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# KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY 

CASE NO. 2006-00148
Response to Commission Staff's Second Data Request

Dated 11/29/06
Question No. 1

Witness: F. Howard Bush, II

Q-1. Refer to the Paragraph 3 of the Answer of KU filed April 12, 2006, wherein KU asserts that continuation of the mining operations in the Harlan Seam through Stillhouse Mine No. 2 should not be considered a new mine nor a new electric consuming facility.
a. State whether the Harlan Seam extends beyond the Kentucky border and state whether it extends into the certified service territories of other electric energy suppliers besides KU and Cumberland Valley Electric, Inc.
b. If the Harlan Seam does extend beyond the Kentucky border or beyond the service territories of the parties to this proceeding, explain why it is appropriate for the Commission to consider the mining activity at Stillhouse Mine No. 2, which was not permitted until 2005, to be a continuation of previous mining operations in that seam rather than a separate and distinct mining activity or a separate electric consuming facility.

A-1a. It is KU's understanding that the Harlan Seam does extend beyond the Kentucky border and that it is not restricted to the service territory of just KU and Cumberland Valley Electric.

A-1b. It is KU's position that the question of whether a new electric consuming facility ("ECF") has been created is a fact-based inquiry tied to the Commission's historical definition and application of the term "central station source." KU's position that Stillhouse Mine No. 2 is an expansion of an existing ECF, and not a new ECF, is not based on the mere fact that coal is being mined in the Harlan Seam. Instead, KU's position is based on the following facts, all of which should be considered together: the mining activities at Stillhouse Mine No. 2 are on a tract of property now controlled by BMR or an affiliate, but which dates back to operations by U.S. Steel; all operations in this same seam of coal and on this same tract of property which have been conducted by U.S. Steel and its successors in interest, including BMR and its affiliates which operate Stillhouse Mine No. 2, have all been served through a customer-owned distribution network connected to KU's Lynch Substation dating back well before the Certified Territories Act; the mining activities at Stillhouse Mine No. 2 are largely, if not completely, in reserves previously permitted to
predecessors in interest, which conducted mining in this same area of reserves but which could not reach all of the coal because of then-existing technological limitations; while the exact number and location of mines has changed over the years, the operations have nonetheless been clustered in one place, mining a continuous area of reserves on a large tract of property in Harlan County, and service has always been delivered at the same point.

That said, however, it is very important to recognize that the issue of whether or not Stillhouse Mine No. 2 is a new ECF is but one part of KU's position in this case. Even if that mine is considered a new ECF, such that the criteria of KRS 278.017(3) are applied to resolve this dispute, it is KU's position that the clear weight of the evidence supports awarding KU the right to continue service to this ECF under those criteria, for all of the reasons set forth in KU's prefiled testimony and otherwise in the record in this proceeding.
13. Does CVE or Mr. Willhite disagree that Arch Minerals (or some Arch affiliate) previously conducted mining operations in the reserves now permitted for Stillhouse Mine No. 2, as those reserves are shown by the boundary depicted on Exhibits Matda-1 and Matda-2? If so, describe the basis for that disagreement in detail, and produce all documents supporting that basis for disagreement.

## ANSWER:

The reserves shown on Exhibits Matda-1, 2 and 3, while appearing to be adjacent to reserves mined by ARCH Mine No. 37, do not appear to overlap the Mine No. 37 reserves extracted prior to June 1998 other than at the cross-over point at Trantrough Branch. The Mine No. 37 Mine Closure Map submitted to the Kentucky Department of Mines and Minerals in June 1998 by Map Transmittal Letter, Agreed Statement of Facts Item 6 , does not appear to show any of the reserves to be mined by Stillhouse Mine No. 2.
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## CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148

Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities

Dated November 29, 2006
14. Does CVE or Mr. Willhite contend that the Commission's order of July 8, 1986 in Case No. 9454, as set forth in the direct testimony of Mr. Bush, is either inapplicable or distinguishable here? If so, state in detail the factual and legal basis for, and produce any documents supporting, that contention.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The Order speaks for itself. The question appears to seek a legal opinion from Mr. Willhite, and Mr. Willhite is not a lawyer. Further, the request may call for the production of information which is protected by the attorney client privilege or the work product doctrine.

