



Indianapolis Power & Light Company
Public Advisory Meeting #2
July 18, 2014
Summary

Welcome

Kelly Huntington, President of Indianapolis Power & Light Company (IPL)

Ms. Huntington said she appreciates everyone coming, and thanked Barnes & Thornburg for hosting us today. At the May 16 meeting, we reviewed the overall Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) process and plans for modeling. Today we'll review preliminary results. IPL received more than 100 comments from the last meeting; all questions have been answered and posted on the IPL IRP webpage. Huntington noted that some of these comments related to the Harding Street power plant. She told participants that a wastewater NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) plan is being prepared to address the future of IPL's five largest coal plants. The wastewater plan should be completed in time to be incorporated into the IRP.

Since the last meeting, IPL has been acknowledged nationally for its efforts in solar investment through its feed-in tariff ranking 5th among U.S. cities with over 50 megawatts of solar. She mentioned that many stakeholder comments from the last meeting related to the need to include a carbon tax in the modeling, and although that's not included at this point it will be included for the final modeling runs.

Touching on safety, Ms. Huntington reiterated that IPL does comply and will comply with all environmental regulations, and will continue to maintain reliability. She said that while IPL offers one of the lowest residential rates in Indiana, there are still customers who have trouble paying their electric bills; therefore, any rate increase will be difficult for these customers. IPL must seek to balance cost with safety and reliability. She said she will be here most of the day and looks forward to talking with participants.

Meeting Agenda & Guidelines

Dr. Marty Rozelle, The Rozelle Group Ltd.
(slides 3-8)

Ms. Huntington had emphasized that safety is the first value at IPL, so Dr. Marty Rozelle pointed out the emergency exits, safety issues of the meeting room, as well as logistics of food and rest rooms. Dr. Rozelle reminded participants that they will need to speak into a microphone for all to hear. She explained how the meeting will be conducted today and provided guidance to those who are joining by telephone.

All participants introduced themselves, including several telephone participants.

Bob Veneck, Executive Director of the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission (Commission), contributed some comments from the Commission's perspective, as summarized below. He noted that the objectives of this advice are to reduce the costs of uncertainty, improve reliability, and increase resiliency in the wholesale markets and distribution system.



1. IRPs are integrally related to other laws and requirements, and the IRP requirement emanates from the Certificate of Need law. If the new EPA 111(d) rules are finally approved, compliance measures should be included in IRPs. Until final rules are approved, the Commission is asking utilities to consider different assumptions (such as a range of CO₂ prices, different prices for natural gas/coal, different load growth assumptions) for incorporation into the scenarios and sensitivities to better bracket the risks and uncertainty.
2. As noted in the Director's Report earlier this year, IRPs should foster a comprehensive review of risks and uncertainties, noting that many participants in previous IRP processes were concerned that the range of risks analyzed was not broad enough. The Commission does not expect the analysis done in 2014 to be completely accurate in predicting future circumstances, but should explore a range of alternatives. While these analyses are only illustrative and hypothetical, they should be thoroughly evaluated and appropriately described in the IRP.
3. The IRP is an evolving tool that should consider next generation planning tools, develop appropriate data bases, and improve the stakeholder process; collaboration with stakeholders is a critical element of the IRP planning process. A broad range of topics and energy alternatives should be evaluated, including customer-owned generation, demand-response, and interrelationship with the transmission and distribution systems.

A participant asked about the state's plan for dealing with 111(d), observing that some states have already begun to assemble advisory groups and stakeholder processes. Mr. Veneck responded that there are discussions beginning within the administration.

The facilitator, Dr. Rozelle, provided an overview of the agenda and reviewed the objectives of the meeting - to enhance understanding, to gather comments and feedback, and to continue to build relationships between IPL and stakeholders. She noted that we will include a discussion about how stakeholder comments have been included so far, along with a brief summary of the first stakeholder workshop. The preliminary scenario results will be presented, and there will be opportunities for questions and discussion. She asked participants to send any additional comments to the IRP email address, IPL.IRP@aes.com by August 1, and responses will be posted to the IRP web page (iplpower.com/IRP/) by August 15th.

Summary of IRP Public Advisory Meeting #1

Herman Schkabla, Director of Resource Planning
(slides 9 – 21)

Herman Schkabla welcomed everyone to the meeting. He reviewed the content of the first workshop on May 16, including the agenda, the IPL service territory, and IPL's generation resources. He recapped the IRP planning process steps, noting that we are now transitioning from the top line to the bottom line on the graphic. The energy forecast for IPL was shown, indicating less than 1% annualized growth. Mr. Schkabla reviewed how demand side management is reflected in the forecast and integrated into the IRP. He noted that despite the recent legislative changes, IPL is committed to continuing to offer its customers cost effective DSM programs.



