

AEP Texas Central Company

2008 Second Quarter Report

Consolidated Financial Statements



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Glossary of Terms	TCC-i
Condensed Consolidated Statements of Income – Unaudited	TCC-1
Condensed Consolidated Statements of Changes in Common Shareholder’s Equity – Unaudited	TCC-2
Condensed Consolidated Balance Sheets – Unaudited	TCC-3
Condensed Consolidated Statements of Cash Flows – Unaudited	TCC-5
Condensed Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements – Unaudited	TCC-6

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

When the following terms and abbreviations appear in the text of this report, they have the meanings indicated below.

Term	Meaning
AEP or Parent	American Electric Power Company, Inc.
AEP East companies	APCo, CSPCo, I&M, KPCo and OPCo.
AEP System or the System	American Electric Power System, an integrated electric utility system, owned and operated by AEP's electric utility subsidiaries.
AEP West companies	PSO, SWEPCo, TCC and TNC.
AEPSC	American Electric Power Service Corporation, a service subsidiary providing management and professional services to AEP and its subsidiaries.
APCo	Appalachian Power Company, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
CAA	Clean Air Act.
CSPCo	Columbus Southern Power Company, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
CSW	Central and South West Corporation, a subsidiary of AEP (Effective January 21, 2003, the legal name of Central and South West Corporation was changed to AEP Utilities, Inc.).
CSW Operating Agreement	Agreement dated January 1, 1997, by and among PSO, SWEPCo, TCC and TNC governing generating capacity allocation. This agreement was amended in May 2006 to remove TCC and TNC. AEPSC acts as the agent.
CTC	Competition Transition Charge.
EITF	Financial Accounting Standards Board's Emerging Issues Task Force.
EITF 06-10	EITF Issue No. 06-10 "Accounting for Collateral Assignment Split-Dollar Life Insurance Arrangements."
FASB	Financial Accounting Standards Board.
Federal EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency.
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.
FIN	FASB Interpretation No.
FIN 48	FIN 48, "Accounting for Uncertainty in Income Taxes" and FASB Staff Position FIN 48-1 "Definition of <i>Settlement</i> in FASB Interpretation No. 48."
FSP	FASB Staff Position.
GAAP	Accounting Principles Generally Accepted in the United States of America.
IRS	Internal Revenue Service.
I&M	Indiana Michigan Power Company, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
KPCo	Kentucky Power Company, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
OPCo	Ohio Power Company, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
OTC	Over-the-counter.
PSO	Public Service Company of Oklahoma, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
PUCT	Public Utility Commission of Texas.
REP	Texas Retail Electric Provider.
SFAS	Statement of Financial Accounting Standards issued by the Financial Accounting Standards Board.
SFAS 133	Statement of Financial Accounting Standards No. 133, "Accounting for Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities."
SIA	System Integration Agreement.
SWEPCo	Southwestern Electric Power Company, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
TCC	AEP Texas Central Company, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
Texas Restructuring Legislation	Legislation enacted in 1999 to restructure the electric utility industry in Texas.
TNC	AEP Texas North Company, an AEP electric utility subsidiary.
True-up Proceeding	A filing made under the Texas Restructuring Legislation to finalize the amount of stranded costs and other true-up items and the recovery of such amounts.
Utility Money Pool	AEP System's Utility Money Pool.

AEP TEXAS CENTRAL COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF INCOME
For the Three and Six Months Ended June 30, 2008 and 2007
(in thousands)
(Unaudited)

	Three Months Ended		Six Months Ended	
	2008	2007	2008	2007
REVENUES				
Electric Generation, Transmission and Distribution	\$ 203,420	\$ 194,327	\$ 379,270	\$ 366,314
Sales to AEP Affiliates	1,509	1,353	3,703	2,483
Other	8,060	7,063	11,058	10,877
TOTAL	212,989	202,743	394,031	379,674
EXPENSES				
Fuel and Other Consumables Used for Electric Generation	-	-	-	825
Purchased Electricity for Resale	-	702	559	2,211
Other Operation	61,080	57,470	119,241	114,866
Maintenance	9,346	8,746	18,584	16,531
Depreciation and Amortization	57,833	56,652	104,367	102,672
Taxes Other Than Income Taxes	18,460	19,125	34,554	37,649
TOTAL	146,719	142,695	277,305	274,754
OPERATING INCOME	66,270	60,048	116,726	104,920
Other Income (Expense):				
Interest Income	1,677	3,987	4,948	8,946
Allowance for Equity Funds Used During Construction	939	814	1,594	1,973
Interest Expense	(41,249)	(46,337)	(84,297)	(92,358)
INCOME BEFORE INCOME TAX EXPENSE	27,637	18,512	38,971	23,481
Income Tax Expense	9,442	6,388	13,410	7,819
NET INCOME	18,195	12,124	25,561	15,662
Preferred Stock Dividend Requirements	60	60	120	120
EARNINGS APPLICABLE TO COMMON STOCK	\$ 18,135	\$ 12,064	\$ 25,441	\$ 15,542

The common stock of TCC is owned by a wholly-owned subsidiary of AEP.

See Condensed Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements.

AEP TEXAS CENTRAL COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CHANGES
IN COMMON SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY
For the Six Months Ended June 30, 2008 and 2007
(in thousands)
(Unaudited)

	<u>Common Stock</u>	<u>Paid-in Capital</u>	<u>Retained Earnings</u>	<u>Total</u>
DECEMBER 31, 2006	\$ 55,292	\$ 132,606	\$ 217,218	\$ 405,116
FIN 48 Adoption, Net of Tax			(2,187)	(2,187)
Preferred Stock Dividends			(120)	(120)
Net Income			15,662	15,662
	<u>55,292</u>	<u>132,606</u>	<u>230,573</u>	<u>418,471</u>
JUNE 30, 2007	<u>\$ 55,292</u>	<u>\$ 132,606</u>	<u>\$ 230,573</u>	<u>\$ 418,471</u>
DECEMBER 31, 2007	\$ 55,292	\$ 133,161	\$ 270,741	\$ 459,194
EITF 06-10 Adoption, Net of Tax of \$402			(748)	(748)
Common Stock Dividends			(8,000)	(8,000)
Preferred Stock Dividends			(120)	(120)
Net Income			25,561	25,561
	<u>55,292</u>	<u>133,161</u>	<u>287,434</u>	<u>475,887</u>
JUNE 30, 2008	<u>\$ 55,292</u>	<u>\$ 133,161</u>	<u>\$ 287,434</u>	<u>\$ 475,887</u>

See Condensed Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements.

