#### **BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY**

ATTORNEYS AT LAW 36 EAST SEVENTH STREET SUITE 1510 CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202 TELEPHONE (513) 421-2255

TELECOPIER (513) 421-2764

RECEIVED

MAR 18 2008

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

#### Via Hand Delivery

March 18, 2008

Beth A. O'Donnell, Executive Director Kentucky Public Service Commission 211 Sower Boulevard Frankfort, Kentucky 40602

Re: Case No. 2006-00472

Dear Ms. O'Donnell:

Please find enclosed the original and twelve (12) copies each of the SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF KEVIN C. HIGGINS on behalf of THE KENTUCKY INDUSTRIAL UTILITY CUSTOMERS, INC. in the above-referenced matter. By copy of this letter, all parties listed on the Certificate of Service have been served.

Please place this document of file.

Very Truly Yours,

Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.

**BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY** 

MLKkew Attachment

cc:

Certificate of Service

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served by mailing a true and correct copy, by overnight mail to all parties on the March 18, 2008.

Lawrence W Cook Assistant Attorney General Office of the Attorney General Utility & Rate 1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200 Frankfort, KY 40601-8204

Greg Howard Appalachian Citizens Law Center, Inc 207 West Court Street, Suite 202 Prestonsburg, KY 41653

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

Stephen A Sanders Appalachian Citizens Law Center, Inc 52 Broadway, Ste B Whitesburg, KY 41858

Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.

#### COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	)	
IN THE MATTER OF GENERAL ADJUSTMENT OF	)	
ELECTRIC RATES OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER	)	CASE NO. 2006-00472
COOPERATIVE, INC.	)	
	)	

#### Supplemental Direct Testimony of Kevin C. Higgins

on behalf of

**Kentucky Industrial Utility Customers** 

March 18, 2008

1	SUPPLEMENTAL	DIRECT TEST	IMONY OF KE	VIN C. HIGGINS
---	--------------	-------------	-------------	----------------

3

11

18

19

20

21

22

-		- 4	1		
In	tr	വ		1	Λ'n
1.11	ŧΙ	vu			vii

- 4 Q. Please state your name and business address.
- 5 A. Kevin C. Higgins, 215 South State Street, Suite 200, Salt Lake City, Utah, 6 84111.
- 7 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
- 8 A. I am a Principal in the firm of Energy Strategies, LLC. Energy Strategies
  9 is a private consulting firm specializing in economic and policy analysis
  10 applicable to energy production, transportation, and consumption.
  - Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding?
- My testimony is being sponsored by Kentucky Industrial Utility

  Customers, Inc. ("KIUC"), which includes Gallatin Steel Company ("Gallatin

  Steel"), AGC Automotive, and Air Liquide. These KIUC members are customers

  of distribution cooperatives that purchase wholesale power from East Kentucky

  Power Cooperative, Inc. ("EKPC")
- 17 Q. Please describe your professional experience and qualifications.
  - A. My academic background is in economics, and I have completed all coursework and field examinations toward a Ph.D. in Economics at the University of Utah. In addition, I have served on the adjunct faculties of both the University of Utah and Westminster College, where I taught undergraduate and graduate courses in economics. I joined Energy Strategies in 1995, where I assist private

1		and public sector clients in the areas of energy-related economic and policy
.2		analysis, including evaluation of electric and gas utility rate matters.
3		Prior to joining Energy Strategies, I held policy positions in state and local
4		government. From 1983 to 1990, I was economist, then assistant director, for the
5		Utah Energy Office, where I helped develop and implement state energy policy.
6		From 1991 to 1994, I was chief of staff to the chairman of the Salt Lake County
7		Commission, where I was responsible for development and implementation of a
8		broad spectrum of public policy at the local government level.
9	Q.	Are you the same Kevin C. Higgins who filed direct testimony in this docket
10		on behalf of KIUC on July 5, 2007?
11	A.	Yes, I am.
12	Q.	Have you testified in other proceedings before this Commission?
13	A.	Yes. I have testified previously in this docket, filing direct testimony on
14		July 6, 2007. I also filed direct testimony in the Union Light, Heat and Power
15		Company general rate case, Case No. 2006-00172, and in the Commission's
16		current investigation of the energy and regulatory issues in Section 50 of
17		Kentucky's 2007 Energy Act, Administrative Case No. 2007-00477
18	Q.	Have you testified previously before any state utility regulatory
19		commissions?
20	A.	Yes. I have testified in over eighty proceedings on the subjects of utility
21		rates and regulatory policy before state utility regulators in Alaska, Arizona,
22		Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Michigan,
23		Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Ohio,

Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Utah, Virginia, Washington,
West Virginia, and Wyoming.

2.2

Α.

#### Overview and Conclusions

#### Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental testimony?

My supplemental testimony describes KIUC's proposal for allocating

EKPC's \$19.0 million revenue requirement increase on the basis of each class's

demand-related revenues, rather than on the basis of each class's total base

revenues, which is the approach adopted by the Commission in its Order issued

December 5, 2007. I also describe the change in the revenue allocation to

EKPC's customer classes that would result from adoption of KIUC's

recommended approach.

#### Q. What conclusions and recommendations are presented in your testimony?

In the Commission's Order in this docket issued December 5, 2007, the Commission ordered that EKPC's \$19.0 million revenue requirement increase be allocated on the basis of the total <u>base</u> revenues currently recovered from each rate class, consistent with the recommendation made by EKPC in its application for a general rate increase. I am respectfully recommending that the Commission amend this aspect of its Order, and instead apportion EKPC's \$19 million revenue requirement increase on the basis of the <u>demand-related</u> revenues currently recovered from each rate class, consistent with the recommendation I made in my direct testimony filed on July 6, 2007.

In my opinion, allocating EKPC's rate increase using demand-related revenue is more appropriate than using total base revenue, given the facts of this proceeding. Using base revenue is not reasonable for revenue allocation in this case because fifty percent of EKPC's base revenue is comprised of fuel and purchased power costs – and the revenue deficiency that caused EKPC's need for a rate increase is largely unrelated to the cost of fuel and purchased power. Consequently, including fuel and purchased power costs in the calculation of the allocation of the rate increase overstates the cost responsibility for those rate classes whose energy-related revenues in relation to their total base revenues is above the system average.

1.2

1.3

EKPC's rate increase was driven by the need for EKPC to build equity, which is a component of <u>fixed</u> cost recovery. Given that the underlying rationale for the rate increase is primarily related to fixed cost recovery, the rate increase is more appropriately apportioned on the basis of each class's demand-related revenue, which is more directly related to fixed costs than are total base revenues.

In determining this demand-based allocation, I recommend that the revenue increase to Gallatin Steel be allocated separately from other special contract customers, given its size and unique load characteristics. The remaining Special Contract customers should be aggregated into a single group for allocation purposes.

#### Review of the Revenue Allocation Issue in this Proceeding

 A.

2	Q.	Please provide a brief review of the history of the revenue allocation issue in
3		this proceeding.

On January 29, 2007, EKPC filed a request for a general rate increase in the amount of \$43.4 million. As part of EKPC's filing, EKPC witness William A. Bosta proposed that the rate increase be apportioned among customer classes on the basis of each class's base revenues.

In addition, as part of its filing, EKPC sought interim rate relief.

Following a hearing on March 22, 2007, the Commission found that EKPC would experience a material credit and operational impairment unless interim rate relief was granted, and accordingly, authorized an interim increase in EKPC's base rates of \$19.0 million on an annualized basis effective April 1, 2007.

The subject of allocating the rate increase across customer classes was not addressed during the hearing on EKPC's request for interim rate relief. In accordance with the Commission's Order setting the ground rules for the interim rate hearing, issued March 16, 2007, the hearing was limited to evidence regarding the potential impairment of EKPC's credit and operations, and no other issues were permitted to be raised.

"We further place the parties on notice that the subject matter of the hearing of March 22, 2007 is limited to the potential impairment of EKPC's credit and operations that may result from a denial of EKPC's request for interim rate relief. No evidence or argument on other issues will be entertained." [March 16, 2007 Order at p. 2.]

Consistent with these ground rules, when the interim rate relief was granted, it was allocated among customer classes on the basis of each class's base revenues, as EKPC had proposed in its filing. [Interim Order at p. 12]

1.2

Subsequent to the Order granting interim relief, I addressed the subject of revenue allocation in my direct testimony, filed July 6, 2007, as part of the general rate proceeding. My analysis of EKPC's rate filing led me to conclude that the most appropriate basis for spreading any general rate increase was not each class's total base revenues, but each class's demand-related revenues.

