## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

## In the Matter of:

UTILITIES COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS ELECTRIC RATES, A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO DEPLOY ADVANCED METERING INFRASTRUCTURE, APPROVAL OF CERTAIN REGULATORY AND ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A ONE-YEAR SURCREDIT	) ) ) CASE NO. ) 2020-00349 ) ) )
ELECTRONIC APPLICATION OF LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT OF ITS ELECTRIC AND GAS RATES, A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO DEPLOY ADVANCED METERING INFRASTRUCTURE, APPROVAL OF CERTAIN REGULATORY AND ACCOUNTING TREATMENTS, AND ESTABLISHMENT OF A ONE-YEAR SURCREDIT	) ) ) ) ) CASE NO. ) 2020-00350 ) )

## COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR INFORMATION TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

The Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, by and through the Office of Rate Intervention (Attorney General), pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, is to file with the Commission an electronic version of the following information. The information requested herein is due on April 1, 2021. The Commission directs the Attorney General to the Commission's March 16, 2020 and March 24, 2020 Orders in Case No. 2020-

00085<sup>1</sup> regarding filings with the Commission. The Commission expects the original documents to be filed with the Commission within 30 days of the lifting of the current state of emergency. All responses in paper medium shall be appropriately bound, tabbed, and indexed. Electronic documents shall be in portable document format (PDF), shall be searchable, and shall be appropriately bookmarked.

Each response shall include the name of the witness responsible for responding to the questions related to the information provided. Each response shall be answered under oath or, for representatives of a public or private corporation or a partnership or association or a governmental agency, be accompanied by a signed certification of the preparer or the person supervising the preparation of the response on behalf of the entity that the response is true and accurate to the best of that person's knowledge, information, and belief formed after a reasonable inquiry.

The Attorney General shall make timely amendment to any prior response if the Attorney General obtains information that indicates the response was incorrect when made or, though correct when made, is now incorrect in any material respect. For any request to which the Attorney General fails or refuses to furnish all or part of the requested information, the Attorney General shall provide a written explanation of the specific grounds for its failure to completely and precisely respond.

Careful attention shall be given to copied material to ensure that it is legible. When the requested information has been previously provided in these proceedings in the requested format, reference may be made to the specific location of that information in

<sup>1</sup> Case No. 2020-00085, Electronic Emergency Docket Related to the Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 (Ky. PSC Mar. 16, 2020), Order at 5–6. Case No. 2020-00085, Electronic Emergency Docket Related to the Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 (Ky. PSC Mar. 24, 2020), Order at 1–3.

Case No. 2020-00349 Case No. 2020-00350 responding to this request. When filing a paper containing personal information, the Attorney General shall, in accordance with 807 KAR 5:001, Section 4(10), encrypt or redact the paper so that personal information cannot be read.

1. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Glenn A. Watkins (Watkins Testimony), page 38, lines 19–26. Explain and provide the specific decision criteria used to determine whether generation is considered to be base, intermediate, or peak. For example, if there is an operating cost threshold, unit size threshold, or nameplate capacity threshold, provide the decision matrix.

2. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 57, lines 1–9. A priori is defined as to be relating to or denoting reasoning or knowledge which proceeds from theoretical deduction rather than from observation or experience. Explain if Mr. Watkins agrees or disagrees whether theoretical deductions are inherent to the analysis associated with cost of service and rate design in general.

3. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 59, lines 9-12. Provide the case numbers where this Commission did not accept the zero-intercept method as a valid measurement of demand and customer related costs for distribution plant.

4. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 68.

For Option 1, provide the rates for all customer classes that would a. result from the proposed allocations in Table 27, assuming that the entire amount of Kentucky Utilities Company's (KU) proposed electric rate increase were approved by the Commission. Provide this in Excel spreadsheet format with all with all formulas, columns, and rows unprotected and fully accessible.