AEP TEXAS CENTRAL COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS

ASSETS

June 30, 2008 and December 31, 2007

(in thousands)

(Unaudited)

	2008	2007
CURRENT ASSETS		
Cash and Cash Equivalents	\$ 100	\$ 101
Other Cash Deposits	149,359	192,725
Advances to Affiliates	963	180,926
Accounts Receivable:		
Customers	68,728	54,355
Affiliated Companies	7,440	6,848
Accrued Unbilled Revenues	36,550	32,056
Miscellaneous	430	637
Allowance for Uncollectible Accounts	(353)	(273)
Total Accounts Receivable	112,795	93,623
Materials and Supplies	28,627	27,624
Accrued Tax Benefits	40,843	-
Prepayments and Other	9,230	4,813
TOTAL	341,917	499,812
PROPERTY, PLANT AND EQUIPMENT		
Electric:		
Transmission	1,000,160	962,859
Distribution	1,713,695	1,670,120
Other	238,649	231,571
Construction Work in Progress	141,329	122,666
Total	3,093,833	2,987,216
Accumulated Depreciation and Amortization	677,104	667,124
TOTAL - NET	2,416,729	2,320,092
OTHER NONCURRENT ASSETS		
Regulatory Assets	152,635	167,991
Securitized Transition Assets	2,120,517	2,107,510
Deferred Charges and Other	109,495	94,592
TOTAL	2,382,647	2,370,093
TOTAL ASSETS	\$ 5,141,293	\$ 5,189,997

See Condensed Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements.

AEP TEXAS CENTRAL COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEETS
LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY
June 30, 2008 and December 31, 2007
(Unaudited)

	2008	2007
CURRENT LIABILITIES	(in thousands)	
Accounts Payable:		
General	\$ 30,857	\$ 21,629
Affiliated Companies	21,462	20,872
Long-term Debt Due Within One Year – Nonaffiliated	131,922	143,419
Customer Deposits	57,731	55,740
Accrued Taxes	32,074	31,344
Accrued Interest	69,427	69,595
Other	35,374	50,450
TOTAL	378,847	393,049
NONCURRENT LIABILITIES		
Long-term Debt – Nonaffiliated	2,713,305	2,794,134
Deferred Income Taxes	1,052,027	1,030,015
Regulatory Liabilities and Deferred Investment Tax Credits	464,210	454,528
Deferred Credits and Other	51,096	53,156
TOTAL	4,280,638	4,331,833
TOTAL LIABILITIES	4,659,485	4,724,882
Cumulative Preferred Stock Not Subject to Mandatory Redemption	5,921	5,921
Commitments and Contingencies (Note 4)		
COMMON SHAREHOLDER'S EQUITY		
Common Stock – Par Value – \$25 Per Share:		
Authorized – 12,000,000 Shares		
Outstanding – 2,211,678 Shares	55,292	55,292
Paid-in Capital	133,161	133,161
Retained Earnings	287,434	270,741
TOTAL	475,887	459,194
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY	\$ 5,141,293	\$ 5,189,997

See Condensed Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements.

AEP TEXAS CENTRAL COMPANY AND SUBSIDIARIES
CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS
For the Six Months Ended June 30, 2008 and 2007
(in thousands)
(Unaudited)

	2008	2007
OPERATING ACTIVITIES		
Net Income	\$ 25,561	\$ 15,662
Adjustments to Reconcile Net Income to Net Cash Flows Used for Operating Activities:		
Depreciation and Amortization	104,367	102,672
Deferred Income Taxes	26,218	17,578
Allowance for Equity Funds Used During Construction	(1,594)	(1,973)
Deferred Property Taxes	(13,300)	(13,376)
Fuel Over/Under-Recovery, Net	(339)	(147,147)
Change in Other Noncurrent Assets	(67,089)	(10,591)
Change in Other Noncurrent Liabilities	6,390	6,959
Changes in Certain Components of Working Capital:		
Accounts Receivable, Net	(19,172)	(45,947)
Materials and Supplies	(1,003)	(2,376)
Accounts Payable	5,356	(3,386)
Customer Deposits	1,991	5,489
Accrued Taxes, Net	(40,113)	(51,810)
Accrued Interest	(168)	45,202
Other Current Assets	(6,155)	(1,464)
Other Current Liabilities	(23,418)	(8,538)
Net Cash Flows Used for Operating Activities	(2,468)	(93,046)
INVESTING ACTIVITIES		
Construction Expenditures	(118,921)	(109,250)
Change in Other Cash Deposits, Net	43,366	(69,898)
Change in Advances to Affiliates, Net	179,963	252,334
Proceeds from Sales of Assets	1,714	45,837
Other	(485)	-
Net Cash Flows from Investing Activities	105,637	119,023
FINANCING ACTIVITIES		
Issuance of Long-term Debt – Nonaffiliated	159,296	6,247
Retirement of Long-term Debt – Nonaffiliated	(253,561)	(32,125)
Principal Payments for Capital Lease Obligations	(785)	(706)
Dividends Paid on Common Stock	(8,000)	-
Dividends Paid on Cumulative Preferred Stock	(120)	(120)
Net Cash Used for Financing Activities	(103,170)	(26,704)
Net Decrease in Cash and Cash Equivalents	(1)	(727)
Cash and Cash Equivalents at Beginning of Period	101	779
Cash and Cash Equivalents at End of Period	\$ 100	\$ 52
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION		
Cash Paid for Interest, Net of Capitalized Amounts	\$ 77,946	\$ 33,769
Net Cash Paid for Income Taxes	34,234	40,816
Noncash Acquisitions Under Capital Leases	395	554
Construction Expenditures Included in Accounts Payable at June 30,	14,052	7,816
Cash Paid for CTC Refunds	67,867	170,177

See Condensed Notes to Condensed Consolidated Financial Statements.

