 | | | |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | | |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 | | | |

PROCEEDING 1 PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: 2 3 morning. My name is Patricia Weathersby. I'm a public member of the Site Evaluation 4 Committee. And I've been appointed to serve as 6 the Precising Officer in the docket. This is 7 Docket 2016-02, the Joint Petition of IFM 8 Global Infrastructure Fund and Nautilus 9 Generation, LLC, for Approval of the Transfer 10 of Membership Interests in Essential Power 11 Newington, LLC. 12 At this point, I'd like to ask the 13 other members of the Subcommittee to introduce 14 themselves. 15 DIR. MUZZEY: Elizabeth Muzzey, 16 representing the Department of Cultural 17 Resources. 18 MR. DUCLOS: My name is John Duclos. 19 I'm representing the Department of

Environmental Services.

PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Also with us is Attorney Michael Iacopino, who's Counsel for the SEC, and Pam Monroe, our Administrator.

20

21

22

23

24

By way of background, on March 30,
2016, IFM Global Infrastructure Fund and
Nautilus Generation, LLC, filed a Joint
Petition with the Committee seeking approval of
transfer of membership interests in Essential
Power Newington, LLC, which was formerly known
as "Newington Energy, LLC", from IFM to
Nautilus.

The Joint Petition requested the appointment of a three-member Subcommittee under RSA 162-H and an expedited review and approval of the proposed transfer of ownership interests in EP Newington from IFM to Nautilus. On March 28th, 2016, an order was issued appointing a Subcommittee.

EP Newington owns and operates a 553.5-megawatt combined-cycle, dual fuel merchant electric generation facility in Newington, New Hampshire. The Facility was constructed and is operated under the Certificate of Site and Facility that was originally issued by the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee to EP Newington on May 25th, 1999.

At the time of certification, EP

Newington was owned by CED/SCS Newington, LLC,
which, in turn, was owned by Consolidated

Edison, Inc. On January 14, 2008, EP Newington
and North American Energy Alliance filed a

Joint Application with the Committee seeking
approval of transfer of ownership interest in

EP Newington from CED/SCS Newington, LLC, to

North American Energy Alliance, LLC.

The Committee approved transfer of ownership in EP Newington to North American Energy Alliance, LLC, on April 18, 2008. At the time, North American Energy Alliance, LLC, was owned by North American Energy Alliance Holdings, LLC, that, in turn, was owned by IFM.

Following the transfer, North

American Energy Alliance, LLC, changed its name
to "Essential Power, LLC" and North American

Energy Alliance Holdings, LLC, changed its name
to "Essential Power Holdings, LLC".

On August 8th, 2012, pursuant to corporate restructuring, IFM contributed its interest in Essential Power Holdings, LLC, to Essential Power Investment, LLC. As a result,

currently, EP Newington is owned by Essential Power, LLC, which is owned by Essential Power Holdings, LLC, which is owned by Essential Power Investments, LLC, which is owned by IFM.

Agreement agreeing to transfer its membership interest in Essential Power Investments, LLC, to Nautilus. As a result of said transfer, EP Newington, as a wholly owned subsidiary of Essential Power, LLC, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Essential Power Investments, LLC, will be transferred to Nautilus. The Petitioners request the Subcommittee to authorize that transfer.

Senior Assistant Attorney General K.

Allen Brooks is Counsel for the Public in this
matter. There's no intervenors.

On or about May 18, 2016, the

Petitioners and Counsel for the Public filed a

Jointly Proposed Decision and Order Approving

Transfer of Ownership Interests in Essential

Power Newington". That Proposed Decision is

essentially a stipulation in the form of a

Proposed Order.

```
1
                   We are here today for an adjudicative
 2
         hearing, in other words a hearing on the merits
 3
         of the Joint Petition. Our authority to hold
         this hearing is set forth in RSA 162-H:4, II and
 4
 5
         RSA 162-H:5, I. The issues to be considered
 6
         are whether we should grant or deny the
 7
         Petition and whether we should adopt or not
         adopt the Proposed Decision.
 8
9
                   Let me begin now by taking
10
         appearances.
11
                   MR. BROOKS: Allen Brooks, Counsel
12
         for the Public.
13
                   MR. BISBEE: Dana Bisbee,
14
         representing Nautilus Generation, and with me
15
         is my associate, Ben Hanna.
16
                   MR. NEEDLEMAN: Barry Needleman, from
17
         McLane Middleton, representing IFM global
18
         Infrastructure.
19
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Welcome
20
         all.
               Now, we'll begin with the presentation of
21
         the witnesses sponsored by the Joint
22
         Applicants. The witnesses should stand and be
23
         sworn by Mr. Bisbee, if you could swear your
24
         witnesses.
```

| 1 | (Whereupon William Felts and |
|----|--|
| 2 | Matthew O'Connor were duly sworn |
| 3 | by Atty. Bisbee.) |
| 4 | PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: So, you |
| 5 | may continue on. |
| 6 | MR. BISBEE: I'm prepared thank |
| 7 | you. And we've presumed, Madam Chair and |
| 8 | good morning to you and to your fellow |
| 9 | Subcommittee members. We've presumed that it |
| 10 | would be okay, and I will ask your blessing to |
| 11 | have these two witnesses appear as a panel. |
| 12 | And I would like to take each one in turn to |
| 13 | get their testimony entered into evidence. |
| 14 | So, starting with Mr. Felts. First |
| 15 | of all, Bill Felts is on the left, to |
| 16 | everybody's left, Matt O'Connor is on your |
| 17 | right. |
| 18 | WILLIAM FELTS, SWORN |
| 19 | MATTHEW O'CONNOR, SWORN |
| 20 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 21 | BY MR. BISBEE: |
| 22 | Q. So, Mr. Felts, would you please state your full |
| 23 | name and business address. |
| 24 | A. (Felts) William Felts, 9405 Arrowpoint |

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

- Boulevard, Charlotte, North Carolina 28273.
- Q. And would you also please state the name of your employer and the nature of your employment.
- A. (Felts) Cogentrix Energy Power Management, LLC.

 I am the Executive Vice President Mergers and

 Acquisitions and Energy Management.
 - Q. You have in front of you, Mr. Felts, a document that is identified as "Exhibit 1". Is that your prefiled testimony, with redline changes to it?
- 12 A. (Felts) Yes.

8

9

10

11

- 13 MR. BISBEE: Madam Chair, I believe

 14 that you each have a copy of a redline version

 15 of Mr. Felts's testimony that was originally

 16 submitted with the Application in this

 17 proceeding.
- 18 BY MR. BISBEE:
- Q. Mr. Felts, if I may ask whether there are any changes that you want to address before your testimony is adopted this morning?
- 22 A. (Felts) Yes.
- Q. And those are reflected in the redlines in Exhibit 1?

A. (Felts) Yes.

- Q. Would you briefly go through those changes and explain them to the Subcommittee please.
 - A. (Felts) Sure. The changes are two categories.

 One is a change in a typo and the others are changes in revision to a summary of megawatts of generation the Company's been involved in years. I'll take them by Page. Page 2, Line 19, the word "in-house" has been deleted.

 Technically, Cogentrix is not in-house at Carlyle; we're owned by Carlyle. Line 22, the megawatts -- gigawatts was listed as "10", it's been revised to "13".

Page 3, Line 4, the megawatts of assets that are owned by -- currently owned by Carlyle, consisting of 17, was listed as "4,080", is revised to "4,070". Line 6, in the table, the first category listed as "Hopewell & Portsmouth", the net capacity was listed as "115", revised to "110". The next line in the table revised is "Southeast PowerGen", the net owned capacity was listed as "2,113", has been revised to "2,108". The "Total" line in that table was listed as "4,080", has been revised

1 to "4,070".

Page 4, Line 1, the megawatts that 2 3 Cogentrix has managed and operated was listed as "7,600", has been revised to "8,200". Line 4 5 6, the chart listed below had a total of "4,000 megawatts", that's been revised to 6 7 "4,200". Line 7, listing the chart, those megawatts have been revised to include two 8 9 additional facilities that were not previously 10 listed. The first being "Mid-Georgia", 11 utilizing the "Siemens Westinghouse W501D" 12 technology, capacity of "300 megawatts" has 13 been added. The second facility that has been 14 added is "River Road", utilizing "GE 7FA" 15 technology, "248 megawatts" of capacity. And the "Total" line at the bottom of the table, 16 17 the left column, which is the "Capacity 18 Megawatts", was listed as "7,671", has been 19 revised to "8,219", and the right sum column, 20 for "GE 7FA megawatts", was listed as 21 "4,026 megawatts", has been revised to 22 "4,274 megawatts". 23 Do you have any other changes that you wish to 24 make to your testimony, Mr. Felts?

```
1
    Α.
          (Felts) No.
```

2

3

4

5

14

15

16

18

19

20

- Then, let me ask you whether the redline Q. version, Exhibit 1, is testimony that you now adopt and affirm it as true and accurate?
- (Felts) Yes.

6 MR. BISBEE: With that, madam Chair, 7 I would ask that it be entered into evidence as "Exhibit 1"? 8

PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: 9 10 entered.

11 (The document, as described, was 12 herewith marked as **Exhibit 1** and 13 entered as a full exhibit.)

