



STOLL · KEENON · OGDEN
PLLC

2000 PNC PLAZA
500 WEST JEFFERSON STREET
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY 40202-2828
502-333-6000
FAX: 502-333-6099
WWW.SKOFIRM.COM

KENDRICK R. RIGGS
DIRECT DIAL 502-560-4222
DIRECT FAX 502-627-8722
kendrick.riggs@skofirm.com

May 24, 2007

RECEIVED

MAY 24 2007

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Elizabeth O'Donnell
Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

RE: **An Examination of the Application of the Fuel Adjustment Clause of
Kentucky Utilities Company From November 1, 2004 Through October 31,
2006**
KPSC Case No. 2006-00509


**An Examination of the Application of the Fuel Adjustment Clause of
Louisville Gas and Electric Company From November 1, 2004 Through
October 31, 2006**
KPSC Case No. 2006-00510

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

Enclosed please find and accept for filing two originals and ten copies of Kentucky Utilities Company's and Louisville Gas and Electric Company's Response to Data Requests of Commission Staff and Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, Inc. Made During the Hearing on May 10, 2007 in the above-referenced matters. Please confirm your receipt of this filing by placing the stamp of your Office with the date received on the enclosed additional copies and return them to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

Should you have any questions or need any additional information, please contact me at your convenience.

Very truly yours,


Kendrick R. Riggs

KRR/ec
Enclosures
cc: Parties of Record

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE APPLICATION)
OF THE FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE OF)
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY FROM) CASE NO. 2006-00509
FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2004 THROUGH)
OCTOBER 31, 2006)

In the Matter of:

AN EXAMINATION OF THE APPLICATION)
OF THE FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE OF)
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC) CASE NO. 2006-00510
COMPANY FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2004)
THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2006)

RESPONSE OF
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY AND
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY TO
DATA REQUESTS OF COMMISSION STAFF AND
KENTUCKY INDUSTRIAL UTILITY CUSTOMERS, INC.,
MADE DURING HEARING ON MAY 10, 2007

FILED: MAY 24, 2007

**KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY AND
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**

**Post-Hearing Responses to Data Request of
Commission Staff and
Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, Inc.,
Made During Hearing on May 10, 2007**

Case Nos. 2006-00509 and 2006-00510

Question No. 1

Witness: Robert M. Conroy

- Q-1. Please provide information on how other states have allowed recovery of MISO and PJM costs and provided credits for MISO and PJM revenues.
- A-1. For the complete results of the Companies' research, please see the attached fuel clause tariff sheets, state utility commission orders, regulations, and statutes concerning other states' approaches to allowing their MISO or PJM member utilities to recover RTO costs and revenues. The results are summarized in the table below:

States/Utilities	Recovery authority	What is recovered
Dakota – North		
MDU – Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Case Nos. PU-05-131, PU-05-135, PU-05-147 (Apr. 6, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rate 58, NDPSC Vol. 4, Sheet No. 42 (Case No. PU-05-135, eff. Apr. 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] On interim basis, native-load-related net MISO costs of energy, including TEMT Schedules 16 and 17 charges and FERC approved uplift charges. - [Tariff] “Net costs linked to the utility's load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities . . .”
Otter Tail Corp. - Otter Tail Power Co.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Case Nos. PU-05-131, PU-05-135, PU-05-147 (Apr. 6, 2005) - Tariff, Cost of Energy Adjustment Clause, Vol. I, Sheet 98 (Case No. PU-05-131, eff. Aug. 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] On interim basis, native-load-related net MISO costs of energy, including TEMT Schedules 16 and 17 charges and FERC approved uplift charges. - [Tariff] “[N]et costs linked to the utility's load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities . . .”

<p>Xcel Energy – Northern States Power</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Case Nos. PU-05-131, PU-05-135, PU-05-147 (Apr. 6, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rider No. 1, Sheet No. E 76.2 (Case No. PU-05-147, filed June 13, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] On interim basis, native-load-related net MISO costs of energy, including TEMT Schedules 16 and 17 charges and FERC approved uplift charges. - [Tariff] “Net Costs linked to the Company's load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operation by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities.”
<p>Dakota – South</p>		
<p>MDU Resources – Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Docket No. EL05-007 (Apr. 7, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rate 58, Vol. 3, Sheet No. 27 (Docket EL05-007, eff. Apr. 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] “The proposed tariff revisions would allow the new MISO transactions to flow through the fuel clause as did prior non-MISO energy procurement transactions.” - [Tariff] “Energy related costs associated with [MISO] Energy Market.”
<p>Otter Tail Corp. - Otter Tail Power Co.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Docket No. EL05-009 (Apr. 7, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Adjustment Clause, Sec. No. 3, Vol. I, Sheet No. 98 (Docket No. EL05-016, eff. June 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] “The proposed tariff revisions would allow the new MISO transactions to flow through the fuel clause as did prior non-MISO energy procurement transactions.” - [Tariff] “Costs or revenues linked to the utility’s load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities”

