

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY  
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE APPLICATION OF JACKSON COUNTY RURAL )  
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION (1) )  
FOR AN ORDER PURSUANT TO KRS 278.300 )  
AND 807 KAR 5:001, SECTION 11 AND )  
RELATED SECTIONS, AUTHORIZING THE )  
CORPORATION TO BORROW AN AMOUNT NOT TO )  
EXCEED \$5,162,500.00 FROM THE NATIONAL )  
RURAL UTILITIES COOPERATIVE CORPORATION )  
(CFC) AND (2) FOR A CERTIFICATE OF )  
CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY PURSUANT TO )  
KRS 278.020(1) AND 807 KAR 5:001, )  
SECTION 9 AND RELATED SECTIONS, )  
AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PROPOSED )  
CONSTRUCTION AND ASSOCIATED CAPITAL )  
OUTLAY )

CASE NO. 93-336

O R D E R

Jackson County Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation ("Jackson County") filed its application on September 13, 1993 for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to construct certain improvements and additions to its existing plant, for approval to borrow \$5,162,500 from the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation, and to execute its notes to secure such loan.

KRS 278.300(2) requires applications for authority to issue or assume securities or evidence of indebtedness to be ruled on within 60 days unless it is necessary for good cause to continue the application. Additional information is needed in the record of this case which will extend the time necessary for ruling on the financing application beyond the 60-day limit. Therefore, the

Commission finds that good cause exists to continue the financing application beyond the 60-day period specified in KRS 278.300(2).

Based on the evidence of record and being otherwise sufficiently advised, the Commission HEREBY ORDERS that:

1. The portion of Jackson County's application for authorization to incur additional indebtedness is hereby continued beyond the 60-day period specified in KRS 278.300(2).


2. Within 10 days from the date of this Order, Jackson County shall file the following information:

a. On page 3 of the 1993-94 Work Plan, the total estimated cost of construction is \$16,363,250; however, the value shown on REA Form 740C is \$16,521,250. Explain the difference between the two values and provide all supporting calculations.


b. REA Form 740C, Item 1a (new line construction underground), shows an estimated cost of \$378,200, but page 113 of the 1993-94 Work Plan shows that estimated cost to be \$220,200. Explain the difference and provide all supporting calculations.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 12th day of November, 1993.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

  
For the Commission

ATTEST:

  
Executive Director