EXHIBIT JEH-1 KPSC Case Page 2-0074 34 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 11 of 43

-

CONTENTS

.

-

		Page
INTRODUC	rion	i
SECTION]	I - SCHEDULES	
SCHI	EDULE I - DETERMINATION OF RECOMMENDED ANNUAL DEPRECIATION ACCRUAL RATES BY THE REMAINING LIFE METHOD	I-l
SECTION 1	II - DISCUSSION OF METHODS AND PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY	
1)	GROUP METHOD	II-l
2)	CAPITAL RECOVERY METHODS	II-1
3)	METHODS OF LIFE ANALYSIS	II-2
	FORECAST ANALYSIS	II-3
	ACTUARIAL ANALYSIS	II-4
	SIMULATED PLANT RECORD ANALYSIS	II-6
4)	PHYSICAL INSPECTION OF PROPERTY	II-9
5)	FINAL SELECTION OF AVERAGE LIFE AND CURVE TYPE	II-9
6)	NET SALVAGE	II-9
7)	NET SALVAGE FOR PRODUCTION PLANT	II-11
8)	CALCULATION OF DEPRECIATION REQUIREMENT AT DECEMBER 31, 1989	II-12
APPENDIX	A - EXAMPLES OF CALCULATIONS DISCUSSED IN SECT	ION II
INTE	ERIM RETIREMENT ANALYSIS	A-1
ACTU	JARIAL ANALYSIS	A-2
SIMU	JLATED PLANT RECORD ANALYSIS	A-5
NET	SALVAGE ANALYSIS	A-6
CALC	CULATION OF DEPRECIATION REQUIREMENT	A-9

EXHIBIT JEH-1 KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 12 of 43

Introduction

This report presents the results of a depreciation study of Kentucky Power Company's (KP) depreciable electric utility plant in service at December 31, 1989. The study was prepared by James E. Henderson, Administrator of Depreciation Studies and Plant Accounting at American Electric Power Service Corporation. The purpose of this depreciation study was to develop appropriate annual depreciation accrual rates for each of the primary plant accounts which comprise the functional groups for which KP computes its annual depreciation expense.

The recommended depreciation rates are based on the Straight Line Remaining Life Method of computing depreciation. Further explanation of this method is contained in Section II of this report.

Section I of this report contains Schedule I, which shows the recommended depreciation accrual rates by primary plant accounts and composited by the functional groups for which KP computes depreciation accruals and maintains the accumulated book depreciation. A comparison of KP's current functional group composite depreciation rates and accruals to the recommended functional group rates and accruals shown on Schedule I follows:

-i-

KPSC Case No. 2005-0034 AG 2nd Set 395 Requests 34 Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 13 of 43

ANNUAL DEPRECIATION ACCRUALS (\$000)

1.2.5

		Current	Reco	mmended
Functional Group	<u>Rate </u> *	Amount	Rate %	Amount
Steam Production	3.67	\$ 7,220	3.78	\$ 7,430
Transmission	2.07	4,640	1.71	3,830
Distribution	3.64	8,244	3.52	7,979
General	2.66	<u> </u>	2.54	<u> </u>
Total	3.09	\$20,6 55	2.96	\$19,766

Calculations were also made to compare the calculated depreciation requirement to the actual accumulated depreciation on KP's books at December 31, 1989. These calculations indic __d the total accumulated depreciation should be \$207,945,152 whereas KP's books showed \$199,619,331. This reflects a variance of \$8,325,821 or about 4%. This difference is small, less than 6 months accrual, and indicates that the accumulated depreciation is at an appropriate level as of the study date.

Section II contains an explanation of the methods and procedures used in this study. Examples of computations discussed in Section II appear in Appendix A.

-11-

ł.

EXHIBIT JEH-1 KPSC Case Rage05000f1 34 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 14 of 43

Section I Schedule I

KPSC Case AH 2015 1003 2 H-1 AG 2nd Spin 2 a Feory star Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 15 of 43

SCHEDULE I

Schedule I shows the determination of the recommended annual depreciation accrual rate by primary plant accounts by the straight line remaining life method. An explanation of the schedule follows:

Column I - Account number.

Column II - Account title.

Column III - Original Cost at December 31, 1989.

- Column IV Average Life and (Iowa) Curve Type. Fcst. indicates lives were determined using a Life-Span Forecast Analysis.
- Column V Terminal Retirement Date for accounts utilizing Life-Span Forecast Analysis.
- Column VI Net Salvage Ratio.
- Column VII Total to be Recovered (Column III) (Column VI).

Column VIII - Calculated Depreciation Requirement.

- Column IX Allocated Accumulated Depreciation KP's functional group accumulated depreciation (book reserve) spread to each account on the basis of the Calculated Depreciation Requirement shown in Column VIII.
- Column X Remaining to be Recovered (Column VII Column IX).
- Column XI Average Remaining Life.
- Column XII Recommended Annual Accrual Amount (Column X/Column XI).
- Column XIII Recommend Annual Accrual Percent or Depreciation Rate (Column XII/Column III).

I - 1

EENTUCEY PONES COMPANY CALCULATION OF DEPERCIATION BATES BY THE BEMAINING LIFE HETEOD BASED ON PLANT IN SEPTICE AT DECEMBER 31, 1989 AVERAGE LIFE GROUP (ALG) HETEOD ACCOUNT RATES

.

	ACCOUNT	OBIGINAL	LVERAGE LIFE	TERRITAL	KET	TOTAL	CALCOLATED	ALLOCATED	BEKAINING	AVIBAGE	BRCORKEN BRCORKEN	DKD Croal
NO. {[}	title (11)	COST AT 12/31/89 (111)	CUBTE TYPE (17)	EETIRKBENT DATE (Y)	SALVAGE RATIO (VI)	TO BE BECOTEBED (TII)	UXPARCIATION BEQUIBEBERT (VIII)	DEPRECIATION (II)	IU BE RECOVERED (I)		ANOUNT (111)	PRECENT (XIII)
STU	IN PRODUCTION PLANT											
311.0 311.0	Structures & Japrovements - Onit 1 Structures & Improvements - Onit 2	6,480,055 18,472,125	TCST. FCST.	2013 2009	1.22 1.22	7,905,667 22,535,993	4,121,315 11,185,533	J,565,895 9,678,085	4,339,772 12,857,907	23.4 19.3	185,778 667,250	2.87% 3.61%
311.0	Structures & Improvements	24,952,180				30,441,560	15,306,848	13,243,981	17,197,679		853,028	3.421
312.0 312.0	Boller Plant Iguipment - Unit 1 Boller Plant Iguipment - Unit 2	18,821,907 86,737,669	ICST. ICST.	2013 2009	1.22 1.22	22,962,727 105,819,956	11,746,357 49,548,861	10,163,328 42,871,279	12,799,398 62,948,677	22.0 17.8	581,526 3,530,492	3.09% 4.07%
312.0	Boiler Plant Equipment	105,559,576				128,782,683	61,295,218	53,034,608	75,748,075		4,112,019	3.90X
314.0 314.0	Turbogenerator Equip Unit 1 Turbogenerator Equip Unit 2	16,294,658 34,042,698	FCST. FCST.	2013 2009	1.22	19,879,483 41,532,092	9,037,906 20,246,148	7,819,889 17,517,623	12,059,594 24,014,465	22.2 17.8	543,715 1,318,370	3.34X 3.95X
314.D	Turbogenerator Iquipment	50,337,356		•		61,411,574	29,284,054	25,337,512	35,074,06	2	1,692,085	1.761
315.0 315.0	Accessory Electrical Equip Unit 1 Accessory Electrical Equip Unit 2	2,481,884 9,401,515	FCST. FCST.	2013 2009	1.22 1.22	3,027,898 11,469,848	1,522,708 5,481,222	1,317,496 4,742,531	1,710,40 6,727,31	2 23.2 19.1	73,724 351,847	2.97¥ 3.74¥
315.0	Accessory Electrical Equipment	11,883,399				14,497,741	7,003,930	6,060,027	8, (37, 72	0	(25,571	3.581
316.0 316.0	Bisc. Power Plant Equip Unit 1 Bisc. Power Plant Equip Unit 2	1,042,317 2,959,278	FCST. FCST.	2013 2009	1.22 1.22	1,271,621 3,610,319	671,23 1,645,03	580,773 1,423,33 9	690,85 2,186,98	3 22.1 0 18.8	31,232 116,082	3.001 3.921 日本 日本
316.0) Miscellaneous Power Plant Equipment	4,001,595				4,881,940	5 2,316,27	2,004,113	2,877,83	1	1(1,11	1.661 Cas
	Total Steam Production Plant	196,734,106				240,015,60	9 115,206,32	99,680,240	140,335,36	9	7,430,017	EXHIBIT JEH sea Pagenoi - oeff 13 Set Data Requests recember 12, 2005 recember 12, 2005 recember 12, 2005 recember 12, 2005 recember 12, 2005 recember 12, 2005
							. 3					ار ها . ار ها

SCHEDULE I

٠.