Without waiver and subject to that objection, Yes, inapplicable.
Without expressing a legal opinion Mr. Willhite notes the Commission in its January 3, 1986 Order addressing HU's motion to strike KU's counterclaim stated: "HU's complaint raises the issues of a utility's authority to continue serving a customer whose load lies within the certified territory of another utility, whereas the counterclaim involves a utility's right to continue serving a customer whose load has grown from within the serving utility's certified territory into another utility's territory. While both the complaint and counterclaim involve the same utilities and the same statute, the legal issues are dissimilar." (emphasis added)

In its July 8, 1986 Order the Commission found that HU had been serving the ECF prior to the 1972 enactment of the statute and that "HU is granted specific authority pursuant to KRS278.018(4) to maintain service to this facility to the exclusion of any other utility". The Commission specifically found the prior coal mine situations cited by KU "involved situations where a customer's load migrated from one utility's service territory into another. In each case, KU and HU were able to resolve the dispute by determining the new point of delivery and referring to the territorial boundary map. The case now pending is dissimilar to those prior disputes. Baldwin \& Baldwin's load has not migrated. The cluster of oil wells now being served has been the only cluster served for over 35 years. The wells have always been served by HU and have always been located in KU's certified territory."

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC 

 CASE NO. 2006-00148
## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

15. Describe in detail the current status of the PSC's focused management audit of CVE, and produce copies of all documents which have been requested by or presented to the PSC or the third party retained to conduct the audit. Have any findings or recommendations been made by the PSC or the third party it has retained to conduct the audit? If so, describe those in detail and produce copies of any documents containing or relating to those findings or recommendations.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The request is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seeks information which is irrelevant to the issues in this proceeding and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence and may call for the production of information which is protected by the attorney client privilege or the work product doctrine. The request also seeks information as to preliminary findings or recommendations of a management audit, and such preliminary findings or recommendations have been held by the Commission not to be discoverable.

Without waiver and subject to that objection, the Audit has not started.
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## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

16. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 2, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. State in detail each and every fact, and produce each and every document, which supports your claim that any part of the J\&M Fields Coal Mine or the Robert Smith Mine were located, in whole or in part, on the U.S. Steel Property, as defined by Mr. Matda in his testimony. Your response should not refer only to your contention that such mines overlapped or touched the boundary of the U.S. Steel property, but should provide in detail the factual basis for your claim that either mining operation was in fact located on or within said boundary, and should include the production of all documents which support that claim. In addition, state with specificity the seam(s) in which coal was mined by the operations at J\&M Fields Coal Mine and the Robert Smith Mine, and produce documents evidencing same.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The request is overly broad, unduly burdensome and seeks the production at least in part of information which is irrelevant to the issues in this proceeding and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant information.

Without waiver and subject to that objection, the only testimony given by Mr. Matda that in any way accurately "defines" the US Steel Property is his agreement at page 2 lines 12 and 13 of his direct testimony that Exhibit LEB-1, provided by Lonnie Bellar of KU, "accurately shows the property on which BMR has rights to conduct mining operations, referred to as the U.S. Steel property". The last entry in the legend of LEB-1 is an entry depicting the symbolism used on the map to indicate "Black Mountain Property Boundary". The red lines shown on Matda-1 and Matda-2 do not indicate property boundary, they indicate a permit boundary. Neither BMR nor KU have produced a map with both a property boundary and a permit boundary. CVE has already asserted, and offered Matda's own exhibits and/or the Arch Mine No. 37 Final Closure Map as evidence, and KU has not denied, that the Robert Smith Mine, J\&M Fields Mine and the
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Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

old underground works on the former G.B. Nolan Property all touched or extended into the permit boundary on Matda-1 and Matda-2. It does not seem a logical conclusion that these mines can extend into Matda's permit boundary and not be on the U.S. Steel Property.

CVE believes the works of the Robert Smith Mine, the J\&M Fields Mine and the underground mine on the former property of G.B. Nolan to be in the Harlan Seam. The Robert Smith Mine and the J\&M Fields Mine appear on the mine license map of Stillhouse \#2 (although they are unlabeled) filed with CVE's complaint as Item 4 of the Agreed Statement of Facts. A box in the upper right corner of that map lists The Kentucky Department of Mines and Minerals seam name as the Harlan seam and the map itself does not indicate that the old works which CVE asserts are the Smith and Fields Mines are in any other than the Harlan seam. The Smith, Fields and Nolan Property mine appear on the Arch Mine No. 37 Final Closure map and it also indicates that the works shown thereon are in the Harlan seam.
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## CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC <br> CASE NO. 2006-00148

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

17. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 2, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. Admit that the "number of residential properties along the south-side of US 119 " referred to on page 2 of 2 of your answer were not located within the boundary of the U.S. Steel Property as defined by Mr. Matda in his testimony. If your answer is anything other than an unqualified admission, state in detail the basis for your answer. In addition, state whether CVE claims that such residences were an "integral" part of any mining operation, and explain your answer in detail.

