Law Offices of **COLLINS & ALLEN**

Post Office Box 475 Salyersville, Kentucky 41465-0475

John C. Collins Gregory D. Allen Phone (606) 349-1382 Fax (606) 349-1322

March 15, 2007

HAND DELIVERED

Ms. Elizabeth O'Donnell
Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Blvd.
Post Office Box 615
Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615

Case Number 2006-00483

RECEIVED

MAR 2 2 2007

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Licking Valley RECC - Rates - Flow-Thru

_

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

Please find enclosed for filing with the Public Service Commission in the above-referenced Case an original and five (5) copies of the Responses of Licking Valley Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation, to the Commission Staff's First Data Requests dated March 12, 2007.

If additional information is needed or required, please let us know.

Sincerely,

RE:

Gregory/D. Allen

Counsel

Enclosures

RECEIVED

MAR 2 1 2007

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Law Offices of COLLINS & ALLEN

Post Office Box 475 Salyersville, Kentucky 41465-0475

John C. Collins Gregory D. Allen

Phone (606) 349-1382 Fax (606) 349-1322

RECEIVED

March 15, 2007

MAR 2 1 2007

HAND DELIVERED

PUBLIC SERVICE

Ms. Elizabeth O'Donnell Executive Director Kentucky Public Service Commission 211 Sower Blvd. Post Office Box 615 Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615

RE: Case

Case Number 2006-00483

Licking Valley RECC - Rates - Flow-Thru

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

Please find enclosed for filing with the Public Service Commission in the above-referenced Case an original and five (5) copies of the Responses of Licking Valley Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation, to the Commission Staff's First Data Requests dated March 12, 2007.

If additional information is needed or required, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Gregory/D. Allen

Counsel

Enclosures

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF LICKING VALLEY RURAL)	
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION TO)	
PASS-THROUGH AN INCREASE OF ITS)	CASE NO.
WHOLESALE POWER SUPPLIER PURSUANT)	2006-00483
TO KRS 278.455(2))	

RESPONSES TO COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST TO LICKING VALLEY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION DATED MARCH 12, 2007

LICKING VALLEY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION PSC CASE NO. 2006-00483

COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST DATED 3/12/07

Licking Valley Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation ("Licking Valley") hereby submits responses to the Commission Staff's First Data Request dated March 12, 2007. Each response with its associated supportive reference materials is individually tabbed.

; ;

LICKING VALLEY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION PSC CASE NO. 2006-00483 FIRST DATA REQUEST RESPONSE

COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST DATED 3/12/07

REQUEST 1

RESPONSIBLE PERSON:

William A. Bosta

COMPANY:

Licking Valley Rural Electric Cooperative

Corporation

Request 1.

Refer to the Application, Exhibits II and III.

Request 1a. Provide all workpapers, calculations, assumptions, and other documentation used to determine the proposed rates and the billing analysis.

Response 1a. Attached is information from EKPC's Exhibit I, Pages 3-5, which shows the present and proposed rates and revenues by wholesale customer class for service to Licking Valley.

As indicated in Mr. Bosta's testimony, the demand charges for retail industrial rates mirror EKPC's proposed rates for Schedules B and C, as applicable.

The increase applicable to all other classes was based on taking the total increase to the member system, subtracting the retail industrial class increase and then dividing that amount by the kWh for all other classes. This resulted in a per unit (cents/kWh) energy cost increase that was applied to all other classes.

See the response to Request 1b for the calculations to determine the proposed rates.

Request 1b. Provide in electronic format the Excel spreadsheets used to determine the proposed rates and billing analysis, with all formulas intact.

Response 1b. Based on discussion with the Commission Staff on March 19, 2007, attached are two (2) copies of the requested information on CD-ROM.