I was not alone in recognizing the merits of such an approach. Prior to filing my direct testimony, KIUC asked EKPC witness William A. Bosta in KIUC Data Request 1.1 whether Mr. Bosta agreed that it would be reasonable to apportion the requested revenue increase across customer classes on the basis of demand-related revenues. In response, Mr. Bosta maintained that while be believed that EKPC's filed allocation approach was reasonable, he "agrees that the overall rate increase is more oriented to demand-related cost and that an apportionment of the increase on the basis of demand-related revenue or non-fuel revenue would be another way to reasonably apportion the increase." Later, in his rebuttal testimony filed on August 20, 2007, Mr. Bosta described my recommended approach as a "feasible alternative." [p. 5, lines 17-19]

On August 31, 2007, EKPC, the Attorney General, and KIUC filed with the Commission a Joint Stipulation and Recommendation ("Joint Stipulation") that addressed revenue requirements and revenue allocation. The revenue allocation portion of the Joint Stipulation adopted the demand-based allocation I had proposed in my direct testimony, which was further supported in the joint brief filed by the three parties.

However, in its final Order, the Commission concluded as follows:

"On April 1, 2007, the Commission granted EKPC's request for interim relief of \$19.0 million and accepted EKPC's allocation of the increase to the rate classes as proposed in the application. KIUC did not voice any opposition to the allocation methodology used for the interim rate increase. Having reviewed EKPC's proposed allocation and KIUC's recommendation, we find that EKPC's allocation is reasonable and should be approved in this proceeding."

1.2

On December 13, 2008, KIUC filed a petition for rehearing, and on December 27, 2007, the Commission issued an Order granting KIUC's petition. In its Rehearing Order, the Commission clarified that the Commission's previous statement referring to KIUC's non-opposition to the allocation methodology used in the interim proceeding was an inadvertent oversight, and was not the justification for the denial of KIUC's allocation proposal. The Commission also reiterated that since the Joint Stipulation endorsing KIUC's allocation approach was non-unanimous, it could not be considered by the Commission is reaching its decision.

In granting KIUC's petition, the Commission concluded:

"After reviewing the evidence and being sufficiently advised, the Commission finds that further examination of the revenue allocation issue is warranted and we will grant KIUC's petition for rehearing." [Order at p. 3.]

#### Revenue Allocation

1.2

A.

Q.

Α.

A.

2	Q.	In its application filed January 29, 2007, what did EKPC propose as the basis
3		for allocating its requested rate increase across customer classes?

As discussed in the direct testimony of William A. Bosta, EKPC proposed to allocate its requested revenue requirement increase on the basis of the total base revenues currently recovered from each rate class. Mr. Bosta explained that due to EKPC's need for "immediate" rate relief, EKPC did not embark on a significant effort to alter the existing rate design in this case.

# Is this the allocation method that was adopted by the Commission in its Order dated December 7, 2007?

Yes. This is also the allocation method that was adopted in the Interim Order. For ease of exposition, I will occasionally refer to this method as the "Interim" allocation method.

#### Q. Please explain your disagreement with using this method for the case at hand.

As I stated in the introductory section to this testimony, using total base revenue to allocate the revenue increase in this proceeding is not reasonable because fifty percent of EKPC's base revenue is comprised of fuel and purchased power costs – and the revenue deficiency that caused EKPC's need for a rate increase is largely unrelated to the cost of fuel and purchased power. Rather, EKPC's rate increase was driven by the need for EKPC to build equity, which is a component of <u>fixed</u> cost recovery. Given that the underlying rationale for the rate increase is primarily related to fixed cost recovery, the rate increase is more

1	appropriately apportioned on the basis of each class's demand-related revenues.
2	which is more directly related to fixed costs than are base revenues.

A.

O.

A.

## Does allocating the rate increase on the basis of total base revenue produce an inequitable result in this proceeding?

Yes, it does. Allocating the rate increase on the basis of total revenue overstates the cost responsibility for those rate classes whose energy-related revenues in relation to their total base revenues are above the system average. These customers already pay for the full recovery of their (relatively high) fuel and purchased power usage in their energy charges and through the fuel adjustment clause ("FAC"). Including fuel and purchased power costs (again) in the calculation of the allocation of the requested rate increase causes fuel and purchase power costs to be over-weighted in the determination of class cost responsibility, and is inconsistent with the ratemaking principle of assigning cost responsibility on the basis of cost causation.

# Q. What is your basis for concluding that EKPC's base revenue increase was primarily related to increased fixed cost recovery?

It is clear from EKPC's filing that its primary objective in seeking a rate increase was to build equity – and EKPC's request to build equity was a request for increased fixed cost recovery.

One of the stated purposes of EKPC witness David G. Eames' testimony was to describe EKPC's need for additional equity. Mr. Eames testified that EKPC's equity as a percentage of its assets had fallen from 13.71% at end of 2002

1		to just 4.87% at the end of the test year ending September 30, 2006. He further
2		testified that:
3 4 5 6 7		A strong equity position is necessary for EKPC to meet its mortgage covenants and to be able to obtain future financing. EKPC expects the need for credit facility financing through 2019 for its capital expansion program. Having the appropriate amount of equity will significantly reduce the cost of future borrowings. <sup>1</sup>
8 9		EKPC's need to increase its equity is a function of the Cooperative's
10		existing asset valuation as well as the Cooperative's need to attract capital to meet
11		future investment requirements. The \$19.0 million rate increase was necessary to
1.2		assure EKPC's continued access to credit markets, which was at risk absent an
13		increase in EKPC's equity.
14	Q.	Was EKPC's credit impairment recognized in the Commission's granting of
15		interim rate relief of \$19.0 million to EKPC in 2007?
16	A.	Yes. In its Order granting interim relief the Commission concluded that it
17		was necessary to increase rates to address EKPC's credit impairment. The
18		Commission noted that but for the willingness of RUS to forbear from making
19		any declaration of default its mortgage agreement, EKPC would be in default.
20		[Interim Order at p. 8]
21	Q.	Are there other indications in EKPC's filing that its rate increase request was
22		driven by fixed costs?
23	A.	Yes. EKPC proposed to recover its requested revenue increase for service
24		to "B" and "C" customers, as well as Special Contract customers, via an increase
25		in the demand charges levied for service to these classes - with no increase in the
26		energy charges. As explained by Mr. Rosta: " [TThis case is geared to improving

EKPC's equity and TIER level and the increase in cost is more oriented to demand-related costs." I agree with Mr. Bosta's statement, and am recommending that the Commission take Mr. Bosta's statement to its logical conclusion by basing the allocation of class cost responsibility on demand-related revenues.

Α.

Q.

A.

Please describe your recommended approach for allocating the \$19.0 million revenue increase awarded in this case.

Given that the underlying rationale for the rate increase is primarily related to fixed cost recovery, I recommend that any revenue increase be allocated on the basis of each class's demand-related revenues. Such an approach would result in a better alignment of revenue recovery and cost causation than allocating based on total base revenues, which includes fuel and purchased power costs. My recommended alternative would also meet EKPC's objective of making a "streamlined" determination of revenue allocation and avoiding a major rate redesign in this proceeding.

Q. Does your recommendation for allocating the rate increase based on demandrelated revenues apply to Special Contract customers?

Yes, it does. In allocating the appropriate revenue increase to Special Contract customers, I recommend that the revenue increase to Gallatin Steel be allocated separately from the other special contract customers, given its size and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Direct testimony of David G. Eames, p. 5, lines 4-8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Direct testimony of William A. Bosta, p. 9, lines 19-21.

unique load characteristics. The remaining Special Contract customers subject to a rate increase should be aggregated into a single group for allocation purposes.<sup>3</sup>

#### Q. Please describe the unique load characteristics of Gallatin Steel.

1.2

Α.

Unlike the other Special Contract customers, most of the service to Gallatin Steel is interruptible. As a result, Gallatin Steel takes service under three different demand charges — one for firm service, another for interruptions on ninety minutes notice, and a third for interruptions on ten minutes notice. These three demand charges were negotiated by the customer, EKPC, and the relevant distribution cooperative (Owen), and were subsequently approved by the Commission. The differentials between these demand charges represent the most reasonable measure of the differences in the level of service received by Gallatin Steel. To the extent that Gallatin Steel receives a rate increase to recover increased fixed costs for EKPC, the increase should be proportionate to the revenues associated with these three levels of demand charges, so as to best reflect the type of service provided to this customer. This can be accomplished with a Gallatin-specific allocation.