.

I-2

7

ERATOCKY POREB COMPANY Calculation of Depriciation bates by the remaining life hethod based on plant in service at december 31, 1989 Avedage life group (ALG) hethod accedal bates

ACCOUNT RECOMMENDED OBICINAL AVEBAGE LIFE TERBINAL BRT TOTAL CALCOLATED ALLOCATED BEXAINING AVERAGE ANNUAL ACCRUAL COST AT AND RETIREMENT SALVAGE DEPRECIATION ACCONDLATED TO BE REMAINING TO BE CORVE TIPE ANOUNT PERCENT XO. TITLE 12/31/89 DATE BATIO RECOVERED BEQUIREMENT DEPERCIATION RECOVERED LITE (111) (1111) (1) (Π) (ΠI) (17) (7) (Π) (711) (7111) (II)(1) (\mathbf{I}) -----.... -----..... TRANSMISSION PLANT 75 R4.0 X.A. 18,343,932 2.123.961 350.2 Bights of Way 18.343.932 1.00 2.955.668 15.388.264 65.1 236.415 1.29% 352.0 Structures & Improvements 4,097,243 55 S1.5 8.1. 1.00 4.097,243 929,029 1,132,816 2,954,127 \$2.5 69,702 1.70% 353.0 Station Equipment 13, 139, 316 50 RO.5 32,579,510 . 5,922,313 7,221,400 25,358,110 10.9 619.851 1.431 N.A. 0.75 Towers & Fixtures Below 138EV 734.914 32 84.0 734.914 403.920 492.522 242.392 11.4 16.821 2.29% 351.0 X.L. 1.00 Towers & Fixtures Above 13817 75,569,462 55 R4.0 1.1. 75.569.462 11,582.836 14.123.584 61.445.878 16.6 1,319,430 1.75% 351.0 1.00 25 \$6.0 12.6 259.842 3.131 Poles & Fixtures Below 138KV 8,302,731 8.1. 1.00 8,302,731 1,131,712 5,041,717 3,251,014 355.0 Poles & Fixtures Above 138KT 4.130.948 45 R3.0 4,130,948 969,355 1,181,987 34.4 85.626 2.071 355.0 1.1. 1.00 2,948,961 185,189 2.06% 356.0 OH Cond. & Devices Below 13817 8,028,919 35 56.0 E.L. 0.98 1,226,021 3,445,607 4.201.417 3.024,610 18.3 355.0 OH Cond. & Devices Above 13889 61,406,717 50 \$3.0 8.4. 0.90 55,266,045 9,628,842 11,740,973 13,525,072 (1.) 1.054.131 1.121 11,590 2.519 298 2.57% 51.0 Underground Conduit 11.590 37 82.0 2,066 9.071 30.4 8.8. 1.00 58.0 Underground Conductor 106.066 44 81.0 N.A. 1.00 106,065 13,099 15,972 90.094 38.6 2.336 2.20% -----. -----..... 39,455,170 224,171,868 206,368,468 48,110,575 158,257,893 3,829,642 1.11 Total Transmission Plant ****** ٠., DISTRIBUTION PLANT ς. 360.2 Bights of Way 2.257.140 75 B4.0 1.1. 1,00 2,257,140 945,495 900,186 1,356,954 (3.6 31.137 1.381 361.0 Structures & Improvements 1,778,665 65 LO.5 X.L. 1.00 1.778.665 253,210 241,016 1,537,589 55.8 27.580 1.55% 20,821,283 25 60.0 15,615,962 4,111,054 635.283 3.05% 362.0 Station Equipment 1.1. 0.75 3,914,047 11,701,915 18.4 364.0 Poles, Towers, & Fixtures 63,822,842 28 LO.0 1.1. 1.00 63, 822, 842 10,653,509 10,142,979 53,679,863 23:3 2.300.894 3.611 365.0 Overhead Conductor & Devices 50.285.231 26 81.5 1.1. 1.75 37,713,923 10,234,024 9,743,597 21,910,321 18.9 1.475.786 587,825 28.3 366.0 0. G. Conduit 157.353 37 82.0 L.A. 1.00 151,353 118,061 169,528 20.771 367.0 0. G. Conductor 1,766,965 (1 81.0 1.00 1,766,966 272.832 259.758 1,507,208 37.2 40,505 ¥.4. 49.415.153 368.0 Line Transformers 25 11.5 8.8. 0.85 42,002,680 11,786,758 11,221,922 30.180.958 18.0 1,711,955 11.4 369.0 Services 13.190.725 18 12.0 1.1. 1.00 13,190,725 1,849.229 4.616.848 8.513.871 153.416 370.0 Beters 15.631.541 27 10.5 ¥.1. 1.00 16.631.541 3.399.360 3,235,458 13.395.083 21.5 623.607 3.813.254 619,759 8.5 11 LO.0 2.139.218 \$90.059 2,149,218 252.552 371.0 Installations on Custs. Prem. 1.1. 0.70 1.823.752 104.547 373.0 Street Lighting & Signal Sys. 15 LO.0 1.1. 0.85 1.550,189 305.015 290,398 1.259.791 12.1 ********* 226,463,905 1,979,035 Total Distribution Plant 199.827.465 47,608,306 45,326,856 154.500.609 *********** ******

SCHIDOLI I

EKNIDCAY POWER COMPANY CALCULATION OF DEPERCIATION BATES BY THE PENAINING LIFE METEOD Based on plant in Sebvice at December 31, 1989 Avebage Life Grodp (ALG) meteod Accedal Rates

•

	ACCOUNT	OBIGINAL	AVERAGE LIPE	TBBNINAL	NET	TOTAL	CALCOLATED	ALLOCATED	BENAINING	LVERAGE	RECOMMENT ARNOAL ACC)KD Chort
¥0. (1)	111L8 (11)	COST AT 12/31/89 (111)	CORVE TIPE (17)	NETIEBREAT DATE (T)	BATIO " (VI)	RECOVERED (¥11)	BEQUIREMENT (YIII)	DEPBECIATION (II)	RECOVERED (I)		TROOKL (111)	PEBCENT (IIII)
GX	NERAL PLANT				•							
389.2 390.0 391.0 392.0 393.0 394.0 395.0 397.0 398.0	Fights of May Structures & Improvements Office Formiture & Equipment Office Trans. Equip. Other Stores Equipment Tools Shop & Garage Equipment Laboratory Equipment Communication Equipment Miscellaneous Equipment	31,964 14,953,539 1,003,832 67,171 167,954 541,771 446,407 3,009,874 498,397	75 84.0 45 13.0 35 80.5 30 83.0 30 81.0 30 80.5 30 15.0 22 13.0 20 55.0	N.A. N.A. N.A. N.A. N.A. N.A. N.A. N.A.	1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	31,964 14,953,539 903,449 67,171 187,954 541,771 446,407 3,009,874 498,397	3,018 3,844,462 219,586 29,745 44,519 110,850 144,397 1,078,317 199,861	3,458 4,404,663 251,583 34,079 51,008 127,003 185,438 1,235,445 228,984	28,506 10,548,876 651,866 33,092 116,848 414,768 280,969 1,774,429 269,413	67.9 33.4 26.5 16.7 27.1 23.8 20.3 14.1 12.0	420 315,551 24,608 1,979 5,304 17,383 13,841 125,888 22,489	1.313 2.111 2.451 2.053 3.163 3.213 3.103 4.183 4.513
	Total General Plant	20,720,909			r ••	20,620,526	5,674,755	6,501,660	14,118,866		527,242	2.54%
	Total Depreciable Plant	668,090,788			:	666,832,068	207,945,152	199,619,331	467,212,737		19,765,937	2.961

SCHEDOLE I

.

