

## VIA HAND DELIVERY ON 04/13/2007

RECEIVED

APR 13 2007

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

April 13, 2007

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

Re: An Investigation of The Reliability Measures of Kentucky's Jurisdictional Electric Distribution Utilities and Certain Reliability Maintenance Practices; Case No. 2006-00494

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

Enclosed are an original and seven copies of Cumberland Valley Electric Cooperative Corporation's ("CVE") responses to the Staffs Informal Conference set of data requests in the above-referenced case.

Please date-stamp and return the two extra copies of this letter in the enclosed envelope.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me, Mark Abner of this office or Gary Grubbs of Patterson and Dewar Engineers, Inc. (270-404-5030).

I certify that an original and seven photocopies of CVE's response to the Informal Conference ("IC") information request and testimony were served and filed by hand delivery to Beth O'Donnell, Executive Director, Public Service Commission, 211 Sower Boulevard, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601; I further state that true and accurate copies of the foregoing were mailed via First Class U.S. Mail, postage pre-paid, to all parties of record.

Sincerely,

Ted Hampton

President & CEO

cc: All parties of record

Led Hungton

# CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC, INC. RESPONSE TO THE STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

CASE NO. 2006-00494

## **SERVICE LIST (PARTIES OF RECORD)**

Allen Anderson South Kentucky R.E.C.C. P.0. Box 910 Somerset, KY 42502-0910

Mark A. Bailey Kenergy Corp. P.0. Box 1389 Owensboro, KY 42302

Kent Blake
Director - Rates & Regulatory
Kentucky Utilities Company
c/o Louisville Gas & Electric P.0.
P.O. Box 32010
Louisville, KY 40232-2010

Dudley Bottom, Jr. Shelby Energy Coop, Inc. 620 Old Finchville Road Shelbyville, KY 40065

Daniel W. Brewer Blue Grass Energy Coop. Corp. P.0. Box 990 Nicholasville, KY 40340-0990

Jackie B. Browning Farmers R.E.C.C. P.0. Box 1298 Glasgow, KY 42141-1298

Sharon K. Carson Finance & Accounting Manager Jackson Energy Cooperative 115 Jackson Energy Lane McKee, KY 40447

Duke Energy Kentucky, Inc. 139 East Fourth Street Cincinnati, OH 45202

Paul G. Embs Clark Energy Cooperative, Inc. P.O. Box 748 Winchester, KY 40392-0748 Carol H. Fraley, CEO Grayson R.E.C.C. 109 Bagby Park Grayson, KY 41143

Ted Hampton Cumberland Valley Electric, Inc. Highway 25E P.0. Box 440 Gray, KY 40734

Larry Hicks
Salt River Electric Coop. Corp.
111 West Brashear Avenue
P.0. Box 609
Bardstown, KY 40004

Kerry K. Howard Licking Valley R.E.C.C. P.0. Box 605 West Liberty, KY 41472

James L. Jacobus Inter-County Energy Coop. Corp. P.0. Box 87 Danville, KY 40423-0087

Robert M. Marshall Owen Electric Cooperative, Inc. P.0. Box 400 Owenton, KY 40359

Burns E. Mercer Meade County R.E.C.C. P.0. Box 489 Brandenburg, KY 40108-0489

Michael L. Miller President & CEO Nolin R.E.C.C. Elizabethtown, KY 42701-8701

Timothy C. Mosher American Electric Power P.0. Box 5190 Frankfort, KY 40602 Barry L. Myers, Manager Taylor County R.E.C.C. P.0. Box 100 Campbellsville, KY 42719

G. Kelly Nuckols Jackson Purchase Energy Corp. P.O. Box 4030 Paducah, KY 42002-4030

Anthony P. Overbey Fleming-Mason Energy Coop. P.0. Box 328 Flemingsburg, KY 41041

Bobby D. Sexton President /General Manager Big Sandy R.E.C.C. 504 11th Street Paintsville, KY 41240-1422

Lawrence C. Cook Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Utility & Rate Intervention Div. 1024 Capital Center Dr. - Suite 200 Frankfort, KY 40601-8204

RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

## CASE NO. 2006-00494

# COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

3

1

2

In the Matter of:

5

6

7

4

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELIABILITY ) ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES OF KENTUCKY'S JURISDICTIONAL ELECTRIC DISTRIBUTION UTILITIES AND CERTAIN ) RELIABILITY MAINTENANCE PRACTICES

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

RESPONSE OF

)

) CASE NO.: 2006-00494

CUMBERLAND VALLEY ELECTRIC ("CVE")

TO INFORMATION REQUESTED VIA STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE

FOR COMMISSION'S ORDER 2006-00494

DATED DECEMBER 12, 2006

FILED: APRIL 13, 2007

Witnesses for All Response Contained Hereinafter:

Mark Abner, CVE

Gary Grubbs, P&D Engineers, Inc.

RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

# CASE NO. 2006-00494

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Rural Utility Service (RUS) Form 300 (O&M) for Past 5 Year Period 3
Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Developed During Past 5 Year Period 3
RUS Form 7, Part G for Each of the Past 5 Years (Summary)
Response to Part 5 ~ Staff Questions For All Utilities (No. 1)4
Response to Part 5 ~ Staff Questions For All Utilities (No. 2) 4
Response to Part 5 ~ Staff Questions For Cumberland Valley Electric 5
CVE's Testimony (Witness: Mark Abner)6
EXHIBIT 1A 9
EXHIBIT 2A-E

#### RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

#### CASE NO. 2006-00494

PSC Staff requested the following via Agenda Item 4 (Summary of Responses) of its prepared notes from the 03/08/2007 Informal Conference ("IC"):

- Q. Each RECC should provide FORM 300 for the past 5 years to the staff.
- A. RUS Form 300 is completed on a 3-year cycle by the RUS General Field Representative ("GFR") and as such was conducted on the CVE system during the years of 2003 and 2006. The report for 2006 is attached as EXHIBIT 1A (we need to obtain a copy of the 2003 report from RUS and will submit upon its delivery).
- Q. Each RECC should provide any CAP {corrective action plan} developed within the past 5 years to the PSC staff.
- A. Corrective actions plans were not required by results of the 2003 or 2006 RUS Form 300 surveys.
- Q. Each RECC should provide a copy of RUS Form 7, Part G for the past 5 years to the PSC staff.
- A. Following is a summary of RUS Form 7, Part G information from years 2002 through 2006. The actual data is presented in EXHIBITS 2A-E.

PART G: SERVICE INTURREPTIONS							
	USE	TOTAL					
ITEM / YEAR	POWER SUPPLIER (a)	EXTREME STORM (b)	PREARRANGED (c)	ALL OTHER (d)	(e)		
2002	0.42	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.58		
2003	0.04	0.10	0.02	1.44	1.60		
2004	0.52	0.05	0.04	1.54	2.15		
2005	0.10	0.02	0.01	1.61	1.74		
2006	0.00	0.10	0.13	2.45	2.68		
5-YEAR AVG.	0.22	0.07	0.05	1.42	1.75		

RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

## CASE NO. 2006-00494

PSC Staff requested the following via Staff Question 5 (All Utilities) of its prepared notes from the 03/08/2007 IC:

- Q. See Handout No. 1 which reflects several types of tree pruning.

  Regardless of whether or not the Commission sets any tree trimming standards, should Through or V pruning, Side pruning, Under pruning, or Topping be allowed?
- A. Yes. Tree trimming methods are like tools; the prudent choice may be different depending on the type tree, the terrain, the type of line construction, the line voltage, the growth contributors, the tree maintenance cycle achievable, the location, the easement, the over-all reliability required, etc. Utilities should be permitted to implement any or all of the methods such as those illustrated in Handout No. 1.
- Q. If the utility does not own the property over which its distribution lines are located, what are the utility's legal rights as far as access to the property, and ability to trim trees?
- A. The ability to trim/cut trees beneath CVE's distribution lines, along with the access for such, is normally obtained via easements from the property owner. For the most part, RUS distribution cooperatives such as CVE are not allowed to monetarily purchase easements but must instead ask for the right to traverse the lands needed to expand/maintain service. Prescriptive rights normally allow for maintenance going-forward once facilities are in place; but with this said, the "happiness/satisfaction" of the property owner must be diligently held in reverence. CVE normally obtains signed easements from property owners which convey such rights.

RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

#### CASE NO. 2006-00494

PSC Staff requested the following via Staff Question 5 (Cumberland Valley Electric) of its prepared notes from the 03/08/2007 IC:

- Q. Provide the other statistics or information used to determine when investigations or corrective actions are warranted as Cumberland Valley states in its response Item No. 1 of Staff's Second Data request in this case.
- A. Other information used by CVE managers consists of verbal or written reports from field line personnel and line inspection reports.
- Q. If Cumberland Valley does not develop formal plans to address its worst performing circuits and reliability performance is addressed on an as needed basis, explain how Cumberland Valley determines whether one circuit should be given priority over another circuit.
- A. As above, field reports are used to determine priority circuits.
- Q. Define what constitutes an "inordinate number and frequency of interruptions" as Cumberland Valley notes in response to Item No. 1 of Second Data Request in this case.
- A. An "inordinate number and frequency of interruptions" generally means more than one outage in a relatively short period of time. "A relatively short period of time" is not exactly defined by CVE but is generally considered to be less than one month.

#### RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

#### CASE NO. 2006-00494

CVE Testimony

2 | Witness: Mark Abner, CVE

- Q. With Respect to Reliability Reporting Requirement ~ is it appropriate for the Public Service Commission to require regular reporting of reliability information from all distribution utilities?
- A. No. Cooperative utilities are currently required to report reliability information to RUS via RUS Form 7.
- Q. With Respect to Reliability Reporting Requirement ~ should the PSC develop standardized criteria for recording and reporting reliability information?
- 11 | A. No

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. With Respect to Reliability Reporting Requirement ~ is it appropriate for the Commission to require reporting at a level smaller than the entire system (i.e. by substation or circuit)?
- A. No
  - Q. With Respect to Reliability Reporting Requirement ~ are there concerns about sharing this information within the industry or with the public?
- 18 A. No
  - Q. With Respect to Reliability Performance Standards ~ please comment on the appropriateness of a reliability performance standard. An example of a performance standard is found in the RUS requirement of no more than five hours outage for the average customer for any reason, and no more than one hour caused by power supply.
  - A. CVE does not believe a performance standard imposed by the Commission is appropriate. Cooperative electric utilities are provided with performance guidelines by the RUS via bulletin 1730-1.

#### RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

#### CASE NO. 2006-00494

- Q. With Respect to Reliability Performance Standards ~ is it more appropriate to develop performance standards on a utility by utility basis or a circuit by circuit basis? What is the most appropriate level for applying performance standard requirements?
- A. The performance guidelines of RUS Bulletin 1730-1 are on a system wide basis and are sufficient.
- Q. With Respect to Reliability Performance Standards ~ Comment on an appropriate requirement to respond to non-attainment of performance standard, or in the alternative explain why a response to non-attainment is not necessary.
- A. CVE views Commission imposed requirements as unreasonable.
- Q. With respect to Right-of-Way Management ~ please provide comments regarding the appropriateness of PSC defined ROW management minimum standard.
- A. CVE does not believe it appropriate for the PSC to define minimum ROW management standards. Each utility should have the latitude and discretion to manage, operate and maintain its ROW's and easements to the best interests of member-owners or customers. Relations between utilities and landowners are longstanding and generally successful under current practices. PSC intrusion into utility/consumer relations by imposition of mandatory ROW management standards may prove damaging in that it may make easement acquisition more difficult.
- Q. With respect to Right-of-Way Management ~ if such a standard were created, to what level of detail should it be defined?
- A. Please see previous response.

RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

# CASE NO. 2006-00494

	1	
1	Q.	With respect to Right-of-Way Management ~ does a PSC requirement give
2		the utility any advantage when performing ROW maintenance?
3	Α.	No
4	Q.	With respect to Right-of-Way Management ~ are there disadvantages?
5	Α.	Possibly (See answer to first question above)
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11	-	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

## CASE NO. 2006-00494

EXHIBIT 1A

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1895, an agency may not conduct or sponser, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information calection is 0572-0026. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 4 hours per response; including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the relationship for the formation.