Q. Does treating Gallatin Steel separately from the other Special Contract customers produce the same total apportionment to Special Contract customers as a group as would an aggregate apportionment to the Special Contract class?

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The TGP contract is not proposed to receive a rate increase. According to EKPC Response to KIUC 1.3, "Due to the nature of the elements that comprise the [TGP] contracts, there is no specific provision in the contracts that permit a general rate increase.

A.	Yes. A Gallatin-specific apportionment within the Special Contract class
	does not change the apportionment to Special Contracts as a class, nor does it
	affect the apportionment to the other rate classes.

 Q.

A.

# What is the revenue increase by class that results from your recommended allocation method at the Commission-approved \$19.0 million revenue increase?

These results are presented in Table KCH-RH1. This table also compares the results of the KIUC allocation method to the class revenue increases resulting from the allocation method used in the Interim Order (currently in effect). The derivation of these results is shown in Exhibit KCH-Rehearing 1. In calculating these results, I coordinated with EKPC to ensure that my calculations and EKPC's calculations produced consistent results.

# Table KCH-RH1 Comparison of KIUC Allocation and Interim Allocation of \$19.0 Million Revenue Increase

	Total	Interim Method			KIUC Method		KIUC vs. Interim	
	Test Year	Proposed	Proposed		Proposed Proposed			
	Present	Increase	Increase		Increase	Increase	Difference	Difference
	Revenue	<b>(\$)</b>	(%)		(S)	(%)	(S)	(%)
Rate B	\$26,620,634	\$1,031,700	3.88%		\$959,500	3.60%	(\$72,200)	-0.27%
Rate B - Inter	\$3,420,921	\$133,000	3.89%		\$77,900	2.28%	(\$55,100)	-1.61%
Rate C	\$15,987,564	\$619,400	3.87%		\$606,100	3.79%	(\$13,300)	-0.08%
Special Contracts (excluding Gallatin Steel)	\$20,905,424	\$708,543	3 39%		\$680,200	3.25%	(\$28,343)	-0.14%
Gallatin Steel	\$30,870,772	\$1,297,857	4.20%		\$634,600	2.06%	(\$663,257)	-2 15%
Rate E	\$392,546,911	\$15,209,500	3.87%	_	\$16,041,700	4.09%	\$832,200	0.21%
Total	\$490,352,228	\$19,000,000	3.87%		\$19,000,000	3.87%	\$0	0.00%

Q. Please compare the results of using KIUC's recommended allocation approach to the approach used in the Interim and Final Orders.

1	A.	As shown in Table KCH-RH1, the KIUC allocation method results in an
2		increase to Rate E customers of 0.21 percent. All other rate classes experience
3		small to modest decreases.
4	Q.	Are you presenting the results of KIUC's recommended allocation approach
5		for each member distribution cooperative and its respective rate schedules?
6	A.	Yes, this information is presented in Exhibit KCH- Rehearing 2.
7	Q.	If KIUC's proposed revenue allocation is adopted, would KIUC seek any
8		refunds based on the difference between the allocation method adopted in the
9		interim proceeding and KIUC's recommended approach?
10	A.	No. KIUC is recommending adoption of its allocation approach on a
11		prospective basis only
1.2		
13	Q.	Does this conclude your supplemental direct testimony?
14	Α.	Yes, it does.

#### COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

	RATES OF EAST KENTUCKY POWER ) (IVE, INC. )  CASE NO. 2006-00472
STATE OF U	AFFIDAVIT OF KEVIN C. HIGGINS  TAH )
COUNTY OF	SALT LAKE )
Kevin	C. Higgins, being first duly sworn, deposes and states that:
1.	He is a Principal with Energy Strategies, L.L.C., in Salt Lake City, Utah;
2.	He is the witness who sponsors the accompanying testimony entitled
	"Supplemental Direct Testimony of Kevin C. Higgins;"
3.	Said testimony was prepared by him and under his direction and supervision;
4.	If inquiries were made as to the facts and schedules in said testimony he would
	respond as therein set forth; and
5.	The aforesaid testimony and schedules are true and correct to the best of his
	knowledge, information and belief.
	Kevin C. Higgins
Subscribed an Higgins.	ad sworn to or affirmed before me this Hay of March, 2008, by Kevin C.  Notary Public
My Commissi	ion Expires: April 10,7011
	KIMBERLIE A. IGNJATOVIC  215 South State Street, Suite 200  Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  My Commission Expires  April 10, 2011  State of Utah  State of Utah

### Comparison of \$19 Million Rate Spread Using Interim Method and KIUC Method

%00.0	0\$	%78.€	000,000,618	%∠8.€	000,000,612	8490,352,228	latoT
%12.0	8832,200	%60°t	007,140,818	%\\ \( \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \\ \	005'607'51\$	116,342,2468	Kate E
%\$1.2- %\$1.4%	(E4E,82\$) (725,E33\$)	%90°7 %57°E	002,085 002,085 002,085	%07.4 %65.5	542,8072 728,792,12	424,206,02 <b>2</b> 277,078,0 <i>E</i> <b>2</b>	Special Contracts (excluding Gallatin Steel) Gallatin Steel
miterence (%) (%2.0- %10.1- %10.1-	KIUC vs.  Difference (\$) (\$72,200) (\$55,100)	thod Proposed Increase (%) 3.60% 2.28% 3.79%	### ##################################	ethod Proposed Increase 3.88% 3.88% 3.87%	Miterim Mo Proposed Increase (\$) \$1,031,700 \$133,000	Total Test Year Present Revenue \$26,620,634 \$3,420,921	Rate B - Inter Rate C
(h) - (t) =	(g) (o) - (o) =	<b>(1)</b>	(ə)	(p)	(a)	(p)	(v)

# Revenue Allocation to Major Classes & Rate Design Interim Methodology

I. Test Year Base Rate Revenue

Rate categories for which no increase being sought		c Allocate to Billing kW S/kW S 19,000,000	9.39% \$ 1,784,100 2,138,666 \$ 0.83	\$ 217,655 325,738 \$ 0.67 \$ 151,013 226,002 \$ 0.67	S 1,297,857 1,942,343 S 0.67 S 339,875 508,649 S 0.67 10.56% S 2,006,400 3,002,732 S 0.67	"E" Billing kWb S/kWh	S 19,000,000	S (1,784,100) S (2,006,400)
$ \begin{array}{ccc} S & 512,025,412 \\ S & (1,356,273) \\ S & 510,669,139 \\ S & (10,219,764) \\ S & (433,500) \\ S & (9,663,647) \end{array} $ Rate 6	\$ 490,352,228	% of Base Revenue Total	\$ 26,620,634 \$ 3,420,921 \$ 15,987,564 \$ 46,029,120 9.3	S 7,391,355 S 4,959,800 S 4,414,903	\$ 30,870,772 \$ 8,554,269 \$ 51,776,196			
Total Test Yr. Existing Revenue Including Buy-Through Less Buy Through Revenue Total Test Yr. Existing Revenue Excluding Buy-Through Load Center Rev Substation Charges Metering Point Charges TGP Contract	Net Revenue	II. Base Revenue Proposed Revenue Increase	Rate B Rate B - Inter Rate C	Inland Electric AGC Gallatin Steel Demand Charge Revenue Only	Gallatin Steel Energy Charge Revenue Only Gallatin Steel	III. Energy Adder to "E" Rate	Total Revenue Increase	B & C Special Contract

9,181,636,048 \$ 0.001656

80.05% \$ 15,209,500

Amount Remaining to "E"