EXHIBIT JEH-1 KPSC CasePage 0000067 34 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 19 of 43

SECTION II

DISCUSSION OF METHODS

AND PROCEDURES USED IN THE STUDY

EXHIBIT JEH-1 KPSC Case-NG 2400-0044134 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 20 of 43

STUDY METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Group Method

All of the depreciable property included in this report was considered on a group plan. Under the group plan, depreciation expense is accrued upon the basis of the original cost of all property included in each depreciable plant account. Upon retirement of any depreciable property, its full cost, less any net salvage realized, is charged to accrued depreciation reserve regardless of the age of the particular item retired. Also, under this plan, the dollars in each primary plant account are considered as a separate group for depreciation accounting purposes and an annual depreciation rate for each account is determined. The annual accruals were then summed, to arrive at the total accrual for each functional group. The total accrual divided by the original cost yields the functional group accrual rate.

Capital Recovery Methods

There are two generally accepted methods that are usually used to develop straight line depreciation accrual rates. The average service life method recovers the original cost of the plant, adjusted for net salvage, over the average service of the investment. The basic assumptions used in determining depreciation rates by the Average Service Life method are: 1) the property will be retired over a specified average life and 2) the future amount

of net salvage is known. One major shortcoming of the Average Service Life method is that it does not provide a mechanism to adjust the accumulated depreciation when changes occur in the average service life or net salvage.

The Remaining Life method compensates for this shortcoming by recovering the original cost of the plant, adjusted for net salvage, less the accumulated depreciation, over the average remaining life of the plant. By this method, the annual depreciation rate for each account is determined on the following basis:

Annual

Depreciation Expense =

(Orig. Cost) (Net Salvage Ratio) - Accumulated Depreciation Average Remaining Life

Annual Depreciation = <u>Annual Depreciation Expense</u> Rate Original Cost

Because the Remaining Life method provides a method to adjust the accumulated depreciation when changes occur in the estimates of service life and net salvage for depreciable property groups, it is recommended that the depreciation rates be determined by the Straight Line Remaining Life Method.

Methods of Life Analysis

Depending upon the type of property and the nature of the data available from the property accounting records, one of three

analysis methods was used to arrive at the historically realized mortality characteristics and service lives of the depreciable plant investments. These methods are identified and described as follows:

Forecast Analysis

The life-span forecast analysis was employed for production plant. KP's investment in production plant is the Big Sandy Generating Station which is located on the Big Sandy River near Louisa, Kentucky and consists of Unit One with a nameplate capacity of 260,000 KW and Unit Two with a nameplate capacity of 800,000 KW. Units One and Two were placed in service in 1963 and 1969, respectively. The life-span method of analysis is particularly suited to specific locations property, such as Big Sandy Plant, where all of the surviving investments are likely to be retired in total at a future date.

The key elements in the life-span forecast analysis are the aged surviving investments, the projected deactivation date of the facility and the expected interim retirements. Interim retirements are those that are expected to occur between the date of the depreciation study and the expected final deactivation date. Examples of interim retirements include fans, pumps, motors, a set of boiler tubes, a turbine rotor, etc.

The aged surviving investments were obtained from KP's property records. The deactivation dates used in the life-span forecast

analysis were 2013 for Unit One and 2009 for Unit Two. The deactivation dates were provided by American Electric Power Service Corporation, System Planning Department. The interim retirement history for each unit was analyzed by primary plant account. The results of those analyses were used to project future interim retirements. An example of the interim retirement analysis for Account 312.0, Boiler Plant Equipment, for Unit One is shown in the Appendix on Page <u>A-1</u>.

Actuarial Analysis

This method of analyzing past experience represents the application to industrial property of statistical procedures developed in the life insurance field for investigating human mortality. It is distinguished from other methods of life estimation by the requirement that it is necessary to know the age of the property at the time of its retirement and the age of survivors, or plant remaining in service; that is, the installation date must be known for each particular retirement and for each particular survivor.

The application of this method involves the statistical procedure known as the "annual rate method" of analysis. This procedure relates the retirements during each age interval to the exposures at the beginning of that interval, the ratio of these being the annual retirement ratio. Subtracting each retirement ratio from unity yields a sequence of annual survival ratios from which a survivor curve can be determined. This is accomplished by the

EXHIBIT JEH-1 KPSC Caseptor 2005 6034# 34 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 24 of 43

consecutive multiplication of the survivor ratios. The length of this curve depends primarily upon the age of the oldest property. Normally, if the period of years from the inception of the account to the time of study is short in relation to the expected maximum life of the property, an incomplete or stub survivor curve results.

While there are a number of acceptable methods of smoothing and extending this stub survivor curve in order to compute the area under it from which the average life is determined, the well-known Iowa Type Curve Method was used in this study.

By this procedure instead of mathematically smoothing and projecting the stub survivor curve to determine the average life of the group, it was assumed that the stub curve would have the same mortality characteristics as the type curve selected. The selection of the appropriate type curve and average life is accomplished by plotting the stub curve, superimposing on it Iowa curves of the various types and average lives drawn to the same scale, and then determining which Iowa type curve and average life best matches the stub.

An example of the calculations involved in the Actuarial Method of Life Analysis is shown in the Appendix on Pages A-2 through A-4 for Account 353.0 - Transmission Station Equipment. Pages A-2 and A-3 show the computation of the actual survivor curve for the experience band 1950-1989 inclusive based on historical data

supplied by KP. The actual survivor curve for the 1950-1989 period is plotted and matched on Page A-4, as explained above. This method was used for the following accounts:

350.2 Transmission-Rights of Way 352.0 Structures and Improvements 353.0 Station Equipment 354.0 Towers and Fixtures 138KV and Above 355.0 Poles and Fixtures 138KV and Above 356.0 OH Conductor and Devices 138KV and Above 360.2 Distribution - Rights of Way 361.0 Structures and Improvements 362.0 Station Equipment 390.0 General - Structures and Improvements

Simulated Plant Record Analysis

The "Simulated Plant Record" (SPR) method designates a class of statistical techniques that provide an estimate of the age distribution, mortality dispersion and average service life of property accounts whose recorded history provides no indication of the age of the property units when retired from service. For each such account, the available property records usually reveal only the annual gross additions, annual retirements and balances with no indication of the age of either plant retirements or annual plant balances. For this study, the "Balances Method" of analysis was used.

EXHIBIT JEH-1 KPSC Case No 2007-067-134 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 26 of 43

The SPR Balance's Method is a trial and error procedure that attempts to duplicate the annual balance of a plant account by distributing the actual annual gross additions over time according to an assumed mortality distribution. Specifically, the dollars remaining in service at any date are estimated by multiplying each year's additions by the successive proportion surviving at each age as given by the assumed survivor characteristics. For a given year, the balance indicated is the accumulation of survivors from all vintages and this is compared with the actual book balance. This process is repeated for different survivor curves and average life combinations until a pattern is discovered which produces a series of "simulated balances" most nearly equalling the actual balances shown in a company's books.

This determination is based on the distribution producing the minimum sum of squared differences between the simulated balance and the actual balances over a test period of years.