	Revenue	3,44(1847) 4. (8.7), 5. (8	34,663,347	8.693 3.201 33,344	43,237	i	Revenue Adjustment 141,759 141,759 104,424 104,798 500,175	395,265	155,420	01177	981,189	2,2773,652	131,186	302,695
		8882188825888	392,164,092	BZ 014 27,539 272,866	382,819	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	Total Revenue 1,024,413 1,137,688 1,086,205 6,129,124	4,415,198	1,806,138	1,900,905	8,307,482	26,620,634	1,449,037	3,420,921
		Resentes 40,177,380 20,177,380 20,177,380 42,47,170 42,012,188 20,582,295 20,581,294 20,581,294 20,587,098 20,587,098 20,587,098 20,587,098 20,587,098 20,587,098 21,773,780 22,416,207 22,416,207 32,46,207 3	426,827,439	Total Revenue 90,707 31,140 304,210	428,056		Total Reventie 1,766,172 2,32,807 1,242,292 1,191,002 8,629,239	4,810,462	1,961,558	2,072,016	8,988,679	28,894,286	Fotal Events 1,580,222 2,143,334	3,723,816
	Free OFF	Recenture (13,171,743 (13,701,598 (13,701,598 (13,701,598 (13,701,598 (13,719,610 (13,719,610 (13,719,610 (14,719,610 (13,719,	138,659,607	Energy-OFF Revenue 14,907 142,717	194,125		Energy 1,217,857 155,912 821,075 780,030	3,256,633	1,365,236	1,352,658	6,341,923	19,944,370	Energy Revenue 1,077,026 1,737,345	2,874,370
·	NO-Ver	8,093,179 8,093,179 8,107,74 8,107,74 8,621,69 8,621,69 8,717,24 8,717,24 1,233,84 1,233,84 1,133,87 1,131,89 1	178,574,684	Energy-ON Revenue 43,013 14,011	198,305		Revenue 17,583 8,223 8,223 82,231 35,538 228,682	149,048	0	251,340	132,435	905,088	intert Excess Dem Revenue · 186 319,805	319,991
	Demand	Revenue Revenue 1/2264,169 1/2264,169 1/27 10,285,115 10	111,593,148	Demand Revenue 11,192 2,221 20213	33,626		Demand SS0,712 68,672 338,885 375,435 1,747,581	1,404,783	596,322	468,018	2,514,321	8,044,828	Firm Demand Revenue 503,010 26,244	529,264
의	-	Ţ		XS-KW 5,407 1,073 9,482	15,942					•				
Billing Units - Base Rate Revenue				2826 WOLLING WOLLING WOLLING	16,062		XS-KW 1,810 846 8,440 3,656 25,527	15,334		25,858	13,625	53,116	XS-KW 45	86,713
s Base R		811_4/M1 911_5081_128 911_5081_128 911_5081_128 141_5081_128 141_208_188 141_208_188 141_208_188 142_208_188 142_208_188 11_508_208_170 273_308_208 273_508_208_208 273_508_20	9,170,197,674	KWH-2 1,181,355 48,2465 4,618,956	6,282,776		BILL-JOWN 44,599,693 5,705,834 30,048,508 28,548,395 170,284,830	119,181,435	49,962,903	49,502,574	232,092,348	729,894,618	BILL-KWH 34415397 65776568	105,191,965
illing Unit		1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,0	20,706,501	KWR44 1,118,258 36,269 3,673,075	5,155,598		BILL-KW 74,610 10,266 54,960 55,156 283,250	208,034	81,800	890'06	358,525	1,196,659	90208	159,313
*****		KWM4-2 208-100-466 208-100-466 445,85577 208-100-46 445,825-83 139-307-27 139-307-27 139-312-83 135-312-80 135	4,487,656,391	CNIR-5YW 0 0 0 120	120		CATTR-JON 72,800 8,420 46,500 51,500 239,723	192,700	81,800	64,200	344,900	1,103,543	<u>CNTR-KW</u> 59000 3600	72,800
0.00378	6.92 0.0314 0.030898	MMHJ 470,322,552 270,032,552 270,032,552 452,186,487 452,186,487 272,652,570 272,902,770 272,902,770 272,903,670 272,903,670 272,903,670 272,903,670 272,903,670 272,903,970 3776,990 3776,990 3776,990	4,682,541,283	9						•	1	l	V a a	•
# 5. 4	5.22 0.038464 0.030888	& un		5.22 2.07 0.033464 0.033888 NAME RIC Cadar Lake [E3 Megnolis Co E3 Chespin E3		92.7 27.2 3.257.20,0	A GROUP	. a	m.	cs	10		7.29 3.69 4.14 0.027325 NAME RC LIJY TUP OUBD	
Demand Energy i	Demand Eng-ON Eng-OFF	00000000000000000000000000000000000000		- Interr Demand Demand Eng-Orf COOP 1 30		Demand Excess D	COOP 1 21 2 2 2 3 2 7 2 1 2 2 3 2 7 2 1 2 2 3 2 7 2 1 2 2 3 2 3 2 7 2 1 2 2 3 2 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 3				- 5 Z 6		3 - Interr Demand Demand Demand Energy COOP	;
н	Rate E	14		Rate E		Rate B	#4						Rate Firm Inter 60 inter 60	