Case No. 2020-00349

-3-

b. For Option 2, provide the rates for all customer classes that would result from the proposed allocations in Table 27, assuming that the entire amount of KU's proposed electric rate increase were approved by the Commission. Provide this in Excel spreadsheet format with all with all formulas, columns, and rows unprotected and fully accessible.

5. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 72.

a. For Option 1, provide the rates for all customer classes that would result from the proposed allocations in Table 30, assuming that the entire amount of Louisville Gas and Electric Company's (LG&E) proposed electric rate increase were approved by the Commission. Provide this in Excel spreadsheet format with all with all formulas, columns, and rows unprotected and fully accessible.

b. For Option 2, provide the rates for all customer classes that would result from the proposed allocations in Table 30, assuming that the entire amount of LG&E's proposed electric rate increase were approved by the Commission. Provide this in Excel spreadsheet format with all with all formulas, columns, and rows unprotected and fully accessible.

- 6. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 74, lines 6–11. Provide what, under economic theory, a competitive firm's decision would be if the marginal cost is less than the average total cost of producing a good or service.
- 7. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 75, lines 15–22. Provide examples where utilities and regulatory bodies are not increasing fixed monthly fees.
- 8. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 76, lines 11–18. Here, Mr. Watkins provides an analogy of the competitive pricing structure with product pipelines.

Case No. 2020-00349 Case No. 2020-00350

- a. Explain how reliability is priced within these product pipelines.
- b. Explain whether the cost of reliability should be included in the fixed or variable rate components.
- 9. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 78, lines 10–12. Mr. Watkins states that a rate structure, which is heavily based on a fixed monthly customer charge, sends a price signal to consumers to use more energy.
- a. Explain whether Mr. Watkins agrees or disagrees that elasticity measures the amount of the response to a price change.
- b. Provide the short-run and long-run price elasticities of demand for electricity.
  - c. Explain what Mr. Watkins defines as "heavily based."
- 10. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 83, lines 13–16. Explain how corporate overhead and other indirect business costs are correlated with usage.
- 11. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 83, lines 27–29. Explain how uncollectible expenses are correlated to usage.
- 12. State whether Mr. Watkins believes that net metering customers pay their full share of customer costs and whether Mr. Watkins believes that customers with distribution generation benefit from intra-class subsidies.
- 13. Refer to the Watkins Testimony, page 101. Provide the rates for all customer classes that would result from the proposed allocations in Table 38, assuming that the entire amount of LG&E's proposed gas rate increase were approved by the Commission. Provide this in Excel spreadsheet format with all with all formulas, columns, and rows unprotected and fully accessible.

Case No. 2020-00349 Case No. 2020-00350 14. Explain whether Mr. Watkins agrees or disagrees whether the 6 CP COSS

approach is a more reasonable approach to measuring cost of service as compared to

the LOLP COSS.

15. Refer to the Direct Testimony of Paul J. Alvarez (Alvarez Testimony), page

13, lines 2–4. Mr. Alvarez states that that the projected budget for Volt Var Optimization

(VVO) is inadequate. Provide what Mr. Alvarez believes to be an adequate budget as

well as support for these estimates.

16. Regarding the Universal Peak Time Rebate Program, provide support that

the costs associated with maintaining such a program such as labor, record keeping, and

billing will be less than the benefits of such a program.

17. Refer to the Alvarez Testimony, page 21, lines 19–20.

a. Provide the rebate paid for Duke Kentucky's pilot Peak Time Rebate

Program.

b. Provide a list of Commission approved rebates paid for all Peak Time

Rebate Programs.

18. Refer to the Alvarez Testimony, page 22, lines 18–20. Explain how a Peak

Time Rebate Program will provide a reason for customers to look forward to smart meters.