He showed a graphic that illustrated recent changes in IPL's generating portfolio, projecting a decrease in coal generation from 79% in 2007 to 54% in 2017, with associated increases in gas, wind, and solar generation. Mr. Schkabila emphasized that IPL is continuing to look at the adoption and potential for distributed energy within the service territory, indicating that solar was best suited for meeting summer peaking needs, but also noted that solar cannot be considered a 'least-cost' resource at this time. Environmental regulations were briefly reviewed, with more detailed information to be presented later in this meeting. He described the Ventyx modeling approach including the North American Power Reference Case and proposed modeling assumptions for IPL, along with the four scenarios to be analyzed.

Demand Side Management Update

Jake Allen, DSM Program Development Manager
(slides 22-33)

Jake Allen gave an update on developments in the demand side management (DSM) area since the last meeting. IPL has filed a 2-year plan for energy efficiency with the Commission, and is working on a plan for the period beyond 2018. While IPL seeks approval of a 2-year plan for the years 2015-2016 (filed as Cause No. 44497), IPL filed a 3-year plan for the years 2015-2017 for transparency. He explained that the Commission adopted an 'opt-out' provision for large commercial and industrial (C&I) customers this year. Mr. Allen reported that 41 customers opted out by the July 1 deadline, representing 13% of total IPL sales; this is about half of the eligible industrial customers' load. The next opt-out date is January 1, 2015. The Commission has since received many comments requesting reinstatement of targets for the state. IPL is seeking approval for only two years of spending authority for DSM programs because of the uncertainties in this area.

Mr. Allen reviewed the suite of specific DSM programs for residential and business customers that IPL proposes to offer over the next two years. There will no longer be a statewide third-party administrator for these programs, but IPL will continue to offer them with a few exceptions for programs that have not proven to be cost-effective. He showed graphics that indicated energy savings and DSM savings over the period of 2010 to 2017. IPL expects to have essentially met the Commission's cumulative target at the end of 2014.

IPL is working with Applied Energy Group (formerly EnerNOC) to develop a longer-range plan for the 2018-2034 timeframe. He emphasized that IPL remains committed to offering cost-effective DSM programs to customers.

Questions and comments from participants included the following:

- What is the dollar cost of energy efficiency charges paid to IPL by those who have opted-out of the DSM programs?
 - Mr. Allen didn't know, but he will provide an estimate of this amount.
- Do the DSM projections presented assume industrial opt-outs?
 - Yes, they reflect current opt outs.
- Is that just for 2014, or does it include future opt outs?
 - We will need to figure out a scenario for future opt outs.



- What is the total resource cost of the residential new construction program that is being dropped?
 - The program was evaluated and considered not to be cost effective.
- We should shoot for a much bigger energy savings rate than 1.2%. Something like 10% should be achievable with technologies available.
 - Customer willingness to participate is the most influential and least predictable aspect of DSM success. Systemic issues like energy efficient appliances are already included.
- Does IPL assume that nobody will opt back in, but only continue to opt out?
 - There may be some who rejoin, but we assume incremental opting out in future.

Environmental Update

Angelique Oliger, Director of Environmental Policy
(slides 34 – 40)

Angelique Oliger provided an update on some of the rules and regulations that were discussed at the last meeting. She reported that EPA did sign a final rule on 316(b) on May 19 that was consistent with the proposed rule.

She then discussed the new federally-proposed Clean Power Plan, under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. The proposed rule was published in the Federal Register on June 18 of this year, with comments due on October 16. The EPA will hold four public hearings around the country. A final rule is expected in June 2015, with state plans due in June 2016 (with provision for extensions under certain circumstances), and the EPA must approve the state plans within one year from that date.

The rule sets rate-based emission targets for states, but does not dictate how this must be accomplished. Utilities are trying to figure out what the rule means to them. In Indiana, emissions are about 1,900 pounds per megawatt hour currently, compared to the EPA goal of 1,607 pounds per megawatt hour average over 2020 and 2029, and 1,531 pounds from 2030 forward. States have flexibility on how they meet the target, and are required to develop specific plans on how to do so. These plans must be approved by the EPA. Multi-state plans are also allowed; for example, Indiana could enter into a plan with other MISO states.