## ANSWER:

The only testimony given by Mr. Matda that in any way accurately "defines" the US Steel Property is his agreement at page 2 lines 12 and 13 of his direct testimony that Exhibit LEB-1, provided by Lonnie Bellar of KU, "accurately shows the property on which BMR has rights to conduct mining operations, referred to as the U.S. Steel property". A comparison of LEB-1 and old CVE facility maps indicates that CVE did in fact serve residential accounts that were on the U.S. Steel Property as defined by LEB-1 as validated by Mr. Matda. These CVE accounts that are not presently in service are:

38-37-22, originally connected in the name of Aaron Dixon on 16 February, 1961
38-37-23, originally connected in the name of Marvin W. Cornett on 16 March, 1961
38-37-25, originally connected in the name of Clarence Isom on 30 March, 1961
38-28-21, originally connected in the name of John Dixon, Jr. on 2 May, 1962
See, also, CVE Response to $2^{\text {nd }}$ PSC -1 .
CVE presently serves account 38-37-47 in the name of Kenneth Keith that appears to be within the U.S. Steel property boundary depicted on LEB-1.

In addition, CVE has obtained a deed record, Attachment 1, from the Office of the Clerk of the County Court of Harlan County at Deed Book 262 Page 53 which documents the conveyance of
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## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006

4.00 acres from U.S. Steel to Clarence R. and Hattie M. Wells on September 5, 1984. Item No. 9 of this deed makes the conveyance "SUBJECT TO AN EASEMENT from United States Steel Coal and Coke Company to Cumberland Valley Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation". A residence on this property was connected to service from CVE on May 8, 1950, in the name of Hamby with account number 38-28-018, Attachment 2. The account is located more or less directly across US119 from the entrance to the haul road to Stillhouse \#2 Mine. Clarence Wells occupied the account on June 14, 1971, purchased the property in September 1984, and the account is connected in his name to this day.

It is unknown to CVE whether any of these did or did not serve as an integral part to any mining operation.
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## CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

18. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 3, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. State in detail each and every fact, and produce each and every document, which supports your claim that any part of the J\&M Fields Coal Mine or the Robert Smith Mine were located, in whole or in part, within the reserve area bounded in red on Exhibit Matda-1. Your response should not refer only to your contention that such mines overlapped or touched said boundary, but should provide in detail the factual basis for your claim that either mining operation was in fact located on or within said boundary, and should include the production of all documents which support that claim.

## ANSWER:

See Response to 16 .

# CUMBERLAND VALLĖY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

19. Refer to the documents attached to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 4, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. Provide the name(s) and job title(s) of each person whose handwriting is contained on any of the documents attached to that Request, explain the purpose for and circumstances under which each of those documents was created, and provide the date(s) on which such documents were created and, if applicable, added to, deleted from, changed or otherwise edited. If the documents were in any way added to, deleted from, changed or otherwise edited after they were initially created, state the date and nature of each such edit.

## ANSWER:

The handwriting on Attachments 1,2 and 4 would typically be that of a CVE Cumberland Office clerk. The identity of the person or persons who wrote on these sheets is unknown. When reviewing the information Mr. Willhite penned in on the system maps the customer name next to the map number location to clarify where CVE personnel advised where the customer was located.

Attachments 1, 2 and 4 are old account records that provide the account number and history of users of said account. It provides information about the account such as the transformer serial number and size, rate, route, connect date, disconnect date, meter numbers, meter readings, etc. These were created with the creation of a new electric account in the field, the date of which would normally be the date of the connection of the first consumer using the new account. These would only be edited on an as-needed basis to record some pertinent change to the account information. The date of the change would normally be recorded on the document.

