

September 6, 2006

RECEIVED

Public Service Commission ATTN: Elie R. Russell 211 Sower Boulevard P. O. Box 615 Frankfort, KY 40602-0615 SEP 1 1 2006

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Dear Mr. Russell:

Pursuant to our conversation September 1, 2006, please file the enclosed Exhibit 1 and 2 in Case No. 2006-00286.

If additional information is needed, please let us know.

.....

Sincerely,

TAYLOR COUNTY RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE CORPORATION

John F. Patterson, Office Manager

JFP:pwr

Enc

cc: Rob Spragens, Jr.



TAYLOR CO RECC													
PO BOX 100								EXHIBIT 1					
CAMPBELLSVILLE, KY	42719							PAGE 1 OF 4					
CASE NO. 2006-0028	6												
SUI	WMARY OF COST JUSTIFICATION	ON AMR											
		12/31/2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
RESIDENTIAL METERS	5	23,575	24,282	25,011	25,761	26,534	27,330	28,150	28,994	29,864	30,760	31,683	
					MODULE	\$110.00	3,375						
AMR INSTALLED	ANNUAL INCREASE 3.0%		7,858	7,858	7,858	1,480	796	820	844	870	896	923	
CUMMULATIVE			7,858	15,716	23,574	25,054	25,850						
METER		\$95.00	\$746,510	\$746,510	\$746,510	\$140,594	\$75,622	\$77,890	\$80,227	\$82,634	\$85,113	\$87,666	
LABOR	ANNUAL INCREASE 3.0%	\$25.00	\$196,450	\$202,344	\$208,414	\$40,429	\$22,398		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
		\$120.00	\$1,697,860	\$953.854	\$959,924	\$186,023	\$103,020	\$82,890	\$85,227	\$87,634	\$90,113	\$92,666	
FAILURE RATE 0.4%			\$6,791	\$10,607	\$14,447	\$15,191	\$15,603	\$15,934	\$16,275	\$16,626	\$16,986	\$17,357	
METERS NORMALLY P	URCHASED	\$55.00	\$277,112	\$285,369	\$293,929	\$81,396	\$45.094	\$46,447	\$47.841	\$49,276	\$50,754	\$52,277	
NET AMR INVESTMEN	T	•-•	\$1,427,539	\$679,092	\$680,441	\$119,817	\$73,528	\$52,377	\$53,662	\$54,984	\$56,345	\$57,746	
LIFE OF INVESTMENT			15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
DEPRECIATION			\$95,169	\$140,442	\$185,805	\$193,793	\$198,694	\$202,186	\$205,764	\$209,429	\$213,186	\$217,035	
INTEREST EXPENSE @	24.0%		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,793	\$7,734	\$9,829	\$11,975	\$14,175	\$16,428	\$18,738	
Rilling of Lipbillod Dever	200		1 061 777 50										
Cost of Poorling 1 D Meter	100 87		16 344 24	16 998 01	17 677 93	18 385 05	19 120 45	19 885 27	20,680,68	21,507,90	22 368 22	23,262,95	
Cost of Reading ETS	61		10,074.24	12 870 75	13 385 58	13 921 00	14 477 84	15 056 96	15 659 23	16 285 60	16 937 03	17.614.51	
2 Month Estimate			16 722 00	17 390 88	18 086 52	18 809 98	19 562 37	20 344 87	21,158,66	22 005 01	22 885 21	23,800,62	
Connorte/Disconnacts			106 071 48	110 314 34	114 726 91	119 315 99	124 088 63	129 052 17	134 214 26	139 582 83	145 166 14	150,972,79	
Tupe 50 Adjustments			56 483 46	58 742 80	61 092 51	63 536 21	66 077 66	68 720 77	71 469 60	74.328.38	77.301.52	80,393,58	
Dhone In Meter Deading			27 987 30	29 106 79	30 271 06	31 481 91	32 741 18	34 050 83	35 412 86	36,829,38	38,302,55	39,834,65	
Interest from earlier due	date		33,106.77	-	-	-		-		*	-	•	
Total Cost Savings			1.297.761.70	245.423.57	255.240.51	265,450,13	276,068.14	287,110.86	298,595.30	310,539.11	322,960.67	335,879.10	
Total Cost Savings Cum	ulative		1,297,761.70	1,543,185.27	1,798,425.78	2,063,875.91	2,339,944.05	2,627,054.91	2,925,650.20	3,236,189.31	3,559,149.98	3,895,029.08	
Cash Flow			(34,608.45)	(293,226.00)	(239,395.83)	334,632.90	393,500.81	427,090.96	438,722.17	450,810.09	463,373.00	476,429.90	
Cumulative Cash Flow				(327,834,45)	(567,230,28)	(232,597,38)	160.903.43	587,994,39	1.026,716.57	1.477.526.66	1,940,899,65	2,417,329.55	