Xcel Energy – Northern States Power (MN)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Docket No. EL05-008 (Apr. 7, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rider, SDPUC No. 2, Sec. No. 5, Sheet No. 64 (Docket No. EL05-008, eff. Apr. 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] “The proposed tariff revisions would allow the new MISO transactions to flow through the fuel clause as did prior non-MISO energy procurement transactions.” - [Tariff] “Net costs or revenues . . . linked to the Company’s load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities”
Illinois		
Ameren – Central Illinois Light Co.	Tariff, Rider TS – Transmission Service, Ill. C.C. No. 18, Sheet No. 39 (Docket No. 06-0070, eff. Jan 2, 2007)	“[P]rior period adjustments implemented by the MISO.”
Ameren – Illinois Power Co.	Tariff, Rider TS – Transmission Service, Ill. C.C. No. 35, Sheet No. 39 (Docket No. 06-0072, eff. Jan 2, 2007)	“[P]rior period adjustments implemented by the MISO.”
Ameren – Central Illinois Public Service Co.	Tariff, Rider TS – Transmission Service, Ill. C.C. No. 16, Sheet No. 39 (Docket No. 06-0071, eff. Jan 2, 2007)	“[P]rior period adjustments implemented by the MISO.”

Indiana		
AES – Indianapolis Power and Light	IURC Final Order in Cause No. 42685 (June 1, 2005)	Fuel clause recovery of: (1) FTR congestion costs; (2) FTR congestion credits; (3) FTR auction settlements; (4) Virtual Bids and Offers in the Day-Ahead Market which are used for hedging jurisdictional load; (5) Day-Ahead Recovery of Unit Commitment Costs; (6) Excess Congestion Charge Fund Credit; (7) Real-Time Marginal Losses Surplus Credit; (8) RAC Recovery of Unit Commitment Costs; (9) Marginal Losses Surplus Credit; (10) Inadvertent Energy Charge or Credit; (11) Uninstructed Deviation Penalties [for one year after order]; and (12) Revenue from Uninstructed Deviation Penalties.
Duke Energy Indiana – PSI Energy	- Same Final Order as AES - Tariff, Standard Contract Rider No. 68, MISO Management Cost and Revenue Adjustment, IURC No. 14, Sheet No. 68 (iss. Mar. 14, 2007)	- [Final Order] Same as AES above - [Tariff] MISO Schedules 10, 16, 17; Standard Market Design costs; MISO transmission revenues; pro forma MISO management costs and MISO transmission revenues; uninstructed deviation penalty revenues.
Vectren Energy Delivery of Indiana, Inc. – Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co.	Same Final Order as AES	Same as AES

Iowa		
Alliant – Interstate Power and Light Co.	UB Order in Docket No. WRU-06-11-150 (June 19, 2006)	Through June 30, 2007, extending “a waiver of the electric energy adjustment clause (EAC) rules related to flowing costs and credits associated with participation in wholesale markets operated by regional transmission organizations through the EAC for recovery.” The waiver allows such costs and credits to flow through IPL’s EAC.
Kentucky		
E.ON US – LG&E and KU	FAC cases pending in Case Nos. 2006-00510 and -00510	None.
E.ON US – LG&E and KU	MISO Trackers denied by KPSC Orders in Case Nos. KPSC Case Nos. 2004-00459 and -00460	None.
E.ON US-LG&E and KU	Electric base rates pursuant to written unanimous settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Case Nos. 2003-00433 and 2002-00434	MISO Day-1 costs and revenues are included in base rates and are applied to the accounting for the MISO Exit Fee
Duke Energy Kentucky – Union Light, Heat & Power Co.	FAC charges and credits pursuant to written unanimous settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Case No. 2006-00172, DEK’s most recent rate case	Only RSG Make Whole Payments are included in the calculation of the FAC charges and credits; all other MISO Day 2 charges accounted for in base rates.
AEP-Kentucky Power	Base rates pursuant to written unanimous settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Case No. 2005-00341	All PJM costs and revenues are treated as base rate items.
Michigan		
CMS Energy – Consumers Energy Co.	Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery Clause, M.P.S.C. No. 12 - Electric, Sheet No. B-64.00 (Case No. U-13917, eff. Jan. 2004)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues

DTE Energy – Detroit Edison Co.	Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery Clause, M.P.S.C. No. 9 - Electric, Sheet No. B4-10 (Case No. U.15002, eff. 2007 plan year)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Wisconsin Energy Corp. – Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	- PSC Order in Docket No. (Nov. 21, 2006) - Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery, M.P.S.C. No. 2 - Electric, Sheet No. 14 (Case No. U-12725, eff. Sept. 16, 2002)	- [Order] Denies PSCR recovery of MISO-related line loss (marginal loss) and RSG costs/revenues - [Tariff] No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Upper Peninsula Power Co.	Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery, M.P.S.C. No. 7 - Electric, Sheet No. 25 (Case No. U-15006, eff. Apr. 2007)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Xcel Energy – Northern States Power Co. Wisconsin	Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery Clause, M.P.S.C. No. 1 - Electric, Sheet No. 182 (Case No. U-11777, eff. Jan. 7, 1999)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Minnesota		
Allete – Minnesota Power	PUC Order in Docket Nos. E-002/M-04-1970 et al. (Dec. 21, 2006)	“1. Except as regards Schedules 16 and 17 costs, discussed below, each petitioning utility may recover the charges imposed by [MISO] for MISO Day 2 operations (offset by revenues from Day 2 operations via net accounting) through the calculation of the utility’s FCA from the period April 1, 2005 through a period of at least three years after the date of this Order.” Also, Order establishes deferral accounting for MISO Schedule 16 and 17 costs.
Alliant – Interstate Power and Light Co.	Same Order as Allete	Same as Allete
Otter Tail Corp. – Otter Tail Power Co.	Same Order as Allete	Same as Allete

Xcel Energy – Northern States Power Co. (MN)	- Same Order as Allele - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rider, MPUC No. 2, Sec. No. 5, Sheet No. 91.1 (Docket No. E002/GR-05-1428, eff. Feb. 1, 2007)	- [Order] Same as Allele - [Tariff] “Costs or revenues linked to the Company’s load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs], or similar entities”
Missouri		
Ameren – Ameren UE	No information	No information
Montana		
MDU Resources – Montana-Dakota Utilities	No information	No information
Ohio		
Duke Energy Ohio (fka Cinergy)	Tariff, Rider TCR – Transmission Cost Recovery Tracker, PUCO Electric No. 19, Sheet No. 57.4 (eff. Nov. 29, 2006)	“[C]osts assessed to the Company by the applicable [RTO].”
First Energy – Ohio Edison	PUC Order in Docket No. 04-1932 (Feb. 14, 2007).	“MISO charges associated with the Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee (RSG) are the type of charges that may be collected though the Companies’ Transmission and Ancillary Service Riders.” Not clear if other MISO Day 2 costs/revenues similarly recovered.
First Energy – The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	PUC Order in Docket No. 04-1932 (Feb. 14, 2007).	“MISO charges associated with the Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee (RSG) are the type of charges that may be collected though the Companies’ Transmission and Ancillary Service Riders.” Not clear if other MISO Day 2 costs/revenues similarly recovered.

First Energy – Toledo Edison	PUC Order in Docket No. 04-1932 (Feb. 14, 2007).	“MISO charges associated with the Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee (RSG) are the type of charges that may be collected through the Companies’ Transmission and Ancillary Service Riders.” Not clear if other MISO Day 2 costs/revenues similarly recovered.
Pennsylvania		
First Energy – Penn Power	PUC Order in Case No. R-00072129 (Apr. 24, 2007)	Not clear which, if any, MISO costs and revenues included for recovery: “[S]ignificant changes are required due to the implementation of the Midwest ISO's energy market and its Open Access Transmission and Energy Markets Tariff (TEMT).”
First Energy – Penelec	Tariff, Rider D - Transmission Service Charge Rider, Electric Pa. P.U.C. No. 79, Page No. 149 (eff. Jan. 11, 2007)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Wisconsin		
Allete – Superior Water, Light & Power	Tariff, Retail Power Cost Adjustment Clause, Vol. 3, Sheet No. 160 (Case No. 5820-UR-110, eff. Jan. 1, 2007)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues

Alliant – Wisconsin Power & Light	PSC Order in Docket Nos. 5-GF-150 & 9300-EI-100 (June 16, 2006)	<p>“With the approval of orders in dockets 6690-UR-116 and 05-GF-148, dated December 21, 2004 and March 29, 2005, respectively, the Joint Utilities were authorized to defer MISO Day 2 congestion costs, net line losses, and the costs of acquiring financial transmission rights (FTRs) for network resources that were not received in the MISO allocation process.”</p> <p>Also allowed to be deferred until June 1, 2007:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedules 16 & 17 3. Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee (RSG) Day Ahead Distribution Amount 4. RSG Day Ahead Make Whole Payments 5. RSG Real Time First Pass Distribution Amount (Effective June 8, 2006) 6. RSG Real Time Make Whole Payments (Effective June 8, 2006) 7. Real Time Revenue Neutrality Uplift 8. Net Inadvertent Distribution (Effective June 8,2006) 9. Miscellaneous Uplift
Madison Gas & Electric	Same Order as Alliant	“MGE has and continues to account for MISO Day 2 costs under the fuel rules and has never requested deferred accounting treatment for these costs.”
We Energies – Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	Same Order as Alliant	Same as Alliant
Integrus – Wisconsin Public Service Corp.	Same Order as Alliant	Same as Alliant
Xcel Energy – Northern States Power Co. (WI)	PSC Order in Docket No. 4220-UR-114 (Dec. 26, 2006)	Of Day 2 costs, all are authorized for deferred accounting treatment until June 1, 2007, except for Schedules 16 and 17, which are in base rates.



S T O L L · K E E N O N · O G D E N
P L L C

2000 PNC PLAZA
500 WEST JEFFERSON STREET
LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY 40202-2828
502-333-6000
FAX: 502-333-6099
WWW.SKOFIRM.COM

KENDRICK R. RIGGS
DIRECT DIAL 502-560-4222
DIRECT FAX 502-627-8722
kendrick.riggs@skofirm.com

May 24, 2007

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Elizabeth O'Donnell
Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

**RE: An Examination of the Application of the Fuel Adjustment Clause of
Kentucky Utilities Company From November 1, 2004 Through October 31,
2006**

KPSC Case No. 2006-00509

**An Examination of the Application of the Fuel Adjustment Clause of
Louisville Gas and Electric Company From November 1, 2004 Through
October 31, 2006**

KPSC Case No. 2006-00510

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

Enclosed please find and accept for filing two originals and ten copies of Kentucky Utilities Company's and Louisville Gas and Electric Company's Response to Data Requests of Commission Staff and Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, Inc. Made During the Hearing on May 10, 2007 in the above-referenced matters. Please confirm your receipt of this filing by placing the stamp of your Office with the date received on the enclosed additional copies and return them to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

Should you have any questions or need any additional information, please contact me at your convenience.

Very truly yours,

Kendrick R. Riggs

KRR/ec
Enclosures
cc: Parties of Record

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE APPLICATION)
OF THE FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE OF)
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY FROM) CASE NO. 2006-00509
FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2004 THROUGH)
OCTOBER 31, 2006)**

In the Matter of:

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE APPLICATION)
OF THE FUEL ADJUSTMENT CLAUSE OF)
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC) CASE NO. 2006-00510
COMPANY FROM NOVEMBER 1, 2004)
THROUGH OCTOBER 31, 2006)**

**RESPONSE OF
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY AND
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY TO
DATA REQUESTS OF COMMISSION STAFF AND
KENTUCKY INDUSTRIAL UTILITY CUSTOMERS, INC.,
MADE DURING HEARING ON MAY 10, 2007**

FILED: MAY 24, 2007

**KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY AND
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**

**Post-Hearing Responses to Data Request of
Commission Staff and
Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers, Inc.,
Made During Hearing on May 10, 2007**

Case Nos. 2006-00509 and 2006-00510

Question No. 1

Witness: Robert M. Conroy

Q-1. Please provide information on how other states have allowed recovery of MISO and PJM costs and provided credits for MISO and PJM revenues.

