

Gulf's Responses to Staff's First Set of Interrogatories Nos. 1-2 (Redacted), 3, 4-5 (Redacted), 6-9.

- For each Request for Proposal (RFP) for coal issued in 2016 by or on behalf of Gulf, list the bids received. For each bid, include the supplier, tonnage bid, coal quality, and delivered price information, as well as the method and route of delivery.

ANSWER:

Solicitations (RFPs) were issued during 2016 on behalf of Southern Company, soliciting bids from all suppliers contained in Southern Company's Internet Bid System (CIBS), which includes approved suppliers listed on the Gulf Power Company Bid List.

Regarding the March 25, 2016 solicitation, purchases of bituminous coal were to be made for Plant Crist. The solicitation requested bids for two proposals: Proposal A with a term of April through December 2016; and Proposal B with a term of April 2016 through December 31 2017. Bids for both proposals were due on April 8, 2016.

Proposal A:

In response to Proposal A, sixty-two (62) bids were received from twenty-eight (28) different coal suppliers. The bids received from the Central Appalachian, Southern Appalachian, Northern Appalachian, Illinois Basin, Colorado and Colombian coal supply regions. Below is a listing of the bids that were received:

TABLE 1

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)
Bid	Supplier	Tons	Btu/lb	Transport	Delivered (\$/MMBtu)
36	ALLIANCE COAL LLC			Rail	
35	ALLIANCE COAL LLC			Rail	
58	MURRAY ENERGY CORP (SC)			Rail	
34	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
41	ARMSTRONG COAL CO			Rail	
40	ARMSTRONG COAL CO			Rail	
45	DOMINION CARBON SALES LLC			Rail	
39	BLUE RIBBON COAL			Rail	
6	B & W RESOURCES, INC			Rail	
48	GLENCORE LTD			Rail	
53	KOLMAR AMERICAS INC			Rail	
47	GLENCORE LTD			Barge	
55	MURRAY ENERGY CORP			Rail	
51	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
49	GLENCORE LTD			Barge	
16	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Barge	
19	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Barge	
43	CONSOL ENERGY INC			Rail	
44	CONSOL ENERGY INC			Rail	
42	CONSOL ENERGY INC			Rail	
38	BLUE RIBBON COAL			Rail	
8	DOMINION CARBON SALES LLC			Rail	
14	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Barge	

TABLE 1 (continued)

(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)
Bid	Supplier	Tons	Btu/lb	Transport	Delivered (\$/MMBtu)
20	SMOKY MOUNTAIN COAL CORP.			Rail	
17	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Barge	
5	NOBLE AMERICAS			Rail	
26	TRAFIGURA AG			Barge	
37	BLUE RIBBON COAL			Rail	
15	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Barge	
18	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Barge	
33	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
57	MURRAY ENERGY CORP			Rail	
59	MURRAY ENERGY CORP			Rail	
46	EMERALD INTERNATIONAL CORP			Rail	
61	BLACKHAWK MINING, LLC			Rail	
3	DELTA COALS LLC			Rail	
2	DELTA COALS LLC			Rail	
54	MURRAY ENERGY CORP (Import)			Barge	
60	MURRAY ENERGY CORP (Import)			Barge	
4	DELTA COALS LLC			Rail	
1	SOLAR SOURCES INC.			Rail	
56	MURRAY ENERGY CORP (CAPP)			Rail	
7	BLACKHAWK MINING, LLC			Rail	
21	SMOKY MOUNTAIN COAL CORP.			Rail	
23	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
62	RHINO ENERGY LLC			Rail	
22	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
9	RHINO ENERGY LLC			Rail	
10	RIVER TRADING COMPANY			Rail	
50	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
32	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
31	CAMBRIAN COAL LLC			Rail	
30	CAMBRIAN COAL LLC			Rail	
29	CAMBRIAN COAL LLC			Rail	
25	CAMBRIAN COAL LLC			Rail	
13	RHINO ENERGY LLC			Rail	
24	CENTRAL COAL CO			Rail	
27	JESSE CREEK MINING			Rail	
28	JESSE CREEK MINING - 2017 bid			Rail	
52	BLACKHAWK MINING, LLC			Rail	
12	RIVER TRADING COMPANY			Rail	
11	RIVER TRADING COMPANY			Rail	

Proposal B:

In response to Proposal B, fifteen (15) bids were received from six (6) different coal suppliers. The bids received from the Central Appalachian, Southern Appalachian, Northern Appalachian, Illinois Basin and Colombian coal supply regions. Below is a listing of the bids that were received:

TABLE 2

(A) Bid	(B) Supplier	(C) Tons	(D) Btu/lb	(E) Transport	(F) Delivered (\$/MMBtu)
6	ALLIANCE COAL LLC			Rail	
13	MURRAY ENERGY (SC)			Barge	
5	ALLIANCE COAL LLC			Barge	
15	MURRAY ENERGY (Williamson / AM)			Barge	
12	MURRAY ENERGY (New Era / Galatia)			Barge	
14	MURRAY ENERGY (Williamson / AM)			Barge	
11	DELTA COALS LLC			Rail	
8	STEARNS ENERGY LLC			Rail	
1	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Rail	
9	DELTA COALS LLC			Rail	
4	CONSOL ENERGY INC			Rail	
3	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Barge	
2	COAL MARKETING COMPANY USA INC			Barge	
10	DELTA COALS LLC			Rail	
7	MURRAY ENERGY CORP (PC)			Rail	

Regarding the May 10th solicitation, purchases of PRB coal were to be made for Plant Daniel. The solicitation requested bids for the purchase of coal for July through September and October through December deliveries. Bids were due May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016. There were a total of 9 bids received from 7 different suppliers. Below is a listing of the bids that were received:

TABLE 3

(A) Bid	(B) Supplier	(C) Tons	(D) BTU/lb	(E) Transport	(F) Delivered (\$/MMBtu)
5	RWE TRADING			Rail	
1	COECLERIC COAL NETWORK			Rail	
3	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
2	BUCKSKIN			Rail	
8	MABANAFT COAL TRADING INC			Rail	
4	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
7	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
6	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
9	ALPHA			Rail	

Regarding the August 11th solicitation, purchases of PRB coal were to be made for Plant Daniel. The solicitation requested bids for the purchase of coal for (Option 1) September—December 2016; and (Option 2) January—December 2017. Bids were due August 18<sup>th</sup> 2016.

Option 1: There were a total of 5 bids received from 2 different suppliers. Below is a listing of the bids that were received:

TABLE 4

(A) Bid	(B) Supplier	(C) Tons	(D) BTU/lb	(E) Transport	(F) Delivered (\$/MMBtu)
7	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
8	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
9	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
10	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
4	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	

Option 2: There were a total of 8 bids received from 4 different suppliers. Below is a listing of the bids that were received:

TABLE 5

(A) Bid	(B) Supplier	(C) Tons	(D) BTU/lb	(E) Transport	(F) Delivered (\$/MMBtu)
6	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
11	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
1	ALPHA / CONTURA ENERGY			Rail	
13	BUCKSKIN			Rail	
12	ARCH COAL INC.			Rail	
3	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	
2	ALPHA / CONTURA ENERGY			Rail	
5	PEABODY COAL SALES, LLC			Rail	

2. Please describe the action taken for each bid identified in response to Interrogatory No. 1. Include in your response an explanation of the evaluation process and how successful proposals were selected.

ANSWER:

1 Regarding the **March 25, 2016** bituminous solicitation, a review of Plant Crist's  
2 inventory plan and burn projections for April through December 2016 (Proposal A) and  
3 April 2016 through December 2017 (Proposal B) indicated a need to purchase low  
4 sulfur bituminous coal. The objective was to purchase either low sulfur single source  
5 coal or a blend of two coals that conformed to the current cap of 3.00/lbsSO<sub>2</sub> at Plant  
6 Crist. The applicable bids received were evaluated on a fully delivered \$/mmBtu basis,  
7 including the value of sulfur. In support of the evaluation process, transportation rates  
8 and SO<sub>2</sub> allowance values were provided and included as part of the analysis. Other  
9 inputs to the evaluation included railcar lease and maintenance and dust suppression  
10 costs.

11  
12 Proposal A: The least cost bituminous coal delivered into Plant Crist that was below the  
13 maximum allowable sulfur content was Bid No. 36 submitted by Alliance Coal LLC  
14 [REDACTED], which delivered for [REDACTED]. GULF agreed to purchase 100,000 tons  
15 from Alliance Coal LLC for the period August through December 2016. This fulfilled  
16 GULF's remaining 2016 uncommitted need.

17  
18 Proposal B: For 2017, the least cost bituminous coal delivered into Plant Crist that was  
19 below the maximum allowable sulfur content and met the other minimum coal quality  
20 specifications was Bid No. 6 again submitted by Alliance Coal LLC [REDACTED] which  
21 delivered for [REDACTED]. GULF agreed to pursue 500,000 ton minimum requirements  
22 contract in 2017 from Alliance Coal LLC.