CONDENSED NOTES TO CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

1. Significant Accounting Matters
2. New Accounting Pronouncements
3. Rate Matters
4. Commitments, Guarantees and Contingencies
5. Disposition
6. Benefit Plans
7. Business Segments
8. Income Taxes
9. Financing Activities
10. Subsequent Event

1. SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING MATTERS

General

The accompanying unaudited condensed consolidated financial statements and footnotes were prepared in accordance with GAAP for interim financial information. Accordingly, they do not include all of the information and footnotes required by GAAP for complete annual financial statements.

In the opinion of management, the unaudited condensed consolidated interim financial statements reflect all normal and recurring accruals and adjustments necessary for a fair presentation of the results of operations, financial position and cash flows for the interim periods. The results of operations for the three and six months ended June 30, 2008 are not necessarily indicative of results that may be expected for the year ending December 31, 2008. The accompanying condensed consolidated financial statements are unaudited and should be read in conjunction with the audited 2007 financial statements and notes thereto, which are included in TCC's 2007 Annual Report.

Reclassifications

Certain prior period financial statement items have been reclassified to conform to current period presentation. These revisions had no impact on TCC's previously reported results of operations or changes in shareholders' equity.

2. NEW ACCOUNTING PRONOUNCEMENTS

Upon issuance of final pronouncements, management thoroughly reviews the new accounting literature to determine the relevance, if any, to TCC's business. The following represents a summary of new pronouncements issued or implemented in 2008 and standards issued but not implemented that management has determined relate to TCC's operations.

SFAS 141 (revised 2007) "Business Combinations" (SFAS 141R)

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS 141R, improving financial reporting about business combinations and their effects. It establishes how the acquiring entity recognizes and measures the identifiable assets acquired, liabilities assumed, goodwill acquired, any gain on bargain purchases and any noncontrolling interest in the acquired entity. SFAS 141R no longer allows acquisition-related costs to be included in the cost of the business combination, but rather expensed in the periods they are incurred, with the exception of the costs to issue debt or equity securities which shall be recognized in accordance with other applicable GAAP. SFAS 141R requires disclosure of information for a business combination that occurs during the accounting period or prior to the issuance of the financial statements for the accounting period.

SFAS 141R is effective prospectively for business combinations with an acquisition date on or after the beginning of the first annual reporting period after December 15, 2008. Early adoption is prohibited. TCC will adopt SFAS 141R effective January 1, 2009 and apply it to any business combinations on or after that date.

SFAS 157 "Fair Value Measurements" (SFAS 157)

In September 2006, the FASB issued SFAS 157, enhancing existing guidance for fair value measurement of assets and liabilities and instruments measured at fair value that are classified in shareholder's equity. The statement defines fair value, establishes a fair value measurement framework and expands fair value disclosures. It emphasizes that fair value is market-based with the highest measurement hierarchy level being market prices in active markets. The standard requires fair value measurements be disclosed by hierarchy level, an entity includes its own credit standing in the measurement of its liabilities and modifies the transaction price presumption. The standard also nullifies the consensus reached in EITF Issue No. 02-3 "Issues Involved in Accounting for Derivative Contracts Held for Trading Purposes and Contracts Involved in Energy Trading and Risk Management Activities" (EITF 02-3) that prohibited the recognition of trading gains or losses at the inception of a derivative contract, unless the fair value of such derivative is supported by observable market data.

In February 2008, the FASB issued FSP SFAS 157-1 “Application of FASB Statement No. 157 to FASB Statement No. 13 and Other Accounting Pronouncements That Address Fair Value Measurements for Purposes of Lease Classification or Measurement under Statement 13” (SFAS 157-1) which amends SFAS 157 to exclude SFAS 13 “Accounting for Leases” (SFAS 13) and other accounting pronouncements that address fair value measurements for purposes of lease classification or measurement under SFAS 13.

In February 2008, the FASB issued FSP SFAS 157-2 “Effective Date of FASB Statement No. 157” (SFAS 157-2) which delays the effective date of SFAS 157 to fiscal years beginning after November 15, 2008 for all nonfinancial assets and nonfinancial liabilities, except those that are recognized or disclosed at fair value in the financial statements on a recurring basis (at least annually).

TCC partially adopted SFAS 157 effective January 1, 2008. TCC will fully adopt SFAS 157 effective January 1, 2009 for items within the scope of FSP SFAS 157-2. Due to TCC’s removal from the CSW Operating Agreement and the SIA in 2006, TCC no longer has Risk Management Assets or Liabilities. The provisions of SFAS 157 are applied prospectively, except for a) changes in fair value measurements of existing derivative financial instruments measured initially using the transaction price under EITF 02-3, b) existing hybrid financial instruments measured initially at fair value using the transaction price and c) blockage discount factors. Although the statement is applied prospectively upon adoption, in accordance with the provisions of SFAS 157 related to EITF 02-3, amounts for transition adjustment are recorded to beginning retained earnings. The impact of considering AEP’s own credit risk when measuring the fair value of liabilities, including derivatives, had an immaterial impact on TCC’s fair value measurements upon adoption.

In accordance with SFAS 157, assets and liabilities are classified based on the inputs utilized in the fair value measurement. SFAS 157 provides definitions for two types of inputs: observable and unobservable. Observable inputs are valuation inputs that reflect the assumptions market participants would use in pricing the asset or liability developed based on market data obtained from sources independent of the reporting entity. Unobservable inputs are valuation inputs that reflect the reporting entity’s own assumptions about the assumptions market participants would use in pricing the asset or liability developed based on the best information in the circumstances.

As defined in SFAS 157, fair value is the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date (exit price). SFAS 157 establishes a fair value hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs used to measure fair value. The hierarchy gives the highest priority to unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (level 1 measurement) and the lowest priority to unobservable inputs (level 3 measurement).

Level 1 inputs are quoted prices (unadjusted) in active markets for identical assets or liabilities that the reporting entity has the ability to access at the measurement date. Level 1 inputs primarily consist of exchange traded contracts, listed equities and U.S. government treasury securities that exhibit sufficient frequency and volume to provide pricing information on an ongoing basis.