Ms. Oliger outlined the “building blocks” states can use to meet to the goals. These include heat rate improvements, substituting coal generation with other sources (with a renewables target of about 7% by 2030), and/or demand side management (target of about 12% by 2030).

Participant questions and comments included the following:

- Is it correct to interpret that although EPA asked for a 30% reduction, this equates to 20% for Indiana?
 - Yes, this does equate to 20% for Indiana from 2012 to 2030. EPA nationwide estimate of a 30% reduction was based on 2005 to 2030.
- Has IPL looked at its portfolio to determine an emissions inventory and possible ways to improve heat rate?



- Yes, we'd need 2.5% heat rate improvement to meet the goal. EPA states that there will be credit for new gas combined cycle, so if we are able to account for Eagle Valley we would meet the goal. However, since this is a new unit, we are unsure how to take credit for it.
- How many pounds per megawatt hour does IPL emit now, and what will it be in 2017 when the combined cycle unit comes on?
 - IPL projects about 1,900 pounds per megawatt hour in 2017 compared to about 2,000 currently.

Overview of Stakeholder Comments and Questions

Herman Schkabla

Jake Allen

Swetha Sundar, Resource Planning Analyst

(slides 41 - 49)

Dr. Rozelle referred participants to a handout listing all the comments and responses received from the last workshop, and said that IPL representatives will highlight a few of those in this presentation.

Swetha Sundar addressed comments about the energy and demand forecasts used in modeling. She said that IPL believes that extrapolating a 10 year forecast over 20 years using an average growth rate for the later years is justifiable for the purpose of the IRP. She said also that historical DSM savings are embedded in the forecast, and future savings will be netted out in the modeling. Finally, she said that IPL's forecasts are consistent with industry-wide forecasts, taking into account energy-efficient appliances, efficiency gains, and demand reduction in the service territory.

- Can you outline the methodology and tools you use for forecasting?
 - IPL uses linear regression models created based on 10-year historical consumption and weather data. The models use a combination of economics and efficiency-trends to drive the forecast.

Jake Allen addressed comments about DSM, saying that IPL will pursue what is cost effective in the absence of state goals. He said that preliminary results of the 2018 to 2034 forecast will be available in September.

Speaking on behalf of John Haselden, who isn't able to be here, Mr. Allen discussed the renewable energy questions. Regarding renewable energy certificates (RECs), these are typically sold in other states like Ohio where there is a Renewable Portfolio standard and thus a higher market value for the RECs. Proceeds of RECs sales are a reduction to fuel costs and a benefit to the IPL Customers. There are limited combined heat and power (cogeneration) opportunities in Indianapolis, mainly due to the existence of a commercial steam plant from which customers can purchase steam rather than producing it themselves.

- Regarding the sale of RECs to Ohio, is it correct to interpret that IPL is buying wind and solar power, selling it to Ohio, and they then take it as a credit toward their renewable portfolio standard?



- Mr. Schkabla responded that IPL is careful not to ‘double-count’ the credits. If you have sold the RECs, you cannot count it as renewable energy in your system anymore.

Mr. Schkabla addressed questions about scenario modeling. To reduce confusion over terminology, he clarified that the term ‘reference case’ means the Ventyx North American Reference Case, which includes a set of assumptions within it as well as the four scenario assumptions. When we talk about the ‘base case’, that is one of their four scenarios. He said that IPL uses company-specific data in the models in addition to assumptions included in the Ventyx regional model (specifically, hourly market prices). The model does compare the cost of running generating units to the cost of purchasing power, taking advantage of the most cost-effective option.

Regarding modeling questions, he noted that off-system sales revenue is shown as a credit against IPL customers’ costs. He referred participants to the written answer for retirement dates of all units, noting that the ‘big 5’ coal units at Petersburg and Harding Street are projected to be retired after an approximate 60-year life in the 2030’s. These dates are not firm and may be adjusted based on a number of economic or environmental conditions; this is one objective of the NPDES waste water filing being prepared currently. Regarding Harding Street upgrade versus replacement cost, there is a \$54 million investment to comply with Mercury and Air Toxics Standard (MATS), whereas replacing it with a combustion turbine (CT) would be about \$300-500 million. Mr. Schkabla noted that questions about how CO₂ and DSM are treated in the model will be addressed later in today’s meeting when Diane Crockett covers the preliminary model results.

