

ATTORNEYS

July 29, 2011

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2011

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION 421 West Main Street Post Office Box 634 Frankfort, KY 40602-0634 [502] 223-3477 [502] 223-4124 Fax www.stites.com

Mark R. Overstreet (502) 209-1219 (502) 223-4387 FAX moverstreet@stites.com

HAND DELIVERED

Jeff R. Derouen Executive Director Public Service Commission 211 Sower Boulevard P.O. Box 615 Frankfort, KY 40602-0615

RE: Case No. 2011-00042

Dear Mr. Derouen:

Enclosed please find and accept for filing in accordance with the Commission's July 14, 2011 Order, the original and ten copies of Kentucky Transmission Company, Inc.'s responses to the Staff's Third Set of Data Requests in the above matter. Copies of the responses are being served upon the parties, along with a copy of this letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

∕trul∕y yours,[<] R. Overstreet

MRO

cc: David F. Boehm Lawrence W. Cook

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF KENTUCKY

)

)

)

)

)

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2011

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

1

THE APPLICATION OF AEP KENTUCKY TRANSMISSION COMPANY, INC. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO OPERATE AS A TRANSMISSION ONLY PUBLIC UTILITY

CASE NO. 2011-00042

RESPONSES OF KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY TO COMMISSION STAFF'S THIRD SET OF DATA REQUESTS

July 29, 2011

IN THE MATTER OF

AFFIDAVIT

Lisa M. Barton, upon first being duly sworn, hereby makes oath that if the foregoing questions were propounded to her at a hearing before the Public Service Commission of Kentucky, she would give the answers recorded following each of said questions and that said answers are true.

Lisa M. Barton

)

)

)

State of Ohio

County of Franklin

Case No. 2011-00042

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public, by Lisa M. Barton this <u>27</u>^{tb} day of <u>July</u> 2011. <u>Rober</u> <u>Smith</u> Notary Public My Commission Expires <u>November</u> 2, 2013

AFFIDAVIT

Gregory G. Pauley upon first being duly sworn hereby makes oath that if the foregoing questions were propounded to him at a hearing before the Public Service Commission of Kentucky, he would give the answers recorded following each of said questions and that said answers are true.

aul Gregory G/Pauley

Commonwealth of Kentucky

County of Franklin

Case No. 2011-00042

Subscribed and sworn before me, a Notary Public, by Gregory G. Pauley this 27% day of July, 2011.

)

)

My Commission Expires January 23, 4013

KPSC Case No. 2011-00042 Commission Staff's Third Set of Data Requests Order Dated July 14, 2011 Item No. 1 Page 1 of 1

KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY

REQUEST

Refer to the Supplemental Testimony of Lisa M. Barton, specifically, the answer beginning on page 2 at line 16, continuing to page 3 at line 4. Clarify whether the last sentence on page 3 at lines 2-4 is intended to mean that (1) a possible future transmission project between the NM Interconnection and the Tennessee Valley Authority systems in Kentucky, constructed by either Authority systems in Kentucky, constructed by either Kentucky Power or KY Transco, will have no direct impact on either Kentucky Power or KY Transco; or (2) because no such project is presently planned and because it has not been determined who would build or own any such facilities, there will be no immediate direct impact on either Kentucky Power or KY Transco Company, Inc. ("AEP").

RESPONSE

The sentence is intended to mean (2), with the minor modifications indicated in strike-through and italics below:

"because no such projects are presently planned and because it has not been determined who would build and own any such new facilities *identified by the study*, there will be no immediate direct impact on either KPCo or KY Transco due to the recent MOU between TVA and AEP."

This point of clarification is needed because this MOU is limited to undertaking transmission planning studies to identify beneficial transmission enhancements along the interface of PJM and the TVA transmission system rather than a proposal for any specific new transmission project.

WITNESS: Lisa M. Barton

KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY

REQUEST

Refer to the Direct Testimony and Exhibits of Gregory G. Pauley ("Pauley Testimony) beginning on page 3 at line 12, continuing to page 4 at line 11.