MR. BISBEE: And, before questioning of Mr. Felts, if I could turn to Mr. O'Connor to get his testimony introduced.

17 BY MR. BISBEE:

- Q. Mr. O'Connor, let me run through those same questions of you. Please state your full name and business address.
- 21 (O'Connor) My name is Matthew O'Connor. My 22 business address is 299 Park Avenue, New York, 23 New York 10171.
- 24 And what is the name of your employer and what Q.

is the nature of your employment?

- 2 A. (O'Connor) My employer is the Carlyle Group.
- And I am a Managing Director and Partner in that company.
- 5 Q. Thank you. You have
 - Q. Thank you. You have in front of you what is marked as "Exhibit 2", a copy of which the members have. Is that a copy of the testimony that you submitted in this proceeding, with redlined changes?
- 10 A. (O'Connor) Yes.

6

7

8

9

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Would you please explain to the Subcommittee what those changes are.
- A. (O'Connor) Sure. On Page 1, the business

 address on Line 6 has changed to reflect the

 new business address for our office at 299

 Park. And I am a Managing Director and Partner

 at the "Carlyle Group", not "Carlyle Group,

 L.P."

The second change to my testimony reflects all of the similar changes that Mr. Felts just went through on the tab -- the table, regarding the megawatts and all of those particular changes in his document.

Q. And, if I could pause you there please. Those

17

```
1
         would be the number changes starting at the
         bottom of Page 4, and going over to the table
 2
 3
         on Page 5?
         (O'Connor) That's correct.
 4
    Α.
         And you have one more at the bottom of Page 5
 5
    Q.
 6
         as well?
 7
         (O'Connor) Yes. One more on the bottom of Page
    Α.
 8
         5, in Line 12. We have secured commitments for
9
         capital of over 1.5 billion as of April the
10
         9th, 2016.
11
         Are there any other changes you would make to
    Q.
12
         your testimony?
13
         (O'Connor) No.
    Α.
14
         Do you now adopt this testimony reflecting the
15
         redline changes in Exhibit 2 as your testimony
16
         and affirm it as true and accurate?
17
         (O'Connor) Yes.
    Α.
18
                   MR. BISBEE: Thank you. Madam Chair,
19
         with that, I would ask that that be entered as
         "Exhibit 2"?
20
21
                    PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Yes.
22
                         (The document, as described, was
23
                         herewith marked as Exhibit 2 and
```

{SEC 2016-02} [Adjudicative Hearing] {06-02-16}

entered as a full exhibit.)

24

```
1
                   MR. BISBEE: And that is all that I
 2
         wanted to accomplish, to get these witnesses
 3
         introduced and their testimony introduced.
         And, with that, I would turn it over to -- oh,
 4
 5
         wait, let me just add for the record, too, that
 6
         you have a redline version of their testimony
 7
         that we provided this morning and that has now
         been entered. I will provide a clean version
 8
         of both of those documents to Ms. Monroe.
9
10
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Thank
11
               Attorney Brooks, do you have any
         you.
12
         cross-examination of these witnesses?
13
                   MR. BROOKS: Yes. Thank you, Madam
14
                 And, first of all, I apologize, I'm
15
         getting over a cold. So, if I'm not clear,
16
         just ask me to repeat myself.
17
                   I would propose, and I believe that
18
         the Applicants' attorneys have agreed, that I
19
         would ask the questions in a somewhat less
20
         formalized manner, so that they can provide a
21
         more narrative response. I think it's easier
22
         to be a little bit more conversational. It's
23
         complicated, and to go through it in a stilted
24
         manner is going to make it, I think, more
```

1 complicated.

And, just by way of background, I would like to point out that the Applicant did meet with me at my office for a considerable amount of time. Did exchange written information outside the record, but I'll ask some of those questions on the record. And actually provided me with a very extensive site visit of the Facility itself. And, so, I can tell you that, by way of background, unlike some generation facilities I've been to that are essentially kind of look like Industrial Revolution era machines, this is state-of-the-art, it's 2002. It essentially looks like a stainless steel kitchen when you get out there.

And, so, we saw everything there was to see. We see the SCR on the outside, we saw turbines on the inside, and we went through it very extensively. And it was explained to me in great detail how the plant functions, and how the Applicant intends to continue the function of that plant. So, I appreciate all of that information from the Applicant.

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

So, with that, I will probably start asking questions of Mr. O'Connor, if that's acceptable.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BROOKS:

- Q. Mr. O'Connor, just tell me again, I think you mentioned you're with the Carlyle Group, but tell me what the Carlyle Group does?
- A. (O'Connor) Sure. So, the Carlyle Group is one of the world's largest alternative asset managers. What that means is we collect investment money from institutional investors all over the world and invest it on their behalf in numerous vehicles. I represent the private equity arm of the Carlyle Group.

 There's more than \$180 billion under management in this firm, and I represent one fund within the firm.
- Q. And, so, when you say it's "alternative investments", how's that -- what's it an alternative to? What's the normal kind of structure and what's different about what you do? I think you mentioned to me that you might have investors that are more like the New

```
1
         Hampshire Retirement System, rather than
 2
         individual investors. But can you explain it?
 3
         (O'Connor) Sure. So, we have a group of
    Α.
 4
         investors, like public pension plans and the
 5
         like, who commit capital to our fund. And we
 6
         then go out and invest it in, for our fund
 7
         purposes, power generation. Other funds that
         we offer are traditional buyout funds, where
 8
9
         you buy a public company and then turn around
10
         and sell it. And, so, we are in the business
11
         of private equity, where we invest in
12
         non-public entities and provide a return to
13
         investors. "Alternative" means not stocks or
14
         bonds, which is what traditional pension plan
15
         money would go into. So, we are -- the reason
16
         it's called "alternative" is because it is an
17
         alternative to traditional publicly listed
18
         securities, like stocks or bonds.
19
    Q.
         Okay. So, the purpose of those investors is
20
         simply to get a return, but you happen to have,
         at least with respect to these types of
21
22
         transactions, some expertise with respect to
23
         managing electric generating units, and
24
         specifically gas facilities. Tell me about
```

1 that level of expertise.

A. (O'Connor) Sure. I'll do it in two ways. One, our investment team, there's ten of us, we collectively have decades of investment experience in the power generation sector. My background is from General Electric. I have experience on the industrial side, where we used to make the machines, but also on the investing side and owning and investing in these facilities. My colleagues have similar experience at different institutions. So, decades of experience in investing in these types of facilities.

In addition, as Bill will describe, we are -- we manage Cogentrix Energy, which has been in the electric power generation business for well over 30 years. And, so, that team has a collective experience that is far greater than even ours in managing and operating these facilities.

- Q. And I notice neither Carlyle or Cogentrix is shown on the org chart. I don't know if you have a copy of that in front of you?
- 24 A. (O'Connor) Yes, I do.

23

1 Q. So, can you just explain the relationship between both of those entities and where they 2 3 might be on the org chart or why they would not 4 be shown on the org chart? 5 MR. BISBEE: Excuse me, just to be 6 Are you referring to Appendix B? 7 MR. BROOKS: I'm going to look at Appendix B, because my understanding is that is 8 9 the proposed new structure. 10 MR. BISBEE: Uh-huh. And this is 11 Appendix B to the Application. 12 MR. BROOKS: Which is on Page 20 13 still, is that right? 14 MR. BISBEE: The Application has not 15 changed. 16 MR. BROOKS: Okay. BY THE WITNESS: 17 (O'Connor) Okay. So, the entity that you see 18 19 at the top of the org chart is "CPP II". 20 is the fund entity that I manage with my 21 partner. That is a fund that is sponsored by 22 the Carlyle Group. And, so, we, CPP II, has 23 its own discrete commitments from investors,

different than the Carlyle Group. So, this is

24

a discrete fund inside of the Carlyle Group and sponsored by the Carlyle Group.

Cogentrix is not an investor or an owner.

It is our -- it is our collective manager of all of our facilities. So, Cogentrix works for Carlyle, and will work for Nautilus in this capacity.

BY MR. BROOKS:

- Q. Okay. Tell me, in broad terms, about what the transaction actually is. My understanding is that this is not a targeted acquisition of the Newington facility, but this is actually an acquisition of a portfolio. So, tell me about what the target is and what the transaction is going to look like?
- A. (O'Connor) Sure. As was read into the opening statement, IFM owns Essential Power

 Investments, which is the third box from the top of this org chart. We are purchasing Essential Power Investments and all of its affiliated companies underneath. There are ten other generation facilities in this portfolio. EP Newington is one of them. EP Newington happens to be one of the larger and more

substantial facilities in the portfolio. The
transaction is the purchase of the entire
Essential Power Company, which is EP -Essential Power Investments, that includes the
11 generating facilities, including EP
Newington, and an operating team and platform
in Princeton, New Jersey.

- Q. Thank you. And I want to go off on just a small tangent, because you did mention that you worked for GE previously.
- 11 A. (O'Connor) Yes.

- Q. And my understanding is that this plant actually, I believe, uses GE turbines, it may have been either managed or run by GE at some point in the past. So, can you tell us the relationship between GE and this particular plant and whether there's any advantages to any existing contracts with GE?
- A. (O'Connor) Sure. So, it is GE technology.