Attachment 3 is a photocopy of a CVE facility map included to show the locations of Hillcrest Farm and Spot Cash Fuels. Facility maps are created when new facilities in any given area are
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## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests <br> For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006

constructed as a means to track CVE property and to assist in operation and maintenance of the system. Creation of facility maps is a requirement of PSC regulations. The creation date of Attachment 3 is unknown.
-

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC 
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## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006

20. Explain in detail the specific circumstances under which a special contract or other special arrangement might be offered by CVE for service to Stillhouse \#2. Explain in detail the circumstances under which a special contract or other special arrangement could not or would not be offered by CVE for service to Stillhouse \#2. Under what rate does CVE bill for its service to any other BMR-affiliated mining operations in Harlan or Letcher County, Kentucky? Do such other BMR-affiliated mining operations take service under a special contract or other special arrangement with CVE? If so, produce a copy of the contract or other documents evidencing the existence or terms of such contract or arrangement. If not, why not?

## ANSWER:

Objection. The request seeks information that is irrelevant to the issues in this proceeding and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Without waiver and subject to that objection, CVE enters into special contracts or arrangements only when the terms and conditions of its tariffs do not provide for the needs and the situation of the consumer or for CVE. Such situations may exist when the consumer's load is extremely large, or specialized service is needed, or some unusual conditions exist. CVE feels that a special contract is not needed to provide service to Stillhouse\#2 because CVE's current tariff's adequately cover the situation and conditions for service to Stillhouse\#2 based on the assumptions stated by KU in 2nd KU Nos. 21 and 22.

CVE provides service to three (3) other BMR-affiliated mining operations and these facilities take service from three (3) separate rate schedules offered by CVE, These rate schedules are Schedule II, Schedule IV and Schedule IV-A.

A special contract or arrangement does not exist between CVE and any BMR-affiliated operations.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 <br> Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006 

21. Assume an initial Stillhouse \#2 load of 800 kW , and assume the load characteristics are otherwise typical for a mining customer with such load. Would a special contract or other special arrangement be available for CVE's service to Stillhouse \#2 under that assumed scenario? If so, state in specific detail the rate provisions which would be available under that contract or special arrangement. If no, state why not and state with specificity the rate under which service would be rendered by CVE. If you contend that you cannot answer this question because sufficient information is not available, explain in detail all information that would be needed in fully answer each part of this question.

## ANSWER:

Under the scenario listed in this question, a special contract would not be needed and not offered. A service contract would be entered into for CVE to provide service under the load characteristics listed above. A special contract is a contract that is a one of kind developed solely for a special need or unique situation. The type of load described above would come under the provisions CVE's Rate Schedule IV-A.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 <br> Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006 

22. Assume an initial Stillhouse \#2 load of 800 kW , and assume the load characteristics are otherwise typical for a mining customer with such load. Provide a detailed rate calculation under each of the following CVE Rate Schedules: IV, IV-A, V and V-A.

## ANSWER:

The load characteristics described above would qualify the Stillhouse\#2 operation for Rate Schedule IV-A. These other rate schedules are for loads larger than Stillhouse\#2. Rate Schedules IV and V are for loads with a minimum size of $2,500 \mathrm{~kW}$ or much larger than the described load. Therefore, a detailed calculation for these loads would serve no purpose. Mr. Howard Bush of Kentucky Utilities did such a calculation in another document in this case and I agree with his calculation except that he did leave out the application of the environmental surcharge in the development of costs for CVE's Schedule IV-A.
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## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

23. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 11, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. What impact, if any, would the need to purchase a new transformer at this time (rather than utilizing an existing stock transformer) have on the cost estimate set forth in Mr. Willhite's testimony. In addition, explain how CVE sized transformers for this load if it has no idea of the load levels and characteristics, as it claimed in response to KU's initial data requests. Explain your answers in detail.


#### Abstract

ANSWER: The cost estimate will change as it appears that the Stillhouse load may be significantly smaller than initially estimated and because other transformers will be taken from stock or purchased. Until more firm information is known regarding the expected load, CVE cannot determine how much the cost estimate would change.

CVE had planned to use transformers it had in stock if awarded service to Stillhouse \#2, until they were placed in service at BMR's request for their new mine at Blair, Kentucky. These units, when banked together to form a three phase transformer installation, are base rated at 5,000 kVA. It is CVE's experience that typical mines, as Stillhouse \#2 is presumed to be, do not require transformers this large. Furthermore, BMR's existing transformer at the Stillhouse \#2 portal was observed to be a $3,000 \mathrm{kVA}$ unit. Therefore, use of the transformers that were in stock would provide more than adequate capacity and prevent the necessity to purchase additional transformers.


## CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

24. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 11, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. Provide a full and complete answer to that Request, without reference to Mr. Willhite's testimony, and produce all documents which support CVE's estimate of costs to provide service to Stillhouse \#2.

## ANSWER:

CVE has performed a preliminary field survey to determine facilities required to extend service to Stillhouse \#2, if awarded, and has estimated costs for same. This preliminary design includes placement of 9 poles and installation of approximately 3,133 feet of three phase line along the haul road to Stillhouse \#2. CVE's estimate of cost for this construction is attached. It does not include right-of-way clearing or transformer installation costs.
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# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006

25. How did CVE apply its line extension policy in the construction of the line used to serve the Stillhouse \#2 water pump, and in the decision to waive the cost of the facilities to serve the water pump? Explain the answer in detail.

## ANSWER:

CVE applied its line extension policy as written. CVE extended service to the Stillhouse Mining water pump per request of Stillhouse Mining upon application for service and the deposit of security, membership fee and Contribution in Aid of Construction. There was no decision to waive facilities cost.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

26. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 12, which answer was served on November 1,2006 . Identify each and every property owner whose land would be crossed by or utilized for placement of any CVE or EKPC facility to serve Stillhouse No. 2. State the width of ROW that is expected to be required for any line constructed to serve Stillhouse No. 2, and the estimated cost per foot to construct said line (including labor and materials).

## ANSWER:

According to LEB-1 and Mr. Matda's agreement of the accuracy of the U.S. Steel property boundary depicted thereon, the only property owner affected by a CVE line extension to Stillhouse \#2 would be Black Mountain Resources. CVE does not obtain easements of specific widths for distribution lines. However, the right-of-way for a three phase distribution line is normally cleared approximately 15 feet each side of center. CVE expects the line extension cost to be approximately $\$ 12$ per foot, labor and materials included.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC <br> CASE NO. 2006-00148 <br> Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests <br> For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006 

27. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 13, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. State the exact amount of the line extension (in linear feet) which is "on the public right of way of US 119 " and the exact amount of the line (in linear feet) which is on private property.

## ANSWER:

This information was not recorded on CVE documentation and its production required a survey in the field. After field measurements were taken, it was found that the length of the line extension on the public R/W of US119 is approximately 93 feet with the remaining majority of 192 feet being on the property of BMR.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006

28. State in detail the efforts undertaken by CVE, before constructing the line extension to serve the water pump near the portal to Stillhouse \#2, to verify that any private land being crossed by that line was "owned or otherwise controlled by the end user, Stillhouse Mining, LLC." In addition, state in detail how CVE came to serve said water pump, including but not limited to whether said service was initiated from original contact by CVE, BMR or Stillhouse Mining LLC.


#### Abstract

ANSWER: The person that dealt with Black Mountain Resources on behalf of CVE for the extension of service to the Stillhouse \#2 Mine water pump has since retired. Exactly what that person did or did not do to verify ownership of any private land affected by the line extension to the water pump is unknown. In any event, the service was extended at the request of Stillhouse Mining. If there is, or was, any private land affected by the line extension that is not, or was not, owned by or otherwise controlled by BMR and/or Stillhouse Mining, BMR/Stillhouse Mining should have made this fact known to CVE, if known, on its own initiative to avoid the encumbrance of any third party property.

When CVE met with BMR at its office in Benham on October 6, 2005 it learned that BMR was considering CVE service for the water pump near US 119. BMR had extended its own line up the mountain side from the Stillhouse \#2 portal to a well that BMR intended to use as the water source to Stillhouse \#2. BMR stated that this well failed to produce sufficient quantity of water which prompted its decision to place the pump in the pond near US119. BMR had constructed a pole line down the haul road from the portal to U.S. 119. At that time only a telephone line occupied the pole route as power would be added later.
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## CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006

29. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 14, which answer was served on November 1, 2006.
(a) Produce a full and unredacted copy of the 2003-2006 Work Plan referred to, and produced in part, in response to Request No. 14.
(b) Provide outage history (SAIFI, SAIDI, CAIFI, CAIDI and ASAI) for each of the past 7 years for the line reconstructed in 1974.
(c) Identify by name and address each of the owners and, if applicable, officers and/or directors, of 5C Construction and Shelton Construction.
(d) Were the "relocated and modernized" facilities referenced on page 12, lines 10-12 of Mr. Willhite's testimony contracted through a competitive bidding process? If so, explain that process in detail and produce all documents generated or received in connection therewith, including but not limited to all bid submissions by interested contractors.
(e) Produce a complete and unredacted copy of any contracts or work orders relating to construction of the "relocated and modernized" facilities referenced on page 12 , lines $10-12$ of Mr . Willhite's testimony.
(f) Is it CVE's position that there are absolutely no documents, other than the 2003-2006 Work Plan, which discuss or in any way involve the need or reason