RECEIVED SEP 1 1 2006 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

EXHIBIT 1 PAGE 2 OF 4

Cost of F	Reading Large Power		COST 3 Month Estimate Readings				
	Meterman Rate	21.27					
	Overhead	14.2	Number of Readings	111			
		35.47	Hours Reading EST	111			
			Rate	36.19			
	Hours per Month	20		4017.09			
		709.4	Transportation				
	Transporatation		111*10	1110			
	Miles	509		1.06			
	Rate	1.06		1176.6			
		539.54					
	CSR Enter Readings		CSR enter Reading Mail Card	3			
	Hours	4	·	28.27			
	Rate	28.27		84.81			
		113.08					
	Yearly	16344.24	Less Meter Charge 111*35	-3885			
	•			0000			
		4		16722			
				10722			
Cost of R	eading ETS		Cost Type 59 Adjustments				
	Serviceman Rate	217	March 666 Adjustment made				
	Overhead	14 49	15 minute per Adjustment	166.5			
	orenteud	26.10	to minute per Aujustment	100.5			
		00.15	COD	20.27			
	Reading 16 meters	16	Cok	20.21			
	reading to meters	F70 04		4,700.90			
		579.04					
	Entoring Deciling	00.07		56483.46			
	Entering Reading	20.21	Philippine for the day that a sta				
	Hansponation	400	Phone in Meter Reading				
	Miles 16-25	400	March 1979 Call Ins				
	Rate	1.06	.5 minute to enter read	16.5			
		424	2 minute phone call	66			
				82.5			
	Yearly Cost	12375.72	CSR	28.27			
				27987.30			
Cost of C	onn/Disc Same trip						
	March	141					
	Service man time	141					
		36.19					
		5102.79					
	Transportation						
	141*25 miles	3525					
		1.06					
		3736.5					
		106071.48					
Decrease	in Unbilled Revenue		PAYMENTS AFTER 20th				
Residenti	al & Smaal Commercial						
30556365	5 KWH @ 40%	11,320,564	1,766,662,66				
	KWH Charge	0.0767	INT 0.057				
	~	868,287	2758.897853				
Large Power			33106.77423				
18139717Kwh/30 days		604.657 per dav					
Davs unbilled		5					
		3.023.285					
KWH Cha	Irae	0.064					
THE CHARGE		193 490					
		1 061 777					
		.,					

TAYLOR CO RECC CASE NO 2006-00286

EXHIBIT 1 PAGE 3 OF 4

. 1 Α.

			KWH	unbill
	PAYMENTS	PERCENt	SOLD	KWH
3/1/2006	110,321.67	2.61%	717,110	717,110
3/2/2006	62,493.39	1.48%	406,218	392,677
3/3/2006	70,356.12	1.67%	457,327	426,839
3/6/2006	89,009.71	2.11%	578,579	482,149
3/7/2006	33,342.66	0.79%	216,733	173,387
3/8/2006	102,462.90	2.43%	666,027	510,621
3/9/2006	96,351.90	2.28%	626,304	459,290
3/10/2006	161,152.93	3.82%	1,047,523	733,266
3/13/2006	881,951.16	20.90%	5,732,839	3,439,703
3/14/2006	133,001.69	3.15%	864,535	489,903
3/15/2006	120,844.90	2.86%	785,513	418,940
3/16/2006	93,570.18	2.22%	608,223	304,111
3/17/2006	300,367.82	7.12%	1,952,444	911,141
3/20/2006	198,680.40	4.71%	1,291,458	473,535
3/21/2006	107,841.61	2.56%	700,990	233,663
3/22/2006	144,319.56	3.42%	938,103	281,431
3/23/2006	94,662.74	2.24%	615,325	164,087
3/24/2006	113,447.29	2.69%	737,427	172,066
3/27/2006	322,040.80	7.63%	2,093,322	279,110
3/28/2006	169,229.57	4.01%	1,100,022	110,002
3/29/2006	211,519.14	5.01%	1,374,912	91,661
3/30/2006	257,865.20	6.11%	1,676,169	55,872
3/31/2006	345,736.75	8.19%	2,247,350	

4,220,570.09 100.00% 27,434,453 11,320,564 11,320,564

	Year 2005	Average
2005 Resid	293,134,705	24,427,892
Sm Com	36,078,726	3,006,561
Total	329,213,431	27,434,453

PAYMENT AFTER 20th

1,766,662.66

TAYLOR CO RECC CASE NO 2006-00286 EXHIBIT 1 PAGE 4 OF 4

EXPLANATION COST FACTORS

The Cost Savings will be realized on an efficiency basis more than a reduced cash outflow.

COST OF READING LARGE POWER METERS

Taylor County reads Large Power meters on a monthly basis, this cost will be eliminated with AMR.

COST OF READING ETS

Taylor County reads the meter on accounts with Electric Thermal Storage devices, this cost will be eliminated with AMR.

COST OF CONNECT/DISCONNECT SAME TRIP

Taylor County currently makes a trip on consumers moving out/consumer moving in locations. This trip will be eliminated with AMR.

DECREASE IN UNBILLED REVENUE

Consumers provide meter reading throughout the month, readings provided the 1st part of the month may have 30 days of usage that is unbilled. With AMR this under billing can be brought up to date.