# Revenue Allocation to Major Classes & Rate Design Proposed by KIUC using Current Demand Revenue

	case being sought			from Current % Change Demand from Current Descriptor Total Demand Rilling kW S/kW	3.87%			14,36% 3,57% 2,138,666 S 0.77	14.35% 3.25% 1,060,389 S 0.64	8 18 2 18 1 2000 2012 1.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2.1 2	2.54% 3,002,732 S	"E" Billing kWh SKWh			14,37% 4,09% 9,181,636,048 \$ 0,001746
	Rate categories for which no increase being sought		% of Base % C	Demand from Revenue Allocate to Den	\$ 19,000,000			8.65% \$ 1,643,500 14	3,58% S 680,200 14.	F1	s 1,314,800		S 19,000,000	S (1,643,500) S (1,314,800)	s 16,041,700 14
Total 512,025,412 (1,356,273) 510,669,139	(10,219,764) (433,500) (9,663,647)	490,352,228	Luce			Total 26,620,634	3,420,921	46,029,120	20,905,424	rr 010 00	51,776,196				
Energy Demand \$ 368,343,135 \$ 143,682,168 \$ \$ (1,356,273) \$ - \$ \$ 366,986,862 \$ 143,682,168 \$	\$ (10,219,764) \$ - \$ (10,219,764) \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	S 358,129,747 S 132,222,373 S				Energy Demand S 19.944,370 \$ 6,676,264 \$	S	34,587,585 S 11,441,535	S 16,166,157 S 4,739,268 S	26,455,869 \$	\$ 26,455,869 \$ 4,414,505 \$ \$ 42,622,026 \$ 9,154,170 \$				
<ol> <li>Test Year Base Rate Revenue</li> <li>Total Test Yr. Existing Revenue Including Buy-Through Less Buy Through Revenue</li> <li>Total Test Yr. Existing Revenue Excluding Buy-Through</li> </ol>	Load Center Rev Substation Charges Metering Point Charges TGP Contract	Net Revenue	II. Base Revenue		Proposed Revenue Increase	Pate R	Rate B - Inter	Nate C	Special Contracts (excluding Gallatín Steel)	Gallatin Steel Demand Charge Revenue Only Gallatin Steel Energy Charge Revenue Only	Gallatin Steel	III. Energy Adder to "E" Rate	Total Revenue Increase	B & C Special Contract	Amount Remaining to "E"

Big Sandy RECC

for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 (Including Environmental Surcharge and Fuel Adjustment Clause Revenues)

Billing Analysis

Recals Flow-Through Summary Page 1 of 1

Recalo Flow-Through Summary Page 1 of 1 Big Sandy RECC

for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 (including Environmental Surcharge and Fuel Adjustment Clause Revenues)

Billing Analysis

	Total Discount		Total					Clar Present		_				•
	Total Treat			9000000				Annualized	Percent of	Proposed	Percent of	_		*
	Amusiced	Annuaized Percent of	posodor.	****					Total Ray.	Revenues	Total Rev.	\$ Increase	% increase	Difference
	Revenues	Total Rev.	Revenues		* Increase	7a increase		ļ	100.00	ACA 000 A 24	70 63 67	1305 AGD	17.6	\$15.542
	X 4 4 3 8 7 0 3 4	\$ 73E5 UL	\$14 697 BR7	70.52%	\$310.657	2.36	Sch A-1 - Fairs and Home	14,354,UZ4	7.7	4,100,000		2		
SON ALL - FEET SING CIDING	414,002,02					7.004	Call & Claim # Borns - Officeat Charact Chara	\$2,238	0.01%	\$2 238	0.01%	261	702	2
Sch A-1 Farm & Home - Off-beak Erletgy Charge	\$2,238		\$2,23	0.02%	D C	- c	A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE	100	74.7	44 757 500	7487 9	411 5.81	3000	\$1.727
Tall to the second of the seco	\$1,319,017	6.77	51 348 871	6.47%	\$29,854	2.56.0	Son A-2 Commercial and Small Power	50000		200		0000		***
	44.	•	27.74 675	7007 50	6.40 576	71117	Sah I.P Lettle Power Service (25-750 kV)	\$2,325,538		\$2,377,359	11.45	\$25,636	7	*202
Sch LP Large Power Service (26-750 kV)	37, 329, 338		36,374,074		2		100 Car 100 Ca	£1757.617	2 47%	\$3 755 737	8.42%	\$38,120		\$2,162
Schi PR Large Power Service (25-750 kVA)	\$1,717,617	8.42%	\$1,753,576	8.42%	848,458	7,007	מפון רגע מיונספ בסאפו ספואנים ליסיו מי אין		, , ,	5	2000	Ş	3,000	5
	02	X000	S	0.00%	S	0.000	Sch Ind 1	2	3	2		2 5	1000	: :
1 DES 130 1			: 5	2000	Ş	0.0740	Set ind 2	205	2002	8	0.00%	3	0.00.0	7
Soh ind 2	3	20.00	2		•									
				••••			*****							
Sot YL-1:				•••		,		5.487.378		\$500,729	••••	\$13,353	2.74%	11.15
175 Watt	\$487,376		\$499,951		917,0/10	7.007	20 44 00			230 555		43.60E	11.	\$223
450.136.24	\$123,149		\$ 126,327	_	\$3,178		4tiO Wati	C+1, 575.0	••••				ì	:
100 11 001	127.16		64 503	_	97		500 Watt	\$1,552	••••	350		755	1.07	;
500 Watt	700'14		400.00				#= M: CCC	85		\$583		\$15	1,70%	;;
1500 Watt	\$568	_	\$583		2	381	Say year	20000		612 570		SR78	777.5	\$45
22.00	\$32,262	_	233 126	_	\$833	285	400 Watt	357756						470.00
TOTAL DOCK		l	003 +223	7005 6	146 641	. 584:	Tetal Sah YL-1	\$644,938	3,16%	\$662,632	3.18%	\$17.6%	142	20071
Total Sch YL-1	3	2,70%	2001 212	2,10/4										
			670 833 877	2400 COT+	\$442 505	1 178:	Total - All Rate Classes	\$20,391,372	100.00%	\$20,857,358	100.00%	\$465,986	2.29%	\$23,481
Total - All Rate Classes	375,185,035	300,007	- 1	T PONTON	27.75			J. C.						
The state of the s														

% Difference 0.11% 0.12% 0.12% 0.02% 0.00%

KIUC vs interim

0.16% 0.11% 0.17% 0.12% 0.16%

0.11%

Big Sandy RECC

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 (excluding Environmental Surcharge and Fuel Adjustment Clause Revenues) for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 (excluding Erwinonmental Surchange and Fuel Adjustment Clause Revenues)

Big Sendy RECC

Billing Analysis

0.13% 0.13% 0.15% 0.16% 0.16% 0.00% 0.16% 0.15% 0.13% 0.12% 0.16% \$16,642 \$3 \$1,727 \$2,894 \$2,162 \$0 \$223 \$223 \$23 \$45 \$1,063 \$23,481 % therease 1715 1718 1735 1735 1735 1745 1745 0.005 2.74% 2.77% 2.70% 2.72% 2.74% \$ hczesse \$326,499 \$31,581 \$52,030 \$38,120 \$13,353 \$3,406 \$42 \$15 \$15 \$678 \$455,936 7024% 7024% 0.01% 6.75% 11.11% 8.13% 0.00% 3,76% 100.00% Proposed Revenues \$12,374,009 \$2,298 \$1,188,569 \$1,956,347 \$1,431,720 \$1,431,720 \$500,729 \$126,556 \$1,594 \$583 \$33,170 \$17,615,595 Percent of Total Rev. 70.25% 0.01% 5.75% 11,10% 8.13% 0.00% 100.00% Total Present Amvalta ed Revenues \$1,047,509 \$1,157,008 \$1,594,316 \$1,393,600 \$0 \$17,149,609 Sub A.1 Farms. Home - Off-peak Energy Charge Sub A.2 Commercial and Brail Brower Sub LP. Large Power Service (25-750 kVA) Sub LP.R. Large Power Service (25-750 kVA) Sub large Power Service (25-750 kVA) Sub large Power Service (25-750 kVA) Total - All Rate Classes Sch YL-1: 175 Wett 400 Wett 500 Wett 1500 Wett % Increase 2.58% 2.58% 2.58% 2.58% 0.00% 0.00% 2.58% 2.58% 2.58% 2.58% 2.58% 2.58% \$10,000 \$310,857 \$58 \$29,854 \$49,136 \$35,959 \$0 \$3,178 \$3,178 \$40 \$15 \$633 \$16,641 \$442,505 Percent of Total Rev. 70.25% 0.01% 6.75% 11.10% 8.13% 0.00% 100,00% Proposed Revenues \$12,356,367 \$2,296 \$1,185,862 \$1,953,453 \$1,429,559 \$1,429,559 \$1,429,559 \$499,951 \$126,327 \$1,592 \$583 \$33,126 \$661,579 \$17,592,114 Percent of Total Rev. 70.25% 0.01% 6.75% 11.10% 8.13% 0.00% 100.00% Total Present Amvalized Revenues \$1,047,508 \$1,157,008 \$1,904,315 \$1,393,600 \$1,393,600 \$1,393,600 \$487,376 \$123,149 \$1,552 \$568 \$32,292 \$644,938 \$17,149,609 Seth A-1 - Farm and Home Seth A-1 - Farm and Home - Off-peak Energy Charge Sch A-2 Commercial and Small Power Seth LP Large Power Service (26-750 kV) Seth LPR Large Power Service (26-750 kVA) Seth Ind 1 Total - All Rate Classes Seh YL-1: 175 Watt 400 Wett 500 Wett 1500 Wett