 It's GE 7FAs. And that's just a particular type of gas turbine that's being used. It's one of the more commonly used generating turbines that GE makes. It's their flagship product, if you will. GE used to own and --

used to, excuse me, own the operations of the Facility. So, they actually did all of the operations for the prior owners. The contract that is in place is a services agreement. And we are going to maintain that for the time being. There is a benefit to an owner that doesn't have an operational team, like we do in Cogentrix, to have that type of a contract. We have our own operational team that can handle a lot of the same things that GE would do at the Facility. But we, at this point, don't have any intention to break that contract.

Having worked at GE, those contracts are relatively common in the marketplace for them to provide services to their own equipment.

Much like any other manufacturer would do in a heavy manufacturing business.

- Q. Right. And GE has been making jet engines since probably the '50s or so. And, so, that kind of expertise will continue to be available.
- A. (O'Connor) Yes, I mean, GE made -- built the first power plant in the United States, way back when, in New York City, through its

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

```
1
         founding of the company through Thomas Edison.
         So, yes, it's been in the business quite a long
 2
 3
         time. It's made all of these engines for a
         number of decades through the years of
 4
 5
         evolution. So, yes. GE has got a ton of
 6
         experience in doing this.
 7
         Okay. So, explain exactly how the acquisition
    Q.
 8
         is going to work financially.
9
         (O'Connor) Sure. So, we -- there is the equity
10
```

A. (O'Connor) Sure. So, we — there is the equity for the transaction or the purchase price is broken — the purchase price, let's start there, is broken into two different components. One is the existing lending facility, or loan, that exists at the Essential Power business. We are going to assume and take over that loan. So, there will be no new financing in place. We will assume the existing loan that's in place. IFM put a loan in place to handle the acquisition, to help finance their deal, much like you would a mortgage for a house, same concept. We are providing equity from our fund. So that the equity for the transaction will be coming from the investors in CPP II.

Q. Okay. Is the intention to buy this portfolio,

```
and then make significant changes to the way in which Newington Power is managed within the portfolio?
```

- A. (O'Connor) The intent is that nothing will change on the day-to-day operation of EP

 Newington and the Facility.
- Q. Let me go back to your previous statement about the debt facility that's already in place. I'm looking at Page 12 of the Application.
- 10 A. (O'Connor) Okay.
- 11 Q. It says "This debt facility" --
- [Court reporter interruption.]
- 13 BY MR. BROOKS:

4

5

6

- 14 "This debt facility contains working capital 15 lines of credit and letter of credit facilities 16 that will be available in order to provide 17 additional function financial resources to 18 operate and maintain Essential Power 19 Investments generation facilities". I assume 20 that's what you were just talking about, is 21 that right?
- 22 A. (O'Connor) That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Will there be any additional stresses on the Newington facility or Essential Power,

1 what's listed as the borrower, or anyone else in the chain that could change the financial, 2 3 you know, viability of the plant or create some kind of stresses that are not there already? 4 5 (O'Connor) None that I can think of. We will 6 -- we're providing fresh capital into the 7 company, and the existing loan facility has been serviced without issue since 2012, and we 8 will maintain that for the foreseeable future. 9 10 And, generally, the Newington facility is able 11 to operate in a way that is actually 12 financially sound, as far as you know, right 13 now? 14 (O'Connor) Yes. 15 There has been, in recent years, constraints on Q. 16 the amount of natural gas that a plant might be 17 able to get during winter, --18 Α. (O'Connor) Uh-huh. 19 -- because there's different users and Q. 20 different needs during that time, and there 21 have been significant price spikes. So, do you

the winter months?

believe that Newington Energy is subject to

those same stressing factors, especially during

22

23

24

30

```
1
    Α.
         (O'Connor) Yes, it is. And that phenomenon, if
 2
         you will, was -- we did a fair bit of diligence
 3
         on that. What I would say is, EP Newington
         doesn't suffer from access to fuel. There are
 4
 5
         times where gas prices spike because of heating
 6
         load, taking gas availability away from
 7
         generators. What happens in those
         circumstances is EP Newington will either
 8
9
         choose to purchase the expensive gas and run,
10
         because there's profit to be made, or, as you
11
         were at the site, you would have seen that we
12
         have oil availability on-site. And, so, to the
13
         extent that the price of burning oil and
14
         converting oil to electricity is better than
15
         the price -- than converting gas to
16
         electricity, we will switch to oil. And that's
17
         the plan going forward. So, there's ample
18
         access to gas. Price spikes are a function of
19
         the market, and we have plans to deal with
20
         that.
21
         Okay. And, remind me, is the alternative fuel
    Q.
22
         oil, is that on-site or is that from the
23
         Sprague facility next door?
24
         (O'Connor) It's from Sprague. But we have
    Α.
```

1 storage available to us, yes.

- 2 Q. All right.
- 3 A. (O'Connor) There's a dedicated pipeline to the
- 4 Sprague facility, that we have a million
- 5 gallons, I believe, of storage.
- 6 Q. All right. And that's directly adjacent, I
- 7 think?
- 8 A. (O'Connor) Yes, it is.
- 9 MR. BROOKS: Okay. I actually have no further questions for Mr. O'Connor.
- MR. BISBEE: Madam Chair, if I could
- ask, actually, if the Subcommittee members are
- going to ask questions of Mr. O'Connor before
- Mr. Felts is examined by Mr. Brooks, then I'll
- wait. But, when the time is right, I have a
- 16 couple of follow-up questions.
- 17 PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: I think
- we'll ask our questions of the panel, and
- whoever is best equipped to handle the question
- 20 to answer. So, you may carry on.
- MR. BISBEE: Just a couple of
- follow-up questions, Mr. O'Connor.
- 23 REDIRECT EXAMINATION
- 24 BY MR. BISBEE:

[MITNESS DANEL . Olsannan Ealtal

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

```
Q. Just a minute ago Mr. Brooks asked you about the million gallons of oil storage.
```

A. (O'Connor) Uh-huh.

3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- Q. And he asked whether it was immediately
 adjacent. Just let me ask you or Mr. Felts,
 the million gallon storage tank is on
 property -- it's on the Essential Power
 Newington property or is it on Sprague
 property?
- 10 A. (Felts) There are two sources for oil. There's

 11 an oil tank on-site. Additionally, there's a

 12 pipeline to Sprague, which also has storage

 13 on-site.
 - Q. Thank you. And just the last question for you,
 Mr. O'Connor. Again, Mr. Brooks asked you
 about the transaction as a whole. You alluded
 to the other facilities, the other companies
 that will be acquired when this transaction
 closes. Would you just describe where the
 Newington plant fits into the mix of all the
 facilities that you'll be acquiring?
- A. (O'Connor) Excuse me, what do you mean by "fits into the mix"?
- 24 Q. The significance of Newington, --

1 Α. (O'Connor) Okay.

-- in relation to the others.

as we're concerned.

(O'Connor) Sure. The Newington facility Α. represents almost a third of the value of the transaction, in terms of how we look at the overall value of Essential Power. It is the most significant asset in the portfolio, as far

33

MR. BISBEE: Thank you. That's all. PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Mr.

Brooks, would you like to cross-examine Mr. Felts?

MR. BROOKS: Yes. Thank you, Madam And, actually, I have just maybe one question that I'd open up to either of these gentlemen to answer.

CROSS-EXAMINATION (resumed)

18 BY MR. BROOKS:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

Q.

Which is the general question that I do ask of Q. the applicants, which is, in this case, are there any pending lawsuits, pending criminal actions, or any other assertions against either Nautilus, CPP II or Cogentrix that are related to fraud or misrepresentations or any other

141 TNECC DANEL - OLGANA - Faltal

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

1 similar actions?

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- A. (O'Connor) None.
- Q. Thank you. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Felts. These questions more go to the operation of the plant. But maybe, in broad terms, can you tell us how the day-to-day operations of the plant
- 7 | will or will not change after the purchase?
 - A. (Felts) Sure. The day-to-day operations won't change after we take over ownership. The day-to-day operations are conducted by personnel at the plant. The personnel at the plant have successfully operated this Facility since its start-up, and we have a lot of
- 15 Q. How many staff members do you think will change over once the purchase is made?

confidence in their capabilities.

- 17 A. (Felts) I don't anticipate any.
- Q. So, if the plant right now is able to run by itself, what value does Cogentrix add to the management of that Facility?
- 21 A. (Felts) Sure. Cogentrix -- is it all right if
 22 I give some background on Cogentrix?
- 23 Q. Sure. Yes.
- 24 A. (Felts) Cogentrix is a power company. It was

formed in 1983. We're the power platform for Carlyle. We were privately held until 2003.

We were purchased by Goldman Sachs, we became their power platform. And, in 2012, Carlyle purchased us, and we became their power platform. Cogentrix has been involved in nearly 50 power plants over our term. That's roughly 13 gigawatts of power. We've developed, built, operated and/or managed facilities that include coal, waste coal, gas, oil, hydro, and solar over our 30 plus years. We have approximately 300 people in the company, of which roughly 80 are in the Charlotte office.