Stakeholder questions and comments were as follows:

- Do you foresee any trends to factor externalities like health effects into your analysis?
 - IPL thinks these are captured implicitly by other factors, i.e. environmental compliance requirements. There could be more done in this regard, of course, but currently the specific subject of these ‘externalities’ are not typically addressed explicitly in the modeling.
- You mentioned that off-system sales are treated as a reduction in revenue in the model – can you explain how it’s treated now?
 - I’m interpreting this question to mean whether we are currently ‘giving back’ wholesale margins to our customers. The model represents this situation as if you’re incurring annual rate cases, but the reality of the situation is that utilities don’t have annual rate cases. IPL currently does not have a sharing mechanism for wholesale margins. The assumption is that revenue/margins will increase, but sometimes conditions work to decrease revenues/margins.
- The NAACP submitted several resolutions signed by interest groups indicating concerns for health effects of the Harding Street plants. Would IPL consider being more socially responsible by moving towards exclusively clean energy, thereby gaining a good reputation and enhancing public health?
 - We haven’t specifically looked into a portfolio that includes exclusively clean energy. We certainly would consider that in the future if it makes sense to do so, while also considering the affordability and reliability for our customers.



- A participant wants to see a robust treatment of climate change in IPL’s modeling, which should consider weather extremes and catastrophic events.
 - Our modeling is not set up to consider these explicitly. There may be a way to put a proxy cost into the model, but we would need to determine how to account for this. Perhaps it could be a shadow cost or elements of the EPA compliance plan. We do recognize that the bottom line concern here is to reduce CO₂ emissions, and we understand this point of view.
- A participant referenced the cost of recent extreme weather events to communities in the United States. This affects quality of life. We know that climate change is directly related to levels of CO₂ emitted into the atmosphere.
 - IPL understands your concern. Bill Henley, Vice President of Regulatory & Government Affairs at IPL, responded that these issues are incorporated into the process through the CO₂ regulations that will be included in the model. IPL recognizes that there is a premium cost associated with alternative energy, but has worked to develop these resources nevertheless (i.e. solar and wind). We will always continue to evaluate whether additional renewable energy should be included. At this time, we rely on federal regulations to guide how to assess these impacts.

How IPL Plans to Incorporate Stakeholder Input

Herman Schkabila
(slides 50 – 55)

Mr. Schkabila reviewed the results of the participant survey from the last workshop indicating the relative importance of key risk factors. This showed that stakeholders attending the May 16 IRP meeting seem to be most interested in distributed energy, CO₂ emissions “tax”, air and water quality regulations, energy conservation, and renewable energy generation. He outlined assumptions developed for wind energy, which reflected a reduction in the estimated cost of wind generation by \$200/KW compared to the original assumption. He noted, however, that the real cost of wind generation to IPL customers varies because of the location of generation resources relative to the load at any given time (LMP price differential). This has the effect of diminishing the energy output of wind. Additional transmission lines would be needed to address this issue. We will continue to refine these assumptions as we complete the IRP.

He explained that currently the Ventyx environmental scenario is the only scenario that includes a carbon cost assumption, but that IPL will incorporate the EPA Clean Power Plan into the base case scenario in the final IRP modeling results.

Regarding DSM, he noted that the DSM cost model uses capacity costs consistent with the IRP assumptions. Because the Ventyx model is not specifically designed to conduct cost-benefit analyses, the approach will be to use the cost-benefit results from the Applied Energy Group analysis and ‘net’ it against the load forecast for the Ventyx modeling.

To reflect the potential for distributed generation in the IRP analysis, we will reduce the IPL energy and peak forecast to reflect a target level, e.g. assume 2% distributed energy generation by 2020.

Participant comments included:



- Is there a process to include quality of life issues into your analyses; for example, effects of coal burning on surrounding areas? It seems that most of this discussion is related to cost.
 - We are learning from you, our stakeholders, about these issues and how they should be considered. Ms. Huntington noted that the company relies on environmental policies and regulations to set the standards and then evaluates them based on stakeholder input.
- Is it safe to say that IPL has never considered becoming a “B Corporation” that uses the power of business to solve social and environmental problems? This is a growing trend around the world.
 - Ms. Huntington explained that corporate social responsibility is an important focus for IPL and its parent company; please look at the AES website for more detail. Within IPL, we continue to have these types of conversations, and they are informed by discussions like this one. Our focus is reflected in our commitment to wind generation, electric vehicle support, and many other “responsible” programs.
- A participant offered that she appreciates the adjustment in cost assumptions for wind generation, and noted that Clean Line Energy Corporation is working hard to develop transmission lines to deliver wind energy at about \$45 per megawatt hour. Can IPL run a sensitivity considering a 50% capacity factor for wind?
 - We will discuss including a sensitivity that looks at a higher capacity factor for wind.