23  
24 In both proposals, GULF was able to achieve their objective of purchasing a low sulfur  
25 coal from a single source rather than incurring the additional costs and handling  
26 associated with purchasing two blend coals.

27  
28 Regarding the **May 10, 2016** PRB solicitation, a review of Plant Daniel's inventory plan  
29 and burn projections for the July through December delivery period indicated a need to  
30 purchase PRB coal. The goal of this RFP was to purchase volumes that conform to the  
31 contracting philosophy contained in the Southern Company Coal and Transportation  
32 Procurement Strategy. The nine (9) applicable bids received were evaluated on a fully  
33 delivered \$/mmBtu basis, including the value of sulfur. In support of the evaluation  
34 process, transportation rates and SO<sub>2</sub> allowance values were provided and included as

1 part of the analysis. Other inputs to the evaluation included railcar lease and  
2 maintenance and dust suppression costs.

3  
4 Option 1: The bids from RWE trading and Coecleric were not included as they did not  
5 offer the flexibility requested for this purchase. Therefore, the least cost PRB coal  
6 delivered into Plant Daniel was Bid No. 3 submitted by Arch Coal, Inc. [REDACTED],  
7 which delivered to Plant Daniel for a price of [REDACTED]. MPC agreed to purchase  
8 300,000 tons from Arch Coal's Black Thunder mine for the Q3 through Q4 delivery  
9 period, with the unilateral option to purchase an additional 300,000 tons at the same  
10 contract price if a need arose.

11  
12 Regarding the **August 11, 2016** PRB solicitation, a review of Plant Daniel's inventory  
13 plan and burn projections for the September - December 2016 and 2017 period  
14 indicated a need to purchase PRB coal. The goal of this RFP was to purchase volumes  
15 that conform to the contracting philosophy contained in the Southern Company Coal  
16 and Transportation Procurement Strategy. For Option 1, the five (5) applicable bids  
17 received were evaluated on a fully delivered \$/mmBtu basis, including the value of  
18 sulfur. Likewise for Option 2, the eight (8) applicable bids were evaluated in a similar  
19 manner. In support of the evaluation process, transportation rates and SO2 allowance  
20 values were provided and included as part of the analysis. Other inputs to the  
21 evaluation included railcar lease and maintenance and dust suppression costs.

22  
23 Option 1: The bids with a BTU less than 8800 were excluded, as they did not meet the  
24 quality requirements of the plant. The least cost PRB coal delivered into Plant Daniel  
25 was Bid No. 9 submitted by Arch Coal [REDACTED] this bid was later negotiated to a  
26 final price of [REDACTED], which delivered to Plant Daniel for a price of [REDACTED].  
27 MPC agreed to purchase 210,000 tons from Arch Coal's Black Thunder mine for the Q4  
28 delivery period.

29  
30 Option 2: The bids with a BTU less than 8800 were excluded, as they did not meet the  
31 quality requirements of the plant. The least cost PRB coal delivered into Plant Daniel  
32 was Bid No. 11 submitted by Arch Coal [REDACTED], which delivered to Plant Daniel for  
33 a price of [REDACTED]. MPC agreed to purchase 500,000 tons from Arch Coal's Black  
34 Thunder mine for the 2017 delivery period.

3. During 2016, did Gulf experience any detention and demurrage charges, or any transportation constraints for coal deliveries? If so, please explain your response and state the charges by event.

ANSWER:

No.



4. For each RFP for natural gas issued in 2016 by Gulf, list the bids received. For each bid, include the supplier, volume bid, and delivered price information, as well as the primary pipeline used for delivery.

ANSWER:

Southern Company Services (SCS), as agent for Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Mississippi Power Company, Gulf Power Company and Southern Power Company, solicited bids in the Summer and Fall of 2016 for firm, base load natural gas supply to assist in serving the fuel requirements of its affiliates.