Request 1a Attachment Page 2 of 3 EXHIBIT I Page 4 of 7

					•	-					
Rate C											
Dement	nc. 7,29						1				
# CODD #	œ	BILLAW	BILL-KWH			Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Revenue	Adjustment	
1 23 2 27		31,800 38,228 85,224	20,987,840 19,611,949 42,585,301			231,822 264,831 621,283	573,493 535,880 1,163,643	805,315 800,711 1,784,928	744,895 731,688 1,823,001	60,420 69,023 161,926	
, 4 , 8 %		107,818	63,360,462			785,993	1,731,325	2,517,318	2,312,464	204.854	
37 5 49	O	6,000	2,889,215			43,740 0	73,483	117,223	105,823 0	11,400	
6 4 a	ၿပပ	321,396 165,155	181,235,637 83,822,028		***************************************	2,342,977	4,952,261 2,290,437	7,295,238 3,494,417	6,694,585 3,180,622 0	610,652 313,795 0	
8 18			-							000	
6 6 6	v	28,973	16,407,017		I.	211,213	448,322	925'659	604,486 0	55,049 0	
Total C		782,694	430,698,767			5,705,839	11,768,844	17,474,683	15,987,564	1,487,719	
iniand Container	ainer								1		
Demand Energy	nd 8.92 y 0.02556					Demand	Energy	Total	Present Total Revenue	Revenue Adjustment	
# COOP 1 52	NAME RUC Inland Conta CM	R_GROUP	BILL-KW 325,738	BILL-KWH 220,486,205		2,254,107	5,635,627	7,889,734	so.	498,379	
AGC											
Dansin	nd 6.92 y 0.02556					,		Į,			
# COOP 1 51 2 51 Total	244	R GROUP	BILL -KW 64,252 161,750 228,002	8111.4KMH 44,113,666 102,273,245 146,386,911	menne cultim	Revenue 444,624 1,119,310 1,563,934	Revenue 1,727,545 2,614,104 3,741,649	Revenue 1,572,169 3,733,414 5,305,583	1,473,864 3,485,937 4,359,800	98,306 247,478 345,783	
Gallatin											
Demend int-10 int-90	nd 6.92 3.32 4.22	• .			ggeneral en						
9 PE	N 0.02765 NFF 0.02465		į			Demand Energy-ON	ON Evergy-OFF	Total Revente		,	
# 5000 75.	5 R_GROUP KW4-1 KWH-2 G 319,667,504 714,688,148	KWIH-2 7,504 714,688,148		1,034,385,652	Interr Chg *		1,806 17,817,063	33,842,557	30,870,772	2,971,785	
·		Firm 10 min intert 90 min interr	180,000 1,440,000 322,343			7,386,687 8,638	8,838,806 17,617,063	700,340,00	30,007,00	3	
TGP			1,842,343								
Dema Eng-C	Denrand 1.75 Eng-ON cate Eng-OFF cate										
# COOP 1 23 2 52	R_GROUP KWH:	1 KWH-2 30735734 36421688 40831542 47735228 71562276 84160396 155726772	BILLAW Sum of FACS 166075 0 300000 0 460875	um of FACS TOTS 4061065 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	81L-KWH 165 67155402 162 88570870 155726272	Demand Energy-ON Revenue Revenue 281,531 525,000 808,531	-ON Energy Revenue 3,779,534 5,077,582 8,857,116	Total Revenue: 4,051,065 5,602,582 9,853,647	4,051,065 5,622,582 9,663,647	0 0	
Injand Steam equiv Demard 5,00073823 equiv Energy 0,02450058	<u>Ш</u> вта 5,00073823 ву 0.02450058										

Request 1a Attachment Page 3 of 3

EXHIBIT I Page 5 of 7

778,224			¥	.0	0	0	0	0	Φ (D C		, 0	0		0	6	0 1	-	1	0	. 0	0	220
		Revenue	Adjustment	•		**	•	•							_								43,364,220
8,554,161		Present	Revenue	259'958	439,596	447,33	384,686	413,076	426,33	355,555	680 443	474,120	1,197,228	325,248	517,548	288,296		410,6/6		10,219,784	428,000	7,500	510,669,030
Total Revenue 9,332,384		Total I.C.	Revenue	885,632	439,596	447,336	991,668	413,076	426,335	250,000	580 443	474,120	1,197,228	325,248	517,548	268,296	0	410,575		10,219,764	428,000	7,500	554,033,251
Dern Ersergy Roventre Roventre																					Metering	5 Matering Point only	140,451,551 166,836,874 216,081,567
			Revenue .	269'988	439,596	447,336	991,868	413,076	426,335	905,900	688 119	474,120	1,197,228	325,248	517,548	268,296	0	410,876		10,219,764	426,000	7,500	10,853,264
277,090,529 Mblu-Energy 2392681.7			4605 F	54		*	4	72	57 F	8 \$. Q	8	48		5			ä		468	the particular to the particul	Met Point only	•
508,649 Mbtu-Demand Mb			2855	228	7	108	350	8	2 5	1 3	777	108	312	*	132	2 6	;	4 £		2364	Met	Met	
converted			237.3	84	5	72	8	Ži į	Ž.	144	<u> </u>	i	8	8	98	5	i	7 5		240			
90m	p	125	944	12						ţ	!							2		98			
583 205 589 4463 7 38014 \$ Mfbu	Center - Normalized	Mater a	±23	32	23	22	en i	8	7	÷ \$	7	S 23	78	98	ot ot	88	88	e 5					

Rate Adj																	MO 4,432,394	330 43,364,220
Present		`															52,390,640	510,669,030
Proposed	46,242,515	25,735,642	21,945,509	46,020,253	20,459,344	23,697,444	86,141,167	21,325,317	34,611,402	51,043,371	56,297,242	13,071,988	24,645,121	12,726,538	344,503	12,902,829	56,823,033	554,033,251
Metering Only					1500			3000		1500	1500							7,500
Metering	39,000	18,500	18,000	40,500	18,500	18,000	34,500	30,000	27,000	18,000	49,500	15,000	22,500	12,000	0	19,500	46,500	426,000.
Load Center	868,692	439,596	447,336	991,668	413,076	426,336	355,980	613,860	689,112	474,120	1,157,228	325,248	517,548	269,296	6	410,676	1,152,992	10,219,764
AGC									5,305,583									5,305,563
951		4,061,065								5,602,582								9,563,647
Gallatin							33,842,557											33,842,557
Container Inland Steam										9,332,384								9,332,384
Inland Container										7,889,734								7,889,734
	6	805,315	117,008	1,784,926	0	2,517,318	6	117.223	Þ	7,295,238	3,494,417	0	•	٥	0	659,535	6	17,474,683
153	3,346,394	232,807	1,242,232	1,191,002	6,629,299	0	6,953,856	0	1,961,558	0	2,072,016	0	0	•	0	0	8,988,679	32,617,902
8)	41,970,429	20,177,360	19,437,170	42,012,158	13,398,969	20,735,790	44,354,285	20,561,234	26,628,149	20,429,813	49,462,581	12,731,750	24,105,073	12,446,242	34,503	11,813,118	48,624,862	427,253,496
0000 B	12	8	22	m	8	×	37	49	51	23	35	26	25	88	23	5	2	