From EKPC Analysis \$ 466,535 Under-Recovery - Rounding \$ (569)

Intertm Order Recale of Flow-Through

Blue Grass Energy

Kitic Method Recase of Flow-Through Summary Page 1 of 2

Bizing Analysis

for the 12 months ending September 30, 2006 (including Environmental Surcharge and Fuel Adjustment Clause Revenues Blue Grass Energy Billing Analysis

0.00% \$11,525 \$1,625 \$1,625 \$1,625 \$1,100 \$1,100 \$1,000 \$ \$66,150 : 57.65 51.69 51.69 51.69 51.70 \$171,475 \$171,475 \$174 \$174 \$174 \$177,775 \$17, \$2,008,355 100.00\* 35.38 0.00 127.664 16.7270 16.7270 16.74.00 11.572 11.572 11.572 11.572 11.702 11.7 100:00% \$90,560,847 \$3,009,682 \$14,009,052 \$14,009,052 \$18,001,152 \$1,000,052 \$2,000,052 \$20,052 \$ \$133,268 \$1,152,119 \$2,033,947 \$1,244,045 \$1,169,069 \$1,964,051 \$2,284,054 \$3,160,270 \$3,160,270 125,919 147,340 181,725 181,0725 181,001 181,001 184,770 18 Total Present Annaturd Revenues \$88,552,492 72.000,000

72.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000,000

73.000

73.000,000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000

73.000 Grand Total Total - Excluding Lights 250 WATT HIGH PRESSIBE SODIUM. COBRA HEAD
200 WATT HIGH PRESSIBE SODIUM. COLOUNA.
70 WATT HIGH PRESSIBE SODIUM. COLOUNA.
60 WATT HIGH PRESSIBE SODIUM INTECTIONAL FLOOD
600 WATT HIGH PRESSIBE SODIUM INTECTIONAL FLOOD
100 WATT HIGH PRESSIBE SODIUM. ACORD RETURNE
100 WATT HIGH PRESSIBE SODIUM. ACORD RETURNE LUPIES.
175 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
175 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
400 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
100 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM.
100 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM. GRIMALITAL
200 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM. GRIMALITAL
200 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM. GRIMALITAL
225 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SOUILM. GRIMALITAL
225 WA Rate 11: GS-1 - Rezidental Hibbitation of Rate 12: Schedule R. Rate, For Dreit Rate 12: Schedule R. Rate, For Dreit Rate 10: Schedule R. Rate, For Dreit Rate 10: Schedule R. Rate 1 - Stendule R. Rate 1 - Stendule R. Rate 1 - Stendule R. Rate 2 - Schedule C. Rate 3 - Schedule L. Rate 3 - Schedule C. Rate 6 - Schedule C. Rate 9 - Schedule C. Rate 9 - Schedule C. Rate 9 - Schedule R. Rat \$17.6 \$10.612 \$10.612 \$10.62 \$1.000 \$ \$52,40 \$51,16 \$11,600 \$15,000 \$15,000 \$15,000 \$16,100 \$14,000 \$17,000 \$12,400 \$12,000 \$1,940,295 for the 12 months ending September 10, 2006 (instuding Environmental Surcharge and Fivel Adjustment Clause Revenues) s becase 18,520,01,200 18,520,520 18,74 100.00% \$90.492.697 Total Proposed Reverses 15.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11.18\*
11 125.910 161.725 161.725 161.725 161.625 161.625 162.203 162.203 162.203 162.203 162.203 162.203 163.20 \$68,552,492 175 WAIT MERCURY VAPOR
175 WAIT MERCURY VAPOR
400 WAIT MERCURY VAPOR
400 WAIT MERCURY VAPOR
400 WAIT MERCURY VAPOR
400 WAIT MERCURY VAPOR
415 WAIT MERCURY VAPOR
415 WAIT MERCURY VAPOR
416 WAIT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM
417 WAIT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM
520 WAIT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM
520 WAIT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM
520 WAIT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM
500 WAIT HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM
50 Grand Total Rin 23 Schedule I.
Rist 23 Schedule I.
Rist 25 Schedule II.
Rist 30 Lugh Wa Sive - Rist 8
Rist 40 Lugh Wa Sive - Rist 8
Rist 44 Lugh Wa Rist 8-2
Rist 46 Lugh Wa Rist 8-2
Rist 46 B-1
Rist 46 B-1
Rist 46 B-1
Rist 47 Lugh Wa B-2
Rist 42 Lugh Wa Rist 8-2
Rist 46 Lugh Wa Rist 8-2
Rist 56 Rist Eschedule C Eschedule C Ecomm & Sm Pwr - Rate 2 Ecomm & Sm Pwr - Rate 2 Rate 11: GS-1 Rate 12: Schedule R Rote 13: Schedule A - Rate 1 Rote 10: GS-2 Rate 17: Schedule R-2 Rate 12: Schedule R-2 Rate 16: Rate 1 ETS

interim Order Recate of Flow-Through Summary Page 2 of 2

Blue Grass Energy

Interim Order
Recale of Flow-Through
Summary
Page 2 of 2

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months ending Beplamber 30, 2006 (excluding Environmental Burcharge and Fuel Adjustment Clause Revenues) Billing Analysis

0.10%
0.10%
0.10%
0.08%
0.08%
0.08%
0.08%
0.13%
0.13%
0.13%
0.13%
0.14%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16%
0.16% 0.113 0.003 0,09% \$11,626 \$9,023 \$12 \$12 \$13 \$13,18 \$23,13 \$13,18 \$13,48 \$14 165,160 Difference 2.75 17.65 11.2972 11.2972 12.695 12.695 13.507 1 \$2,009,355 \$ Increase 100.001 13.38. Percent of Total Revenue 100.00% \$75,008,887 120,910
5474,336
140,725
140,725
140,636
15,000
140,736
15,000
140,736
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
15,000
1 113-647,00 113-647,00 110-647,00 110-647,00 110-647,00 110-647,00 111-647,00 \$73,000,533 Total Present Amarized Revenues Grand Total Total - Lents fotal - Exchding Light 20 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODUM
200 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODUM. COBRA MEAD
70 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODUM. COLOURA.
400 WATT WITH HIGH SESSURE SODUM. SOCIETATION, ELOO
400 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODUM. SOCIETA HEAD
100 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODUM. CORRANGE FITTINE
100 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODUM. 175 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
175 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
175 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
400 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
400 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
175 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
175 WATT MERCURY VAPOR
176 WATT MERCURY VAPOR SEPARATE TRANSFORMER
170 WATT MER PRESSURE SODUM ORNAMENTAL
120 WATT HIGH PRESSURE SODUM ORNAMENTAL
12 Table 77. Lurge find B-2 Table 48. Lurge find Rate B-2 Table 49. Lurge find Rate B-2 Table 50. Lurge PAT Sive, LPR 2 - State B Schedule C Schedule C Scomm & Sm Pwr + Rate 2 S Comm & Sm Pwr - Rate 2 2) Schedde L S. Schedde M B. Lig Pwr Swe-Rate B D. Large Ind - Rate B A: Large Ind - Rate B-2 S. Large Ind - Rate B-2 G. Barge Ind - Rate B-2 G. Barge Ind - Rate B-2 Rate 17: GS-1 Flate 12: Schedde R Rate 13: Schedde A-Rate i Flate 16: Schedde R-2 Rate 17: Schedde R-2 Rate 16: Rate 1 ETS Rate & Scheduse 55.240 51.16 50 51.16 50 51.16 50 51.16 50 51.16 50 51.16 50 51.17 50 51.27 73 51.27 \$17.00 \$10.00 \$1 \$1,940,205 for the 12 months ending Septamber 30, 2008 (excluding Environmenta) Surcharge and Fuel Adjustment Cituse Revenues) 15.35. 15.35. 15.35. 15.35. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 15.37. 16.37. 17.37. 100.00\* 127,835 1460,900 1460,900 141,1010 141,541 141,541 142,600 140 100 00% \$74,540,738 Total Proposed Revenues 15.38°, 16.59° \$47.328 \$10.725 \$401,895 \$10,725 \$401,895 \$1,507 \$1,507 \$1,507 \$1,507 \$1,507 \$1,507 \$1,607 \$1 \$73,000,533 Grand Total otal - Exchdeng Lights 175 WATH MERCURY VAPOR