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

for "relocating and modernizing" its three-phase facilities in the relevant area, as discussed on page 12, lines 10-12 of Mr. Willhite's initial testimony? If not, produce copies of all other responsive documents.
(g) Describe in detail the CVE plan to "transfer" load from the 1974reconstructed line to the "relocated and modernized" line, including but not limited to an explanation of whether the plan is to transfer all such load and when the transfer(s) is expected to be completed. Produce copies of all documents which discuss, describe or relate to the "transfer" of such load.
(h) What is the source which feeds the 1974-reconstructed line? What is the length of the 1974-reconstructed line, from feed source to line end? What is the length of the "relocated and modernized" line, from feed source to line end?
(i) Provide a single map depicting the location of the full length of the 1974reconstructed line, the full length of the "relocated and modernized" line, and the feed source for both lines.
(j) Explain in detail why the 1974 line is still in use, and whether CVE plans to de-energize or demolish the line at any time in the next ten (10) years.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 <br> <br> Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests <br> <br> Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006 

 Dated November 29, 2006}

Produce all documents discussing any plan or intent to either leave the line in service, de-energize it, or demolish it.
(k) State whether the 1974 line is presently capable (from an engineering feasibility standpoint) of serving each of the customers presently served by the "relocated and modernized" line. If not, state the number of such customers which the 1974 line is capable of serving, and explain in detail why the line is not capable of serving all customers presently served by the "relocated and modernized" line.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The request is unduly burdensome, and requests a multitude of information, at least some of which is irrelevant to issues in this proceeding and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Without waiver and subject to that objection,
a. A full and unredacted copy of CVE's 2003-2006 Work Plan is available at the Commission. Case No. 2003-00026.
b. Outage data is not readily available for Chad Substation circuit 4 previous to 2003. Data for 2003 through YTD 2006 follows:

2003:
SAIFI 0.3008 CAIDI 1.8125
SAIDI 0.0069 ASAI 99.9999
2004:
SAIFI $0.7730 \quad$ CAIDI 1.4545

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

SAIDI 0.0153 ASAI 99.9998

2005:
SAIFI 1.2672
SAIDI 0.0050

2006:
SAIFI $1.4904 \quad$ CAIDI 2
SAIDI 0.0057 ASAI 99.9999
c. CVE understands that both of these companies are Kentucky corporations. Public information, as submitted by each company on its own behalf, is available from the website of the Kentucky Secretary of State: www.sos.ky.gov
d. The project was not contracted through a competitive bidding process, but the contractors themselves were selected through a competitive bidding process.
e. A complete and unredacted copy of CVE's work order is attached.
f. Yes.
g. CVE plans to extend the "relocated and modernized" line an additional 2.57 miles and connect its end to some point (said point is yet to be determined) of the 1974 line at which time all load will be transferred to the "new" line. Subsequently, most or all of the 1974 line from that point back to the Chad Substation will be retired. This process is expected to be completed within the next 4 years. There are no documents "which discuss, describe or relate to the "transfer" of such load".
h. Chad Substation

CVE is uncertain of the length of original line that was reconstructed in 1974.
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Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests<br>For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

The "relocated and modernized" line appears on Matda-2, LEB-1 and CVE's Vicinity Map. Scaling from CVE's Vicinity Map yields approximately 3.2 miles
i. CVE is uncertain of the exact length of the original line that was reconstructed in 1974. A map depicting all of Chad Substation circuit 4, which is the source for both lines, is attached. The "relocated and modernized line is depicted on LEB-1, Matda-2 and CVE's Vicinity Map.
j. See sections (d) and (j) of CVE's response to KU's initial data request \#14 for an explanation of why the 1974 line is still in service. CVE plans to retire the line within the next 4 years.
k. As CVE disclosed in section (h) of its response to KU's initial data request \#14, the "relocated and modernized" line, as of the date of said response, presently serves approximately 85 customers. The 1974 line is capable (from an engineering feasibility standpoint) of serving each of those customers presently served by the "relocated and modernized
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## CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC <br> CASE NO. 2006-00148

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

30. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 16, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. Provide a fully responsive answer to that request, based on the additional information provided to CVE through its discovery requests to the parties in this proceeding. If you contend that you still have "insufficient information" to fully respond to this request, state in detail what additional information is needed in order to be in a position to fully respond.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The request is argumentative, and inaccurate in implying that CVE's response was not fully responsive.