Licking Valley RECC

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months ending September 30, 2006

	Total Present	Total		
	Annualized	Proposed		
	Revenues	Revenues	\$ Increase	% Increase
Sch A - Rate 1 - Res, Farm, Sm Comm Church	\$15,888,281	\$16,657,306	\$769,025	4.84%
Sch B - Rate 4 Comm & Sm Pwr Service	\$1,130,156	\$1,181,498	\$51,342	4.54%
Sch LP - Rate 5 Large Power	\$2,435,101	\$2,544,363	\$109,262	4.49%
Sch LPR Rate 0,2,3,7,8 & 9 Large Power Rate	\$1,325,595	\$1,402,846	\$77,252	5.83%
Sch SL - Security Lights Rate 6	\$675,706	\$705,941	\$30,235	4.47%
Total - All Rate Classes	\$21,454,838	\$22,491,954	\$1,037,116	4.83%

Licking Valley RECC Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

Schedulo A Residential, Farm, Small Community Hall & Church Service Rate 1

				Sale 1						
Non-BJC kWh			Existing			Proposed		\$ Incipase	% Increase	Dem \$ Cust Chiq's Energy \$
		Billing	Current	Annualized	Billing		Annualized			
		Daterminante	Rate	Revenues	Determinants	Rato	Revenues			
	- Customer Charge	188,725	\$7.00	\$1,321,076	188,726	\$7,00	\$1,321,075	. 50		
154,846,316	Energy charge per kWh	184,848,318	\$0.065438	12,096,104	184,848,318	\$0.059598	12,865,129	789,025		
	Total from base rates			13,417,179		-	14,186,204			
•	Fuel adjustment Environmental surcharge		÷	1,476,377 994,726			1,476,377 994,725			
	Total revenues			\$15,050,281			\$16,657,306	\$769,025	4.84%	•
	Average Bill			\$84.19			565.28	\$4,07	4,64%	
			Co	Schedule mmorcial and Small Rate 4						
			Existing			Proposed		\$ Increase	% Increase	
		Billing	Current	Annualized	Billing		Annualized			
		Determinants	Role	Revenues	Determinanta	Rate	Revenues			
	Customer Charge	41,335	\$14.50	\$164,368	11,335	\$14.50	\$164,358	\$0		
12,341,015	Energy charge per kWh	12,341,015	\$0.065373	806,769	12,341,015	\$0,069533	858,112	0		
	Total from base rates			971,127		-	1,022,469	51,342		
	Fuel adjustment			91,251		•	91,251			
	Environmental surcharge			67,778			67,779			
	Total revenues			\$1,130,156			\$1,181,498	\$51,342	4.54%	
	Average SIN			\$99.70			\$104.23	\$4.53	4,54%	
				Schedule I Large Pow Rate 5						
			Existing			Proposed		Sincrease	% Increase	
		Bullion	Current	Annualized	Billing		Annualized	Lamenton Alexander		
		Billing Determinants		Revenues	Determinants	Rate	Revenues			
	Customer Charge	1,964	\$ 45.00	88,380	1,964	\$45.00	68,350	•		•
	kW Demand	103,350	\$ 6.61	672,609	103,350	\$6.61	672.809	•		•
26,262,936	Energy charge per kWh	26,262,935	0,050758	1,333,054	25,262,936	50.054918	1,442,316	109,262		
	Total from base retas			2,094,243 .			2,203,604	109,262		
	Fuel adjustment			195,514			195,614			
	Environmental surcharge			145,344			145,344			
	Total revenues			\$2,435,101			\$2,544,363	\$109,262	4.49%	
	Average Bill			\$ 1,239.87			\$ 1,295,50	\$ 55,63	4,49%	

Licking Vailey RECC Silling Analysis for the 12 months ended Scotlember 30, 2006

Schedule LPR Large Power Rate Rate 9, 2, 3, 7, 8 & 9

			Existing			Proposed		Sintresse 3	6 Increase
		Billing Determinants	Gurrent Rate	Annualized Revenues	Billing Determinants	Rate	Annualized Revenues		
	Customer Charge	131	\$90.00	\$11,790	131	\$90,00	\$11,790	\$0	
	Demand Charge	48,693	\$6.10	\$297,027	48,693	\$6.10	\$297,027	\$0	
18,568,755	Energy charge per kWh	18,568,755	0.043295	803,934	18,568,755	\$0,047455	881,186	77,252	
.4,-4							1,190,003	77,252	
	Total from base rates			1,112,752					
	Fuel adjustment Environmentel surcharge		,	134,972 77,871			134,972 77,871		
	Total revenues			\$1,325,595			\$1,402,846	\$77,252	5.83%
	Average Bill ·			\$10,119			\$10,709	\$589.71	\$.63%