We have our own Engineering Department, which has been involved in the construction of plants. As such, we have significant knowledge in how plants are designed. We have substantial experience in how power plants are operated. When we are involved in managing power plant assets, we take the skill sets we've learned over 30 plus years and we apply those principles to the plant. Every plant is different. No plant will always have the same

procedures and processes in place that we will like to see. And we learn as well from every plant that we purchase or manage. And we apply that incremental knowledge to every new plant, and those principles are what allows Cogentrix to stand apart from other power companies in the industry.

How we intend to apply that to this

Facility is we will allow the Facility to

utilize the engineering expertise at Cogentrix,

whereas the Facility now would need to hire a

third party to get that engineering expertise.

As well as our operations personnel have the

ability to see across the fleet of plants that

Cogentrix has and apply knowledge learned at

other facilities to each individual plant.

That, as well, would be applied to this

Facility.

In addition, the existing team that provides for the purchasing of fuel and the sales of power, that team is still in place, has been in place since 2012, in Princeton, and that team will continue to be there and perform those functions for the plant.

Q. Okay. And you mentioned the experience
Cogentrix has with managing other facilities.
Does that include experience with the GE 7FA

A. (Felts) It does. We have, over the 30 plus years, operated or managed 16 combined cycle plants, that is what Newington is, and, of those 16, seven of those plants use the GE 7FA technology, just like Newington.

turbine that you have at this Facility?

- Q. Okay. And I'll ask you the next question, but either of you are welcome to answer. When the purchaser was considering whether or not to seek out this portfolio, did you perform your own due diligence as to the operations of this Facility? And, if so, what did you learn?
- A. (Felts) We do due diligence at Cogentrix for technical reasons and support the overall diligence effort that is led by Carlyle. We have a team of personnel that, on any acquisition, we send out to each site to review what we see for equipment condition and the practices and procedures that are conducted at the facility. We also perform internal analysis on the state of the facility, the

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

```
health of the facility, and generate from that
a report, to then provide to Carlyle as to our
recommendations for areas for improvement and
areas for deficiencies. For the Newington
facility, we found it to be a well-run,
well-maintained facility that we think would be
a good addition to our fleet.
```

- Q. Okay. When the SEA-3 facility was being evaluated, I believe that there had been an issue, because some of the water infrastructure out to that part of Newington has some constraints, and some additional requirements were placed on that facility in the past. Does this Facility have anything similar with respect to access to water?
- A. (Felts) Not that I am aware of. The Facility does have an agreement in place to provide water. There aren't constraints that I'm aware or under that agreement or under operating conditions.
- Q. Is there any tank on-site that's for water storage?
- 23 A. (Felts) There is water storage on-site.
- 24 Q. And, again, what do you envision day-to-day

Cogentrix's role being with respect to the day-to-day operations of the Facility?

- A. (Felts) We'll have folks from our Management group, which includes the Asset Management personnel, which get involved with commercial contract issues, if there are any. We'll have folks from our Operating group, which will work with the plant regarding plant outages, plant outage planning, part purchases, and we'll also be assisting with the day-to-day purchase of natural gas, and the sales of electricity into the marketplace.
- Q. Okay. And you just mentioned "outages". My understanding is that the Facility currently has a forced outage rate of about 3 percent or so. How does that relate to these types of plants overall or plants in general?
- A. (Felts) Quite good. The industry average for this type of combined cycle facility is about four and a half percent. Newington has fared extremely well over the years, which does demonstrate the quality of the personnel at the plant.
- 24 Q. Okay. And, just to make sure everybody

```
understands, can you describe what a "forced outage" is? My understanding is that it's different from like a planned maintenance outage. And can you just explain what a "forced outage" is?
```

- A. (Felts) Sure. Planned outages are situations where you know that you need to bring equipment down for annual maintenance type of work, and you plan that ahead of time. Forced outages are situations where equipment breaks, you weren't anticipating that, and, as such, you end up having a situation where you're not providing power when you had committed to providing that power. It's an important metric that's measured in the power industry, because it allows you to see how well you are performing relative to the industry average.

 Newington has consistently performed better than the industry average over the years.
- Q. And I believe in the Application, or maybe in your testimony, you also provide a metric for how well Cogentrix does with facilities that it manages with respect to forced outages. So, what is -- what is the Cogentrix metric for

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

```
1
         forced outages?
         (Felts) Sure. Ours is better than at
 2
    Α.
 3
         Newington, and that's not to take anything away
 4
         from Newington, but we have an extremely
 5
         focused approach to operations on facilities,
 6
         and have many years of experience, and our rate
 7
         is even lower than Newington's. And that's
         part of what we would hope to bring to the
 8
9
         facilities, assisting the folks at the plant
10
         with the things that we have learned, to help
11
         them to operate their plant more efficiently
12
         and to plan better for things that will happen,
13
         but you don't know when they're going to
14
         happen, but you try to avoid them.
15
                   MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thank you.
16
         have no further questions.
17
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Okay.
18
         Are there any questions from the Subcommittee?
19
                   MR. DUCLOS: Well, if I may begin?
20
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Sure.
21
                   MR. DUCLOS: My name is John Duclos.
22
         And I represent the Department of Environmental
23
         Services.
24
    BY MR. DUCLOS:
```

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

```
Q.
 1
         And, Mr. Felts, I'm a little confused on the
 2
         relationship between IFM and Cogentrix.
 3
         Because they're not owned by Carlyle, but
         you're speaking about "we" now and you work for
 4
 5
         Carlyle. So, is there like a contractual
 6
         relationship or is this a longstanding
 7
         agreement? Or how is that relationship really
 8
         consummated?
         (Felts) So, I'm an employee of Cogentrix, and
9
    Α.
10
         Cogentrix is owned by Carlyle.
11
         Okay. So, I must be confused on that part, the
    Q.
```

- Q. Okay. So, I must be confused on that part, the part with the updated testimony was that

 Carlyle did not own Cogentrix?
- 14 A. (O'Connor) If I may? It's a little

 15 complicated. So, --
- 16 Q. I'm here to understand it.
- 17 (O'Connor) So, let me at least clarify. Α. 18 way the relationship is structured is that the 19 Carlyle Group, who I work for, does not own 20 Cogentrix, but our investors do. So, the money 21 that came to buy Cogentrix came from our 22 investors. So, technically, the fund investors 23 own Cogentrix. We manage it day-to-day on 24 their behalf. So, that's why when we say "the

Carlyle Group, the corporate entity, doesn't

own it", because our fund investors do. That's

the basic, they each take a proportionate

interest in the entity that owns Cogentrix as

investors in that company, and we manage it for

43

MR. BROOKS: And, if I may, I think one of the word changes may have been from "in-house" to "own". So, I think "in-house" would imply that there was a department or something internally within the organization, I think that was what was changed on the testimony.

WITNESS O'CONNOR: Correct.

BY MR. IACOPINO:

them.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

- Q. Is it just the CPP II fund that has that relationship?
- 18 A. (O'Connor) No. Our prior funds do as well.
- So, there are three current owners of
- 20 Cogentrix. We have two predecessor funds in
- 21 the Carlyle Group that have ownership interests
- in Cogentrix. We, as the Carlyle Power
- 23 Partners investment team manage the Cogentrix
- 24 entity on our investors behalf on a day-to-day

44

1 basis.

- Q. And the other two Carlyle entities that share the ownership of Cogentrix, are they in the power business or is Cogentrix in some other industry as well?
- A. (O'Connor) No. They are -- the investments
 that are managed by Cogentrix are in the power
 business only.

9 BY MR. DUCLOS:

- 10 Q. So, it would be safe to say that Cogentrix

 11 and -- or, Carlyle Group has some operational

 12 control over the Carlyle Group as a -- or,

 13 sorry, over Cogentrix as a whole?
- 14 A. (O'Connor) Correct.
- Q. Have the technical capabilities to provide to this generation facility?
- 17 Α. (O'Connor) So, that what I would say the way to 18 think about it is, we are on the board of 19 Cogentrix Energy, we, from Carlyle. And we are 20 in the management framework of the company. 21 The CEO or the president of Cogentrix reports 22 into us at Carlyle. And Cogentrix Energy is 23 handling all of the technical aspects of 24 managing our power generation fleet across all

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

1 the funds.

So, we sit on the management side of the

business and Cogentrix handles all of the

technical and engineering type activities for

all of our power plants across everything we've

owned.

- Q. Thank you. Another question on the financial aspects. You said on, I believe, Mr. O'Connor, secured the, on April 9th, 2016, secured the \$1.5 billion in your updated testimony?
- 11 A. (O'Connor) Uh-huh.
- 12 Q. What is the total acquisition of this transfer overall?
- 14 A. (O'Connor) The total enterprise value?
- 15 Q. Right.

7

8

9

10

- 16 A. (O'Connor) Or how much in equity we'll be providing?
- 18 Q. How much are you -- what's the total cost of the acquisition?
- A. (O'Connor) We've not publicly disclosed that.