Without waiver and subject to that objection, CVE has insufficient information to render an opinion as to whether KU, particularly as extended through BMR's distribution system, is capable of providing adequate service to all BMR mining operations through the Lynch Substation. To render such an opinion would require a comprehensive engineering analysis of both KU and BMR systems. Information necessary for such an analysis would require the production of, but not necessarily limited to, plan and profiles for all lines involved complete with all conductor sizes and types and terrain profiles, conductor attachment positions on all structures, all structure sizes and classes and spacings, conductor and equipment loadings, all equipment ratings and settings and a review of vegetation management and line/equipment maintenance practices of KU and BMR . Such an undertaking would be extremely laborious, expensive and time consuming. CVE contends that KU is not entitled, pursuant to KRS 278.016.018 , to furnish, make available, render or extend its retail electric service to BMR for use in the certified territory of CVE in the electric consuming facility, the Stillhouse Mine \#2 electrical load.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

31. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 18, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. Provide a fully responsive answer to that request, based on the additional information provided to CVE through its discovery requests to the parties in this proceeding. If you contend that you still have insufficient information to fully respond to this request, state in detail what additional information is needed in order to be in a position to fully respond.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The request is speculative, in that neither KU nor BMR will provide CVE with information sufficient to make such a determination. KU further claims that usage at the Stillhouse Mine No. 2 is not separately metered, rendering any actual comparison based on usage impossible and purely hypothetical. The information requested is irrelevant to any issue in this proceeding and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence, as rates are not a factor considered by the Commission unless and until it is determined that no other basis for a determination under KRS278.010(3) exists.

Without waiver and subject to that objection, as a purely hypothetical exercise, see Responses to KU Supplemental Requests Nos. 20, 21 and 22.

KU's calculation of billing costs, based on the assumptions and applicable rates therein contained, appears to be accurate. However, KU is applying rate LMP-TOD. CVE agrees that this may be the appropriate KU rate schedule for all of BMR loads served from KU's Lynch Station. CVE is not proposing to serve all BMR loads, just Stillhouse \#2. If Stillhouse \#2 is taken as a stand alone ECF, KU's LMP-TOD rate may not be applicable.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006

32. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 19, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. Provide a fully responsive answer to that request, based on the additional information provided to CVE through its discovery requests to the parties in this proceeding. If you contend that you still have insufficient information to fully respond to this request, state in detail what additional information is needed in order to be in a position to fully respond.

## ANSWER:

In light of CVE's response to question 17 of this request, it appears evident that Mr. Matda's "recitation of the history of ownership of the U.S. Steel property" is, in fact, incomplete and inaccurate as asserted by CVE's response to initial KU Request No. 19. In all fairness to Mr. Matda, the U.S. Steel property is quite extensive and its history spans more than 80 years. CVE does not believe that Mr. Matda can presume to know every action taken by U.S. Steel or Arch Minerals that physically affected the property in any particular way.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC <br> CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

33. Refer to CVE's answer to initial KU Request No. 25, which answer was served on November 1, 2006. Specifically, refer to that portion of CVE's answer thereto which states that "under the provisions of KRS 278.017(3) CVE would be entitled to serve Stillhouse Mine No. 2 even if customer lines are considered." State in specific detail, with reference to each and every one of the four criteria set forth in KRS 278.017(3), what evidence exists in the record or is otherwise known to CVE which would entitle CVE to serve Stillhouse Mine No. 2 if the customer's lines are considered. In addition, admit that CVE is aware of no other evidence which would support its claim of right to serve Stillhouse Mine No. 2, if customer-owned lines are considered, beyond that which it specifically describes in response to this request.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The evidence in this proceeding is as available to KU as to CVE. The request for CVE to disclose the evidence which it considers to be relevant to an issue raised by KU in a format desired by KU may call for the production of information which is protected by the attorney client privilege or the work product doctrine. The evidence is still being developed in this case, and a request that CVE limit its position in this case at this stage is unreasonable and unduly burdensome. Further, CVE objects to any assumption that customer lines should be considered.