Licking Valley RECC Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

Schedule SL Security Light Rate 6

		Billing Determinants	Existing Current Rate	Annuelized Revenues	Billing Determinants	Proposed Rate	Annualized Revenues	\$ increase	% Increase
	Customer Charge	96,900	\$6.94	\$672,486	96,900	\$7,25	\$702,721	\$39,235	
7,267,500	Energy charge per kWh	7,267,500	\$0.00000	0	7,267,500	\$0,00000	0	0	
	Total from base rates			672,486			702,721	30,235	
	Fusi adjustment Environmental surcharge			1,665 1,555			1,665 1,555		
	Total revenues			\$675,706			\$705,941	\$30,236	4.47%
	Average Billi			\$ 6.97			\$ 7.29	5 0.31	4,47%

Total Non-dom kWh excl lights 242,021,024
Total Non-dom kWh loci lights 7,257,500
Total Non-dom kWh 249,285,524

\$ increase - Non - Lights \$ increase - Lights Total \$ increase

Total \$ increase \$ increase per EXPC Dom \$ | Guet Chg \$ | Energy \$

\$ 1,006,681 Total\$ \$1,027,116 \$1,027,116 \$0 Less Non Sch B/C \$1,027,116 \$0 Less Non Sch B/C \$1,027,116 \$0 Less Cout Chg \$1,027,116 \$0 Less Chg \$1,027,

\$0

Licking Valley RECC Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

Schedule OL Outdoor Lighting

		Existing			Proposed		\$ Increase \%	6 Increase
	Billing Determinants	Current Rate	Annualized Revenues	Billing Determinants	Rate	Annualized Revenues		
Mercury Vapor (MV) 175W - 75 kWh Sodium Vapor (HPS) 100W - 48 kWh Sodium Vapor (HPS) 250W - 104 kWh Sodium Vapor (HPS) 400W - 165 kWh Decorative Undergr (HPS) 100 W - 48 kWh Underground MV w/o pole 175W - 75 kWh Underground MV w pole 175W - 75 kWh Overhead Durastar (MV) 175W - 75 kWh	96,900 0 0 0 0 0 0	6.94 - - - - - -	672,486 0 0 0 0 0 0	96,900 0 0 0 0 0	\$7.25	702,721 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	30,235 0 0 0 0 0 0	4.50%
Env Surcharge & Fuel Adjustment			672,486 3,220 675,706			702,721 3,220 705,941	30,235	4.50% 4.47%
Average Invoice Mercury Vapor (MV) 175W - 75 kWh Sodium Vapor (HPS) 100W - 48 kWh Sodium Vapor (HPS) 250W - 104 kWh Sodium Vapor (HPS) 400W - 165 kWh Decorative Undergr (HPS) 100 W - 48 kWh Underground MV w/o pole 175W - 75 kWh Underground MV w pole 175W - 75 kWh Overhead Durastar (MV) 175W - 75 kWh		6,94 - - - - - -			\$7.25 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00		\$0.31 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00 \$0.00	4.50%
							\$0.00	



LICKING VALLEY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION PSC CASE NO. 2006-00483 FIRST DATA REQUEST RESPONSE

COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST DATED 3/12/07 REQUEST 2

RESPONSIBLE PERSON:

William A. Bosta

COMPANY:

Licking Valley Rural Electric Cooperative

Corporation

Request 2. KRS 278.455(2) provides that a distribution cooperative may change its rates to reflect a change in the rate of its wholesale supplier if the effects of an increase or decrease are allocated to each class and within each tariff on a proportional basis that will result in no change in the rate design currently in effect. 807 KAR 5:007, Section 2(2), provides that the distribution cooperative shall file an analysis demonstrating that the rate change does not change the rate design currently in effect and the revenue change has been allocated to each class and within each tariff on a proportional basis. In the cover letter to its Application, Licking Valley states:

In each instance, the retail rates for a particular class have been developed in a manner that is consistent with the method proposed by EKPC. The proposed rate design structure at retail does not change the rate design currently in effect and is consistent with the rate design methodology used at wholesale.

Request 2a. For each retail Rate Schedule listed in Exhibit II of the Application, identify the corresponding wholesale Rate Schedule of East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc.

Response 2a. Please see the attached information.

Request 2b. Would Licking Valley agree that KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR5:007, Section 2(2), require that increases or decreases in rates from the wholesale supplier must be allocated to each retail class and within each retail tariff on a proportional basis? Explain the response.

Response 2b. Yes. EKPC and each Member System understands these requirements and have developed proposed rates that meet the intent of KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR5:007. As explained in Mr. Bosta's testimony, EKPC began the rate design process at wholesale by allocating the proposed rate increase to each rate class on a proportional basis. The proportional increase to each rate class was then applied to the most appropriate rate mechanism for each rate class.

The proposed increase at retail is strictly a pass-through of EKPC's increased wholesale costs and each Member System must recover the dollar increase from new wholesale rates. As a result, EKPC and each Member System recognized that it was important to implement retail rates that mirror the change at wholesale, while meeting the proportionality and rate design requirements.