A-1. For the complete results of the Companies' research, please see the attached fuel clause tariff sheets, state utility commission orders, regulations, and statutes concerning other states' approaches to allowing their MISO or PJM member utilities to recover RTO costs and revenues. The results are summarized in the table below:

States/Utilities	Recovery authority	What is recovered
Dakota – North		
MDU – Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Case Nos. PU-05-131, PU-05-135, PU-05-147 (Apr. 6, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rate 58, NDPSC Vol. 4, Sheet No. 42 (Case No. PU-05-135, eff. Apr. 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] On interim basis, native-load-related net MISO costs of energy, including TEMT Schedules 16 and 17 charges and FERC approved uplift charges. - [Tariff] “Net costs linked to the utility's load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities”
Otter Tail Corp. - Otter Tail Power Co.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Case Nos. PU-05-131, PU-05-135, PU-05-147 (Apr. 6, 2005) - Tariff, Cost of Energy Adjustment Clause, Vol. I, Sheet 98 (Case No. PU-05-131, eff. Aug. 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] On interim basis, native-load-related net MISO costs of energy, including TEMT Schedules 16 and 17 charges and FERC approved uplift charges. - [Tariff] “[N]et costs linked to the utility's load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities”

<p>Xcel Energy – Northern States Power</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Case Nos. PU-05-131, PU-05-135, PU-05-147 (Apr. 6, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rider No. 1, Sheet No. E 76.2 (Case No. PU-05-147, filed June 13, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] On interim basis, native-load-related net MISO costs of energy, including TEMT Schedules 16 and 17 charges and FERC approved uplift charges. - [Tariff] “Net Costs linked to the Company's load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operation by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities.”
<p>Dakota – South</p>		
<p>MDU Resources – Montana-Dakota Utilities Co.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Docket No. EL05-007 (Apr. 7, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rate 58, Vol. 3, Sheet No. 27 (Docket EL05-007, eff. Apr. 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] “The proposed tariff revisions would allow the new MISO transactions to flow through the fuel clause as did prior non-MISO energy procurement transactions.” - [Tariff] “Energy related costs associated with [MISO] Energy Market.”
<p>Otter Tail Corp. - Otter Tail Power Co.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Docket No. EL05-009 (Apr. 7, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Adjustment Clause, Sec. No. 3, Vol. I, Sheet No. 98 (Docket No. EL05-016, eff. June 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] “The proposed tariff revisions would allow the new MISO transactions to flow through the fuel clause as did prior non-MISO energy procurement transactions.” - [Tariff] “Costs or revenues linked to the utility’s load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities”

<p>Xcel Energy – Northern States Power (MN)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSC Order in Docket No. EL05-008 (Apr. 7, 2005) - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rider, SDPUC No. 2, Sec. No. 5, Sheet No. 64 (Docket No. EL05-008, eff. Apr. 1, 2005) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - [Order] “The proposed tariff revisions would allow the new MISO transactions to flow through the fuel clause as did prior non-MISO energy procurement transactions.” - [Tariff] “Net costs or revenues . . . linked to the Company’s load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs] or similar entities”
<p>Illinois</p>		
<p>Ameren – Central Illinois Light Co.</p>	<p>Tariff, Rider TS – Transmission Service, Ill. C.C. No. 18, Sheet No. 39 (Docket No. 06-0070, eff. Jan 2, 2007)</p>	<p>“[P]rior period adjustments implemented by the MISO.”</p>
<p>Ameren – Illinois Power Co.</p>	<p>Tariff, Rider TS – Transmission Service, Ill. C.C. No. 35, Sheet No. 39 (Docket No. 06-0072, eff. Jan 2, 2007)</p>	<p>“[P]rior period adjustments implemented by the MISO.”</p>
<p>Ameren – Central Illinois Public Service Co.</p>	<p>Tariff, Rider TS – Transmission Service, Ill. C.C. No. 16, Sheet No. 39 (Docket No. 06-0071, eff. Jan 2, 2007)</p>	<p>“[P]rior period adjustments implemented by the MISO.”</p>