The iterative nature of the simulated methods makes them ideally suited for computerized analysis. For each analysis of a given property account, the computer program provides a single page summary containing the results of each analysis indicating the "best fit" based on criteria selected by the user.

The results of such and analysis by the Balance Method is shown for Account 368 - Line Transformers on page A-5 in the Appendix. In

EXHIBIT JEH-1 Page 18 of 34 KPSC Case No: 2005-00341 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 27 of 43

the case of the Balances Method each curve type tested is shown along with the average service life which produced the minimum sum of squared differences from the actual balances. The analysis also shows the value of the Index of Variation of the deference which is calculated according to the following equation for the Balances Method:

The lower the value of the Index the better the agreement with the actual data. The best fit is marked with a dash on the output. The SPR Method of Life Analysis was utilized for the following accounts:

354.0 Transmission - Towers and Fixtures Below 138 KV 355.0 Poles and Fixtures Below 138 KV 356.0 OH Conductor and Devices - Below 138 KV 364.0 Distribution - Poles, Towers and Fixtures 365.0 OH Conductor and Devices 366.0 Underground Conduit 367.0 Underground Conductor and Devices 368.0 Line Transformers 369.0 Services 370.0 Meters

.

371.0 Installations on Customers Premises

373.0 Street Lighting and Signal Systems

391.0 Office Furniture and Equipment

392.0 Transportation Equipment - Other

393.0 Stores Equipment

394.0 Tools, Shop and Garage Equipment

395.0 Laboratory Equipment

397.0 Communication Equipment

398.0 Miscellaneous Equipment

Physical Inspection of Property

On November 27, 1990, we visited the Big Sandy Generating Station and viewed other facilities including Baker substation to observe housekeeping, maintenance and construction practices in order to be familiar with the equipment and the environment in which it functions.

Final Selection of Average Life and Curve Type

The final selection of average life and curve type for each depreciable plant account analyzed by the Actuarial and Simulating Methods was primarily based on the results of the mortality analyses of past retirement history.

Net Salvage

The net salvage percentages used in this report are expressed as percent of original cost and are based primarily on the Company's experience. KP maintains salvage and removal costs at the

EXHIBIT JEH-1 Page 20 of 34 KPSC Case NO: 2005-00341 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 29 of 43

functional plant level, rather than by primary plant accounts. To aid in the selection, a review was made of the Company's experience for each plant function with respect to salvage and removal costs for the period 1954 to 1989. A sample of the type of salvage analysis made appears in Appendix A on Pages A-6 through A -8 for the Distribution Plant function. The salvage program analyzes historical experience on an annual basis, on the cumulative history basis and for 5-year moving averages to get the historical net salvage, as well as indicated trends. In order to determine a net salvage percent for the individual plant accounts, the original cost retirements were detailed by account for the period 1975-1989 and, based on judgement, a net salvage percentage was selected for each account.

The net salvage percents selected were converted to net salvage ratios and appear in Column VI on Schedule I and were used to determine the total amount to be recovered through depreciation. The same net salvage was also reflected in the determination of the calculated depreciation requirement, which was used to allocate the accumulated depreciation at the functional group to the accounts comprising each group.

The net salvage ratios shown in Column VI on Schedule I in Section I of this report may be explained as follows:

1. Where the ratio is shown as unity (1.00), it was assumed that

the net salvage in that particular account would be zero.

- 2. Where the ratio is less than unity, it was assumed that the salvage exceeded the removal costs. For example, if the net salvage were 20 percent, the net salvage ratio would be expressed as .80.
- 3. Where the ratio is greater than unity, it was assumed that the salvage was less than the cost of removal. For example, if the net salvage were minus 5 percent, the net salvage ratio would be expressed as 1.05.

Net Salvage for Steam Production Plants

While the analyses described above would be applicable to the interim retirements for production plants, the most significant net salvage realization for generating plants (units) occurs at the end of their life. Therefore, to assist in establishing the net salvage applicable to KP's steam generating plant, KP had a detailed cost of removal study made by the engineering firm Sargent and Lundy (S&L). S&L estimated the probable net cost to demolish each plant based on the current price level. The S&L cost estimate indicates that the demolition costs are labor intensive. We recommend that KP adjust the estimated cost of removal in future depreciation studies to reflect changes in price level. This will enable KP to recover the estimated actual removal costs that can

reasonably be expected to be incurred at the time Big Sandy plant is retired.

Calculation of Depreciation Requirement at December 31, 1989 KP maintains the accumulated depreciation by functional plant group as required by the FERC Uniform System of Accounts. Therefore, it was necessary to allocate the functional accumulated depreciation to the individual plant accounts to complete the accrual rate calculation. The allocation was based on the calculation of a depreciation requirement (theoretical reserve) for each plant account using the average service life and curve type recommended in this study. An example of the calculation of the depreciation requirement at December 31, 1989 for Account 353 - Transmission Station Equipment, is shown on Pages A-9 and A-10 in Appendix A.

That sample printout is explained in detail as follows:

- Column I Age of each year's installation at December 31, 1989 based on the conventional procedure that all property installed in any year is assumed to be installed at the midpoint of that year.
- Column II Year of installation of the surviving dollars shown in Column III.
- Column III The original cost at December 31, 1989 by year installed, as supplied directly from Company records.

- Column IV The Average Remaining Life of each vintage of ^{Page 32 of 43} Original Cost at the various ages indicated in Column I.
- Column V Depreciation Reserve Ratio based on the Life and Dispersion (Iowa Curve) shown in Column IV heading.
- Column VI Theoretical Reserve is the product of Column III times Column V for each year.

The effect of any estimated net salvage, as indicated on page A-10, is provided by adjusting the subtotal rather than have each vintage of original cost appearing in Column III reflect such salvage.

The Average Remaining Life, also shown, is the result of the weighting of the dollars of each age.

EXHIBIT JEH-1 KPSC Case Rage024030f 34 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 33 of 43

Appendix A

Examples of Calculations Discussed In Section II Interim Retirement Analysis

Actuarial Analysis

Simulated Plant Record Analysis

Net Salvage Analysis

Calculation of Depreciation Requirement

EXHIBIT JEH-1 Page 25 of 34 KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 A-1 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 34 of 43

KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY CALCULATION OF INTERIM RETIREMENT RATIOS BIG SANDY GENERATING STATION UNIT #1 ACCOUNT 312.0 BOILER PLANT EQUIPMENT

	YEAR	ADDITIONS	RETIREMENTS	BALANCE	AVERAGE BALANCE	RETIREMENT RATIO
	1963	16 508 970	0	16.508.970	N. A.	N. A.
	1964	119.842	3.093	16,620,719	16,564,845	0.0005
	1965	33.135	7,505	16,646,349	16,633,534	0.0005
	1966	176,256	19,803	16,802,802	16,724,576	0.0012
	1967	7,026	3,196	16,806,632	16,804,717	0.0902
	1968	39,011	127,966	16,717,677	16,762,155	0.0076
	1969	2,096	5,000	16,714,773	16,716,225	0.0003
	1970	960,242	569,493	17,105,522	16,910,148	0.0337
	1971	20,599	7,136	17,118,985	17,112,254	0.0004
	1972	12,074	12,000	17,119,059	17,119,022	0.0007
	1973	2,546	5,700	17,115,905	17,117,482	0.0003
n	1974	4,167	126,850	16,993,222	17,054,564	0.0074
	1975	382	5,683	16,987,921	16,990,572	0.0003
	1976	60,093	· 0	17,048,014	17,017,968	0.0000
	1977	689,813	215,065	17,522,762	17,285,388	0.0124
	1978	81,885	119,379	17,485,268	17,504,015	0.0068
	1979	60,521	379	17,545,410	17,515,339	0.0000
	1980	14,685	62,704	17,497,391	17,521,401	0.0036
	1981	89,615	318,487	17,268,519	17,382,955	0.0183
	1982	208,013	16,842	17,459,690	17,364,105	0.0010
	1983	0	6,754	17,452,936	17,456,313	0.0004
	1984	207,517	77,996	17,582,457	17,517,697	0.0045
	1985	548,169	17,686	18,112,940	17,847,699	0.0010
	1986	554,796	212,823	18,454,913	18,283,927	0.0116
	1987	179,327	78,768	18,555,472	18,505,193	0.0043
	1988	137,220	19,359	18,673,333	18,614,403	0.0010
	1989	194,155	45,581	18,821,907	18,747,620	0.0624
TOTAL :	1968-1989	4,066,926	2,051,651	385,354,076	384,346,439	0.1182
AVERAGI	E INTERIM	RATE = 0.118	2	2 0054		
		22	Ξ.	0.0054		