Level 2 inputs are inputs other than quoted prices included within Level 1 that are observable for the asset or liability, either directly or indirectly. If the asset or liability has a specified (contractual) term, a Level 2 input must be observable for substantially the full term of the asset or liability. Level 2 inputs primarily consist of OTC broker quotes in moderately active or less active markets, exchange traded contracts where there was not sufficient market activity to warrant inclusion in Level 1, OTC broker quotes that are corroborated by the same or similar transactions that have occurred in the market and certain non-exchange-traded debt securities.

Level 3 inputs are unobservable inputs for the asset or liability. Unobservable inputs shall be used to measure fair value to the extent that the observable inputs are not available, thereby allowing for situations in which there is little, if any, market activity for the asset or liability at the measurement date. Level 3 inputs primarily consist of unobservable market data or are valued based on models and/or assumptions.

The following table sets forth, by level within the fair value hierarchy, TCC's financial assets and liabilities that were accounted for at fair value on a recurring basis as of June 30, 2008. As required by SFAS 157, financial assets and liabilities are classified in their entirety based on the lowest level of input that is significant to the fair value measurement. Management's assessment of the significance of a particular input to the fair value measurement requires judgment, and may affect the valuation of fair value assets and liabilities and their placement within the fair value hierarchy levels.

Assets and Liabilities Measured at Fair Value on a Recurring Basis as of June 30, 2008

Assets:	<u>Level 1</u>	<u>Level 2</u>	<u>Level 3</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
	(in thousands)				
Other Cash Deposits (a)	\$ 149,343	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16	\$ 149,359

(a) Amounts in "Other" column primarily represent cash deposits with third-parties. Level 1 amounts primarily represent investments in money market funds.

SFAS 159 "The Fair Value Option for Financial Assets and Financial Liabilities" (SFAS 159)

In February 2007, the FASB issued SFAS 159, permitting entities to choose to measure many financial instruments and certain other items at fair value. The standard also establishes presentation and disclosure requirements designed to facilitate comparison between entities that choose different measurement attributes for similar types of assets and liabilities. If the fair value option is elected, the effect of the first remeasurement to fair value is reported as a cumulative effect adjustment to the opening balance of retained earnings. The statement is applied prospectively upon adoption.

TCC adopted SFAS 159 effective January 1, 2008. At adoption, TCC did not elect the fair value option for any assets or liabilities.

SFAS 160 "Noncontrolling Interest in Consolidated Financial Statements" (SFAS 160)

In December 2007, the FASB issued SFAS 160, modifying reporting for noncontrolling interest (minority interest) in consolidated financial statements. It requires noncontrolling interest be reported in equity and establishes a new framework for recognizing net income or loss and comprehensive income by the controlling interest. Upon deconsolidation due to loss of control over a subsidiary, the standard requires a fair value remeasurement of any remaining noncontrolling equity investment to be used to properly recognize the gain or loss. SFAS 160 requires specific disclosures regarding changes in equity interest of both the controlling and noncontrolling parties and presentation of the noncontrolling equity balance and income or loss for all periods presented.

SFAS 160 is effective for interim and annual periods in fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008. The statement is applied prospectively upon adoption. Early adoption is prohibited. Upon adoption, prior period financial statements will be restated for the presentation of the noncontrolling interest for comparability. Although management has not completed its analysis, management expects that the adoption of this standard will have an immaterial impact on the financial statements. TCC will adopt SFAS 160 effective January 1, 2009.

SFAS 161 "Disclosures about Derivative Instruments and Hedging Activities" (SFAS 161)

In March 2008, the FASB issued SFAS 161, enhancing disclosure requirements for derivative instruments and hedging activities. Affected entities are required to provide enhanced disclosures about (a) how and why an entity uses derivative instruments, (b) how derivative instruments and related hedged items are accounted for under SFAS 133 and its related interpretations, and (c) how derivative instruments and related hedged items affect an entity's financial position, financial performance and cash flows. SFAS 161 requires that objectives for using derivative instruments be disclosed in terms of underlying risk and accounting designation. This standard is intended to improve upon the existing disclosure framework in SFAS 133.

SFAS 161 is effective for fiscal years and interim periods beginning after November 15, 2008. Management expects this standard to increase the disclosure requirements related to derivative instruments and hedging activities. It encourages retrospective application to comparative disclosure for earlier periods presented. TCC will adopt SFAS 161 effective January 1, 2009.

SFAS 162 “The Hierarchy of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles” (SFAS 162)

In May 2008, the FASB issued SFAS 162, clarifying the sources of generally accepted accounting principles in descending order of authority. The statement specifies that the reporting entity, not its auditors, is responsible for its compliance with GAAP.

SFAS 162 is effective 60 days after the SEC approves the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board’s amendments to AU Section 411, “The Meaning of Present Fairly in Conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.” Management expects the adoption of this standard will have no impact on the financial statements. TCC will adopt SFAS 162 when it becomes effective.

EITF Issue No. 06-10 “Accounting for Collateral Assignment Split-Dollar Life Insurance Arrangements” (EITF 06-10)

In March 2007, the FASB ratified EITF 06-10, a consensus on collateral assignment split-dollar life insurance arrangements in which an employee owns and controls the insurance policy. Under EITF 06-10, an employer should recognize a liability for the postretirement benefit related to a collateral assignment split-dollar life insurance arrangement in accordance with SFAS 106 “Employers’ Accounting for Postretirement Benefits Other Than Pension” or Accounting Principles Board Opinion No. 12 “Omnibus Opinion – 1967” if the employer has agreed to maintain a life insurance policy during the employee’s retirement or to provide the employee with a death benefit based on a substantive arrangement with the employee. In addition, an employer should recognize and measure an asset based on the nature and substance of the collateral assignment split-dollar life insurance arrangement. EITF 06-10 requires recognition of the effects of its application as either (a) a change in accounting principle through a cumulative effect adjustment to retained earnings or other components of equity or net assets in the statement of financial position at the beginning of the year of adoption or (b) a change in accounting principle through retrospective application to all prior periods. TCC adopted EITF 06-10 effective January 1, 2008 with a cumulative effect reduction of \$1.2 million (\$748 thousand, net of tax) to beginning retained earnings.

