

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE 2005 JOINT INTEGRATED RESOURCE)	CASE NO.
PLAN OF LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC)	2005-00162
COMPANY AND KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY)	

COMMISSION STAFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL DATA REQUEST
TO LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
AND KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

Louisville Gas and Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company ("LG&E/KU") are requested, pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, to file with the Commission the original and 7 copies of the following information, with a copy to all parties of record. The information requested herein is due on August 19, 2005. Each copy of the data requested should be placed in a bound volume with each item tabbed. When a number of sheets are required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 1(a), Sheet 2 of 6. Include with each response the name of the person who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to ensure that it is legible. Where information requested herein has been provided, in the format requested herein, reference may be made to the specific location of said information in responding to this information request.

1. Refer to the response to Item 8 of the Commission Staff's June 16, 2005 data request ("Staff's First Request") and Exhibits DSM-3 and -5 of the DSM Analysis contained in Volume III of LG&E/KU's Integrated Resource Plan ("IRP").

a. The response states why LG&E/KU chose 2.4 as the cut-off point for measures identified in Exhibit DSM-3 in the preliminary DSM qualitative screening

analysis, but does not explain how 2.4 was selected versus another point, such as 2.3 or 2.5. Explain how 2.4 was selected as the cut-off point.

b. The measures that passed the qualitative screen were included in the Phase I quantitative screening process, the results of which are summarized in Exhibit DSM-5.

(1) In performing the quantitative screen, what dollar amounts were assigned to the kw and kWh reductions?

(2) Describe how these amounts were derived.

(3) Identify and quantify the specific components of the costs, including fuel costs and environmental compliance costs.

2. Refer to the response to Item 1(b) of this request and the Annual Average Fuel Forecast shown on page 27 of 44 of the NO_x Compliance Analysis contained in Volume III of the IRP.

a. For each of the coal quality categories shown on page 27 of 44, provide a comparison of LG&E/KU's actual fuel cost for January through July of 2005 and the 2005 fuel cost included in the forecast.

b. For the gas and oil categories shown on page 27 of 44, provide a comparison of LG&E/KU's actual fuel cost for January through July of 2005 and the 2005 fuel cost included in the forecast.

3. Refer to the response to Item 1(b) of this request and the Cost Comparison of Alternative NO_x Compliance Plans shown on pages 31-35 of 44 in the NO_x Compliance Analysis contained in Volume III of the IRP.

a. Provide a comparison of the average NO_x allowance price per ton reported nationally for the first 7 months of 2005 and the forecast 2005 NO_x allowance price shown on pages 31-35 of 44.

b. Provide a comparison of the average SO₂ allowance price per ton reported nationally for the first 7 months of 2005 and the forecast 2005 SO₂ allowance price shown on pages 31-35 of 44.

4. Refer to the response to Item 9 of the Staff's First Request and Exhibits DSM-3, -5 and -11 of the DSM Analysis contained in Volume III of the IRP.

a. The response indicates that LG&E/KU generally do not favor implementing DSM measures that do not pass the screening process. Is any type of uncertainty analysis performed as part of the screening process or are the screening criteria and assumptions considered "absolutes" with no flexibility and with no means of incorporating uncertainty into the process. Explain the response.

b. Assume the qualitative screening process, the results of which are summarized on Exhibit DSM-3, included the use of a standard deviation with a 95 percent confidence interval. Identify, given this assumption, the additional measures that would have been passed on to the quantitative screening analysis.



Beth O'Donnell
Executive Director
Public Service Commission
P. O. Box 615
Frankfort, KY 40602

DATED: July 29, 2005

cc: All Parties