

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

JOINT APPLICATION OF)	
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC)	
COMPANY AND KENTUCKY UTILITIES)	
COMPANY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION)	CASE NO. 2005-00467
OF TRANSMISSION FACILITIES IN)	
JEFFERSON, BULLITT, MEADE, AND)	
HARDIN COUNTIES, KENTUCKY)	

JOINT APPLICATION OF)	
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC)	
COMPANY AND KENTUCKY UTILITIES)	
COMPANY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION)	CASE NO. 2005-00472
OF ALTERNATIVE TRANSMISSION)	
FACILITIES IN JEFFERSON,)	
BULLITT, MEADE, AND HARDIN)	
COUNTIES, KENTUCKY)	

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

Pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, Commission Staff requests that Louisville Gas and Electric Company ("LG&E") and Kentucky Utilities Company ("KU") file the original and 8 copies of the following information with the Commission on or before March 13, 2006, with a copy to all parties of record. 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 witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to ensure its legibility. When the requested information has been previously provided in this proceeding in the requested format, reference may be made to the specific location of that information in responding to this request.

1. Describe the efforts, such as the use of post insulators or V-string insulators, that were made to reduce additional right-of-way requirements.

2. Were any mitigation efforts considered in addition to those mentioned in Item 1 above? If yes, describe them.

3. If Route #2 were constructed, would the increased length of line require any different system elements or element timing in the Transmission Expansion Plan for serving native load need during the study period? Has this been verified by analysis?

4. Roads are used as collocation possibilities. Is there a deduction given to these line segments because of visual considerations? If yes, describe in detail.

5. When using gas pipeline corridors as route segments, were the gas companies consulted about impacts of stray currents or right-of-way use perspective? If no, were transmission line costs increased because of these factors?

6. Refer to CMD-1. Are the weighting factors the same as those used in Case No. 2005-00207?¹ If no, state the before and after weighting factors and document the reason for the change.

7. Provide the 15-year LG&E and KU annual system 50/50 peak load forecast used in the evaluation of need in Case No. 2005-00142² and the similar current system load forecasts.

¹ Case No. 2005-00207, The Application of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. For a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Construct a 161 kV Transmission Line in Barren, Warren, Butler, and Ohio Counties, Kentucky.

² Case No. 2005-00142, Application of Kentucky Utilities Company For the Construction of Transmission Facilities in Jefferson, Bullitt, Meade, and Hardin Counties, Kentucky.

8. Have LG&E/KU reliability criteria or system rating methods for the determination of system reinforcements to serve native load changed since that information was supplied in Case No. 2005-00142? If yes, specifically describe the changes.

9. Provide the logic that Linear Projects, Inc. ("LP") and Photo Science, Inc. ("PS") has used in other engagements when making its semi-final and final route selections using the Electric Power Research Institute ("EPRI") evaluation. If the EPRI evaluation process was not used, describe the logic that was used.

10. If a transmission project were to cost \$10 million in capital investment, and assuming immediate rate base inclusion, provide the annual revenue requirements of that investment over its life including operations and maintenance ("O&M"), property taxes, and accelerated federal income tax. Provide the inputs used, including inflation and O&M.

11. Considering the results of Item 10 above and the current load forecast for average annual customer kWh usage and growth, and the current forecast for total customer count and energy growth per average customer, provide the average customer cost by year for the life of the project assuming immediate rate base inclusion.

12. Which routes would LP/PS recommend to the Commission as reasonable routes in addition to Route #1 and Route #2?

13. State the instructions given to either LP or PS by LG&E/KU and the instructions given to PS by LP for the conduct of the independent route analysis.

14. Describe any consideration given to road crossings to reduce visual impacts.

15. Provide a copy of the presentation by J. Wolfram dated January 11, 2006 describing LGE/KU's efforts in siting the proposed facilities.

16. Provide the cost-per-mile for the various transmission structure configurations (double circuit steel, single circuit H-frame, etc.) used to generate route costs. Also provide various angle structure costs.

17. Provide the LGE/KU route decision sheet discussed at the January 11, 2006 interview after adding total new acres and number of parcels.

18. Refer to MSJ-2. Explain why Route AJU is the preferred route when other routes, such as AJW, KY, KU, etc., appear to score better on a composite basis in most of the emphasis categories.

19. Provide a list of the right-of-way widths that LGE/KU would desire for various voltage and transmission tower configurations (i.e., 200 feet for 345 kV H-frame construction).

20. When did LP/PS become aware of the LGE/KU preferred and alternate routes?

21. Provide a list of the "top five" routes selected and discussed by LP/PS on January 13, 2006. Apply to this list the methodology that LP/PS used to flag undesirable routes in the semi-final and final stages of its analysis as a whole with the calculation of thresholds modified by adding/subtracting the standard deviation to the mean, including percent collocation with roads.

22. Do any major transmission projects in the LGE/KU 10-year expansion plan present opportunities for collocation of the routes considered in this application? If yes, describe in detail.

23. State which sections of Route #1 and Route #2 represent collocation.
24. Provide a map that shows representative routes along both east and west corridors that are 100 percent collocated, 90 percent collocated, 80 percent collocated, and 70 percent collocated, and state the associated costs.
25. Refer to CMD-1. Explain the 3,000 foot proximity for listings in the National Register of Historic Places.



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

DATED: March 6, 2006

cc: Parties of Record

Case No. 2005-00467
Case No. 2005-00472