 We will contribute, I'll give you the range of
 equity, the amount of equity commitment we're
 going to make for this is somewhere around 20
 percent of our fund capital. So, this is a

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

```
1 significant investment for us.
```

- Q. As you know, I represent the Environmental Services Department. So, I tried to look at some of the environmental record of the Carlyle Group's CPP I and II, to try and determine what your environmental record is overall. Is there any environmental orders or civil actions or criminal actions of any of your acquisitions or operating facilities currently, do you know?
- A. (Felts) None that I'm aware of.
- 11 A. (O'Connor) Nor am I.
- MR. DUCLOS: That's it for me for now. I'd probably reserve the right to ask more questions, should they come up.
- PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Sure.
- DIR. MUZZEY: Thank you.
- 17 BY DIR. MUZZEY:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- 18 Q. Just a couple more questions about Cogentrix.
- 19 You spoke of all the different power plants
- 20 that you had worked with through time since
- 21 1983. Have any of those been in the area, in
- 22 the New England area, New Hampshire area?
- 23 A. (Felts) No.
- 24 Q. And, thinking --

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

- 1 A. (Felts) I'm sorry. I was thinking New
- 2 Hampshire. In New England, we do have a
- 3 facility in New England.
- 4 Q. Where is that?
- 5 A. (Felts) It's in northwest of Providence. It's
- 6 called the "RISEC" facility.
- 7 BY MR. IACOPINO:
- 8 Q. What type of facility?
- 9 A. (Felts) It's a gas-fired, combined cycle,
- similar to this.
- 11 Q. Size?
- 12 A. (Felts) About the same size.
- 13 BY DIR. MUZZEY:
- 14 Q. And that was one of the facilities newly added
- to your chart in the prefiled testimony?
- 16 A. (Felts) I don't think that was newly added. I
- think that was in the chart previous.
- MR. BISBEE: If I may, Madam Chair?
- 19 If we look at Page --
- MR. DUCLOS: Page 5 of 8.
- MR. BISBEE: Yes.
- MR. DUCLOS: In Matthew's testimony.
- 23 WITNESS FELTS: Listed right above
- 24 the newly added "River Road" --

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

1 [Court reporter interruption.]

2 | WITNESS FELTS: It's the facility

3 above "River Road".

DIR. MUZZEY: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. BISBEE: It's all on the prior

6 page as well, if I may add, in the original.

DIR. MUZZEY: Thank you.

8 BY DIR. MUZZEY:

7

- 9 Q. And, thinking of the existing expertise that GE
- offers the EP Newington plant, how do you see
- 11 Cogentrix working with that? You mentioned
- that Cogentrix will be doing the fuel
- purchasing and sale of power?
- 14 A. (Felts) Yes.
- 15 Q. Is GE not doing that now?
- 16 A. (Felts) They do not.
- 17 Q. And, so, who is doing that now for EP
- 18 Newington?
- 19 A. (Felts) There are -- there's a team of people
- in Princeton that do that now, and have been
- 21 doing that since --
- 22 Q. Oh.
- 23 A. (Felts) -- they purchased the Facility.
- 24 Q. Okay. I misunderstood that.

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: I'm

sorry. You say, "in Princeton", that is

Essential Power headquarters?

WITNESS FELTS: That's correct. Yes.

5 Sorry.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

6 BY DIR. MUZZEY:

- 7 Q. So, Cogentrix won't be doing that going into 8 the future?
- 9 A. (Felts) That same team will continue to do
 10 that. However, Cogentrix will be providing
 11 assistance to that team, as well as Carlyle
 12 will be providing assistance to that team.
 - Q. And this "assistance", what's the nature of that relationship? Is it a contracted service, that type of thing?
 - A. (Felts) Once we close on the transaction, we'll have contractual relationships between

 Essential Power operating business units and Cogentrix. Over time, those will be changed, and, since we'll be one company, those will no longer be needed. But, until that time, we'll have some short-term arrangements put in place to allow for that.
 - A. (O'Connor) And just to clarify a little

further, if I may? Today, EP Newington
purchases services from the Essential Power
Operating Company and the Essential Power
Services Companies. So, Essential Power
headquarters in Princeton, New Jersey, provide
services to EP Newington for which it pays them
a fee. That relationship will continue until
we merge the companies. And the fee
arrangement will stay in place, just the funds
will go to a Cogentrix entity, instead of an
Essential Power entity over time.

- Q. Thank you. And the GE contracts that are currently existing, those will continue as well?
- A. (Felts) The plan is to keep those in place for now. Because Cogentrix has operated so many plants with GE equipment, and because there are a number of other companies that provide the same types of services on GE equipment,

 Cogentrix will continue to evaluate alternatives that could ultimately result in cost savings to the plant, but still provide the same level of service. And, if, at some point, we think that makes sense to do, then we

would reevaluate. But, today, I don't see a
change occurring.

- Q. Okay. Thank you. And, finally, you spoke about how Newington has performed well with respect to the forced outages industrywide, and that Cogentrix has an even better record in regard to that. Could you explain why you feel Newington has performed well? Is it because it's a new power plant, that type of thing? And do you have any concerns going forward as the power plant ages?
- A. (Felts) Sure. Newington is a newer facility of more recent design. It was well-designed, which we recognized in our due diligence as something that is important to us. If we find, in our diligence, that there are deficiencies in design, that is certainly a flag for us to think about what changes and the cost associated with those changes that will be necessary to correct those flaws. This plant was well-designed, at least from our determination from our diligence review.

The other thing is the plant has been very well maintained, and the turnover rate of

52

1 personnel at the plant has been extremely low. 2 In fact, the plant manager was around when the 3 plant was commissioned for operation. So, he has a significant amount of history and 4 5 knowledge with the facility's design and 6 operational parameters. 7 Over time, as the plant ages, we continue, at Cogentrix, to look for ways to extend the 8 9 life of facilities by our maintenance, 10 preventative maintenance plans, and we would 11 apply those same principles here. 12 DIR. MUZZEY: Thank you. 13 WITNESS FELTS: You're welcome. 14 DIR. MUZZEY: I'm all set. 15 you. 16 PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: So, I 17 have several questions. 18 BY PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: 19 Q. Mr. O'Connor, just a moment ago you said 20 something that I hadn't heard before, and that 21 concerned the merger of the Essential Power 22 entities. Could you explain which ones are 23 being planned to merge? And we have --24 (O'Connor) Sure. Α.

Q. We have the post transfer org chart and I think there's a post post org chart.

A. (O'Connor) Yes. So, the post post org chart is in development. And it's more around people than it is around, when I say the "org chart", more the people involved. So, the personnel org chart of Essential Power and the personnel org chart of Cogentrix will be merged.

The entities you see here are part of a -the loan, and that's not changing. Until we,
at some point in time, when the loan matures,
we will refinance it, and that structure may
change then. But, up until that point, until
the loan is refinanced, this org structure,
from a legal entity perspective, will stay in
place. But the organizational charts of
personnel will be put together.

We have, as Bill mentioned, almost 80 people in Charlotte, and we have about 55 people in Princeton. And there's going to be some, you know, redundancies and there's going to be a lot of jobs that are going to change across the platform, and that's what we're going through now. That's what I was referring

[WIINED IIMEE, O COMMOI ICICS

1 to.

- Q. Okay. But there won't be local changes, it's
- 3 more --
- 4 A. (O'Connor) None.
- 5 Q. -- in the management, mid-level changes?
- A. (O'Connor) That's correct. It's the management
 of the platform. So, the Cogentrix Charlotte
 team and the Essential Power Princeton, New
 Jersey team, there will be job-shuffling going
 on. No changes at all to any of the operating
- 11 facilities, including Newington.
- 12 Q. How much time is left on the loan?
- 13 A. (O'Connor) The loan matures in 2019, the term
- loan. And it has a working capital facility, a
- revolving credit facility, that we need to --
- which would mature in October of 2017.
- 17 Q. And the purchase of the entity is, the purchase
- 18 price, in a sense, is the assumption of that
- debt. Is there also -- so, there's plenty of
- debt and access to capital in place, it sounds
- 21 like. But what about just working capital --
- 22 A. (O'Connor) Uh-huh.
- 23 Q. -- and just operational funds?
- 24 A. (O'Connor) Right.

1 Q. What's the status there?

A. (O'Connor) So, no change from what's gone on over the past, I would say, eight years of the ownership of the Facility by IFM, or even its predecessors. EP Newington generates its own cash flow. So, EP Newington sells power into the market and generates cash. They will use that cash to fund the payroll and the daily operations of the Facility.

To the extent that EP Newington requires capital that is not self-generated, it would come from the Essential Power Investments' debt facility, as that's the working capital facility that is available to it, to provide it funds in excess of its cash flow.

- Q. Okay. Changing subjects slightly. Is FERC approval needed for this transfer? And, if so, what's the status of that?
- 19 A. (O'Connor) FERC approval is needed. We've
 20 applied. We are expecting it any day.
- Q. So, everything's going smoothly. So, you don't anticipate --
- 23 A. (O'Connor) We did have one intervenor. And the time of passage for their filing a follow-up --

```
1
         I guess a follow-up order or complaint has
 2
         passed.
                  So, we expect our approval, we had, I
 3
         believe, one question back from the Commission
 4
         that we've answered, and that was, I believe,
 5
         about ten days ago. And, so, we expected it
 6
         early this --earlier this week, and we're still
 7
         waiting for that final approval.
         Okay. And do you expect that this transfer of
8
    Q.
9
         ownership will have any effect at all on the
10
         rates charged for energy generated by this
11
         Facility? Any effect on the consumer?
12
         (O'Connor) No. No. We don't, just so that we
    Α.
13
         can -- just so I can clarify, we don't actually
14
         sell power to consumers. We sell to the
15
         market. So, our power is determined by the
16
         market clearing price. So, we sell wholesale,
```

power could be your local provider. It could

if you will. And, then, the buyers of that

- be Eversource, it could be whatever utility it
- is that buys the power locally and then feeds
- 21 it to retail.