OW WATH MERCURY VAPOR

OW WATH MERCURY VAPOR

OW WATH HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM

115 WATH HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM

116 WATH HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM

OW WATH HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM

OW WATH HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM

COW WATH HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM

COM WATH HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM

CORNATH HIGH

TOW WATH HIGH PRESSURE SODIUM

COM WATH HIG Rain II. GS-1
Rain 10. Schedule A. Rain 1
Rain 17. Schedule R. 2
Rain 18 Rain 1 ETS
Rain 18 Rain 1 ETS
Rain 18 Rain 1 ETS
Rain 19. Schedule C.
Rain 25. Schedule C.
Rain 25. Schedule C.
Rain 25. Schedule I.
Rain 25. Schedule II.
Rain 26. Lurge Ind - Rain B-2.
Rain 41. Lurge Ind - Rain B-2.
Rain 41. Lurge Ind Rain B-2.
Rain 42. Lurge Ind Rain B-2.
Rain 43. Lurge Ind Rain B-2.
Rain 44. Lurge Ind Rain B-2.
Rain 44. Lurge Ind Rain B-3.
Rain 44. Lurge Ind Rain B-3.
Rain 44. Lurge Ind Rain B-3. ste & Schedule

Recalc of Flow-Through Interim Order

Billing Analysis

Clark Enorgy

Summary

Clark Energy

Recalc of Flow-Through Summary Page 1 of 1

KIUC Method

Billing Analysis

for the 12 month ending September 10, 2006 including Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues

for the 12 ma	for the 12 month ending September 39, 2006 Including Environmental Surcharge & FAC Rovenues	er 39, 2006 Incl.	uding Environme	ntal Surcharge	* FAC Revenues		for the 12 mo	for the 12 month ending September 30, 2005 including Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues	r 30, 2006 inclu	ding Environmen	ai Surcharge &	FAC Revenues		KIUC vs Interim	Intorim
								Total Present	<u></u>	Total					
	Total Present		ola	_		_	-				7			•	%
	Total Control of	Consone of	Oronogood	Domont of	****	_		Annualized	Percent of	Proposed	Forcent of			•	:
	Annualized	round of	Toposod I		C Judeout &	W. Increases	Orbedule	Revenues	Total Rov.	Revenues	Total Rov.	\$ Increase	% increase	Difference	Difference
Schedule	Revenues	Total Hev.	Hevenues	Jorgi Kev.	o Birlegge	acases of	0 117	A30 054	79 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	C26 906 173	72.22%	\$555.309	2.10%	\$24,446	0.09%
Arbadella 10	\$76 439.864	72.23%	\$26,971,728	72.23%	\$531,863	2.01%	Schedule K	+00'cc+'pz¢	7.55.7			5	2008	\$	76000
Total Control	6	2000	5	7000	Ş	0.00%	Schedule R-TOD	25	0.00%	7	2000	3	5.5	2	
Schedule R-100	ne.	2000		2000	2	980	Cobradio D	\$97.870	0.27%	599.900	0.27%	\$2,030	2.07%	292	0.09%
Schedule D	\$97,870	0.27%	\$88,808	0.21%	0000	0/00	1	6104 138	7987	5403 373	0 28%	52.247	2.22%	\$112	0.11%
Schodule T	\$101,126	0.28%	\$103,261	0.28%	52,135	2.31%	Schedule	2101,160	0.6040	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		200	2000	63.086	U 44%.
	000	7030 F	5502 531	1 85%	\$42.343	181%	Schedule S	5681,288	1.86%	2070,/10	4,00.	913,423	2,00.7		
Schedule S	\$551,260	1.00%	00000	1007		200	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	C2 64 122	%250	\$361,688	0.97%	\$7,566	2.14點	2409	0.11%
Schedule E	\$354,122	0.97%	\$361,279	0.97%	77.13/	2.0278	ociacona c	77, 100	2000	44 400 440	2006	C31 E83	2 17%	\$4.471	0.10%
1	64 450 723	7 0897	<1 488 945	%05 *	530.212	2.07%	Schedule A	\$1,458,733	6,50%	(C) +(D6+) 0	0,000	3	- !		
Schedule A	20,000,000		7		100	2000	C-hodyle B	C1 238 DB5	3.38%	51 264 709	3.38%	\$26,624	2.15%	\$1,463	0.12%
Schedule B	\$1,238,086		21,263,257	4,36%	255,17	S.CO.7	Company of	400000000000000000000000000000000000000	7000	67 776 443	10 7007	200 108	2 13%	\$6.873	0.12%
Orbodulo	S4 646 916	12.69%	\$4,740,240	12.69%	\$93,324	2.07%	Schedule	54,040,910	20.037	2	200	, ,	è	17.7	0 4487
Scaleumer	5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6		707	/200	241 185	1 07%	Schedille	\$669.594	1.83%	\$683,527	1.83%	\$13,933	d, 20.7	74/4	: :
Schedule P	\$669,594	1.83%	2002,780	.63%	200	9			70000	S	75000	5	0.00%	S	0.00%
H opportug	5	0.00%	25	0.00%	SS	0.00%	Schedule H	200	9/03/5	3 :	2 1		200	•	, <del>0</del> 000
The second		/9000	69	72000	ç	2000	Schedule G	- S	0.00%	3	200.0	3	200°	3	2
Schedule G	กั	6.00.0	3	0,000	3 3	7000	1000	5782 047	747F C	5798 355	2.14%	\$16,307	2.09%	\$817	0.10%
Schedule M	\$782,047	2.14%	\$797,538	2.14%	515,491	- P. 22.	Collegue W	100 C	744.0	100000	0 27%	CO 807	2.05%	\$143	0.10%
e)strong	5137 184	0.37%	5139,850	0.37%	\$2,665	1.94%	Schedule J	513/,184	0.37%	102,2216	6,70,70	45,001			
Colonia C									••••						ò
Total - All Rate Classes	\$36,606,830	100.00%	\$37,342,314	100.00%	\$735,485	2.01%	Total - All Rate Classes	\$36,606,830	100.00%	\$37,380,960	100.00%	5/74,130	2.1 170	\$30,000	0,10,0
	-														
		Clark Energy	inorgy						Clark Enorgy	ABJOI					

Clark Enorgy

Billing Analysis

for the 12 month ending September 30, 2006 excluding Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues

for the 12 month anding Septembar 30, 2006 excluding Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revanues

Biiling Analysis

KIUC vs Interim

0.11% 0.12% 0.49% 0.13% 0.11% 0.15% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.12% DIMorences \$24,446 \$32 \$112 \$3,086 \$3,086 \$1,471 \$1,473 \$5,873 \$0 \$0 \$817 \$141 \$38,646 % Increase 2.50% 2.50% 2.51% 2.51% 2.51% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.51% \$2,030 \$2,247 \$15,429 \$7,566 \$31,683 \$26,624 \$99,196 \$13,933 \$0 \$15,307 \$2,807 \$774,130 72.06% 0.00% 0.26% 0.29% 2.00% 0.97% 3.41% 12.67% 1.78% 0.00% 2.10% 0.36% 100.00% Porcent of Total Rev. Proposed Revenues \$22,799,226 \$83,042 \$91,691 \$308,078 \$1,293,859 \$1,779,248 \$4,007,655 \$564,725 \$564,725 \$564,725 \$663,575 \$114,027 \$31,637,710 0.00% 0.25% 0.29% 2.00% 0.97% 3.41% 12.65% 1.78% 0.00% 0.00% 2.10% 0.36% 100.00% Annualized