EKPC and its Member Systems understand that a "pure" proportional increase at retail, as discussed in Item 3 herein, would result in increases at retail to customer, demand and energy charges. However, EKPC and its Member Systems came to the conclusion that, for example, an increase in the customer charge at retail made no sense because the wholesale increase had no relationship to customer cost. EKPC has not proposed an increase in its substation charges or metering point charges in this proceeding. Consequently, EKPC and its Member Systems could not justify increasing the retail customer charge when the wholesale increase has no relationship to that cost.

Therefore, EKPC believes that its proposed wholesale increase using a proportional basis, coupled with the use of the wholesale rate design methodology at retail, is a reasonable approach to meeting the intent of the requirements.

Request 2c. Would Licking Valley agree that KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR 5:007, Section 2(2), require that the retail rate change does not change the retail rate design currently in effect? Explain the response.

Response 2c. Yes. EKPC and its Member Systems understand the requirements set forth in KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR 5:007 and believe that the proposed rates do not alter the existing rate design structure at retail.

As indicated in the response to Item 2b, the rate design used for the pass-through increase at retail was intended to meet these requirements, while also maintaining the existing wholesale/retail rate design relationship and recognizing cost causation principles.

Industrial customers at retail, for example, will pay the same demand charge as the Member System pays to EKPC. This maintains the rate design relationship from wholesale to retail that has existed for a number of years. Likewise, the proposed increase in the "E" wholesale rate, which is only applied to the energy charge, is being passed through only to the energy charge at retail. This process allows the rate design relationship from wholesale to retail to remain in place.

Fundamentally, for every retail rate class, there has been no change in the rate design structure. The demand, energy, and customer components for industrial rates remains intact and the residential and commercial rate design structure remains as is through a continuation of the customer and energy charge structure. This adherence to the rate

design structure, coupled with a retention of the wholesale to retail rate design relationship, is a reasonable approach and meets the legal requirements.

Request 2 a Attachment Page 1 of 1

The present and proposed rates structures of Licking Valley RECC are listed below:

		EKPC		
Schedule .	Rate Class	Rate Schedule	Present	Proposed
A	Residential, Farm, Small Community Hall	E-2		
	and Church Service			
	Customer Charge per month		\$7.00	\$7.00
	Energy Charge per kwh		\$0.065438	\$0.069598
В	Commercial & Small Power Service	E-2		
	Customer Charge per month		\$14.50	\$14.50
	Energy Charge per kwh		\$0.065373	\$0.069533
LPS	Large Power Service	E-2		
	Demand Charge per KW		\$6.51	\$6.51
	Customer Charge per month	•	\$45.00	\$45.00
	Energy Charge per kwh		\$0.050758	\$0.054918
LPR	Large Power Rate	E-2		
	Demand Charge per KW		\$6.10	\$6.10
	Customer Charge per month		\$90.00	\$90.00
	Energy Charge per kwh		\$0.043295	\$0.047455
SL	Security Lights and/or Rural Lighting	E-2		
	175 Watt Mercury Vapor per lamp		\$6.94	\$7.25



LICKING VALLEY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION PSC CASE NO. 2006-00483 FIRST DATA REQUEST RESPONSE

COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST DATED 3/12/07

REQUEST 3

RESPONSIBLE PERSON:

William A. Bosta

COMPANY:

Licking Valley Rural Electric Cooperative

Corporation

Request 3.

Refer to Exhibit III of the Application.

Request 3a. Prepare the following comparative analyses of Licking Valley's present and proposed revenues:

- (1) Calculate the percentage that each rate schedule or class represents of the total revenues for both the present revenues and proposed revenues. Percentages should be expressed to 2 decimal places.
- (2) Calculate the percentage that each component of the base rates within each rate schedule or class represents of the total base rate revenues for both the present revenues and proposed revenues. Do not include fuel adjustment revenues, environmental surcharge revenues, or green power revenues. Percentages should be expressed to 2 decimal places.

Response 3a.

- (1) Please see the attached information.
- (2) Please see the attached information.

Request 3b. Based upon the results of the analyses prepared in part (a) above, explain in detail how Licking Valley's proposed pass-through rates are in compliance with the retail rate requirements of KRS 278.455(2) and 807 KAR 5:007, Section 2(2).

Response 3b. Maintaining the existing revenue proportion as shown in part (a) above assumes that the proportionality requirement would follow strict adherence to the existing proportion of revenues at retail, by rate mechanism component (i.e. customer, energy and demand). EKPC and the Member Systems believe that the proportionality requirement is not so narrow and that the pass-through at retail has followed the proposed wholesale rate design process in a proportional manner. At retail, for example, there is no increase in the customer charge because EKPC did not increase the metering point charge or substation charge at wholesale. Moreover, the "B" and "C" type retail industrial classes will have the same demand rate as the proposed demand rate for industrial customers at wholesale. It follows the matching concept upon which these rates were originally created.

See also the response to Item 2(b) and 2(c) herein. KRS 278.455(2) explicitly recognizes "proportional" allocation without recognizing a specific method, whether KWh, revenue, or other means of proportionality. EKPC has chosen the proportional method of applying wholesale to retail, with the intended matching concept of costs vs. revenue. The retail rates reflect this top-down approach to proportionality. Please see the attached analysis which illustrates this approach.