collection of Information.				Y	
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF		JRE		BORROWER DESIGNATION	
RURAL UTILITIES SERV	/ICE		KY 57		
REVIEW RATING SU	<b>IMMAR</b>	Y		DATE PREPARED	
				March 29, 2007	
Ratings on form are: 0: Unsatisfactory - No	Records	2: Accept	able, but Sho	uld be Improved See Attached Recommendations	****************
NA: Not Applicable 1: Corrective Action N	ceded	3: Satisfa	ctory No A	Iditional Action Required at this Time	***************************************
	TRANSMIS!		<del></del>	ON FACILITIES	······································
1. Substations (Transmission and Distribution)		(Rating)		lion - Underground Cable	(Rating)
a. Safety, Clearance, Code Compliance		NA_	7	ing and Corrosion Control	3
b. Physical Conditions: Structure, Major Equipment, Appea	irance	NA NA	~~	Grading, Appearance	3
c. Inspection Records - Each Substation d. Oil Spill Prevention		NA NA	c. Riser P	ole: Hazards, Guying, Condition	3
G. On Spin Flevengon		1//	5. Distribut	tion Line Equipment: Conditions and Records	
2. Transmission Lines			1	Regulators	3
a. Right-of-Way: Clearing, Erosion, Appearance, Intrusions		NA	-	alizing Equipment	3
b. Physical Condition: Structure, Conductor, Guying		NA	~3	alion Transformers	3
c. Inspection Program and Records		NΛ	d. Pad Mo	ounted Equipment	***************************************
			1	Safety: Locking, Dead Front, Barriers	3
3. Distribution Lines - Overhead				Appearance: Settlement, Condition	3
a. Inspection Program and Records		3	1	Other	***************************************
b. Compliance with Safety Codes: Clearance	:s	3	c Kilowa	It-hour and Demand Meter	
Foreign S		3	Read	ing and Testing	3
Attachme	nts	2	4		
c. Observed Physical Condition from Field Checking:		_			
Right-of-	Way	3	-		
Other		***************************************	-		
PARTI	I. OPERATI	ONS and M	AINTENAN	CE	
6. Line Maintenance and Work Order Procedures		(Rating)	8. Power Q	nality	(Rating)
a. Work Planning & Scheduling		3	a. General	Freedom from Complaints	3
b. Work Backlogs: Right-of-Way Maintenan	nce	3	4		
Poles		3	-	and Load Balance	
Retirement of Idle Servi	ces	3	7	tion Transformer Loading	3
Other			7	ontrol Apparatus	NA NA
7. Service Interruptions  a. Average Annual Hours/Consumer by Cause (Complete for ea			c. Substati	on and Feeder Loading	3
PREVIOUS POWER MAJOR SCHEDULED ALL	TOTAL	- years)	10 Mont a	nd Plant Records	
5 YEARS SUPPLIER STORM OTHER	TOTAL		1	ng Maps: Accurate and Up-to-Date	3
(Year) a. b. c. d.	c.	(Rating)	b. Circuit	- ·	3
2002 0.42 0.06 0.03 0.73	1.24	3	c. Staking	-	3
2003 0.04 0.10 0.02 1.44	1.60	3	]		
2004 0.52 0.05 0.04 1.54	2.15	3			
2005 0.10 0.02 0.01 1.61	1.74	3			
2006 0.10 0.13 2.45	2.68	3	1		
b. Emergency Restoration Plan		3			
	# 1 **~ **	<u> </u>	1		
1) System I and Conditions and Y array	PART III.	ENGINEE	·	udiar and Planting	/h
11. System Load Conditions and Losses a. Annual System Losses 4,779	N£	(Rating)	1	udies and Planning inge Engineering Plan	(Rating)
a. Annual System Losses 4.775 b. Annual Load Factor 43.99		3	7	otion Work Plan	3
c. Power Factor at Monthly Peak 95+9		3	3	alizing Study	3
d. Ratios of Individual Substation Annual Peak kW to kVA		3	3	nta for Engineering Studies	3
A ****** Of the state of the st		<u> </u>	7	recasting Data	3
12. Voltage Conditions			U. L.ORG PO	remaing with	· · · · · ·
a. Voltage Surveys		3			
b. Substation Transformer Output Voltage Spread		3	]		
RUS Form 300 (Rev. 4-02) (VI, 4/2002)			<u> </u>	PAGE 1 OF	N. D. J. G. P. G.

RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

# CASE NO. 2006-00494

## EXHIBIT 1A

			ERATION AND MAINT	ENANCE BUDGETS	N W.L A VI	
		ous 2 Years	For Present Year	2000	For Future 3 Years 2009	2010
YEAR	2005	2006	2007	2008 Budget	Budget	Budget
	Actual	Actual	Budget \$ Thousands	\$ Thousands	\$ Thousands	S Thousan
	\$ Thousands	\$ Thousands	3 Indusanus	y anduquia		
Normal Operation	1,263,088	1,211,481				
Normal Maintenance	1,766,341	2,068,895				
Additional (Deferred) Maintenance						
Total	3,029,429	3,280,376	3,429,109	3,531,982	3,637,942	3,747,08
14. Budgeting: A	Adequacy of Budgets for N	eeded Work	3	(Rating)		
15. Date Discuss	ed with Beard of Director	rs	4/12/2007	_(Date)		
			EXPLANATORY NO			
ITEM NO.			СОМ	MENTS		
3b.	Telephone poles left star Cable TV attachments re	nding close to the electric equire constant monitoring	pole should be removed. g and follow-up to ensure	code requirements are me	al.	
		•				
1						
1						
	1					
				Т	ITLE	DATE
RATED BY:	Led 1	hunter		PRESID	ENT & CEO	03/29/0
I	,,	9				1
REVIEWED BY	··			l		1
REVIEWED BY		N.		RU	JS GFR	03/29/0

EXHIBIT 1A Page 2 of 2

RESPONSE TO STAFF INFORMAL CONFERENCE OF 03/08/2007

# CASE NO. 2006-00494

EXH	TR	TΨ	2 A
TIALL			45

## FROM 2002 RUS FORM 7

CVE Part G. Service Interruptions ~ 2002									
ITEM	Avg Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg. Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg. Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg. Hours per Consumer by Cause	JATOT				
	Power Supplier (a)	Extreme Storm	Prearranged (c)	All Other (d)	(e)				
1, Present Year	0.42	0 06	0.03	0.74	1.25				
2. Five-Year Average	114	6.14	0 02	1,23	8 53				

6 EXHIBIT 2B

# FROM 2003 RUS FORM 7

	CVE Part G. Set	vice Interruptions	~ 2003		
HCA	Avij Haits ( r Consciment) Class	Avg. Holds bet Consumer by Cause	Avg Hours p Consumer b Cause	Ayy Huam paz Consener by Các v	TOTAL
	Power Supplier on	Extrene: Storm (t.)	Pecatrange i 10)	All Ct. c≠ (d)	(e)
1 Presurt Year	0.04	0 10	62	1,44	1 60
2 Five-Year Average	0.16	0.67	03	1 33	1 59

# FROM 2004 RUS FORM 7

CVE Part G. Service Interruptions ~ 2004									
ITEM	Avg Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg. Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg. Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg. Hours per Consumer by Cause	TOTAL				
	Power Supplier (a)	Extreme Storm (b)	Prearranged (c)	Ail Other (d)	(e)				
1. Present Year	0.52	0.05	0.04	1.54	2.15				
2. Five-Year Average	0.25	0.06	0.03	1.25	1.59				

## EXHIBIT 2D

EXHIBIT 2C

## FROM 2005 RUS FORM 7

	CVE Part G Se	rvice Interruptions	~ 2005		The state of the s
FEM	Avg Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg. Hours per Consumer by Cause	Avg. Hours per Consumer by Cause	TOTAL
	Power Supplier (a)	Extreme Storm (b)	Prearranged (c)	Al-Other (d)	(e)
1 Present Year	0 10	0 02	0.01	: 8:	1
2 Five-Year Average	0 22	0.05	0 03	1 36	:

## EXHIBIT 2E

## FROM 2006 RUS FORM 7

CVE PART G. SERVICE INTERRUPTIONS ~ 2006								
VM70.4	A'	VERAGE HOURS PER CO			TOTAL			
ITEM	POWER SUPPLIER (a)	EXTREME STORM (b)	PREARRANGED (c)	ALL OTHER (d)	(e)			
1. Present Year	0.00	.10	.13	2.45	2.68			
2. Pive-Year Average	.22	.07	,05	1.56	1.90			