FUTURE ANNUAL INTERIM RETIREMENTS = 18,821,907 * 0.0054

101,633

EXHIBIT JEH-1

DEPRECIATION SYSPERI December 127005 RELEASE

Page 35 of 43

DELOITTE HASKINS & SELLS

STUDY AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1989

**** KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY **** ACCOUNT NO.: 35300000

1950 THRU 1989 BAND ANALYSIS SURVIVOR REPORT

AGE	RETIREMENTS	EXPOSURES *	ANNUAL SURVIVORS	CUMULATIVE % SURVIVORS
0.50	85384.	47795798.	99.82	99.82
1.50	124128.	46770563.	99.73	99.56
2.50	164148.	46177414.	99.64	99.20
3.50	663567.	45128700.	. 98.53	97.74
4.50	166590.	43378492.	99.62	97.37
5,50	389781.	41783167.	99.07	96.46
6.50	87653.	41420690.	99.79	96.26
7.50	454579.	40323548.	98.87	95.17
8.50	934988.	40171236.	97.67	92.96
9.50	339612.	38688633.	99.12	92.14
10.50	165754.	22809318.	99.27	91.47
11.50	286107.	21758943.	98.69	90.27
12.50	239179.	21599311.	98.89	89.27
13.50	152052.	20330849.	99.25	88.60
14.50	121464.	19912025.	99.39	88.06
15.50	157036.	19801288.	99.21	87.36
16.50	225197.	19647103.	98.85	86.36
17.50	33783.	19407908.	99.83	86.21
18.50	86261.	19001265.	99.55	85.82
19.50	254107.	18512958.	98.63	84.64
20.50	634015.	18063094.	96.49	81.67
21.50	29937.	7694907.	99.61	81.35
22.50	28296.	7155196.	99.60	81.03
23.50	116468.	6889829.	98.31	79.66
24.50	140673.	6550338.	97.85	77.95
25.50	46497.	5937298.	99.22	77.34
26.50	11929.	5553437.	99.79	77.17
27.50	69537.	4583786.	98.48	76.00
28.50	37592.	4139021.	99.09	75.31
29.50	166512.	3912958.	95.74	72.11
30.50	48748.	3711018.	98.69	71.16
31.50	34134.	3553118.	99.04	70.48
32.50	46759.	3416574.	98.63	69.51
33.50	144209.	3363453.	95.71	66.53
34.50	7829.	3162746.	99.75	66.37
35.50	· 3112.	3046997.	99.90	66.30

10-23-1:

PAGE

EXHIBIT JEH-1 Page 27 of 34

ye Lr UI 34 A-3

KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 AG 2nd Set Data Requests DEFRECIATION SYSCAL December 46, 2005 RELEASE

Page 36 of 43

DELOITTE HASKINS & SELLS

STUDY AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1989

**** KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY **** ACCOUNT NO.: 35300000

1950 THRU 1989 BAND ANALYSIS SURVIVOR REPORT

			ANNUAL	CUMULATIVE
AGE	RETIREMENTS	EXPOSURES %	SURVIVORS %	SURVIVORS
36.50	25729.	3033563.	99,15	65.74
37.50	23997.	2913798.	99.18	65.20
38.50	1987.	2378568.	99.92	65.14
39.50	1130.	2131863.	99.95	65.11
40.50	19212.	2120705.	99.09	64.52
41.50	5625.	1999343.	99.72	64.34
42.50	706.	1954434.	99.96	64.31
43.50	84069.	1950108.	95.69	61.54
44.50	86535.	1823282.	95.25	58.62
45.50	240935.	1534841.	84.30	49.42
46.50	287.	1215711.	99.98	49.41
47.50	0.	1206809.	100.00	49.41
48.50	0.	942806.	100.00	49.41
49.50	Ο.	911701.	100.00	49.41
50.50	0.	888445.	100.00	49.41
51.50	54.	856052.	99.99	49.40
52.50	0.	822605.	100.00	49.40
53.50	0.	666113.	100.00	49.40
54.50	0.	602832.	100.00	49.40
55.50	0.	592105.	100.00	49.40
56.50	6860.	589121.	98.84	48.83
57.50	134.	582261.	99.98	48.82
58.50	0.	575141.	100.00	48.82
59.50	13553.	575141.	97.64	47.67
50.50	0.	136693.	100.00	47.67
				•

TOTAL 7208430.

REALIZED LIFE = 43.94 YEARS

10-23-1

PAGE



ENMMANS INBORED

A-4

ţ

KP

EXHIBIT JEH-1 Page 29 of 34 KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 AG 2nd Set Data Requests

DEPRECIATION STOLEN - HEMANNOL 40 TELEASE 5.) Page 38 of 43

PAGE 1

DELDITTE HASKINS & BELLS

STUDY AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1989

· 22

TITE KENTLEKY POWER COMPANY TITE

2-15-1990

SINULATED PLANT BALANCE METHOD OF LIFE ANALYSIS FOR ACCOUNT 36800000

USING BALANCEE PERIOD EGUAL TO LAST 40 YEARS

AVERAGE LIFE AT WHICH BOOK BALS EDUAL SIMULATED BALS AT END OF MORT INDEX-OF VARIATION FOR ANALYSIS OF DATA ENDING IN 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1956 1967 1963 1967 1965 1965 1961 1962 1963 1984 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969

35.4 34.9 34.5 34.0 33.7 33.5 33.3 33.1 77.4 77.6 25-30.6 30.3 30.1 27.8 29.7 29.5 29.5 29.4 29.4 29.4 S-15 26.8 25.8 25.8 26.8 27.9 26.9 27.7 27.5 27.3 27.1 25.4 25.4 25.4 25.6 25.5 25.5 80.5 26.2 26.0 25.7 25.7 24.2 24.9 24.8 24.5 24.5 24.4 24.3 24.0 24.2 24.2 23.5 23.5 23.4 24.0 23.9 23.8 23.7 23.5 23.6 23.5 \$1.5 23.2 23.2 23.1 23.0 23.0 22.9 22.9 22.5 12.3 22.8 22.5 22.5 22.5 22.4 22.3 22.2 22.2 22.1 22.1 22.0 AGE. 21.6 21.5 22.0 22.0 22.0 21.9 21.8 21.8 21.7 2i.j S4 21.5 21.4 21.3 21.2 21.5 21.5 21.8 21.8 21.7 21.7 21.6 21.6 21.6 21.5 21.5 21.4 21.3 21.3 21.2 21.1 34.1 33.7 33.4 33.0 32.7 32.5 32.4 32.3 32.3 32.2 30.8 30.5 30.3 30.0 29.9 29.7 29.6 29.6 29.6 29.3 L0.5 28.5 28.3 28.1 27.8 27.7 27.6 27.5 27.4 27.4 27.4 £1 24ċ 26.9 26.7 26.5 26.3 26.2 26.1 26.0 25.9 25.7 25.9 L1.5 25.4 25.3 25.1 25.0 24.8 24.7 24.6 24.5 24.6 24.5 L3 23.5 23.4 23.3 23.2 23.1 23.0 23.0 22.9 22.9 22.8 22.4 22.4 22.4 22.3 22.2 22.1 22.1 27.0 21.9 21.9 L4 22.0 22.0 21.9 21.8 21.8 21.7 21.8 21.5 21.5 21.4 1.5 30.9 30.5 30.4 30.1 30.0 29.9 29.8 29.7 29.7 29.7 20.5 28.1 27.9 27.8 27.6 27.5 27.4 27.3 27.3 27.3 27.3 R1 -208 -226 -175 26.3 26.2 26.1 25.9 25.8 25.8 25.7 25.7 25.7 25.7 -:"] R1.5 -242 -236 -225 -211 -198 -134 24.8 24.7 24.6 24.5 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.3 24.4 24.4 R2 23.7 23.3 23.7 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.4 23.4 23.4 23.4 R2.5 23.0 22.9 22.9 22.8 22.8 22.7 22.7 22.7 22.5 22.6 R3 ----22.3 22.2 22.2 22.1 22.1 22.0 22.0 21.9 21.9 21.8 R4 21.8 21.8 21.8 21.7 21.7 21.6 21.5 21.4 21.4 21.3 R5

THE INDEX OF VARIATION IS MULTIPLIED BY 10 TO OSTAIN A HIGHER LEVEL OF RANKING PRECISION

DELOITTE HASKINS & SELLS.