Licking Valley RECC

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months ending September 30, 2006

Sch	A - Rate 1 - Res, Farm, Sm Comm Church
Sch	B - Rate 4 Comm & Sm Pwr Service
Sch	LP - Rate 5 Large Power
Sch	LPR Rate 0,2,3,7,8 & 9 Large Power Rate
Sch	SL - Security Lights Rate 6

Total Present	Percent of	Total	Percent of		
Annualized	Total	Proposed	Total		1
Revenues	Revenue	Revenues	Revenue	\$ Increase	% Increase
\$15,888,281	74.05%	\$16,657,306	74.06%	\$769,025	4.84%
\$1,130,156	5.27%	\$1,181,498	5.25%	\$51,342	4,54%
\$2,435,101	11.35%	\$2,544,363	11.31%	\$109,262	4.49%
\$1,325,595	6.18%	\$1,402,846	6.24%	\$77,252	5.83%
\$675,706	3.15%	\$705,941	3.14%	\$30,235	4.47%
\$21,454,838	100.00%	\$22,491,954	100.00%	\$1,037,116	4.83%

100.00%

Licking Valley RECC Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

Schedule A Residential, Farm, Small Community Hall & Church Service Rate 1

				Rate	•					
	ſ <u></u>	Exi	sling			Proposed		\$ Increase	% Increase	
	Billing	Current	Annualized	Actual Component %	Billing		Annualized			Proposed Component % of Base Rates
	Determinants	Rate	Revenues	of Base Rates	Determinants	Rate	Revenues		L	or base kates
Customer Charge	188,725	\$7,00	\$1,321,075	9.85%	188,725	\$7,00	\$1,321,075	\$0		9.31%
Energy charge per kWh	184,848,318	\$0.065438	12,096,104	90.15%	184,848,318	\$0.069598	12,865,129	769,025	-	90.69%
Total from base rates			13,417,179	100.00%			14,186,204			100.00%
Fuel adjustment Environmental surcharge			1,476,377 994,725				1,476,377 994,725			
Total revenues			\$15,888,281	•			\$16,657,306	\$769,025	4.84%	
Average Bill			\$84.19		•		\$88.26	\$4.07	4.84%	
				Schedule B and Small Power S Rate 4	Service					
		Ex	isting			Proposed		\$ Increase	% Increase	•
	Billing Determinants	Current Rate	Annualized Revenues	Actual Component % of Base Rates	Billing Determinants	Rate	Annualized Revenues			Proposed Component % of Base Rates
Customer Charge	11,335	\$14.50	\$164,358	16.92%	41,335	\$14.50	\$164,358	\$0		16.07%
Energy charge per kWh	12,341,015	\$0.065373	806,769	83.08%	12,341,016	\$0.069533	858,112	. 0		83,93%
Total from base rates			971,127	100.00%			1,022,469	51,342	•	100.00%
Fuel adjustment Environmental surcharge			91,251 67,778	<u></u>			91,251 67,778			
Total revenues			\$1,130,156	z.			\$1,181,498	\$51,342	4.54%	
Average Bill			\$99,70				\$104.23	\$4,63	4.54%	
				Schedule LP Large Power Rate 5						
	·[E	xisting			Proposed		\$ Increase	% Increase	
	Billing Determinants	Current Rate	Annualized Revenues	Actual Component % of Base Rates	Billing Determinants	Rate	Annualized Revenues			Proposed Component % of Base Rates
Customer Charge	1,964	\$ 45.00	88,380	4.22%	1,964	\$45.00	88,380	.44		4.01%
kW Demand	103,350	\$ 6.51	672,809	32.13%	103,350	\$6,51	672,809	•		30.53%
Energy charge per kWh	26,262,936	0.050758	1,333,054	63.65%	26,262,936	\$0.054918	3 1,442,316	109,262		65.46%

100.00%

2,094,243

195,514 145,344

\$2,435,101

1,239.87

Total from base rates

Total revenues

Average Bill

Fuel adjustment Environmental surcharge 2,203,504

195,514 145,344

\$ 1,295,50 \$

\$2,544,363

109,262

\$109,262

55.63

4.49%

Licking Valley RECC Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

Schedule LPR Large Power Rate Rate 0, 2, 3, 7, 8 & 9

		Exi	sting			Proposed		\$ Increase	% Increase	
	Billing Determinants	Current Rate	Annualized Revenues	Actual Component % of Base Rates	Billing Determinants	Rate	Annualized Revenues			Proposed Component % of Base Rates
Customer Charge	131	\$90.00	\$11,790	1.06%	131	\$90.00	\$11,790	\$0		0.99%
Demand Charge	48,693	\$6.10	\$297,027	26,69%	48,693	\$6.10	\$297,027	\$0		24.96%
Energy charge per kWh	18,568,755	0.043295	803,934	72.25%	18,568,755	\$0.047455	881,186	77,252		74.05%
Total from base rates			1,112,752	100.00%			1,190,003	77,252		100.00%
Fuel adjustment Environmental surcharge			134,972 77,871	-			134,972 77,871			
Total revenues			\$1,325,595	=			\$1,402,846	\$77,252	5.83%	
Average Bill			\$10,119				\$10,709	\$589.71	5.83%	•