Revenues

\$22,242,918

\$20,242,918

\$00,000

\$81,012

\$89,445

\$80,17,153

\$300,512

\$1,022,624

\$3,908,459

\$550,792

\$647,268

\$647,268 \$30,863,579 Total Present Totai - Ali Rate Classes Schedule R-TOD Schedule D Schedule S Schedule S Schedule B Schedule B Schedule P Schedule P Schedule P Schedule P Schedule P Schedule P Schedule B % increase 2.33% 2.33% 2.33% 2.33% 2.33% 2.33% 2.33% 2.33% 5. 2.33% 5. 0.00% 5. 0.00% 5. 0.00% 5. 0.00% 5. 0.00% 5. 0.00% 2.38% \$1,938 \$2,135 \$12,343 \$7,157 \$30,212 \$25,171 \$23,324 \$13,186 \$13,186 \$13,186 \$13,186 \$735,485 Total Rev. 72.07% 0.00% 0.26% 0.25% 1.39% 0.41% 1.99% 0.41% 1.79% 0.40% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.00% 0.36% 0.36% 100.00% Percent of S22,774,781 \$0 \$2,950 \$91,560 \$307,669 \$1,292,388 \$1,077,795 \$4,001,783 \$563,978 \$0 \$0 \$662,758 \$113,886 \$31,599,064 Total Proposed 72.07% 0.00% 0.26% 0.29% 2.00% 0.97% 3.41% 12.66% 1.78% 0.00% 2.10% 0.36% 100.00% Percent of Total Rev. Total Present
Annualized
Revenues
\$22,242,918
\$81,012
\$81,012
\$81,012
\$89,445
\$617,163
\$300,512
\$1,052,024
\$3,008,459
\$550,792
\$550,792
\$550,792
\$550,792 \$30,863,579 fotal - All Rate Classes Schedule R. Contadie R. TOD Schedule D. Schedule D. Schedule E. Schedule E. Schedule B. Schedule B. Schedule P. Schedule P. Schedule P. Schedule M. Schedule J. Sc

775,268 (1,138) From EKPC Under-Recover Rounding KIUC Method Recals Flow-Thru Summary

interim Order Recate Flow-Thru Summary

Interim	0.14% 0.14% 0.15% 0.15% 0.12% 0.13% 0.15% 0.10%	777		0,60%	0.11%				
KIUC vs Interim	\$ 50 \$20,048 \$50 \$1,506 \$1,025 \$1,025 \$1,025 \$1,180 \$2,180 \$2,581		145,46U	\$0	\$45,400				
	2.62% 2.62% 2.62% 2.63% 2.63% 2.52% 2.62% 2.80% 2.76%		2.52%		2 34%				
	\$_increase		908,395		305 300		910,020	2,432	
	26 of 10th 64 51% 0.14% 3.04% 2.34% 6.73% 17.84% 2.98%		100.00%					Under-recever - rounding	
illey Is stember 30, 2006	Proposed 21,395,642 21,395,642 1,007,699 802,079 774,883 2,233,687 5,918,407 986,888		33,167,307	6,566,936		39,734,243		Under-rec	
Cumberland Valley Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006	% of Total 64.51% 0.45% 2.44% 2.42% 6.73% 6.73% 17.85% 2.96%		100,00%						
for the 12	Existing 20,009,486 46,169 960,169 780,181 753,818 2,171,799 5,777,254 960,202		32,258,910	6.556.936		38,625,846			
	Residential H-5 C-1 C-2 C-2 E-1 E-1 P-1 L-1 Street Lighting and Security Lights			20 H	23.00	Total			
	2.68% 2.68% 2.69% 2.69% 2.69% 2.68% 2.68% 2.66% 2.59%		2 67%			2.22%			
	\$ Increase \$ 557,314 1,241 26,194 20,936 20,240 57,850 155,034 24,105		862 916			862,916	863.878		962
	25.0f Total 64.51% 0.14% 2.42% 2.34% 6.73% 17.85% 2.97%		700 000	100.0078					
Cumberland Valloy Baling Analysts for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006	Proposed 21,506,802 47,410 1,006,393 801,119 2,773,856 5,912,846 5,912,847			33,121,62/	6,556,936	19,688,763			
Cumberland Valloy Biling Analysts months ended Septem	26 of Tolin 64.51% 0.14% 3.04% 2.34% 6.73% 17.85% 2.90%		l	100.00%					
for the £2	Existing 20,000,488 46,169 980,199 780,181 73,518 5,757,54 960,202		- Campanananan	32,258,910	6,566,936	38.825.846			
	Residential H-1 C-1 C-2 E-1 P-1 L-1 Street Lighting and Socurity Lights				SE A CAR	To be			

Page 1 of 1 Recalt Flort-Thru Interim Order

Farmers Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation Billing Analysis Far the 12 months ended September 30, 2000

ŀ	4 5		3	0.50	6.10	80	647	10.5	ï	G.	00	2.07	8				
	Total	100	17.657.0	84,920	1,838,875	5	136,646,3	3,177,600	366,583	2,641,533	16.812	623.108	30,125,125		6,443239	30,500,364	
			Schedule R - Residential Service	Schedue R.R Residential Off-Peak Marketon	Schedule C Section 1 - Commercial & Industrial Service Less than 50 kW	Schedule CM - Small Commercial Off-Peak Marketing	Schedule C Section 2 - Commercial & Industrial Service 50 kW or Above	Schedule C Section 2a - Commercial & Industrial Sentre 50 kW or Above	Schedule D - Large Commercial Industrial Service Oxfornal Time-of-Day Rate	Schedule E - Large Industrial Rate	Schedule St Street Lighting Service	Schedule OL - Outdoor Uniting Service	Total Date Rates		FAC&ES	Town inchaing FAC and ES	
		A Increase	2.79%	2.76%	28.4	2 80%	2.75%	2 76%	2,60%	2.79%	7.60%	2.63%	2.79%			2308	
		Tremese & Incress	537,017	7.35	41.601	,	20.00	A7 E24	10 282	70.161	127	17,630	833 848			833,648	840,821
	S 3 <sup>4</sup>	Local	*@B	2000	70,5	,	7.00	10.55%	1.23%	2.5	2000	2078	100 0015				
	Proposed	total \$	19,782,438	F7 770	274 000 1		2000	1 265 621	120 Mar	7 970 634	17.783	640,738	440 150 02		6,443,239	37,408,211	
	9 *	H H	8383	2000		2000	42.4	25.05		1	1000	207%	*OO DO				
	Enstro	1015	19 275 423	0.00	276'60	Classia.	100	CALL 14. C	7,111,000 1,111,000	1044 571	45.04	622,109	20, 50,5	20,000	6,443,233	36,568,364	
			and the second s	Service of the servic	Schedule Rid - Residential Off-Feat Marketin	Schedule C Section 1 - Commental & Industrial Sentre Less than 50 KM	Schooles Cal - Small Competital Off-Peak Markets	Schedule C Section 2 - Commercial & Indianal Service of Ref of Association	Schedule C Section 2s - Commercial & Industrial General Section of Autore	Schedule D Lega Correspondibilitational service Opportunisme control nate	から はないない 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一 一	Schedule SL, - Street Lathard Service Schedule SL - Ordoor Lathard Service		COLUMN STRUCTURE	FAC & ES	Total Including FAC and ES	

Farmers Rural Electric Cooperative Corporation Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

Page 1 of 1 Recate Flow-Then KTUC Method

Exalmo							
ntmo				L		•	,
	2	Proposed	9			•	
1000	Total	Total\$	TOTAL ST	\$ trenesses	S Incerte	Cifferactos	ă
0 225 421	8308	19,774,053	E3 62.4	559,531	2.91%	\$22.616	0.17%
84 920	0.28%	67,130	028%	2,470	2.91%	***	20.53%
A.VA 875	5 10%	1,632,231	6,10%	53,415	290%	\$2,016	0.51%
501	8000	5	1000	ū	2,90%	2	0.50%
12000	7.77	2,006,101	6.47%	56,197	2.88%	\$7,426	2,12%
3 177 600	10.55%	3,259,496	10.55%	169,19	2.83%	£78,£\$	0.17%
260,583	1228	177.158	*22.8	10,573	7.85%	2	7800
26.53	X 2 7 G	2.924.348	X276	52,815	2.91%	13,564	0.13%
15.812	*900	17,300	1500	<b>297</b>	2,80%	11	. 10. 20.
623,108	2.07%	640,825	2.07%	17,718	2.64%	<b>#</b>	0.05%
30,125,125	100 00%	31,000,034	100 00%	874.909	2 90%	\$36,067	0.175
6,443,239		6,443,239				2	0.00%
X0,568,364		37,443,273		874,909	2.39%	126.062	X60.0
				575, 157			
		Unde	HECONTRE	278			
108 3,177,500 3,177,500 3,60,563 3,60,563 1,151,53 1,125,125 1,125,125 1,125,125 1,125,125 1,125,125		100 100%	2000 1209 1209 140 1400 1400 17,440	171 2000.101 2120.404 217.150 200.101 2120.404 217.150	2000.111 0.07% 2000.101 0.47% 2000.406 10.57% 2000.406 10.57% 2000.406 10.00%	173 000%   5 2000,101 0.47%   54,197 2000,101 0.47%   54,197 200,469 0.55%   51,197 200,469 0.43%   0.573 17300 0.00%   0.571 21,000,034 100,00%   0.74,00 0.44,229   0.74,00 21,44,229   0.74,00 21,44,229	17   000   17   17   17   17   17   17