STUDY AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1989

EXHIBIT JEH-1 Page 30 of 34 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 39 of 43

KENTUCKY PONER COMPANY ACCOUNT NO.: 10860000 DISTRIBUTION PLANT

			REIMBURS	EMENTS	SAL	VAGE	COST OF	REMOVAL	NET S	ALVAGE
YEAR	ADDITIONS	RETIREMENTS	AMOUNT	RATIO	AMDUNT	RATIO	AMOUNT	RATID	W/REIMB.	W/O REINB.
1954	0.	345614.	J.	0.7	154293.	43.7	<u>56201.</u>	19.2	28.7	28.7
1955	0.	329795.	5.	0.1	163818.	50.1	58760.	21.1	29.I	29.1
1956	0.	340400.) .	9.4	175639.	57.1	31544.	24.1	28.2	28.2
1957	0.	560530.	0.	0.7	243234.	43.Z	141931.	25.7	18.7	18.7
1958	0.	505375.	0.	9.%	206808.	41.Z	144792	29 . Z	12.7	12.1
1959	0.	624939.	э.	0.7	259031.	41.Z	152087.	24.7	17.1	17.7
1960	0.	472849.	9.	0.7	271181.	55.Z	161636.	33.I	22.1	22.7
1961	0.	819969.	9.	0.7	381111.	46.7	170331.	21.7	26.I	26.7
1962	0.	558194.	0.	0.7	2993B8.	54.2	192682.	35.1	19.2	19.2
1963	0.	706977.	0.	0.2	279116.	39.2	194420.	28.7	12.I	12.2
1964	0.	773027.	0.	0.2	30466B.	39.1	189822.	25.7	15.Z	15.2
1965	0.	1012221.	0.	0.1	374123.	37.2	239135.	24.2	13.2	13.7
1966	0.	1071099.	0.	0.1	450349.	42.1	285103.	27.1	15.7	15.2
1967	Û.	1463163.	0.	0.Z	413889.	28.1	342901.	23.I	5.7	5.7
1968	0.	1330710.	0.	0.2	670448.	50.Z	479783.	36.Z	14.7 .	14.Z
1969	Û.	1560135.	0.	0.1	646533.	41.Z	347617.	22.7	19.7	17.1
1970	0.	1143715.	0.	0.1	400222.	35.I	357897.	31.Z	4.7	4.7
1971	0.	1315603.	0,	0.7	543957.	41.7	401721.	31.7	11.7	11.7
1977	0.	1475429.	0.	0.7	752589.	51.2	490837.	33.7	18.7	18.7
1973	0.	1773250.	0.	0.7	703812.	40.Z	491738.	28.7	12.7	12.1
1974	N	1273997	9.	0.7	921165.	72.7	527796.	41.7	31.7	31.Z
1975	ð.	1413889.	. 0.	0.7	633350.	45.Z	485488.	34.Z	10.Z	10.7
1976	0.	1770503	0.	0.7	905056.	51.7	680443.	38.7	13.7	13.7
1977	0	1790525	0.	0.7	1032217.	58.7	728730.	52.X	6.7	6.7
1979	0.	2839810	0.	0.7	1677814.	57.7	952797.	34.7	24.1	24.7
1970	· · ·	22370105	v. A	0.7	1748971	58.7	1048294	44.7	13.7	13.7
17/7	0	2017070	v. n	6.7	1455974	47.7	1423814	46.7	1.7	1.7
1780	۰. ۵	1107701	0	0.7	1827720	47.7	1737741	39.1	3.7	3.7
1701	V. A	7772340.	v. A	v ۸ 7	1584478	12 1	1507077	59.7	3.1	77
1007	v. o	2JJ2J07. 70177A4	ν. Λ	0.7	15404702	40 7	1361570	75.7	5.7	5.7
1703	· ·	271774012	v. A	0.7	1975047	56.7	1444490	44 7	_R 7	-9.7
1704	.	7700014	v. ^	0.7	1077746	TO T	1715547	70 9	-9.7	-9 7
1783	v.	3370814.	v. A	0.7	1703014	JV . M	1014704	44 7	4.4 	-T 7
1780	v.	9 <u>121</u> 921.	V. A	V 4 4 A 4	1703714.	71.5 AL 9	1617277.	77+M 77 4	17 7	17.7
1787	V.	JV82887.	v. c	0.7	2371308.	70.4	1001070	JJ+4 77 7	1014	77
1788	, V.	JV7267J.	v. ^	0.1	20071784	37±4 70 4	10010/7.	3/14 7/ 4	57 7	57 7
1787	Q.	7285672.	V.	0.2	_3/2/203.		1888777.	20.2	JJ.4	JJ. L
	0.	70931308.	0.	0.2	34763996.	49.2	25702580.	36.7	13.7	13.7
ROLLING BAND					• •	-				
1954-1958	0.	2081714.	0.	o.z	953792.	46.2	503728.	24.2	22.I	22.1

A-6

DELDITTE HASKINS & SELLS

STUDY AS OF DECEMBER 31. 1989

KENTUCKY POWER COMPANY ACCOUNT NO.: 10860000 DISTRIBUTION PLANT

EXHIBIT JEH-1 Page 31 of 34 APSC Case No. 2005-00341 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 40 of 43