COST OF 3 MONTH ESTIMATE READINGS.

When a consumer does not provide Taylor Co with a reading for 3 consecutive months Taylor Co makes a trip to the location to get a meter reading, this cost will be eliminated with AMR.

COST TYPE 59 ADJUSTMENTS

Taylor County makes adjustment to the bills of consumers that have been over billed (Example: estimated high, billed through wrong reading, etc.). With AMR these type adjustments will be decreased.

PHONE IN METER READING

Taylor County has approximately on average about 1980 consumers phone in the meter reading, with AMR this cost will be eliminated.

INTEREST FROM EARLIER DUE DATE

Taylor Co. plans on changing billing dates when AMR is implemented, an earlier due date will increase cash flow.

Exhibit 2

1.14

Taylor County RECC P.O. Box 100 Campbellsville, KY 42719

Case No. 2006-00286

Explanation of Voltage Drop Variance - Exhibit U page 1 of 4 of Original Filing

Attached is a document from our consulting engineers, Patterson and DeWar, detailing thoughts on noted variances.

RECEIVED SEP 1 1 2006 PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION PATTERSON & DEWAR ENGINEERS, INC 850 CENTER WAY, NORCROSS, GEORGIA 30071-4844

P.O. BOX 2808, NORCROSS, GEORGIA 30091-2808 OFFICE (770) 453-1410 FAX (770) 453-1411

A. NORMAN DELONG GEORGE E. INGRAM JOSEPH E. PERRY, III RICHARD CANADAY MICHAEL J. KLINE RICHARD C. RUSH GEORGE L. CHAPMAN J. B. FRANKLIN H. EDGAR HALL LAYNE A. JORDAN DANIEL H. PARKER CHRIS R. HAMMOND WILLIAM E. HENRY GARY L. HASTY KEITH H. COMER JOHN T. MATTISON WILLIAM A. MONCRIEF JERRY G. CRAWFORD PHILLIP A. BARE GARY E. GRUBBS

Mike Skaggs Taylor County RECC PO Box 100 Campbellsville, KY 42719

Re: Explanation of noted variances between recorded min/max voltage reading and calculated voltages from the TRECC Engineering Model

Mike,

Following within this document are a few of the possible explanations in regard to observed variances between measured/recorded voltage levels and calculated levels from software such as Milsoft Windmil[®]. Please do take note that the development and use of an engineering model is simply one of many tools used to assist a distribution planning engineer in the review and recommendations of a very complex electrical distribution system such as that found at Taylor County RECC.

Electric distribution modeling and analysis can be likened to tools such as those a physician might use; you take readings such as blood pressure and temperature, listen to the patient's symptoms, and observe the reflexes. The engineer takes all of the various system inputs, factors in the economics and operational considerations and massages them with years of education and experience. Just as medical tools have continued to evolve from X-Ray to CAT Scans to MRIs; the engineer's tools, software and inputs also evolve. Products such as AMR, SCADA and voltage/current recording continue to gravitate to within reach of smaller utilities and give the engineer a much better picture of the interactions within a specific distribution system. Samples of the variables are:

- Un-Balanced vs. Balanced Voltage Calculations ~ one enhancement having a stellar improvement to system modeling comes about as utilities migrate toward full implementation of AMR. Inherent to most AMR systems is the ability to continuously maintain a database of which electrical phase each consumer is on and to monitor the loading and interval kWh usage of such.
- Load Transfers ~ Systems that do not have AMR may fail to advise of adjustments for the engineering model to reflect possible load transfers during peak periods.

- **Capacitor Banks** ~ Capacitors that are modeled as on-line may actually be nonenergized during peak periods for reasons such as blown fuses, inoperative capacitor controls or even failure to re-energizing banks that were manually opened during summer months.
- **Regulator Banks & Controls** ~ Regulators and associated controls may have setting changes not reflected in the model or configured with line drop compensation that continuously adjusts the set-point as a function of percentage of assigned peak load. Another possible regulator error would be a malfunction of the controls during the once-yearly peak conditions.
- Allocation of Peak Load by Substation vs. by Feeder/Circuit ~ Systems without SCADA may elect to allocate peak load to their model by substation areas as they oftentimes do not have accurate feeder/circuit peak load information. This change in load allocation can vary the model's accuracy greatly depending upon factors such as density of residential consumers, availability of natural gas and the mix of commercial & industrial customers.

As mentioned earlier in this correspondence, the model and its accompanying analysis is but one of many tools used to develop/design a growing distribution system. Many other factors such as conductor loading, system losses, sectionalizing, economics and reliability go into the mix of inputs reviewed to reach a collaborative solution to each violation of a specific utilities design criteria. The optimal solutions then must be reviewed against the approved long range system plan to confirm a coherent progression of the distribution build-out and/or replacement.

Please advise if additional explanations and/or discussions are needed.

Sincerely,

. . .

Lary E Drubbe

Gary E Grubbs, P.E. Patterson & Dewar Engineers, Inc.