- Q. Thank you. Has the Newington facility had any issues that you're aware of complying with its
- conditions of the Certificate that's been

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

```
granted by this Committee earlier? And, if so, are there any outstanding and how will they be addressed?
```

- A. (Felts) I'm not aware of any.
- 5 A. (O'Connor) Neither am I.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

- Q. And, my last question, are there any, on the local level, any operational steps that need to be taken prior to the closing of the plant, such as switchovers of information, you know, technology systems or contracts, personnel?

 Are there any sort of final steps that still need to be taken? And what are those and what's the time frame?
- A. (Felts) No. We are ready to go. They will continue to operate the Facility day-to-day from the plant, and the day-to-day gas purchases and power sales will be continued to manage out of the Princeton office, won't change it.

20 PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Michael.

- 21 BY MR. IACOPINO:
- 22 Q. I just want to get back to your FERC proceeding --

[Court reporter interruption.]

```
1 MR. IACOPINO: I'm sorry.
```

- 2 BY MR. IACOPINO:
- 3 Q. I wanted to get back to your FERC proceeding 4 for a moment.
- 5 A. (O'Connor) Uh-huh.
- Q. You indicated there was "one intervenor". Is
 that an individual or is it an institutional or
 government agency?
- 9 A. (O'Connor) It was a nonprofit entity called -
 I believe it's Public Citizens. They were

 representing 600,000, I think was the number of

 customers, I may get it wrong, but 600,000

 customers in New England, and they wanted -
 they didn't complain, they wanted to see more

 details of the transaction.
- 16 Q. And were they provided with more detail?
- 17 A. (O'Connor) They were.
- 18 Q. And, then, subsequent to that, they have taken no further action?
- 20 A. (O'Connor) That's correct. They had 21 days
 21 from the receipt of the information to file
 22 further issues, and that time period passed.
- Q. One of you, actually, maybe both of you, during the course of your testimony here today, talked

```
about the benefit that EP Newington has,

because it's got dual fuel capacity, and you

mentioned the oil use. But what is the present

status of your regulatory limits on the use of

oil at that Facility?
```

- A. (Felts) There's a permit that requires a limitation of the amount of oil you burn in any calendar year, or 12-month period, I think it's calendar year. So, that can't be exceeded.

 And that hasn't changed, nor will that change.
- Q. Okay. Do you understand that to be in terms of the amount of oil burned or the amount of days in which you can burn oil?
- A. (Felts) I think it's the quantity of oil. I would have to go back and check the permit itself. Typically, they're listed in the amount or quantity of fuel.
- Q. Okay. You were asked by Counsel for the Public, I think this was a question to Mr.

 O'Connor, if there were any fraud allegations or criminal actions against entities in the Carlyle family of businesses. In the conduct of your due diligence, before entering into this sale, did you determine whether, in the

[WITNESS PANEL: O'Connor~Felts]

```
1
        Essential Power family of businesses, there
2
        have been any fraud investigations, complaints,
3
        anything along those lines?
```

- (O'Connor) We did that in legal due diligence, Α. and there were none that were flagged.
- Okay. Now, what about from the regulatory Q. standpoint? Any major environmental or regulatory actions against any of the entities in the Essential Power family of businesses?
- 10 (O'Connor) None that I'm aware of.

4

5

6

7

8

9

19

21

- 11 (Felts) I'm aware of one, but it was prior to Α. 12 the ownership of this current group in 2008, 13 and that was regarding a landfill in 14 Massachusetts. But, again, that was prior to 15 this current group that was involved.
- 16 Q. Was that a landfill power generation facility, 17 gas -- landfill gas facility?
- 18 Α. (Felts) I don't know the specifics of that, too long ago, and it was resolved. But it was 20 landfill that was coming from one of the facilities of Essential Power.
- 22 Q. Then, I guess I have a couple questions 23 about the relationship of Cogentrix with, 24 primarily, Newington. Once this sale goes

through, you have somebody who is ultimately
the responsible official, responsible executive
for operating Essential Power Newington.

Somebody from Cogentrix goes down to Newington,

what is the relationship between Cogentrix and that manager? Who has the final say, in terms of what may or may not occur at the Newington

facility, from a management perspective?

- A. (Felts) Well, Cogentrix's approach to managing facilities is collaborative. We take the general manager's input from these facilities, and that, coupled with what we have learned over the years, and between the operations manager at Cogentrix and the asset management manager at Cogentrix and the general manager, those three will come up with collective solutions to problems, and a decision will be arrived at by those three. It won't be arrived at by just one individual.
- Q. What happens if there's disagreement between the two members from Cogentrix and the plant manager?
- 23 A. (Felts) That can happen.
- 24 Q. And who has the final say?

A. (Felts) At the end of the day, if those three folks can't agree on things, then that will move up the chain within Cogentrix for a determination. And, ultimately, our president will get involved, if we can't make the three folks get along.

A. (O'Connor) I'd just like to clarify, too. I
think one of the things that's important to
know is that, on a day-to-day basis, the
general manager is running his or her facility
with very little involvement from our Charlotte
staff. And the Charlotte staff is really
there, in Cogentrix, to be a support mechanism.
It's the corporate "we're from corporate, we're
here to help", really, type of relationship.

What Bill's referring to is, if there's a problem, what's unique for the plants we operate is, they — the plant manager will pick up the phone, call Charlotte, and get a response immediately. Whereas, in other relationships with third parties, the plant manager may call, and it may take time for a response and for teams to be mobilized. That's one of the benefits that we bring.

```
1
              But, day-to-day, no one from Cogentrix is
 2
         going to sit in Newington, next to the plant
 3
         manager, turning dials. The plant manager runs
 4
         the facility. The Cogentrix support team is in
 5
         Charlotte, and is available for help, not to
 6
         operate the plant on a day-to-day basis.
 7
         There was some discussion during your testimony
    Q.
 8
         about water on-site brought up by Counsel for
9
         the Public. You indicated that there was water
10
         storage on-site. Is that water storage, is
11
         that designed for cooling or is that for fire
12
         protection?
13
         (Felts) There's fire protection water on-site
14
         and there's also water on-site for the HRSG, or
15
         boiler. So, it's water we have treated
16
         on-site, so that it's of a purity that can be
17
         accepted into the boiler.
18
                   MR. BROOKS: And, again, if I can
19
         just jump in. As we did the site visit, I
20
         believe what they showed me was a smaller
21
         demineralized water tank, is what you just
22
         described, and then a larger city water tank.
23
                   MR. BISBEE: And could I ask
24
         Mr. Felts to indicate what "HRSG" is?
```

1 WITNESS FELTS: It's a boiler. Ιt 2 stands for "Heat Recovery Steam Generator". BY MR. IACOPINO: 3 And, along that line, these are GE 7F -- this 4 Q. 5 is a GE 7FA turbine. And you talked about 6 "it's been well-maintained and it's operating 7 well". Is that technology, that 7FA, is that the -- does GE still market and sell that 8 9 turbine technology? 10 (O'Connor) They do. 11 MR. IACOPINO: I don't have any 12 further questions. PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Director 13 14 Muzzey. 15 DIR. MUZZEY: I have a question in 16 regard to timing of this transaction. 17 WITNESS O'CONNOR: Uh-huh. BY DIR. MUZZEY: 18 19 Q. Essential Power appears to own a number of 20 different power plants in a number of different 21 states that are part of this transaction. Are 22 you going through similar proceedings, such as 23 this one, in those states as well? 24 (O'Connor) No, we're not. This is the only Α.

1 one.

- Q. So, what do you see is the timing of this transaction, after today's proceeding?
 - A. (O'Connor) I could almost ask that same question of you.

PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Assuming we grant.

WITNESS O'CONNOR: Yes.

BY THE WITNESS:

A. (O'Connor) I'll give you some background, just to give you the total timeline here. So, the Purchase and Sale Agreement was signed on February the 1st. And, so, we've been going through all of our federal approvals, the last is the FERC 203 process that we had previously talked about. We expect that any day. And that the last condition precedent to our closing of the transaction is the approval of this Committee to grant the transfer of the Certificate. So, the timing would be within days of, if we are so granted, it would be within days of that order.

DIR. MUZZEY: Okay. Thank you.

WITNESS O'CONNOR: You're welcome.