			REIMBURS	EMENTS	SALV	/AGE	COST OF	REMOVAL	NET S	ALVAGE
YEAR	ADDITIONS	RETIREMENTS	AMOUNT	RATID	ANOUNT	RATIO	ANDUNT	RATIO	W/REIMB.	W/O REIMB.
1955-1959	0.	2361039.	J.	0.7	1048530.	44.7	589614.	25.1	19.7	:9.2
1956-1960	0.	2524093.	٥.	0.7	1155893.	46.2	682290.	27.1	19.7	19.Z
1957-1961	0.	3003662.	0.	0.7	1361365.	45.Z	770777.	26.7	20.X	20.1
1958-1962	0.	3001328.	9.	0.1	1417519.	47.1	821528.	· 27.1	20.1	20.1
1959-1963	0.	3202930.	0.	0.1	1469827.	47.7	871156.	27.1	19.7	17.%
1960-1964	0.	3351018.	0.	0.2	1535464.	46.1	908891.	27.1	19.7	19.7
1961-1965	0.	3870390.	0.	0.1	1638406.	42.1	786370 .	25.7	17.1	17.7
1962-1966	0.	4121520.	0.	0.2	1707644.	41.1	1101162.	27.1	15.Z	15.1
1963-1967	0.	5026487.	0.	0.7	1822145.	36.2	1251381.	25.1	11.7	11.7
1964-1968	0.	5650220.	0.	0.Z	2213477.	39.Z	1536744.	27.1	12.7	12.1
1965-1969	0.	6437328.	0.	0.Z	2555342.	40.Z	1694539.	26.7	13.7	13.7
1966-1970	0.	6568822.	0.	0.7	2581441.	39.1	1813301.	28.7	12.7	12.1
1967-1971	0.	6813326.	٥.	0.1	2675049.	39.Z	1929919.	28.7	11.7	11.7
1968-1972	0.	6825592.	0.	0.7	3013749.	44.I	2077855.	30.Z	14.Z	14.7
1969-1973	0.	7268132.	0.	0.7	3047113.	42.7	2087810.	29.1	13.7	13.7
1970-1974	0.	6981994.	0.	Q.Z	3321745.	48.Z	2269989.	33 . 1	15.7	15.Z
1971-1975	0.	7252168.	٥.	Q.Z	3554873.	49.1	2397580.	33 . Z	16.7	16.7
1972-1976	0.	7707068.	0.	0.7	3915972.	51.I	2676302.	35.2	16.7	16.7
1973-1977	0.	8022164.	0.	0.7	4195600.	52.X	3114195.	39.I	13.7	13.7
1974-1978	0.	9088724.	0.	0.7	5114602.	56.I	3575254.	39.7	17.I	17.7
1975-1979	0.	10194422.	0.	0,7	5562368.	55.2	4095752.	40.7	14.2	14.7
1976-1980	0.	11848419.	0.	0.7	6384944.	54.7	5034078.	42.7	11.7	11.7
1977-1981	0.	14570222.	0.	0.7	7363270.	51.X	6090876.	42.7	9.7	9.1
1978-1982	0.	15332281.	0.	0.7	7917531.	52.7	6665169.	43.2	8.7	8.7
1979-1983	0.	16410175.	0.	0.Z	7855149.	48.2	7073942.	43.2	5.Z	5.2
1980-1984	. 0.	16305422.	0.	0.Z	7761265.	48.1	7490128.	46.1	2.7	2.1
1981-1985	0.	16628350.	0.	0.7	7338585.	44.7	7381861.	44.7	0.1	0.7
1982-1986	· 0.	16258465.	0.	0.7	7159117.	44.7	7458914.	46.7	-2.7	-2.7
1983-1987	0.	18768750.	0.	0.7	7914007.	42.7	7642638-	41.7	1.7	1.7
1984-1988	- 0.	19943741.	0.	0.7	8362773.	42.7	8162947.	41.7	1.7	1.7
1985-1989	0.	24954471	0.	0.Z	12814989	51.7	8587466	34.7	17.7	17.2

A-7

i

EXHIBIT JEH-1 Page 32KPSE 34 No. 2005-00341 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 41 of 43

:

1

					let [renenli			-						
Terr	361	362	364	365	366	367	366	369	110	11¢	513	Total	Saltafe	Yelghled
1975	1 112	115.275	258.071	230.227	•	1.477	253.630	166. (57	105.836	61.832	16.546	1.428.790	2	14.288
1976	E	(82.265	326.967	302.693	138	2,083	265.974	116.814	111.211	66,077	1.117	1,114,396	2	13,067
1151	-	252.200	376.298	369.728	-	3,175	312.212	177.138	249,384	58, (98	15,865	1,816,198	-07	10,899
1161	1.16	600.488	541.825	(12.645	216	115	627,160	201,569	174,912	67,643	26,008	2, 715, 785	ž	65, 179
1919	(66)	203.011	618, 797	516,238	-	8,720	111,111	322,670	196,583	61,903	11,100	2,402,240	=	31,229
1980	5. (82	(89.660	111.013	532,297	13,358	18,792	101,768	216,061	211,875	111,552	31,156	3,067,016		3,067
1861	11.139	961.140	1.253.167	876,800	E	6,681	1, 160, 266	116,185	261,646	124,056	53,310	4,989,653	~	14,969
1982	•	196,085	635,766	452,557	•	5,334	667,258	166,004	246,786	102,664	41,115	2,519,249	•••	7,558
1961	(89	128,249	768,785	598,823	18	8,742	616, 657	319,764	279,281	156,108	28,192	3,105,408	~	15,527
1981	15.027	253.706	608.923	517,838	3,998	1.761	509,740	304,542	385, 107	152,915	13,841	3,007,400	÷	(21,059)
5861	159	376, 843	937,730	519.259	5,819	5,614	640,462	201,524	388, 485	181,064	37,932	3, 378, 091	ę	[27,025]
1986	2.048	199.948	1.438.007	919,744	636	8,069	714.994	304,674	350,900	195,928	40, 399	4,175,807	?	(12,527)
1981	4.659	331.975	1.607.747	1.004.247	6,368	20, 306	784,243	129,089	373,822	121,123	13,264	5,057,443	=	65,147
1988	3.211	151.011	1.966.798	1.118.110	112	12.291	601.150	392,321	199, 199	257,746	110.010	5,023,957	~	15,072
1989	6,295	259,802	3,823,950	833,036	3, 823	8,169	1,161,193	374,843	320,905.	291, 379	109,998	1,259,453	5	384,751
		•										*********	•	
.	51,440	5, 251, 757	16,100,884	9,331,202	35,567	111,603	9,635,064	4,117,041	4,107,565	2,345,488	630,635	51, 721, 246	=	587,741
												11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11		

ERMIUCET PONER CONPANT Distribution Plant Net Salvage Test

IFALDATION BASED ON 1915-1989 ACTUAL • •

10111

5,889,241 630,635 51,721,246 Ξ 111 Total 34,595 15 111.603 9.635,064 4,117.041 4,107,565 2,345.488 703,6(6 20 IIC 370 369 15 1.115,260 366 367 35,567 366 0 2,332,801 54,440 5,251,757 16,100,884 9,331,202 33 365 364 0 1, 312, 939 22 362 0 361 Xet Salvage, T Hat Salvage, \$ Total Relate

A-8

ţ

PAGE 1

• • •

ŗ

STUDY AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1989

INTUCIT POWER COMPANY . 11- 2-1990

AVERAGE LIFE GROUP METHOD THEORETICAL RESERVE ACCOUNT 35300000

			REMAINING		
		SURVIVING	LIFE		
	VINTAGE	BALANCE	ASL CURVE	RESERVE	THEOBETICAL
AGR	YEAR	12/31/1989	50.0 RO.5	RATIO	RESERVE
0.5	1989	1247738.	49.6904	0.00619	7725.
1.5	1988	574176.	49.0704	0.01859	10675.
2.5	1987	893616.	48.4521	0.03096	27665.
3.5	1985	1139198.	47.8355	0.04329	49316.
4.5	1985	1686248.	47,2206	0.05559	93733.
5.5	1984	78286.	46.6075	0.06785	5312.
6.5	1983	1200975.	45.9960	0.08005	96175.
1.5	1982	8064.	45.3860	0.09228	744.
8.5	1981	640224.	44.7777	0.10445	66869.
9.5	1980	15638250.	44.1709	0.11658	1823146.
10.5	1979	917014.	43.5655	0.12869	118010.
11.5	1978	88898.	42.9616	0.14077	12514.
12.5	1977	1185500.	42.3591	0.15282	181319.
13.5	1976	391512.	41.7579	0.16484	64538.
15.5	1974	1037.	40.5593	0.18881	196.
16.5	1973	15220.	39,9619	0.20076	3256.
17.5	1972	379846.	39.3658	0.21268	80787_
18.5	1971	402045.	38.7711	0.22458	90290
19.5	1970	£82D67.	38.1780	0.23644	161268.
20.5	1969	9870865.	37.5865	0.24827	2450635.
21.5	1968	509774.	36,9969	0.2500E	132573.
22.5	1957	237071.	36.4092	0.27182	64440.
23.5	1966	236739_	35.8237	0.28353	67122.
24.5	1965	494885.	35.2405	0.29519	146085.
25.5	1964	350263.	34.6598	0.30580	107462.
26.5	1963	957722.	34.0818	0.31836	304904.
27.5	1962	467496	33.5066	0.32987	154212.
28.5	1961	188471.	32.9345	0.34131	64327.
29.5	1960	36134.	32.3654	0.35263	12744.
30.5	1959	109152.	31.7998	0.36400	39732.
31.5	1958	102410.	31.2376	0.37525	38429.
32.5	1957	6362.	30,6790	0.38642	2458.
33.5	1956	59095.	30.1241	0.39752	23491.