Indiana		
AES – Indianapolis Power and Light	IURC Final Order in Cause No. 42685 (June 1, 2005)	Fuel clause recovery of: (1) FTR congestion costs; (2) FTR congestion credits; (3) FTR auction settlements; (4) Virtual Bids and Offers in the Day-Ahead Market which are used for hedging jurisdictional load; (5) Day-Ahead Recovery of Unit Commitment Costs; (6) Excess Congestion Charge Fund Credit; (7) Real-Time Marginal Losses Surplus Credit; (8) RAC Recovery of Unit Commitment Costs; (9) Marginal Losses Surplus Credit; (10) Inadvertent Energy Charge or Credit; (11) Uninstructed Deviation Penalties [for one year after order]; and (12) Revenue from Uninstructed Deviation Penalties.
Duke Energy Indiana – PSI Energy	- Same Final Order as AES - Tariff, Standard Contract Rider No. 68, MISO Management Cost and Revenue Adjustment, IURC No. 14, Sheet No. 68 (iss. Mar. 14, 2007)	- [Final Order] Same as AES above - [Tariff] MISO Schedules 10, 16, 17; Standard Market Design costs; MISO transmission revenues; pro forma MISO management costs and MISO transmission revenues; uninstructed deviation penalty revenues.
Vectren Energy Delivery of Indiana, Inc. – Southern Indiana Gas & Electric Co.	Same Final Order as AES	Same as AES

Iowa		
Alliant – Interstate Power and Light Co.	UB Order in Docket No. WRU-06-11-150 (June 19, 2006)	Through June 30, 2007, extending “a waiver of the electric energy adjustment clause (EAC) rules related to flowing costs and credits associated with participation in wholesale markets operated by regional transmission organizations through the EAC for recovery.” The waiver allows such costs and credits to flow through IPL’s EAC.
Kentucky		
E.ON US – LG&E and KU	FAC cases pending in Case Nos. 2006-00510 and -00510	None.
E.ON US – LG&E and KU	MISO Trackers denied by KPSC Orders in Case Nos. KPSC Case Nos. 2004-00459 and -00460	None.
E.ON US-LG&E and KU	Electric base rates pursuant to written unanimous settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Case Nos. 2003-00433 and 2002-00434	MISO Day-1 costs and revenues are included in base rates and are applied to the accounting for the MISO Exit Fee
Duke Energy Kentucky – Union Light, Heat& Power Co.	FAC charges and credits pursuant to written unanimous settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Case No. 2006-00172, DEK’s most recent rate case	Only RSG Make Whole Payments are included in the calculation of the FAC charges and credits; all other MISO Day 2 charges accounted for in base rates.
AEP-Kentucky Power	Base rates pursuant to written unanimous settlement agreement approved by the Commission in Case No. 2005-00341	All PJM costs and revenues are treated as base rate items.
Michigan		
CMS Energy – Consumers Energy Co.	Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery Clause, M.P.S.C. No. 12 - Electric, Sheet No. B-64.00 (Case No. U-13917, eff. Jan. 2004)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues

DTE Energy – Detroit Edison Co.	Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery Clause, M.P.S.C. No. 9 - Electric, Sheet No. B4-10 (Case No. U.15002, eff. 2007 plan year)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Wisconsin Energy Corp. – Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	- PSC Order in Docket No. (Nov. 21, 2006) - Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery, M.P.S.C. No. 2 - Electric, Sheet No. 14 (Case No. U-12725, eff. Sept. 16, 2002)	- [Order] Denies PSCR recovery of MISO-related line loss (marginal loss) and RSG costs/revenues - [Tariff] No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Upper Peninsula Power Co.	Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery, M.P.S.C. No. 7 - Electric, Sheet No. 25 (Case No. U-15006, eff. Apr. 2007)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Xcel Energy – Northern States Power Co. Wisconsin	Tariff, Power Supply Cost Recovery Clause, M.P.S.C. No. 1 - Electric, Sheet No. 182 (Case No. U-11777, eff. Jan. 7, 1999)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Minnesota		
Allele – Minnesota Power	PUC Order in Docket Nos. E-002/M-04-1970 et al. (Dec. 21, 2006)	“1. Except as regards Schedules 16 and 17 costs, discussed below, each petitioning utility may recover the charges imposed by [MISO] for MISO Day 2 operations (offset by revenues from Day 2 operations via net accounting) through the calculation of the utility’s FCA from the period April 1, 2005 through a period of at least three years after the date of this Order.” Also, Order establishes deferral accounting for MISO Schedule 16 and 17 costs.
Alliant – Interstate Power and Light Co.	Same Order as Allele	Same as Allele
Otter Tail Corp. – Otter Tail Power Co.	Same Order as Allele	Same as Allele

