Ernie Fletcher Governor

LaJuana S. Wilcher, Secretary Environmental and Public Protection Cabinet

Christopher L. Lilly Commissioner Department of Public Protection

Honorable Charles A. Lile Senior Corporate Counsel East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. 4775 Lexington Road P. O. Box 707 Winchester, KY 40392-0707



Commonwealth of Kentucky

Public Service Commission

211 Sower Blvd. P.O. Box 615 Frankfort, Kentucky 40602-0615 Telephone: (502) 564-3940 Fax: (502) 564-3460 psc.ky.gov

September 26, 2006

Mark David Goss Chairman

Teresa J. Hill Vice Chairman

RE: Case No. 2006-00236

Please see enclosed data request from Commission Staff in the above case.

If you need further assistance, please contact Fereydoon Gorjian at (502) 564-3940 ext. 412.

Sincerely,

Beth O'Donnell

Executive Director



COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE APPLICATION OF EAST KENTUCKY)	
POWER COOPERATIVE, INC. FOR APPROVAL)	CASE NO.
OF A DEPRECIATION STUDY)	2006-00236

SECOND DATA REQUEST OF COMMISSION STAFF TO EAST KENTUCKY POWER COOPERATIVE, INC.

Pursuant to 807 KAR 5:001, Commission Staff requests that East Kentucky Power Cooperative, Inc. ("East Kentucky") file the original and 7 copies of the following information with the Commission no later than 10 days from the date of this request, with a copy to all parties of record. Each copy of the information requested should be placed in a bound volume with each item tabbed. When a number of sheets are required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 1(a), Sheet 2 of 6. Include with each response the name of the witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided. Careful attention should be given to copied material to ensure its legibility. When the requested information has been previously provided in this proceeding in the requested format, reference may be made to the specific location of that information in responding to this request.

1. Refer to the response to the Commission Staff's First Data Request dated July 27, 2006 ("Staff's First Request"), Item 3(a). In the response East Kentucky states, "EKPC had understood that such a change in depreciation rates could be applied retroactively for ratemaking purposes, once the new rates are approved by the

Commission, and assumed that such an adjustment for a reduction in expenses could be made to the environmental surcharge prior to final action by the Commission in a two-year review."

- a. Explain the basis for East Kentucky's understanding that new depreciation rates could be applied retroactively in the environmental surcharge.
- b. Explain the basis for East Kentucky's assumption that there would be an adjustment in the environmental surcharge during the 2-year review to reflect the retroactive application of the new depreciation rates.
- 2. Refer to the response to the Staff's First Request, Item 7, page 4 of 4. The response shows that East Kentucky's annual depreciation expense, based on December 31, 2005 data, would be reduced by approximately \$13.5 million due to the implementation of the proposed depreciation rates. The depreciation rates approved in the settlement agreement in Case Nos. 2001-00140¹ and 2001-00141² for Kentucky Utilities Company ("KU") and Louisville Gas and Electric Company ("LG&E") resulted in reductions of annual depreciation expense of \$12.8 million and \$5.3 million respectively.³
- a. Given that the proposed depreciation rates result in a reduction of its annual depreciation expense, would East Kentucky agree that in this regard its application is similar to the KU and LG&E depreciation rate proceedings? Explain the response.

¹ Case No. 2001-00140, Application of Kentucky Utilities Company for an Order Approving Revised Depreciation Rates, final Order dated December 3, 2001.

² Case No. 2001-00141, Application of Louisville Gas and Electric Company for an Order Approving Revised Depreciation Rates, final Order dated December 3, 2001.

³ Case Nos. 2001-00140 and 2001-00141, December 3, 2001 Order at 7.

- b. Given that the settlement depreciation rates in Case Nos. 2001-00140 and 2001-00141 and the depreciation rates proposed in this proceeding all result in reductions in annual depreciation expense, explain in detail why the application of East Kentucky's proposed depreciation rates to its environmental surcharge should not be consistent with the decision in Case Nos. 2001-00140 and 2001-00141.
- 3. For purposes of this question, assume that East Kentucky's proposed depreciation rates produced an increase, rather than a decrease, in depreciation expense of \$13.5 million annually. Would East Kentucky have proposed to retroactively apply the new depreciation rates to its environmental surcharge calculations? Explain the response.

Beth O'Donnell

Executive Director

Public Service Commission

P. O. Box 615

Frankfort, Kentucky 40602

DATED September 26, 2006