, , ..

• •

PAGE 2

11- 2-1990

Pages 34 as No. 2005-00341 AG 2nd Set Data Requests Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 46 Page 43 of 43

EXHIBIT JEH-1

:

STUDY AS OF DECEMBER 31. 1989

LISTUCKT POWER COMPANY

AVERAGE LIFE GROUP METHOD THEORETICAL RESERVE ACCOUNT 35300000

	VINTAGE	SURVIVING Ralater	REMAINING LIFE ASL CURVE	VRSERVR	THEORETICAL
AGE	YEAD	12/31/1989	50.0 RD.5	RATIO	RESERVE
34.3 75 5	1900	10/2/0.	29.5/31	0.40004 8 11019	44003.
33.3	1061	19462.	23.VL01 79 /939	9.11310 A /1871	4000.
35.3	1059 1059	299JD. 611997	20.30J2 97 0112	V.1JVJ1 0-44111	2V101. 996618
J1.J 79 E	1051	J11233. 9/8719	21.3443	0.34111 A /6190	110561
30.J 30 E	1050	499/10, 18890	21,9101	9.33100 0 45940	110303.
10 E	1739	100150	20.0001	V.1041U 0 /7701	.)60% 9/1701
40.J	1343	102130.	10.JJ13 95 8222	V.41231 A 19333	10000 10007
11.7	1340 1017	JJ201. 3030	23.0333	0.40333	10301-
42.2	1010	302V. 49757	27 0040	0,43300	1191. 91585
10.0	1940	42121. 301000	21.0010	0.30330	41313. 102700
44.J	1343	1910C .	41.4314	CU416.U	10000
42.2	1244	(6110) 1100	20.1340	0.32411	40303.
40.0	1343	0013. 564063	23.2303 00 0030	0.33401	40UI.
4/,0 40 E	1942	204003.	22.0030	0.34334	143002.
40.0	1341	311U3.	22.3143.	0.000/1	11223.
49.0	1940	23236.	21.8301	U.20J4U	13102.
28.2	1939	32393.	21.3505	0.57299	18561.
51.5	1938	33333.	20.8755	0.58249	19451.
52.5	1937	155492.	20.4052	0.59190	92627.
53.5	1935	53281.	19.9393	0.60121	38045.
54.5	1935	10727.	19.4779	0.51044	6548.
55.5	1934	2984.	19.0208	0.61958	1849.
57.5	1932	5986.	18.1194	0.63761	4454.
59.5	1930	424895.	17.2348	0.65530	278436.
60.5	1929	136693.	16.7984	0.66403	90768.
		43439346.			7896418.
	131		T SALVAGE VAL	JE(X)	25.
		PE	SERVE AFTER S	ALVAGE	5922313.
		RI	MAINING LIFE	(TRS)	40.91

KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 Attorney General Second Set Data Request Order Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 47 Page 1 of 1

Kentucky Power Company

REQUEST

Refer to AG Request No. 155, which requested a reconciliation of the plant account balances used in the Study with those shown in the 2004 FERC Form 1. Please explain why Production Plant Land Rights were not included in the study, when Land Rights for Transmission, Distribution and General Plant were. Also, reconcile the amounts for Transmission, Distribution and General Plant Land Rights between the Study and the FERC Form 1.

RESPONSE

Production Plant land rights represent an investment with an original cost of \$5,420 and they were unintentionally excluded from the study. FERC Form 1 combines land in fee and land rights in a single account. Any differences between the Transmission, Distribution and General Land Rights as shown in the study and as shown in FERC Form 1 represents non-depreciable land in fee.

KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 Attorney General Second Set Data Request Order Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 48 Page 1 of 1

Kentucky Power Company

REQUEST

Refer to AG Request No. 161. Please provide all documents and correspondence related to the review of FIN 47 as they currently exist.

RESPONSE

The only potential Asset Retirement Obligations the Company has identified in connection with the review of FIN 47 is for asbestos removal and abatement at Big Sandy Generating Plant. The preliminary cost estimates, in 2005 dollars, for the asbestos removal and abatement is as follows:

					In				Dollars for
Business					Service	O/S	Percent	Cubic	Removal &
Unit	Plant	Unit	Size	Fuel	Date	Date	Asbestos	Yard	Disposal
KPCo	Big								
	Sandy	BS-1	260	Coal	1963	2030	60	1054.56	\$1,265,472
			MW						
KPCo	Big			-					
	Sandy	BS-2	800	Coal	1969	2036	25	1352.0	\$1,622,400
			MW						

The removal dates will not correspond to the plant retirement dates (2015-2034) shown in the depreciation study. That is because it is not expected that asbestos removal would begin until some time after the plant is retired.

Kentucky Power Company

REQUEST

Refer to the response to AG Request No. 166. The files provided do not explain how the cost of removal reserve was calculated (the numbers are hardcoded). Please explain how these amounts are calculated and provide the embedded cost of removal amounts by account.

RESPONSE

The Company's current depreciation rates identify a removal cost for only the Production Plant function. The amount of removal costs embedded in the Production Plant functional depreciation reserve was determined using the following formula:

Gross Removal % / (100%-Net Salvage %) x Accumulated Depreciation

Based on the Company's last depreciation study approved in Case No. 91-066, the cost of removal and gross salvage percentages included in the approved depreciation rates are as follows:

Gross Removal % = 24% Gross Salvage % = 2% Net Salvage Percent = -22%

The removal costs were calculated for the total Production Plant function. The amounts were not identified by account.

e s

KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 Attorney General Second Set Data Request Order Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 50 Page 1 of 1

Kentucky Power Company

REQUEST

Refer to AG Request No. 167. Please explain why the requested calculation was not made and please make the requested calculation.

RESPONSE

Kentucky Power objects to the request to perform the requested calculation as unduly burdensome. The calculation was not made because Kentucky Power has not identified a reason to make this calculation.

KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 Attorney General Second Set Data Request Order Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 51 Page 1 of 1

Kentucky Power Company

REQUEST

Refer to AG Request No. 168, part a. Please explain fully the reasons behind the Company's beliefs as detailed in that response.

RESPONSE

The Company's reclassification complies with the SEC guidance and FERC Order 631 for accounting for cost of removal that does not constitute a legal obligation.

KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 Attorney General Second Set Data Request Order Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 52 Page 1 of 1

Kentucky Power Company

REQUEST

Refer to AG Request No. 168, part e. What proof is available to support your claim that the money was spent on the ongoing operations of Kentucky Power? Please provide such proof.

RESPONSE

The revenues collected go into the general fund of the Company. There is no dollar tracking mechanism to track dollars collected in revenues to dollars spent.

KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 Attorney General Second Set Data Request Order Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 53 Page 1 of **2**

Kentucky Power Company

REQUEST

Refer to AG Request No. 172. Has anyone else in Kentucky Power or AEP conducted such an analysis? If so, please provide it.

RESPONSE

The company cannot at this time fully assess the effects of the recent passage of the Act and no analysis by AEP or Kentucky Power has been conducted concerning the matters identified in AG Request No. 172. This 700-page bill that became law on August 8th has been described as the most sweeping revision of the electric utility industry in 70 years. However, much of the bill requires action by state and federal regulatory agencies to implement the policies contained within the legislation. These agencies, including the Department of Energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and state utility commissions, must develop rules and establish policies consistent with the Act and are given months or even years to do so.

KPSC Case No. 2005-00341 Attorney General Second Set Data Request Order Dated December 12, 2005 Item No. 54 Page 1 of 1

Kentucky Power Company

REQUEST

Refer to AG Request No. 173. Please provide all supporting documentation underlying the Company's expectation that "federal environmental regulations may not permit the continued operation of Big Sandy Unit 1 without the addition of FGD equipment."

RESPONSE

There is no specific supporting documentation. See, Federal Clean Air Act as amended.

`