Licking Valley RECC Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

Schedule SL Security Light Rate 6

	Billing Determinants	Existing Current Rate	Annualized Revenues	Actual Component % of Base Rates	Billing Determinants	Proposed Rate	Annualized Revenues	\$ Increase	% Increase	Proposed Component % of Base Rates
Customer Charge	96,900	\$6.94	\$672,486	100.00%	96,900	\$7,25	\$702,721	\$30,235		100.00%
Energy charge per kWh	7,267,500	\$0,00000	0		7,267,500	\$0,00000	0	0		
Total from base rates		•	672,486	100.00%			702,721	30,235		100.00%
Fuel adjustment Environmental surcharge			1,665 1,555				1,665 1,555			
Total revenues			\$675,706				\$705,941	\$30,235	4,47%	
Average Bill			\$ 6.97				\$ 7.29	\$ 0.31	4,47%	

\$ Increase - Non - Lights \$ Increase - Lights Total \$ Increase

\$ Increase per EKPC \$ Differential \$ 1,006,881 \$30,235 \$ 1,037,116 \$1,037,116

Licking Valley RECC Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

Schedule OL Outdoor Lighting

		Existing		Percent of		Proposed		\$ Increase	% Increase	Percent of
				Actual					1	Proposed
	Billing	Current	Annualized	Base	Billing		Annualized			Base
	Determinants)	Rate	Revenues	Revenues	Determinants	Rate	Revenues		L	Revenues
Mercury Vapor (MV) 175W - 75 kWh	96,900	6.94	672,486	100.00%	96,900	\$7.25	702,721	30,235	4.50%	100.00%
Sodium Vapor (HPS) 100W - 48 kWh ·	. 0	-	0 1		0		0	0		
Sodium Vapor (HPS) 250W - 104 kWh	0	-	0		0		0	0		
Sodium Vapor (HPS) 400W - 165 kWh	0	-	0		0		0	0		
Decorative Undergr (HPS) 100 W - 48 kWh	0	-	0		0	Billia Y.	0	0		
Underground MV w/o pole 175W - 75 kWh	0		0		0		0	0		
Underground MV w pole 175W - 75 kWh	0	-	0		0		0	0		
Overhead Durastar (MV) 175W - 75 kWh	0	*	0		0		. 0	0		
			672,486	100.00%			702,721	30,235	4.50%	100.00%
Env Surcharge & Fuel Adjustment			3,220				3,220		4 470/	
			675,706				705,941		4.47%	
Average develop		:								
Average invoice Mercury Vapor (MV) 175W - 75 kWh		6.94				\$7,25		\$0.31	4.50%	
Sodium Vapor (HPS) 100W - 48 kWh		0.54				\$0,00		\$0.00	4.5074	
Sodium Vapor (HPS) 250W - 104 kWh						\$0.00		\$0.00		
Sodium Vapor (HPS) 400W - 165 kWh						\$0.00		\$0.00		
Decorative Undergr (HPS) 100 W - 48 kWh						\$0.00		\$0.00		
Underground MV w/o pole 175W - 75 kWh						\$0.00		\$0.00		
Underground MV w pole 175W - 75 kWh						\$0.00		\$0.00		
Overhead Durastar (MV) 175W - 75 kWh		-				\$0.00		\$0.00		
CTOMOGO WORDOWN (1917) 13 VIII - 7 V WAII						90,00		00.00		
								\$0.08		

Analysis of Wholesale to Retail Proportionality

					Retail			٦
W	Wholesale							
	Existing	Proposed	Change		Existing	Existing Proposed	Change	
I Customer Charge Metering Point Charge Substation at less than 3 MVA	\$125/Mo. \$944/Mo.	\$125/Mo. \$944/Mo.	, , 49 69	Customer Charge A Residential Customer Charge A Residential	\$7.00/Mo \$7.00/Mo	\$7.00/Mo \$7.00/Mo \$7.00/Mo \$7.00/Mo	; i	
II Demand Charge B&C Demand Charge (\$/kW)	\$5.39	\$7.29	\$1.90	Industrial Rate (\$/kW)	\$5.39	\$7.29	\$1.90	06
III Energy Charge The non-industrial wholesale increase was based on the dollar amount remaining to be recovered at wholesale, divided by kW	ncrease was b red at wholes	oased on the dollar sale, divided by kWh.	ilar y kWh.	The non-industrial retail increase was based on the dollar amount remaining to be recovered at retail, divided by kWh.	us based on the d t retail, divided l	lollar by kWh.		



LICKING VALLEY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION PSC CASE NO. 2006-00483 FIRST DATA REQUEST RESPONSE

COMMISSION STAFF'S FIRST DATA REQUEST DATED 3/12/07

REQUEST 4

RESPONSIBLE PERSON:

William A. Bosta

COMPANY:

Licking Valley Rural Electric Cooperative

Corporation

Refer to Exhibit III of the Application. For each type of street light and/or outdoor light included in the billing analysis, provide the following information:

Request 4a. The assigned or estimated kWh usage per light for each light that is not separately metered.

Request 4b.

The number of lights.

Response 4a-b.

4(a) 4(b)

Number of Lights

Light

Description

KWH

H Billed

175 Watt Mercury Vapor

75

96,900