Xcel Energy – Northern States Power Co. (MN)	- Same Order as Allete - Tariff, Fuel Clause Rider, MPUC No. 2, Sec. No. 5, Sheet No. 91.1 (Docket No. E002/GR-05-1428, eff. Feb. 1, 2007)	- [Order] Same as Allete - [Tariff] “Costs or revenues linked to the Company’s load serving obligation, associated with participation in wholesale electric energy markets operated by [RTOs], [ISOs], or similar entities”
Missouri		
Ameren – Ameren UE	No information	No information
Montana		
MDU Resources – Montana-Dakota Utilities	No information	No information
Ohio		
Duke Energy Ohio (fka Cinergy)	Tariff, Rider TCR – Transmission Cost Recovery Tracker, PUCO Electric No. 19, Sheet No. 57.4 (eff. Nov. 29, 2006)	“[C]osts assessed to the Company by the applicable [RTO].”
First Energy – Ohio Edison	PUC Order in Docket No. 04-1932 (Feb. 14, 2007).	“MISO charges associated with the Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee (RSG) are the type of charges that may be collected though the Companies’ Transmission and Ancillary Service Riders.” Not clear if other MISO Day 2 costs/revenues similarly recovered.
First Energy – The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.	PUC Order in Docket No. 04-1932 (Feb. 14, 2007).	“MISO charges associated with the Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee (RSG) are the type of charges that may be collected though the Companies’ Transmission and Ancillary Service Riders.” Not clear if other MISO Day 2 costs/revenues similarly recovered.

First Energy – Toledo Edison	PUC Order in Docket No. 04-1932 (Feb. 14, 2007).	“MISO charges associated with the Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee (RSG) are the type of charges that may be collected though the Companies’ Transmission and Ancillary Service Riders.” Not clear if other MISO Day 2 costs/revenues similarly recovered.
Pennsylvania		
First Energy – Penn Power	PUC Order in Case No. R-00072129 (Apr. 24, 2007)	Not clear which, if any, MISO costs and revenues included for recovery: “[S]ignificant changes are required due to the implementation of the Midwest ISO's energy market and its Open Access Transmission and Energy Markets Tariff (TEMT).”
First Energy – Penelec	Tariff, Rider D - Transmission Service Charge Rider, Electric Pa. P.U.C. No. 79, Page No. 149 (eff. Jan. 11, 2007)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues
Wisconsin		
Allete – Superior Water, Light & Power	Tariff, Retail Power Cost Adjustment Clause, Vol. 3, Sheet No. 160 (Case No. 5820-UR-110, eff. Jan. 1, 2007)	No explicit mention of MISO costs or revenues

Alliant – Wisconsin Power & Light	PSC Order in Docket Nos. 5-GF-150 & 9300-EI-100 (June 16, 2006)	<p>“With the approval of orders in dockets 6690-UR-116 and 05-GF-148, dated December 21, 2004 and March 29, 2005, respectively, the Joint Utilities were authorized to defer MISO Day 2 congestion costs, net line losses, and the costs of acquiring financial transmission rights (FTRs) for network resources that were not received in the MISO allocation process.”</p> <p>Also allowed to be deferred until June 1, 2007:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Schedules 16 & 17 3. Revenue Sufficiency Guarantee (RSG) Day Ahead Distribution Amount 4. RSG Day Ahead Make Whole Payments 5. RSG Real Time First Pass Distribution Amount (Effective June 8, 2006) 6. RSG Real Time Make Whole Payments (Effective June 8, 2006) 7. Real Time Revenue Neutrality Uplift 8. Net Inadvertent Distribution (Effective June 8,2006) 9. Miscellaneous Uplift
Madison Gas & Electric	Same Order as Alliant	“MGE has and continues to account for MISO Day 2 costs under the fuel rules and has never requested deferred accounting treatment for these costs.”
We Energies – Wisconsin Electric Power Co.	Same Order as Alliant	Same as Alliant
Integrus – Wisconsin Public Service Corp.	Same Order as Alliant	Same as Alliant
Xcel Energy – Northern States Power Co. (WI)	PSC Order in Docket No. 4220-UR-114 (Dec. 26, 2006)	Of Day 2 costs, all are authorized for deferred accounting treatment until June 1, 2007, except for Schedules 16 and 17, which are in base rates.