EITF Issue No. 06-11 “Accounting for Income Tax Benefits of Dividends on Share-Based Payment Awards”(EITF 06-11)

In June 2007, the FASB ratified the EITF consensus on the treatment of income tax benefits of dividends on employee share-based compensation. The issue is how a company should recognize the income tax benefit received on dividends that are paid to employees holding equity-classified nonvested shares, equity-classified nonvested share units or equity-classified outstanding share options and charged to retained earnings under SFAS 123R, “Share-Based Payments.” Under EITF 06-11, a realized income tax benefit from dividends or dividend equivalents that are charged to retained earnings and are paid to employees for equity-classified nonvested equity shares, nonvested equity share units and outstanding equity share options should be recognized as an increase to additional paid-in capital. EITF 06-11 is applied prospectively to the income tax benefits of dividends on equity-classified employee share-based payment awards that are declared in fiscal years after December 15, 2007.

TCC adopted EITF 06-11 effective January 1, 2008. The adoption of this standard had an immaterial impact on the financial statements.

FSP SFAS 142-3 “Determination of the Useful Life of Intangible Assets” (SFAS 142-3)

In April 2008, the FASB issued SFAS 142-3 amending factors that should be considered in developing renewal or extension assumptions used to determine the useful life of a recognized intangible asset under SFAS 142, “Goodwill and Other Intangible Assets.” The standard is expected to improve consistency between the useful life of a recognized intangible asset and the period of expected cash flows used to measure its fair value.

SFAS 142-3 is effective for interim and annual periods in fiscal years beginning after December 15, 2008. Early adoption is prohibited. Upon adoption, the guidance within SFAS 142-3 will be prospectively applied to intangible assets acquired after the effective date. Management expects that the adoption of this standard will have an immaterial impact on the financial statements. TCC will adopt SFAS 142-3 effective January 1, 2009.

FSP FIN 39-1 “Amendment of FASB Interpretation No. 39” (FIN 39-1)

In April 2007, the FASB issued FIN 39-1. It amends FASB Interpretation No. 39, “Offsetting of Amounts Related to Certain Contracts” by replacing the interpretation’s definition of contracts with the definition of derivative instruments per SFAS 133. It also requires entities that offset fair values of derivatives with the same party under a netting agreement to also net the fair values (or approximate fair values) of related cash collateral. The entities must disclose whether or not they offset fair values of derivatives and related cash collateral and amounts recognized for cash collateral payables and receivables at the end of each reporting period.

TCC adopted FIN 39-1 effective January 1, 2008. This standard changed the method of netting certain balance sheet amounts. It requires retrospective application as a change in accounting principle for all periods presented. It had no impact on TCC.

Future Accounting Changes

The FASB’s standard-setting process is ongoing and until new standards have been finalized and issued by the FASB, management cannot determine the impact on the reporting of operations and financial position that may result from any such future changes. The FASB is currently working on several projects including revenue recognition, contingencies, liabilities and equity, emission allowances, leases, hedge accounting, trading inventory and related tax impacts. Management also expects to see more FASB projects as a result of its desire to converge International Accounting Standards with GAAP. The ultimate pronouncements resulting from these and future projects could have an impact on future results of operations and financial position.

3. RATE MATTERS

As discussed in TCC’s 2007 Annual Report, TCC is involved in rate and regulatory proceedings at the FERC and the PUCT. The Rate Matters note within the 2007 Annual Report should be read in conjunction with this report to gain a complete understanding of material rate matters still pending that could impact results of operations, cash flows and possibly financial condition. The following discusses ratemaking developments in 2008 and updates the 2007 Annual Report.

TEXAS RESTRUCTURING

Texas Restructuring Appeals

Pursuant to PUCT orders, TCC securitized its net recoverable stranded generation costs of \$2.5 billion and is recovering such costs over a period ending in 2020. TCC has refunded its net other true-up items of \$375 million during the period October 2006 through June 2008 via a CTC credit rate rider. Cash paid for CTC refunds for the six months ended June 30, 2008 and 2007 was \$68 million and \$170 million, respectively. TCC appealed the PUCT stranded costs true-up and related orders seeking relief in both state and federal court on the grounds that certain aspects of the orders are contrary to the Texas Restructuring Legislation, PUCT rulemakings and federal law and fail to fully compensate TCC for its net stranded cost and other true-up items. The significant items appealed by TCC are:

- The PUCT ruling that TCC did not comply with the Texas Restructuring Legislation and PUCT rules regarding the required auction of 15% of its Texas jurisdictional installed capacity, which led to a significant disallowance of capacity auction true-up revenues.
- The PUCT ruling that TCC acted in a manner that was commercially unreasonable, because TCC failed to determine a minimum price at which it would reject bids for the sale of its nuclear generating plant and TCC bundled out-of-the-money gas units with the sale of its coal unit, which led to the disallowance of a significant portion of TCC’s net stranded generation plant costs.
- Two federal matters regarding the allocation of off-system sales related to fuel recoveries and a potential tax normalization violation.

Municipal customers and other intervenors also appealed the PUCT true-up and related orders seeking to further reduce TCC's true-up recoveries.

In March 2007, the Texas District Court judge hearing the appeal of the true-up order affirmed the PUCT's April 2006 final true-up order for TCC with two significant exceptions. The judge determined that the PUCT erred by applying an invalid rule to determine the carrying cost rate for the true-up of stranded costs and remanded this matter to the PUCT for further consideration. The District Court judge also determined that the PUCT improperly reduced TCC's net stranded plant costs for commercial unreasonableness.

TCC, the PUCT and intervenors appealed the District Court decision to the Texas Court of Appeals. In May 2008, the Texas Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court decision in all but one major respect. It reversed the District Court's decision finding that the PUCT erred by applying an invalid rule to determine the carrying cost rate. The Texas Court of Appeals denied intervenors' motion for rehearing. Management expects intervenors to appeal the decision to the Texas Supreme Court. If upheld on appeal, this ruling could have a favorable effect on TCC's results of operations and cash flows.

Management cannot predict the outcome of these court proceedings and PUCT remand decisions. If TCC ultimately succeeds in its appeals, it could have a favorable effect on future results of operations, cash flows and financial condition. If municipal customers and other intervenors succeed in their appeals, or if TCC has a tax normalization violation, it could have a substantial adverse effect on future results of operations, cash flows and financial condition.