1 PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Any 2 further questions from members of the Committee? 3 4 MR. DUCLOS: I just have two final 5 questions, really. BY MR. DUCLOS: 6 7 I just wanted to understand, how do you make a transition from the natural gas to the oil? 8 How's the dual fuel work? Would it be to shut 9 10 down? Who would do the technical aspects of 11 that transfer? 12 (Felts) Well, there are several ways to do Α. 13 that. Some facilities will start up on natural 14 gas, and then they will switch to oil once the 15 gas turbine has reached a certain load 16 condition. Other plants have the ability to 17 consistently and successfully start up on oil 18 without burning any natural gas. This is a 19 plant that has been able to do that. And some 20 of that is a function of the technology itself, 21 which is the GE 7FA technology, which has 22 proven its capability of doing that, and the 23 other is the personnel at the plant have to 24 know what they're doing to accomplish that.

```
1
    Α.
         (O'Connor) And just to follow on.
                                            The machines
 2
         are actually designed to do that. There's
 3
         no -- it's just an operational procedure that
         you go through. But there's no -- there's not
 4
 5
         days of rework that you have to implement into
         the technology to do it. It's designed to
 6
 7
         actually burn either. And it's just how you,
         as Bill mentioned, you start it one way or you
 8
9
         start it another way, but it's not -- it's not
10
         a complicated process, when the machine itself
11
         has been designed as the GE 7FA has.
12
```

Q. Thank you. Another question is, if the turbine breaks down for some reason, needs a part, how would you go about, in your network of support, to make that repair?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A. (Felts) We have a Field Services group that

Cogentrix will deploy. If the type of repair

is one that our Field Services group can

actually complete on-site, we'll do that.

They'll deploy out within hours notice, because

it's important to get the plant back up as soon

as possible.

If it's not a service repair that can be conducted on-site by our group, then we'll

```
1
         look, typically, to GE or fabricators of GE
 2
         equipment to see who has a part. We'll also
 3
         look at the rest of our fleet, to see if there
 4
         are any plants that have those parts within
 5
         their storerooms. And, if they do, then it
 6
         becomes rather easy to swap those out of our
 7
         storeroom and bring those over. That's the
         advantage of having a large portfolio, is your
 8
9
         ability to swap out parts amongst facilities.
10
    Q.
         So, Cogentrix, out of Charlotte, would kind of
11
         manage that type of repair and looking off into
12
         their assets, to see if parts are available?
13
         (Felts) That's correct.
14
                   MR. DUCLOS: Thank you.
15
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
16
         further questions from the Subcommittee for the
17
         witnesses?
18
                         [No verbal response.]
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Does
19
20
         anyone have any questions for Counsel for the
21
         Public?
22
                   DIR. MUZZEY:
                                  I do.
23
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Director
24
         Muzzey.
```

Brooks, in similar proceedings in the past
before this Committee, there's been some
discussion, some concern as to whether new
owners should assume any type of responsibility
for the conditions in the original certificate.
Is that something that you have any concerns
about with this transaction?

MR. BROOKS: Thank you for your question. This, obviously, came up in the last Subcommittee hearing that we had for the Granite plant. That was somewhat, I think, a function of both the characteristic of that transfer, and specifically somewhat an artifact of the way that they wrote and presented their information in their Application. In other words, they said "Entity A should receive the Certificate", and then went on to say "because Entity B has financial wherewithal and management", and they really didn't connect those two. And, so, I felt that there had to be a connection between those, and we did it in the way that we were able to agree to.

{SEC 2016-02} [Adjudicative Hearing] {06-02-16}

This type of transaction I think

fundamentally is different from that. I think
that you have seen that this new entity has
capabilities. Cogentrix, obviously, is a big
part of that. But that's really added on. I
think that you heard testimony that, if it
functioned the way it functions today, it would
be just fine.

And, so, really what this is is a much higher up level purchase of an entire portfolio of assets, that happens to be made by someone who has a lot of experience in gas-fired generation. But it could really be a pure financial transaction. It could be Merrill Lynch or Bank of America, whoever, wanting to buy certain assets for their investment portfolio.

It really is, I think, fairly removed from the actual operations of the plant, other than, again, the fact that this particular buyer happens to come in wanting to protect its assets, comes in with kind of an army of folks that are ready to jump in and to do what's necessary. So, I think it's a positive.

I didn't see, in this case, you know,

```
1
         again, having sat down with them at great
         length, the need to put those additional
 2
         restrictions in there. And I do want to be
 3
         sensitive to the fact that these somewhat
 4
 5
         complicated business structures are created for
 6
         a specific reason, and those are to cordon off
 7
         certain liabilities, to make sure that certain,
         you know, holding companies have certain
 8
9
         responsibilities, the facility has certain
10
         responsibilities, and investors are down the
11
         line.
12
                    And, so, I don't want to actually
13
         destabilize any of the funding mechanisms and
14
         the financing by making artificial connections,
15
         when -- if I don't have to do that. So, in
16
         other words, I don't have a concern with this,
17
         with this transfer.
18
                    DIR. MUZZEY: Okay. Thank you very
19
         much.
20
                    MR. BROOKS:
                                 Thanks.
21
                    PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
22
         further questions from the Subcommittee?
23
                         [No verbal response.]
24
                    PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
                                                 Mr.
```

Brooks, I understand you don't have any witnesses. Would you like to make any further statement or argument?

MR. BROOKS: I think, actually, that Director Muzzey's question helped me flesh out some of what I would have said anyway. I do think that it was a good process to go through to have them come in and to show exactly what was going on.

I think that, generally, this level of transaction, again, if it were just the statute that you were looking at, they could legitimately raise a question as to whether they needed to come before the SEC at all. They have to, because the Certificate says that they do, and they agreed to do it.

But, that being the case, I do think it's removed enough that we don't need to seek additional conditions. But I do also think that I have seen a great deal of information through the site visit and through the meetings and through the testimony that shows me that, if anything, this transfer is going to be a net positive for this Facility in Newington.

73

```
PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
 1
                                                 Okay.
 2
         Thank you. Would the Joint Applicants like to
 3
         be heard by way of a closing?
 4
                   MR. BISBEE: Not really -- excuse me,
         not really a closing, but just one minute to
 5
 6
         thank you to all concerned here. Allen has
 7
         been great to work with. We've been open with
         him, and he's been receptive to the information
 8
9
         that we've provided. And I thank the Committee
10
         for its attention this morning. I couldn't
11
         present a better summary than has already been
12
         provided to you.
                           Thank you.
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
13
14
               So, there's no further evidence for the
15
         Subcommittee. Is the Subcommittee interested
16
         in proceeding to deliberations?
17
                         [Court reporter interjection.]
18
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Oh, take
19
         a break?
20
                   MR. PATNAUDE: Yes.
21
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Okay.
22
         Why don't we break for ten minutes, okay,
23
         Steve?
                   MR. PATNAUDE:
24
                                   Yes, that's fine.
```

| 1 | PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: For ten |
|-----|---|
| 2 | minutes, and then we'll come back and start |
| 3 | deliberations. |
| 4 | (Recess taken at 10:39 a.m. and |
| 5 | the hearing resumed at 10:57 |
| 6 | a.m.) |
| 7 | PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Okay. |
| 8 | Back on the record. Thank you for the break. |
| 9 | I'd like to make one correction to |
| 10 | what I started off with here this morning. In |
| 11 | my opening remarks, I had indicated that, "on |
| 12 | March 30, 2016, IFM Global Infrastructure Fund |
| 13 | and Nautilus Generation, LLC, had filed the |
| 14 | Joint Petition with this Committee", and the |
| 15 | actual date was February 29th, 2016. So, just |
| 16 | correct that for the record. |
| 17 | DELIBERATIONS |
| 18 | PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: And, as |
| 19 | we begin our deliberative proceeding here, I'd |
| 20 | like to just review the analysis that we will |
| 21 | take. |
| 22 | To approve a transfer in ownership, |
| 23 | the proposed owner must demonstrate by a |
| 2 4 | preponderance of the evidence that it possesses |

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the adequate financial, managerial, and technical capabilities to assure that the conditions of the Certificate are continuously met. That's a requirement, a statutory requirement.

We also have administrative rules that provide us guidance. And those are New Hampshire Code of Administrative Rules, Site 301.13, concerning the financial capability. When determining whether the applicant has the financial capability to construct and operate a facility, the Committee is required to consider the following: (1) The applicant's experience in securing funding to construct and operate energy facilities similar to the proposed facility; (2) the experience and expertise of the applicant and its advisors, to the extent the applicant is relying on advisors; (3) the applicant's statements of current and pro forma assets and liabilities; and (4) financial commitments the applicant has obtained or made in support of construction and operation of the proposed facility.

When determining whether the

{SEC 2016-02} [Adjudicative Hearing] {06-02-16}

applicant for a Certificate of Site and
Facility has the technical capability to
construct and operate the facility, the
Committee is required to consider the
following: (1) The applicant's experience in
designing, constructing, and operating energy
facilities similar to the proposed facility;
and (2) the experience and expertise of any
conductors or consultants engaged or to be
engaged by the applicant to provide technical
support for the construction and operation of
the proposed facility, if known at the time.

And, finally, when determining whether an applicant for a Certificate of Site and Facility has the managerial capability to construct and operate the facility, the Committee is required to consider the following: The applicant's experience in managing the construction and operation of energy facilities similar to the proposed facility, was number (1); and number (2) the experience and expertise of any contractors or consultants engaged or to be engaged by the applicant to provide managerial support for the

construction and operation of the proposed facility, if known at the time.

Although those regulations address requirements that apply specifically to the applicants who seek Certificate for Site and Facility, those regulations provide valuable guidance for determining Nautilus's financial, managerial, technical capability to continue operation of the Facility in accordance with its Certificate.