LUNCH BREAK

Presentation of Ventyx Scenario Results

Diane Crockett, Ventyx
(slides 56 – 70)

Diane Crockett gave a brief review of the modeling process, assumptions, and scenarios. She described the four scenarios included in the Reference Case, and showed a graph depicting gas price forecasts and proposed MISO-Indiana market prices. She noted that this is an energy-only price and does not include capacity. She noted that Ventyx included a carbon price in only the environmental scenario.

The results of modeling were shown in a table outlining expansion plans (portfolios) selected by the model. Ms. Crockett explained that there a number of market purchases indicated as a ‘bridge’ used during periods to postpone new capacity construction. New resources include combined cycle and wind generation to meet a 14% reserve margin. She explained that the model selects the least-cost plans from options available. Coal unit retirements are also indicated, mainly in the latter stages of the planning period.

In presenting the 2034 generation mix, she noted that all scenarios include the same amounts of coal, gas, and solar generation, with wind being the variable factor. This takes into account all previous (during the period 2014-2033) unit conversions and other system modifications. She noted that market purchases will be needed to fulfill planned reserve margins in later years of the planning timeframe.



The present value revenue requirement (PVRR) was shown for each of the four scenarios. The low gas scenario is the least costly and the environmental scenario is the most costly. For a better understanding of the price differential, the environmental scenario is approximately \$3.5 billion more than the low gas scenario.

Regarding SO₂ emissions, the graphic shows the conversion of Harding Street 5 & 6 coal units to gas in the 2017 timeframe. A slight increase in emissions over the period indicated increasing capacity factors of various units. NO_x emissions follow a similar pattern, with a further reduction when the remaining coal units are retired in the 2030s. CO₂ emissions remain relatively stable over the timeframe for the base and high gas cases, with the environmental and low gas cases having lower emissions.

Mr. Schkabila provided a summary of the results, saying that since IPL does not have a need for new resources for the next 15 years, the resource plans are all very similar until the latter part of the 20 year study period. He noted that the NPDES waste water study may change this picture if it indicates an earlier retirement of coal units is warranted. Combined cycle was a preferred capacity resource addition in all scenarios.

Discussion included the following questions and comments:

- When are you going to stop burning coal at Harding Street?
 - There are currently three coal units at Harding Street. Units 5 and 6 will come off line in 2016. Unit 7 is being analyzed as part of the NPDES wastewater filing; in these model results Unit 7 runs until 2034.
- Regarding the purchase of 450 MW in 2016, is that price predetermined? Or could spot prices change?
 - No, they are not predetermined. Yes, it will change.
- Is the wind being added new wind development or Purchase Power Agreements?
 - New wind development.
- What is the timeline for Harding Street Unit 7?
 - The wastewater treatment evaluation (NPDES) is looking at this issue, focused on IPL's five coal units, to decide what makes the most sense (retirement, refueling, etc.). This filing will take place this year, hopefully before November 1, and will be incorporated in the 2014 IRP.
- What chance for review or input will this group have for the NPDES study?
 - There won't be an opportunity in this type of forum to review that study before filing; stakeholders can file as intervenors at the Commission after filing. There is usually a field hearing associated with these filings as well for people who don't want to become formal intervenors to provide their input.
- Can we request that IPL provide an informal notice (e-mail) to people who are attending this workshop once the NPDES wastewater case is filed?
 - Yes, we will do that.
- It seems that there should be more diversity in the various portfolios. How can you evaluate and compare them?
 - We agree that they seem to be similar. This is because no significant new resources are needed for 15 of the 20 planning years.