Deferred Investment Tax Credits and Excess Deferred Federal Income Taxes

Appeals remain outstanding related to the stranded costs true-up and related orders regarding whether the PUCT may require TCC to refund certain tax benefits to customers. The PUCT agreed to allow TCC to defer a \$103 million refund to customers (\$61 million in present value of the tax benefits associated with TCC's generation assets plus \$42 million of related carrying costs) pending resolution of whether the PUCT's proposed refund is an IRS normalization violation. In May 2008, as requested by the PUCT, the Texas Court of Appeals ordered a remand of the tax normalization issue for the consideration of additional evidence.

The IRS issued final regulations on March 20, 2008 addressing Accumulated Deferred Investment Tax Credit (ADITC) and Excess Deferred Federal Income Tax (EDFIT) normalization requirements. Consistent with the Private Letter Ruling TCC received in 2006, the regulations clearly state that TCC will sustain a normalization violation if the PUCT orders TCC to flow the tax benefits to customers. TCC notified the PUCT that the final regulations were issued. TCC expects that the PUCT will allow TCC to retain and not refund these amounts, which will have a favorable effect on future results of operations and cash flows as TCC will record the ADITC and EDFIT tax benefits in income due to the sale of the generating plants that generated the tax benefits.

However, if the PUCT orders TCC to flow the tax benefits to customers, thereby causing TCC to have a normalization violation, it could result in TCC's repayment to the IRS of ADITC on all property, including transmission and distribution property, which approximates \$103 million as of June 30, 2008, and a loss of TCC's right to claim accelerated tax depreciation in future tax returns. Tax counsel advised management that a normalization violation should not occur until all remedies under law have been exhausted and the tax benefits are actually returned to ratepayers under a nonappealable order. Management intends to continue its efforts to work with the PUCT to resolve the issue and avoid a normalization violation.

Deferred Fuel

TCC and the PUCT have been involved in litigation in the federal courts concerning whether the PUCT has the right to order reallocation of off-system sales margins thereby reducing recoverable fuel costs. In 2005, TCC recorded provisions for refunds after the PUCT ordered such reallocation. After receipt of favorable federal court decisions and the refusal of the U.S. Supreme Court to hear a PUCT appeal, TCC reversed its provision in the third quarter of 2007 of \$16 million.

The PUCT or another interested party could file a complaint at the FERC to challenge the allocation of off-system sales margins under the FERC-approved allocation agreement. In December 2007, some cities served by TNC requested the PUCT to initiate, or order TNC to initiate a proceeding at the FERC to determine if TNC misapplied its allocation under the FERC-approved agreement. In January 2008, TNC filed a response with the PUCT recommending the cities' request be denied. Although management cannot predict if a complaint will be filed at the FERC, management believes its allocations were in accordance with the then-existing FERC-approved allocation agreement and additional off-system sales margins should not be retroactively reallocated to the AEP West companies including TNC or TCC.

Excess Earnings

In 2005, a Texas appellate court issued a decision finding that a PUCT order requiring TCC to refund to the REPs excess earnings prior to and outside of the true-up process was unlawful under the Texas Restructuring Legislation. From 2002 to 2005, TCC refunded \$55 million of excess earnings, including interest, under the overturned PUCT order. On remand, the PUCT must determine how to implement the Court of Appeals decision given that the unauthorized refunds were made in lieu of reducing stranded cost recoveries in the True-up Proceeding. As a result, TCC's stranded cost recovery, which is currently on appeal, may be affected by a PUCT remedy.

In December 2007, the Texas Court of Appeals issued a decision in CenterPoint's, a nonaffiliated Texas utility, true-up proceeding determining that even though excess earnings had been previously refunded to the affiliated REP, CenterPoint still must reduce stranded cost recoveries in its true-up proceeding. In 2005, TCC reflected the obligation to refund excess earnings to customers through the true-up process and recorded a regulatory asset of \$55 million representing a receivable from the REPs for prior refunds to them by TCC. However, certain parties have taken positions that, if adopted, could result in TCC being required to refund additional amounts of excess earnings or interest through the true-up process without receiving a refund back from the REPs. If this were to occur it would have an adverse effect on future results of operations and cash flows. AEP sold its affiliate REPs in December 2002. While AEP owned the affiliate REPs, TCC refunded \$11 million of excess earnings to the affiliate REPs. Management cannot predict the outcome of these matters and whether they will adversely affect future results of operations, cash flows and financial condition.

Texas Interim Transmission Rates

In March 2008, TCC filed an application with the PUCT for an interim update of wholesale-transmission rates. The PUCT issued an order in May 2008 that provided for increased interim transmission rates for TCC, subject to review during the next TCC base rate case. This review could result in a refund if the PUCT finds that TCC has not prudently incurred the transmission investment. The FERC also approved the new rates in May 2008. The new transmission rates, effective May 2008, are estimated to increase annual transmission revenues by \$9 million. TCC has not recorded any provision for refund. Management believes these new rates are reasonable and necessary to recover costs associated with new transmission plant; however, management cannot predict the outcome of future proceedings related to the interim transmission rates. A refund of the interim transmission rates would have an adverse impact on results of operations and cash flows.

4. COMMITMENTS, GUARANTEES AND CONTINGENCIES

TCC is subject to certain claims and legal actions arising in its ordinary course of business. In addition, business activities are subject to extensive governmental regulation related to public health and the environment. The ultimate outcome of such pending or potential litigation cannot be predicted. For current proceedings not specifically discussed below, management does not anticipate that the liabilities, if any, arising from such proceedings would have a material adverse effect on the financial statements. The Commitments, Guarantees and Contingencies note within the 2007 Annual Report should be read in conjunction with this report.

GUARANTEES

There is no collateral held in relation to any guarantees. In the event any guarantee is drawn, there is no recourse to third parties.

Indemnifications and Other Guarantees

Contracts

TCC enters into certain types of contracts which require indemnifications. Typically these contracts include, but are not limited to, sale agreements, lease agreements, purchase agreements and financing agreements. Generally, these agreements may include, but are not limited to, indemnifications around certain tax, contractual and environmental matters. With respect to sale agreements, exposure generally does not exceed the sale price. Prior to June 30, 2008, TCC entered into sale agreements including indemnifications with a maximum exposure of \$13 million related to the sale price of generation assets and ETT. See “Texas Plants – Oklaunion Power Station” and “Electric Transmission Texas LLC (ETT)” sections of Note 7 of the 2007 Annual Report. There are no material liabilities recorded for any indemnifications.