Does anyone on the Subcommittee have a motion or wish to begin our deliberative discussions?

Director Muzzey.

DIR. MUZZEY: Thank you. And thank you for reviewing those standards of review for us and reminding us of that guidance.

Based on the information provided in the Application, the prefiled testimony, as amended today, as well as the verbal testimony we heard today, the comments of Attorney Brooks, and as well as the plant's existing record of operation, I would make a motion that, following acquisition by Nautilus, EP

```
1
         Newington will continue to have the adequate
 2
         financial, managerial, and technical
 3
         capabilities in order to ensure its continued
         compliance with all the terms and conditions of
 4
 5
         its original Certificate issued under Docket
         Number 98-01.
 6
 7
                   MR. IACOPINO: So, your motion is to
         grant the relief requested?
 8
9
                   DIR. MUZZEY: Yes, it is. And to
10
         grant the relief requested.
11
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Is there
12
         a second?
13
                   MR. DUCLOS: Second that motion.
14
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
15
         further discussion?
16
                         [No verbal response.]
17
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: I would
18
         just concur that I think the record, written
19
         record and the oral record, is pretty
20
         compelling that the Applicant has the
21
         financial, technical, and managerial capacity.
22
         And that this ownership change is taking effect
23
         so many levels above the -- is really corporate
24
         ownership change several levels above where the
```

```
actually Facility is owned, that there's really
 1
         very little effect on the Facility. If
 2
 3
         anything, I think there's a great benefit,
 4
         given particularly Cogentrix's experience.
 5
                    So, I would -- I think it's going to
 6
         be -- I think it's definitely good to grant the
 7
         relief requested.
                    I also would just note for the record
 8
         that only one comment has been received in this
9
10
         docket, and that was the Town of Newington.
11
         And they are supportive of the ownership
12
         transfer as well.
                    So, we have a motion and a second to
13
14
         grant the relief requested, to approve the
15
         transfer of ownership. All in favor?
16
                   DIR. MUZZEY:
                                  Aye.
17
                   MR. DUCLOS: Aye.
18
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
19
         Unanimous approval.
20
                   MR. IACOPINO: Madam Chair?
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Yes.
21
22
                   MR. IACOPINO: I would point out that
23
         there's been a Jointly Proposed Order that has
24
         been provided to the Committee by the Applicant
```

{SEC 2016-02} [Adjudicative Hearing] {06-02-16}

| 1 | and Counsel for the Public. Is it the |
|----|---|
| 2 | intention of the Committee to deliberate on |
| 3 | whether or not to adopt that order as the Order |
| 4 | of the Subcommittee? |
| 5 | PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Yes, |
| 6 | that's our intention. Does anyone like to make |
| 7 | a motion or deliberate concerning whether we |
| 8 | should adopt the Proposed Order? |
| 9 | Director Muzzey. |
| 10 | DIR. MUZZEY: I would ask of Attorney |
| 11 | Iacopino, our counsel, have you had an |
| 12 | opportunity to review this drafted Order and |
| 13 | did you have any questions or concerns with the |
| 14 | material? |
| 15 | MR. IACOPINO: I have had the |
| 16 | opportunity to fully review the proposed order, |
| 17 | the Jointly Proposed Order. There are a couple |
| 18 | of extremely minor tweaks, with respect to a |
| 19 | couple of instances of where there's some |
| 20 | parentheses that have to be removed, there's a |
| 21 | couple of style changes on the first page. But |
| 22 | the substance of the Order is substantially |
| 23 | similar, if not very close, to exactly what we |
| 24 | would probably write, based upon your prior |

1 ruling in this case.

And, so, as Counsel to the Committee,
I have no problem with the Jointly Proposed
Order, given those small stylistic changes that
we have to make, and would recommend -- if
you're asking for a recommendation? I would
recommend that you authorize the use of that
Jointly Proposed Order -- or, I'm sorry, the
adoption of the Jointly Proposed Order.

PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Director Muzzey.

DIR. MUZZEY: Thank you. And I would note that the Order not only authorizes the transfer, but also notes that any changes -- future changes in ownership will require the approval of this Committee, and that all the terms and conditions of the Certificate originally issued remain in full force and effect as well. So, those were some of my concerns, and I see they're included here.

So, I would make a motion that, with those minor changes that Attorney Iacopino just discussed, for the Committee to adopt this Jointly Proposed Decision and Order as our

```
1
         language.
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
 2
                                                 And,
 3
         Director Muzzey, your motion refers to the
         Draft Order of June 1, 2016?
 4
 5
                   DIR. MUZZEY: Correct. The draft
 6
         that we received today.
 7
                   PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: So, we
         have a motion to adopt this Proposed Decision,
 8
9
         Jointly Proposed Decision and Order Approving
10
         Transfer of Ownership Interests, dated June 1,
11
         2016, with the stylistic changes. Is there a
12
         second?
13
                   MR. DUCLOS: I guess I would note at
14
         this point is that I really don't have a
15
         problem using this as the boiler for a
16
         Committee's order. However, I think that we
17
         should make the stylistic changes, and, if
18
         we're going to approve an order, vote on what
19
         we're going to approve, that would be my
20
         preference.
21
                   DIR. MUZZEY: So, it's my
22
         understanding you would like to sort of read
23
         into the record what those stylistic changes
24
         are?
```

1 MR. DUCLOS: Yes. Not knowing them 2 specifically, it would be hard for me to cast a 3 vote on it. That's correct. PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Attorney 4 5 Iacopino, are you in a position where you could 6 say those changes that you believe should be 7 made? MR. IACOPINO: Yes. I can do that. 8 9 The first page on the draft that you received 10 today would be eliminated, other than the title 11 up at the top, because the style that we've 12 been using under the last two chairmans of the 13 Site Evaluation Committee has -- we have not 14 used the style where you have sort of the 15 little description, followed by the 16 appearances. So, that is purely a stylistic 17 change. And, so, what would happen is, after 18 the title "Jointly Proposed Decision and Order 19 Approving Transfer of Ownership Interests in 20 Essential Power Newington, LLC", you would move right onto the part indicating, excuse me, 21 22 "Introduction". 23 Then, if you turn to Page -- well, 24 obviously, it would include the two redline

{SEC 2016-02} [Adjudicative Hearing] {06-02-16}

| 1 | changes that the Parties yes, the Parties |
|----|---|
| 2 | made to this, which are on Page 13, changing |
| 3 | those things. |
| 4 | There was also, I may have been |
| 5 | looking at the prior draft, but there was also |
| 6 | a couple of parentheticals that looks like they |
| 7 | have been removed in this draft. There was |
| 8 | some parentheses around certain |
| 9 | MR. BROOKS: There used to be some on |
| 10 | Page 6. I don't know if they have been removed |
| 11 | yet. |
| 12 | MR. IACOPINO: Yes, it looks like |
| 13 | they have been removed in the redline draft. |
| 14 | I'm sorry. No, they're still there. And those |
| 15 | parentheses would be removed. |
| 16 | PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: And |
| 17 | where are you, Michael? |
| 18 | MR. IACOPINO: On Page 6. For some |
| 19 | reason, there's a parentheses just before the |
| 20 | sentence that starts with "The prehearing |
| 21 | conference was held on May 18th." Those |
| 22 | parentheses would be removed. |
| 23 | Ms. Monroe has also pointed out to me |
| 24 | a non-gender-neutral reference with the she |

| 1 | might have to refresh my recollection on the |
|----|---|
| 2 | page? |
| 3 | ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Page 10. |
| 4 | MR. IACOPINO: On Page 10, where the |
| 5 | word "manned", m-a-n-n-e-d, would be changed to |
| 6 | the word "staffed". |
| 7 | And I think that is pretty much the |
| 8 | changes. They're not major. |
| 9 | Was there any other that you saw, |
| 10 | Ms. Monroe? |
| 11 | ADMINISTRATOR MONROE: Just adding a |
| 12 | signature block for the Subcommittee members. |
| 13 | MR. IACOPINO: Right. We would add a |
| 14 | signature block for you all to sign on. |
| 15 | Other than that, as I indicated |
| 16 | before, this Order is not much different than |
| 17 | what you would have gotten from me, if this had |
| 18 | not been proposed and you had voted the way you |
| 19 | had on your first motion. |
| 20 | MR. DUCLOS: And I believe the only |
| 21 | other change that was made by the Parties, on |
| 22 | Page 10, it wasn't written into the record. |
| 23 | And, with those comments in the |
| 24 | record, I would second the motion that's |

```
currently in front of the Committee.
 1
 2
                    PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Okay.
         All those in favor of the motion to adopt this
 3
         Proposed Decision, Proposed Order, with those
 4
         stylistic changes, say "aye"?
 5
 6
                    DIR. MUZZEY: Aye.
 7
                    PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY: Aye.
 8
                    MR. DUCLOS: Aye.
                    PRESIDING OFCR. WEATHERSBY:
9
                                                  Unani-
10
         mous approval.
                    Okay. So, having no further
11
12
         business, we will adjourn the proceeding.
13
         Thank you.
14
                         (Whereupon the deliberations and
15
                         hearing was adjourned at 11:11
16
                         a.m.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```