- We would like to see earlier retirement of coal units and replacement with renewable resources.
- What is included in the annual revenue requirement?
 - Return on rate base for incremental capital (new unit capital costs), fuel, fixed and variable cost for existing and new units and other costs included in base rates.
- If CO₂ costs on the “big 5” coal units are only included in the environmental scenario, that’s not a fair comparison. This participant suggests that capital, O&M, and CO₂ costs should be split out and displayed for each scenario in these graphics.
 - That’s an understandable suggestion. In the next round of modeling each scenario will be run against each other, and this should equalize the CO₂ costs across the scenarios.
- Will results of the NPDES study affect the IRP results? Does each scenario dictate when retirements happen, or can you force it to select retirement dates?
 - The NPDES analysis is more detailed than the IRP study in terms of the coal-fired units. We will not specifically run that analysis through each of the modeled scenarios. However, the results will be meshed with the IRP in a logical manner. We had hoped the NPDES analysis would have been completed, but it’s not yet done.
- How difficult is it to run these scenarios?
 - The more complex scenarios, like the environmental, can take 10 to 15 hours to run; some are much quicker and can be completed in a couple of hours.
- What criteria would it take to consider earlier retirement of Harding Street Unit 7?
 - We need to choose the least-cost alternative according to regulations. We need to consider current regulations, likely future regulations, and costs of compliance. Costs of fuel under different scenarios are also a major consideration. Other variables include the size of the unit and the types of environmental controls already installed. Consequently, this is a very dynamic process. At last analysis, retrofits were indicated as the preferred approach. With a different regulatory environment today, this could change. All of IPL’s decisions are guided by legislative and regulatory requirements.
- What’s the timeline for making a decision about Unit 7?
 - We won’t know until we complete the NPDES wastewater assessment for all five coal units. This will happen soon.

Participant Feedback and Comments

Marty Rozelle

Dr. Rozelle asked participants if there are any additional thoughts and comments. These were:

- There is a 10-year timeframe in which no new generation is included. Does this account for distributed generation?
 - This analysis was done to meet a 14% reserve margin. Without that, there is no need for new capacity. This doesn’t mean we can’t support distributed generation or additional wind resources; this might be a way of addressing the new EPA requirements. We expect that there will be new approaches and issues related to alternative resources.
- IPL hasn’t filed a rate case for 20 years. How can you assume a rate case every year in the model?



- The modeling is not intended to reflect the actual timing of utilities' rate case filings. The PVRR calculation in the modeling simulates the annual revenue requirements of the IPL system, which serves as a proxy for a utilities rate adjustments.
- What would happen if 200,000 residents asked to participate in the “Green Power” program next year?
 - When we sell green power, we acquire RECs to do that since we don't have direct connectivity. There is a premium cost associated with it. If more people participated there might be some scarcity in RECs. The price of RECs may increase and it may cause some additional renewable resources to be developed.
- A participant noted that another Indiana utility has proposed an alternative to the REC process (Indiana-Michigan has proposed to build 16% green power).
 - IPL is evaluating those types of options. Everyone benefits from green energy in the service territory. The solar facility near the airport, for example, shows that the area is ready for this option.

Meeting Recap and Next Steps

Marty Rozelle
(slide 73)

Marty Rozelle reviewed items for which participants have requested IPL to follow-up:

- Determine and report the amount of money that has been saved by large industrial clients who have opted out of the energy efficiency programs.
- Please notify IRP workshop participants when the NPDES filing for Harding Street plant is made.

Dr. Rozelle presented a slide outlining next steps and dates for comment submission and future meetings. These are:

July 25, 2014	Public Advisory Meeting #2 Notes Posted to IPL Website
August 1, 2014	Deadline to Submit Comments/Questions
August 15, 2014	IPL's Response to Comments/Questions Posted to IPL Website
September 23, 2014	Public Advisory Meeting #3 – Final Modeling Results
Oct 31, 2014	Submit IRP Document to the IURC

To submit ideas and comments, please email:

IPL.IRP@aes.com

Herman Schkabla said that at the next workshop IPL will share results of additional modeling and will hopefully share results of the NPDES wastewater study. We will most likely know what IPL's preferred resource plan for the 20-year period will look like. He reminded participants that the 2014 IRP is the current “snapshot in time”, and IPL continues to evaluate, update, and revise these plans. For example, there may be more clarity about environmental requirements and DSM guidelines for the next IRP process in two years.

In closing, Kelly Huntington thanked everyone for coming and contributing valuable ideas and comments. She said that this process is important and is very valuable to the IRP process, since it helps to reflect our customer's views. While IPL operates in a regulatory environment,



we value the opportunity to discuss and share our assumptions with our stakeholders to ‘test’ our ideas. She noted that she’s been impressed with the professionalism and collegiality of the participants, and looks forward to meeting again in September.

Correction to May 16, 2014 Workshop Summary:

The representative from NAACP asked that her comments be attributed, to reflect the concerns of that organization. These included the following.

- As you look at different energy sources, what will be the impact on employment in Indianapolis from changes in the coal stations (i.e. Harding Street)? Will workers be retrained to other jobs?
- Do you have goals for contracting minority businesses in solar and wind industries?