Master Operating Lease

TCC leases certain equipment under a master operating lease. Under the lease agreement, the lessor is guaranteed to receive up to 87% of the unamortized balance of the equipment at the end of the lease term. If the fair market value of the leased equipment is below the unamortized balance at the end of the lease term, TCC has committed to pay the difference between the fair market value and the unamortized balance, with the total guarantee not to exceed 87% of the unamortized balance. Historically, at the end of the lease term the fair market value has been in excess of the unamortized balance. Assuming the fair market value of the equipment is zero at the end of the lease term, the maximum potential loss for these lease agreements was approximately \$6 million as of June 30, 2008.

CONTINGENCIES

Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) Public Nuisance Claims

In 2004, eight states and the City of New York filed an action in federal district court for the Southern District of New York against AEP, AEPSC, Cinergy Corp, Xcel Energy, Southern Company and Tennessee Valley Authority. The Natural Resources Defense Council, on behalf of three special interest groups, filed a similar complaint against the same defendants. The actions allege that CO₂ emissions from the defendants’ power plants constitute a public nuisance under federal common law due to impacts of global warming, and sought injunctive relief in the form of specific emission reduction commitments from the defendants. The dismissal of this lawsuit was appealed to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals. Briefing and oral argument have concluded. In April 2007, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a decision holding that the Federal EPA has authority to regulate emissions of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases under the CAA, which may impact the Second Circuit’s analysis of these issues. The Second Circuit requested supplemental briefs addressing the impact of the Supreme Court’s decision on this case. Management believes the actions are without merit and intends to defend against the claims.

Alaskan Villages’ Claims

In February 2008, the Native Village of Kivalina and the City of Kivalina, Alaska filed a lawsuit in federal court in the Northern District of California against AEP, AEPSC and 22 other unrelated defendants including oil & gas companies, a coal company, and other electric generating companies. The complaint alleges that the defendants’ emissions of CO₂ contribute to global warming and constitute a public and private nuisance and that the defendants

are acting together. The complaint further alleges that some of the defendants, including AEP, conspired to create a false scientific debate about global warming in order to deceive the public and perpetuate the alleged nuisance. The plaintiffs also allege that the effects of global warming will require the relocation of the village at an alleged cost of \$95 million to \$400 million. Management believes the action is without merit and intends to defend against the claims.

Claims by the City of Brownsville, Texas Against TCC

In July 2007, the City of Brownsville, Texas filed an original petition in litigation pending in the District Court of Dallas County, Texas. The petition seeks recovery against TCC based on allegations of breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, unjust enrichment, constructive trust, conversion, breach of the Texas theft liability act and fraud allegedly occurring in connection with a transaction in which Brownsville purchased TCC's interest in the Oklaunion electric generating station (see Note 5). In October 2007, the court heard various motions for partial summary judgment. No date for a ruling is indicated by the court. Management believes that the claims are without merit and intends to defend against them vigorously.

FERC Long-term Contracts

In 2002, the FERC held a hearing related to a complaint filed by Nevada Power Company and Sierra Pacific Power Company (the Nevada utilities). The complaint sought to break long-term contracts entered during the 2000 and 2001 California energy price spike which the customers alleged were "high-priced." The complaint alleged that TCC and other AEP subsidiaries sold power at unjust and unreasonable prices because the market for power was allegedly dysfunctional at the time such contracts were executed. In 2003, the FERC rejected the complaint. In 2006, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit reversed the FERC order and remanded the case to the FERC for further proceedings. That decision was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. In June 2008, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the validity of contractually-agreed rates except in cases of serious harm to the public. The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the Ninth Circuit's remand on two issues, market manipulation and excessive burden on consumers. Management is unable to predict the outcome of these proceedings or their impact on future results of operations and cash flows. Management asserted claims against certain companies that sold power to TCC and other AEP subsidiaries, which was resold to the Nevada utilities, seeking to recover a portion of any amounts that may be owed to the Nevada utilities.

5. DISPOSITION

Texas Plants – Oklaunion Power Station

In February 2007, TCC sold its 7.81% share of Oklaunion Power Station to the Public Utilities Board of the City of Brownsville for \$43 million plus capital adjustments. The sale did not have a significant effect on TCC's results of operations. Management does not expect that the remaining litigation will have a significant impact on future results of operations. See "Claims by the City of Brownsville, Texas Against TCC" section of Note 4.

6. BENEFIT PLANS

TCC participates in AEP sponsored qualified pension plans and nonqualified pension plans. A substantial majority of employees are covered by either one qualified plan or both a qualified and a nonqualified pension plan. In addition, TCC participates in other postretirement benefit plans sponsored by AEP to provide medical and death benefits for retired employees.

Components of Net Periodic Benefit Cost

The following tables provide the components of AEP's net periodic benefit cost for the plans for the three and six months ended June 30, 2008 and 2007:

	Pension Plans		Other Postretirement Benefit Plans	
	Three Months Ended June 30, 2008	2007	Three Months Ended June 30, 2008	2007
	(in millions)			
Service Cost	\$ 25	\$ 23	\$ 11	\$ 11
Interest Cost	62	57	28	26
Expected Return on Plan Assets	(84)	(82)	(28)	(26)
Amortization of Transition Obligation	-	-	7	7
Amortization of Net Actuarial Loss	10	14	2	3
Net Periodic Benefit Cost	\$ 13	\$ 12	\$ 20	\$ 21

	Pension Plans		Other Postretirement Benefit Plans	
	Six Months Ended June 30, 2008	2007	Six Months Ended June 30, 2008	2007
	(in millions)			
Service Cost	\$ 50	\$ 47	\$ 21	\$ 21
Interest Cost	125	116	56	52
Expected Return on Plan Assets	(168)	(167)	(56)	(52)
Amortization of Transition Obligation	-	-	14	14
Amortization of Net Actuarial Loss	19	29	5	6
Net Periodic Benefit Cost	\$ 26	\$ 25	\$ 40	\$ 41

The following table provides TCC's net periodic benefit cost for the plans for the three and six months ended June 30, 2008 and 2007:

	Pension Plans		Other Postretirement Benefit Plans	
	2008	2007	2008	2007
	(in thousands)			
Three Months Ended June 30,	\$ 208	\$ 101	\$ 1,503	\$ 1,574
Six Months Ended June 30,	416	202	3,005	3,149

7. BUSINESS SEGMENTS

TCC has one reportable segment, an integrated electricity transmission and distribution business. TCC's other activities are insignificant.