Without waiver and subject to that objection, CVE cannot admit that there is not other evidence until it has reviewed supplemental information requests and whatever information is subsequently provided before, during and after a hearing. CVE does not accept the assumption regarding BMR's distribution lines as it does not comport with the ACT. However, consistent with prior Commission Orders the electric consuming facility ("ECF") is comprised of the

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

mining equipment that will use electricity to mine the reserves as presented to the Kentucky Department of Mines and Minerals on the Stillhouse Mine No. 2 Mine License Map, Agreed Statement of Facts Item 4, and the water pumping equipment above and below the portal. In general, the evidence of which CVE is aware and that currently exists in the record with respect to each of the four factors includes as follows:

Factor 1 - The respective distances of various lines and facilities of CVE, KU and BMR from the ECF;

Factor 2 - Evidence as to the date and location of the provision of electric service and age of facilities in the area;

Factor 3 - Evidence as to the adequacy and dependability of existing distribution lines, including BMR's lines in producing high quality electric service;

Factor 4 - Evidence as to the impact of the location, current serviceability, duplication and other impacts of all lines, extensions of lines, and use of lines for single or multiple purpose, including BMR's lines, and including planning for future growth, in advancing the goal of the elimination of and prevention of duplication of electric lines and facilities supplying such territory.
.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

34. Provide a full citation to any Kentucky PSC or court opinion, ruling or decision which has in any way addressed the consideration of customer-owned distribution or transmission facilities in the context of a territorial boundary dispute between two retail electric suppliers.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The request is overbroad, burdensome, and may call for the production of information which is protected by the attorney client privilege or the work product doctrine. CVE further objects as the language of all Kentucky PSC and court opinions is as available to KU as to CVE.

Without waiver and subject to the objection, Mr. Willhite's testimony specifically cites at least four Commission cases where only the facilities of the suppliers were considered. Further, Mr. Willhite is unaware of any Commission decision in which customer-owned facilities have been attributed to one utility or another in applying the four factors contained in KRS278.017(3). See Willhite testimony at pp. 14-16.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC CASE NO. 2006-00148 

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006

35. Provide a full citation to any Kentucky PSC or court opinion, ruling or decision which has in any way used the phrase "electric consuming device(s)" in connection with consideration or identification of an electric consuming facility, electric consuming facilities, or a central station source.

## ANSWER:

Objection. The request is overbroad, burdensome, and may call for the production of information which is protected by the attorney client privilege or the work product doctrine. CVE further objects as the language of all Kentucky PSC and court opinions is as available to KU as to CVE.

Without waiver and subject to the objection, KU is presumably referring to CVE's Response to initial KU Request No. 15, in which Mr. Willhite uses the term "electrical device" (not "electric consuming device(s)" as stated by KU in this Request). Mr. Willhite was providing examples of what could be an ECF from a logical and engineering standpoint. Any definition of electrical device as used by Mr. Willhite is not from his knowledge of any previous PSC or court opinion or as a legal definition, but rather as a term to describe a piece of electrical equipment.

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC 

CASE NO. 2006-00148

## Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities <br> Dated November 29, 2006

36. Assume a Stillhouse \#2 load of 1200 kW , and assume the load characteristics are otherwise typical for a mining customer with such load. What improvements or upgrades, if any, to the CVE system would be required in order for CVE to provide service to Stillhouse \#2 at that level? Explain your answer in detail.


#### Abstract

ANSWER: The question, as posed, must allow the supposition that CVE is providing service to Stillhouse \#2. CVE is not currently providing service to Stillhouse \#2. Therefore, CVE must first extend three phase facilities to Stillhouse \#2 and place adequate metering and transformer installations suitable for 1200 kW loading. With those supposed facilities in place, CVE does not expect any other system improvements or upgrades to be necessary to provide service to Stillhouse \#2 at that load level.


# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC <br> CASE NO. 2006-00148 <br> Response to Supplemental Data and Document Requests For Information From Kentucky Utilities Dated November 29, 2006 

37. Produce all documents which in any way support, or in any way provide evidence relating to, any and all of your responses to the foregoing requests, and the requests issued by KU on October 18,2006 , to the extent not otherwise requested or produced.

ANSWER:

All documents [if any] supporting CVE's responses are attached to these responses.