The bids received from the summer and fall 2016 request for proposals are documented on pages 2 and 3.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Bidder	Pipeline	Point	Volume	Price	Begin Date	End Date
Tenaska	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
ConocoPhillips	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
BG	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
WGL Midstream	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
United Energy Trading	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
Constellation	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
Noble	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
United Energy Trading	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
Direct Energy	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
BP	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
Southeast Fuels	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	May-17
Tenaska	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
Sequent	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
Koch Energy	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
ConocoPhillips	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
BG	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
WGL Midstream	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
United Energy Trading	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
Constellation	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
Direct Energy	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
Noble	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16
United Energy Trading	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16

A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Bids Received - Fall 2016 RFP	Pipeline	Point	Volume	Price	Begin Date	End Date
Chevron	FGT	Mobile Bay			June-17	May-18
Cross Timbers	FGT	Mobile Bay			June-17	May-18
Cross Timbers	FGT	Mobile Bay			June-17	May-18
Exelon-Constellation	FGT	Mobile Bay			June-17	May-18
Texla Energy	FGT	Mobile Bay			June-17	May-18
Texla Energy	FGT	Mobile Bay			June-17	May-18
Cross Timbers	Transco	Pine View			May-17	Sep-17
Cross Timbers	Transco	Pine View			Jun-17	Jul-19
ETC	Transco	Pine View			Jun-17	May-18
Devon	Transco	Scott Mountain			Jun-17	Aug-19
Shell	Transco	Scott Mountain			Jun-17	May-18
ConocoPhillips	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
BP	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18 or May-19
Laclede Energy	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Shell	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Mercuria	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Devon	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	Aug-19
J Aron	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-19
Exelon-Constellation	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Direct Energy	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Southeast Fuels	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Southeast Fuels	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-19
Texla	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Sequent	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Emera Energy	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
ConocoPhillips	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-18
Macquarie	Transco	Station 85 Pool			May-17	Sep-17
BP	Transco	Station 85 Pool			May-17	Sep-17
Shell	Transco	Station 85 Pool			May-17	Sep-17
Mercuria	Transco	Station 85 Pool			May-17	Sep-17
Sequent	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Apr-17	Oct-17
Exelon-Constellation	Transco	Station 85 Pool			May-17	Sep-17
Direct Energy	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	Sep-17
Southeast Fuels	Transco	Station 85 Pool			May-17	Sep-17
Texla	Transco	Station 85 Pool			May-17	Sep-17
Direct Energy	Transco	Central AL			Apr-17	Oct-17

5. Please describe the action taken for each bid identified in response to Interrogatory No. 4. Include in your response an explanation of the evaluation process and how successful proposals were selected.

ANSWER:

After reviewing the gas supply needs, each bid was evaluated based on price, location, volume, term, transportation rights (firm or interruptible) and the flexibility of supply.

The bids accepted from the Summer and Fall 2016 RFPs are documented on page 2.

A B C D E F G

**Bids Accepted - Summer 2016 RFP**

Bidder	Pipeline	Point	Volume	Price	Begin Date	End Date
Koch Energy	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-16	Sep-16

**Bids Accepted - Fall 2016 RFP**

Bidder	Pipeline	Point	Volume	Price	Begin Date	End Date
Cross Timbers	FGT	Mobile Bay			June-17	May-18
Cross Timbers	FGT	Mobile Bay			June-17	May-18
Cross Timbers	Transco	Pine View			Jun-17	May-19
Devon	Transco	Scott Mountain			Jun-17	Aug-19
Shell	Transco	Scott Mountain			Jun-17	May-18
BP	Transco	Station 85 Pool			Jun-17	May-19

6. In 2016, did Gulf participate in any capacity discussions or bid for any firm pipeline capacity during "open season?" Please explain your response and identify the pipeline companies.

ANSWER:

No.

7. In 2016, did Gulf participate in any discussions or bid for any firm gas storage capacity? Please explain your response and identify the gas storage providers.

ANSWER:

No.

8. For the purpose of this interrogatory and sub-parts, please refer to the testimony and exhibits of C. Shane Boyett, filed in Docket No. 160001-EI, on August 4, 2016.
- a. At Page 4, Lines 1-10, the testimony provides information about rededicating Gulf's ownership interest in Scherer Unit 3 to serving native load, stating that the impact would begin in July 2016, as shown in the accompanying schedules (Schedule E-4 for the months of July through December, 2016). Please explain why Gulf's A4-Schedules for July through December, 2016 do not reflect any impact regarding rededicating Gulf's ownership interest in Scherer Unit 3 to serving native load.
  - b. At Page 4, Line 6, the testimony refers to an \$866,563 adjustment that Gulf is including to its 2016 Actual / Estimated fuel costs. Please explain why this adjustment was necessary, and how the adjustment amount was calculated.
  - c. At Page 4, Line 10, the testimony refers to a figure of \$29,298,004. Please explain how that amount was calculated.