8. INCOME TAXES

TCC adopted FIN 48 as of January 1, 2007. As a result, TCC recognized an increase in the liabilities for unrecognized tax benefits, as well as related interest expense and penalties, which was accounted for as a reduction to the January 1, 2007 balance of retained earnings.

TCC joins in the filing of a consolidated federal income tax return with its affiliates in the AEP System. The allocation of the AEP System's current consolidated federal income tax to the AEP System companies allocates the benefit of current tax losses to the AEP System companies giving rise to such losses in determining their current tax

expense. The tax benefit of the Parent is allocated to its subsidiaries with taxable income. With the exception of the loss of the Parent, the method of allocation reflects a separate return result for each company in the consolidated group.

TCC and other AEP subsidiaries are no longer subject to U.S. federal examination for years before 2000. However, TCC and other AEP subsidiaries have filed refund claims with the IRS for years 1997 through 2000 for the CSW pre-merger tax period, which are currently being reviewed. TCC and other AEP subsidiaries have completed the exam for the years 2001 through 2003 and have issues that will be pursued at the appeals level. The returns for the years 2004 through 2006 are presently under audit by the IRS. Although the outcome of tax audits is uncertain, in management's opinion, adequate provisions for income taxes have been made for potential liabilities resulting from such matters. In addition, TCC accrues interest on these uncertain tax positions. Management is not aware of any issues for open tax years that upon final resolution are expected to have a material adverse effect on results of operations.

TCC, along with other AEP subsidiaries, files income tax returns in various state and local jurisdictions. These taxing authorities routinely examine the tax returns and TCC and other AEP subsidiaries are currently under examination in several state and local jurisdictions. Management believes that TCC and other AEP subsidiaries have filed tax returns with positions that may be challenged by these tax authorities. However, management does not believe that the ultimate resolution of these audits will materially impact results of operations. With few exceptions, TCC is no longer subject to state or local income tax examinations by tax authorities for years before 2000.

9. FINANCING ACTIVITIES

Long-term Debt

Long-term debt and other securities issued, retired and principal payments made during the first six months of 2008 were:

	<u>Type of Debt</u>	<u>Principal Amount</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
		(in thousands)		
Issuances:	Pollution Control Bonds	\$ 40,890	5.625%	2017
	Pollution Control Bonds	120,265	5.125%	2030
	<u>Type of Debt</u>	<u>Principal Amount Paid</u>	<u>Interest Rate</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
		(in thousands)		
Retirements and Principal Payments:	First Mortgage Bonds	\$ 18,581	7.125%	2008
	Securitization Bonds	28,920	5.01%	2008
	Securitization Bonds	44,905	4.98%	2010
	Pollution Control Bonds	40,890	Variable	2015
	Pollution Control Bonds	60,000	Variable	2028
	Pollution Control Bonds	60,265	Variable	2028

In the first quarter of 2008, TCC had \$161 million of tax-exempt long-term debt (Pollution Control Bonds) sold at auction rates that are reset every 7 or 35 days. This debt is insured by Financial Guaranty Insurance Co., which was previously AAA-rated. Due to the exposure that this bond insurer has in connection with recent developments in the subprime credit market, the credit rating of this insurer has been downgraded or placed on negative outlook. These market factors have contributed to higher interest rates in successful auctions and increasing occurrences of failed auctions, including auctions of TCC's tax-exempt long-term debt. The instruments under which the bonds are issued allow for conversion to other short-term variable-rate structures, term-put structures and fixed-rate structures. As of June 30, 2008, all \$161 million of the prior auction rate debt was issued at fixed rates ranging from 5.125% to 5.625%.

Lines of Credit

The AEP System uses a corporate borrowing program to meet the short-term borrowing needs of its subsidiaries. The corporate borrowing program includes a Utility Money Pool, which funds the utility subsidiaries. The AEP System corporate borrowing program operates in accordance with the terms and conditions approved in a regulatory order. The amount of outstanding loans to the Utility Money Pool as of June 30, 2008 and December 31, 2007 are included in Advances to Affiliates on TCC's balance sheets. TCC's Utility Money Pool activity and corresponding authorized borrowing limit for the six months ended June 30, 2008 are described in the following table:

<u>Maximum Borrowings from Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Maximum Loans to Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Average Borrowings from Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Average Loans to Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Loans to Utility Money Pool as of June 30, 2008</u>	<u>Authorized Short-Term Borrowing Limit</u>
(in thousands)					
\$ 19	\$ 183,166	\$ 19	\$ 81,157	\$ 963	\$ 600,000

Maximum, minimum and average interest rates for funds either borrowed from or loaned to the Utility Money Pool for the six months ended June 30, 2008 and 2007 are summarized in the following table:

	<u>Maximum Interest Rates for Funds Borrowed from the Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Minimum Interest Rates for Funds Borrowed from the Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Maximum Interest Rates for Funds Loaned to the Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Minimum Interest Rates For Funds Loaned to the Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Average Interest Rate for Funds Borrowed from the Utility Money Pool</u>	<u>Average Interest Rate for Funds Loaned to the Utility Money Pool</u>
2008	2.92%	2.92%	5.37%	2.91%	2.92%	4.09%
2007	-%	-%	5.46%	5.30%	-%	5.35%

Credit Facilities

In April 2008, the Parent, the AEP East companies and the AEP West companies entered into a \$650 million 3-year credit agreement and a \$350 million 364-day credit agreement. Under the facilities, letters of credit may be issued. As of June 30, 2008, there were no outstanding amounts for TCC under either facility.

10. SUBSEQUENT EVENT

In July 2008, TCC suffered damages in its southern Texas service territory related to Hurricane Dolly. Management is currently developing an estimate of the storm recovery costs related to Hurricane Dolly, but does not believe that these costs will have a material effect on future results of operations due to expected recovery in rates.