- a. The reference to the speech by Mr. Michael G. Morris states that "Mr. Morris used Kentucky Power Company as an example of an asset that has had a recent history of under earning" When reviewing the earnings of its assets, describe what time time frame AEP typically considers as "recent history."
- b. Provide, for each year from 2001 through 2010, the earned return on equity for each of the AEP operating companies.

RESPONSE

- a. There is no standard definition of "recent history" employed by AEP when reviewing the earnings of its assets. The time period employed may vary depending on the purpose for which the earnings review is being undertaken, the general economic conditions at the time of the earnings review, or other constraints. Moreover, as the general nature of the term itself suggests, the term "recent history" is not intended to indicate a precise period of time.
- b. Please see Page 2 of this response.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley

KPSC Case No. 2011-00042 Commission Staffs Third Set of Data Requests Order Dated July 14, 2011 Item No. 2 Page 2 of 2

American Electric Power Operating Companies' Per Books Returns on Equity TWELVE MONTHS ENDED

COMPANY	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	<u>2001</u>
Appalachian Power Company	4.88%	5.93%	5.35%	2.60%	9.42%	8.32%	10.86%	21.85%	17.22%	14.24%
Wheeling Power Company	58.63%	62.55%	60.68%	53.14%	24.78%	8.83%	18.92%	33.92%	15.38%	14.67%
Ohio Power Company	9.64%	10.58%	9.37%	12.44%	11.69%	15.13%	14.20%	27,16%	16.43%	12.29%
Columbus Southern Power Company	16.06%	21.09%	19.18%	22.91%	17.84%	14.54%	15.28%	22.98%	21.22%	21.45%
Indiana Michigan Power Company	7.40%	13.71%	9.12%	10.22%	9.42%	12.91%	12.14%	8.10%	6.96%	8.46%
Kentucky Power Company	8.12%	5.75%	6.14%	8.57%	9.73%	6.25%	8.08%	10.68%	6.79%	8.26%
Kingsport Power Company	29.42%	-7.03%	7.24%	13.80%	10.23%	14.13%	12.93%	19.42%	18.05%	14.60%
AEP Texas Central Company	11.22%	14.69%	17.88%	13.81%	4.96%	-14.56%	14.74%	18.69%	25.42%	13.11%
Public Service Company of Oklahoma	8.83%	9.66%	11.13%	-3.91%	6.46%	10.69%	7.79%	11.93%	9.85%	12.16%
Southwestern Electric Power Company	8.90%	8.29%	8.46%	7,49%	11.23%	9.44%	12.31%	14.57%	12.01%	13.04%
AEP Texas North Company	7.92%	5.69%	10.26%	13.79%	4.77%	10.41%	18.17%	28.55%	-5.87%	4.76%

KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY

REQUEST

Refer to Pauley Testimony, page 8 at lines 1-16.

- a. If Kentucky Power and KY Transco were no longer under common ownership at some point in the future, explain whether the Project Selection Guideline process would continue to be viable.
- b. Refer to the statement beginning on line 9 and ending on line 12. Explain whether by "consumers within the Commonwealth" the statement means that, in the event Kentucky Power and KY Transco are not under common ownership, the transmission facilities to be constructed and owned by KY Transco would be intended to provide service to Kentucky Power customers, non-Kentucky Power customers, or both.

RESPONSE

- a. No, the Project Selection Guideline process would no longer be viable. This process is intended to identify which new transmission facilities are eligible to be funded and owned by KY Transco, assuming Commission approval of this application, versus those that would be funded and owned by KPCo. If KPCo and KY Transco were no longer under common ownership, this selection guideline would not be necessary and KY Transco would only have the opportunity to fund and own new transmission facilities to which it had rights under applicable laws and regulations.
- b. Both. Facilities owned by KY Transco will be intended to provide service to KPCo and non-KPCo customers even if KPCo and Transco are under common ownership.

WITNESS: Gregory G Pauley