ANSWER:

- a. As reported by Gulf's letter dated May 5, 2016, 2016 was a transition period for Gulf's ownership in Scherer 3 which was planned, acquired and built in the 1980s as the cost-effective replacement for wholly-owned Gulf generation under development at Gulf's Caryville site. As detailed in that letter, in order to postpone the need for Gulf's retail customers to support the revenue requirements associated with Scherer 3, Gulf entered into a series of long-term off-system sales through wholesale agreements with non-affiliated utilities. The last three of these agreements representing 100% commitment to the wholesale purchasers, began reaching the end of their terms, with the largest of the three expiring December 31, 2015. The second of the three final contracts expired May 31, 2016, and the final contract is scheduled to expire December 31, 2019. Although there are numerous ways to reflect this transition back to retail service, Gulf elected to use the 2016 estimated actual filing and the 2017 projection filing to begin the transition back into the form of routine reporting originally followed in the fuel cost recovery clause when Scherer 3 first began commercial operation back in 1987. Gulf originally planned to begin including Scherer 3 on the monthly A-schedules once the estimated actual true-up for 2016 and the projection for 2017 were approved; however, after the Commission's approval of those items in November 2016, Gulf made the decision to reflect a 12-month adjustment for Scherer 3 on the A-schedules in December 2016 of \$(177,882.72) and to



include the reintegration of Scherer 3 as projected beginning in January 2017. This adjustment reflects the impact on the fuel clause of transitioning Scherer 3 to retail for January 2016 through December 2016.

- b. The Scherer adjustment is necessary to correctly account for the retail portion of Scherer 3's actual fuel cost consistent with methodologies used to account for actual fuel costs at other Gulf plants which are dedicated to serving native load customers (e.g., Plants Crist, Smith and Daniel, etc.). Since 2012, a period in which Gulf's ownership interest in Scherer 3 was 100% committed to long-term off-system sales, any Scherer 3 energy not scheduled by the wholesale customers to whom it was contractually committed was available to serve Gulf's retail customers. Such Scherer 3 energy that was then used to serve Gulf's retail customers was recovered through the fuel clause as purchased power energy and priced each hour at the Associated Interchange Energy Rate (AIER), as determined under the Southern Company System Intercompany Interchange Contract (IIC). The \$866,563 adjustment was determined hourly over the period January 2016 through June 2016 as the difference between Scherer 3's actual fuel cost incurred to serve Gulf's native load customers for a given hour versus pricing that Scherer 3 generation at that hour's AIER.
- c. The true-up amount of \$29,298,004 is the 2016 estimated true-up amount resulting from reflecting Scherer 3 energy at AIER for the period January through December 2016. This amount was calculated by:
  - 1) removing the \$866,563 adjustment for the January through June period,
  - 2) removing the Scherer 3 generation actual fuel costs from the E-Schedules,
  - 3) adding purchased power energy costs to the E-Schedules for projected Scherer 3 retail energy at projected AIERs, and
  - 4) recalculating the resulting over/under recovery amounts.

9. For the purpose of this interrogatory, please refer to the testimony and exhibits of Cody Nicholson, filed in Docket No. 160001-EI, on March 16, 2016. At Page 4, Lines 14-18, the testimony states that Gulf calculated a GPIF penalty in the amount of \$45,708, based on the comparison of GPIF results and GPIF targets for 2015. Please list all significant outages or performance-related events that occurred which contributed to this GPIF result.

ANSWER:

All unit outages are filed monthly with the Commission Clerk. GPIF reward/penalty is calculated using weighted points in accordance with the GPIF procedure. As such, no single outage event in 2016 was more significant than another in regards to GPIF. In the calculation of the \$45,708 penalty, all events contributed to the overall GPIF performance because they are descriptive of the yearlong operation of each unit.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF FLORIDA     )  
                                  )  
COUNTY OF ESCAMBIA )

Docket No. 170001-EI

Before me the undersigned authority, personally appeared Susan D. Ritenour, Corporate Secretary, Treasurer, and Corporate Planning Manager of Gulf Power Company, and who on behalf of said corporation, being first duly sworn, deposes, and says that pursuant to Rule 1.340(a), Florida Rules of Civil Procedure, she verifies that the foregoing answers to the interrogatories are submitted on behalf of said corporation, and that the foregoing constitute true and correct answers to the best of her knowledge, information, and belief based on the information provided by others in the course of business. She is personally known to me.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Susan D. Ritenour  
Corporate Secretary, Treasurer and  
Corporate Planning Manager

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of February, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public, State of Florida at Large