Linda C. Bridwell, PE

Executive Director

**Public Service Commission** 

P.O. Box 615

Frankfort, KY 40602

**DATED MAR 19 2021** 

cc: Parties of Record

\*Honorable Allyson K Sturgeon Managing Senior Counsel - Regulatory & LG&E and KU Energy LLC 220 West Main Street Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202 \*Honorable David Edward Spenard Strobo Barkley PLLC 239 South 5th Street Ste 917 Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202 \*John Horne
Office of the Attorney General Office of Rate
700 Capitol Avenue
Suite 20
Frankfort, KENTUCKY 40601-8204

\*Angela M Goad Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Office of Rate 700 Capitol Avenue Suite 20 Frankfort, KENTUCKY 40601-8204 \*Emily W Medlyn General Attorney U.S. Army Legal Services Agency Regul 9275 Gunston Road Fort Belvoir, VIRGINIA 22060 \*Honorable Kurt J Boehm Attorney at Law Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street Suite 1510 Cincinnati, OHIO 45202

\*Barry Alan Naum Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 1100 Brent Creek Blvd., Suite 101 Mechanicsburg, PENNSYLVANIA 17050 \*Thomas J FitzGerald Counsel & Director Kentucky Resources Council, Inc. Post Office Box 1070 Frankfort, KENTUCKY 40602 \*Honorable Kendrick R Riggs Attorney at Law Stoll Keenon Ogden, PLLC 2000 PNC Plaza 500 W Jefferson Street Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202-2828

\*Clay A. Barkley Strobo Barkley PLLC 239 South 5th Street Ste 917 Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202 \*G. Houston Parrish Labor Law Attorney Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, B 50 3rd Avenue Fort Knox, KENTUCKY 40121 \*Larry Cook Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Office of Rate 700 Capitol Avenue Suite 20 Frankfort, KENTUCKY 40601-8204

\*Carrie H Grundmann Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 110 Oakwood Drive, Suite 500 Winston-Salem, NORTH CAROLINA 27103 \*James W Gardner Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney, PLLC 333 West Vine Street Suite 1400 Lexington, KENTUCKY 40507 \*Matt Partymiller
President
Kentucky Solar Industries Association
1038 Brentwood Court
Suite B
Lexington, KENTUCKY 40511

\*Honorable David J. Barberie Managing Attorney Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government Department Of Law 200 East Main Street Lexington, KENTUCKY 40507 \*Jody M Kyler Cohn Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street Suite 1510 Cincinnati, OHIO 45202 \*Matthew Miller Sierra Club 50 F Street, NW, Eighth Floor Washington, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 20001

\*Don C Parker Spilman Thomas & Battle, PLLC 300 Kanawha Blvd, East Charleston, WEST VIRGINIA 25301 \*Joe F. Childers Childers & Baxter PLLC 300 Lexington Building, 201 West Sho Lexington, KENTUCKY 40507 \*J. Michael West Office of the Attorney General Office of Rate 700 Capitol Avenue Suite 20 Frankfort, KENTUCKY 40601-8204 \*Honorable Michael L Kurtz Attorney at Law Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry 36 East Seventh Street Suite 1510 Cincinnati, OHIO 45202

\*Kentucky Utilities Company 220 W. Main Street P. O. Box 32010 Louisville, KY 40232-2010

\*Rick LoveKamp Kentucky Utilities Company 220 W. Main Street P. O. Box 32010 Louisville, KY 40202 \*M. Todd Osterloh Sturgill, Turner, Barker & Moloney, PLLC 333 West Vine Street Suite 1400 Lexington, KENTUCKY 40507

\*Honorable Robert C Moore Attorney At Law Stites & Harbison 421 West Main Street P. O. Box 634 Frankfort, KENTUCKY 40602-0634

\*Robert Conroy Vice President, State Regulation and Rates LG&E and KU Energy LLC 220 West Main Street Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202

\*Randal A. Strobo Strobo Barkley PLLC 239 South 5th Street Ste 917 Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202

\*Sara Judd Senior Corporate Attorney LG&E and KU Energy LLC 220 West Main Street Louisville, KENTUCKY 40202

\*Susan Speckert Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government Department Of Law 200 East Main Street Lexington, KENTUCKY 40507