22

Underscovered

KIUC Method Recalc Flow-Thru Summany KIUC vs Interim

Floming-Mason Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

interim Order Recale Flow-Thru Bummary

Rocal

Fleming-Mason Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

% Difference 0.06%	0.06%	2,03%	0.04%	2.00	0.05%	0.05%	0.06%	%90°0	5.00.0	0.12%	2.17%	0.00%	4.01%	0.00%	-0.01%		
8	\$29	\$1,120	\$1,012	\$37	\$1,069	\$2,563	\$367	\$47,988	2	-\$9,772	415,276	05	-\$7,060	8	-\$7.060		
% increase 2.89%	3,01%	2.93%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	3.00%	2.99%		264%	3.81%			***	2.18%		
	1,815	94,568	72,332	4,146	68,947	151,410	18,827	1,016,933		208,472	325,504	,	1,550,908		1,550,908	1,553,717	(2,809)
ed % Total 58.38%	0.18% 3.18%	9.31%	7.11%	0.41%	6.76%	14.84%	1.85%	100.00%						***************************************			~ Rounding
Proposed Total 5 19,726,578 5	62,089	3,257,985	2,485,930	142,150	2,366,012	5,190,614	646,043	34,968,313 100.00%	336	8,096,060	8,879,676	6,035,198	57,999,582	14,694,241	72,693,623		Under-recovery ~ Rounding
" "	0,18% 3,18%	9,31%	7.10%	0.41%	6.76%	14.83%	1.85%	100.00%									
Existing Total 19,153,932	60,274 1 078 770	3,163,317	2,413,598	138,005	2,297,065	5,039,204	627,216	33,971,380 100.00%	336	7,887,588	8.554.172	6,035,198	56,448,674	14,694,241	71,142,915		
Residential	Farm and Home Marketing Rate (ETS)	Large General Service	Large Industriial Service 1	All Electric Schools	Guardian Industries	Dravo	Street Lighting and Security Lights		Green Power	Injand Cantainer	Injand Steam	Tennessee Gas	Suddotal Including Special Contracts	FACAES	Talai		
% Increase 2.83%	2.95%	2.96%	2,95%	2,93%	2.95%	2.95%	2.94%	2.94%		2774	2000				2.19%		
\$ (ncrease 561.452	1,776	93.548	71,320	4,049	67.878	148.847	18,460	998,945		246	340 770		1,557,969		1,557,969	1,558,226	257
56 38%	0.18%	6 10 0	7.11%	0.41%	6.75%	14 84%	1.85%	100.00%									
Proposed Total 5	62,050	1,130,385	2 484.918	142.054	2 354 943	5 188 051	645,675	34,970,325 100.00%	325	0 100 000	350,501,0	6,035,198	58,006,643	14,694,241	72,700,884		Оядвичесомен
% Total	0.18%	3,16%	7 10%	0.43%	6.75%	44 875	1.85%	100.00%									
Existing Total	60,274	1,078,770	2,102,211	138 005	2 262 065	2,152,1	627,216	33,971,360 100.00%	4	330	000,100,1	6,035,198	56,448,674	14,694,241	71,142,915		
Cost dential	Farm and Home Marketing Rate (ETS)	Smail General Service	Large Ceneral Sector 1	An Grands School	All Electric Schools	Gualdian Industries	Street Lighting and Security Lights		:	Green Power	Intand Container	Inland Steam Tennessee Gus	Subtotal Including Special Contracts	PAC SES	Totai		

KiUC Method
Recalc of Flow-Through
Bummary

Interim Order Recals of Flow-Through Busmary

rie su	.*	Difference	7,500	2000		7	0.03%	0.13%	0.08%		300	300	<u>.</u>	T		0.0176		rteilm		[		- Sillerance	t		2,11	4 1 2	2.17.	20.00	0,10%	21.5			0.11%		
KSUC vs txtarim	**	Difference	115.067	•		2	21,448	2\$	\$228	** 764			į	-	: :	\$21.046		KTUC vs breatm				Difference	190'91"	2	*20	51,443	2	\$228	\$2,762	\$230	\$32		\$23,046		
Proposed	Recented	Percent	30 11.4	Ē			6,73%	0.01*	13%			0.7	*			100.003			Proposed		Laterino	Percent	79.76	<u>:</u>	0.14	6,70	•.100	133.	13.96	3.91.	1.61.		100,00%		
Present	Revenue	Percent	70.10		· ·	<u>.</u>	.11.9	0.01	7.773			1	1.45% 1.45%			100 00%			Present	Daniel Co.	enseau.	Percent	10.76	.58	0.34%	6.70	1,150		3.96	1,91	19		100 00%		
		% Increase	2024	1000	200	233%	2.03%	2.38%	25.50	, ,	200	, i	2363	***************************************		2.03%					;	% nerease	2.38%	2.38%	239%	2.38%	2.38%	236%	2.37%	2.38%	2 38%		2.36%		
Ravenues)		\$ increase	720 077		1,022	631	31,199	77	4.73	3	200,40	707'91	7,805			464,655			Revenues	,	;	5 increase	328,947	7,022	631	31, 190	41	6,136	64,681	18,292	7,805		464,654	464,672	(18)
Surcharge & FAC		Total	40 00 000	000,000,00	44.434	520,73	1,568,485	1,766	300 304	200,63	3,304,602	972,830	335,808			23,376,023			Starbatch & FAC			Total	14,146,486	302,077	27,085	1,340,483	1,766	266,291	2,790,450	782,602	335,808		19,993,047	EKPC Incr	Under-Recover - Rounding
Grayson Billing Analysis ir 30, 2006 (incl. Envir.)		Total		10,550,000	337,432	26,454	1,537,295	1725	250 455	7007	3,240,121	954,629	328,003			22,911,369	Graveon	Billing Analysis	2000 favel Emile			Total	13,617,539	295,055	28,454	1,309,293	1,725	260,155	2,725,769	764,401	326,003		19,528,393		Under-Re
Grayson Billing Araitals for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 (Incl. Envir. Surcharge & FAC Revenues)				Cometat - raim and nome delvice	Domestic - Farm & Home Service, Barns & Camps	ETS	Small Commercial	Water Pamoing Service	CLA TO THE PARTY OF THE PARTY O	All the ornoos orn and	Large Power Service - Single & Three-Phase	Large Industrial Service - HLF	Street & Security Lighting Outdoor Lighting				e		see the 4th manages and address to 2000 force Errole Street & FAC Streetings	for receivance partie similars 21 at 101			Domestic - Farm and Hame Service	Domestic - Farm & Home Service, Barns & Camps	ETS	Small Commercial	Water Pumping Service	All Elec Schools Set AES	Large Power Service - Single & Three-Phase	Lunge Industrial Service - HLF	Street & Security Lighting Outdoor Lighting				
personal designation of the second se		100000	T COOK	70.8		0,17	4.71	100	-100	•	54141	+ 16.	1416.			100 00%				Date of the	Revolute	Percent	70.76	1.51%	0.14*	6.70*	9.00	1335	13.96.1	3,91*	58.		100.001		
Pieses	-	o province	reces	70.87	147	0.1274	4.334.		4:10:0	1,14*	17.5	4.17	143.			\$00.00t				Present	Revenue	Percent	70.76*	.15	0.14	6.70	0.01	1334	13.9%*	1.91".	191		100 00%		
			A Increase	1,93%	1.99%	2.27%	407	,,,,,,	277	2.27%	1,91%	1.82%	227%			1.94%						% increase	2.27%	2.27%	2.27%	277%	2.27%	2.27%	2 27%	2.27%	2.27%		227%		
Revenues			2 100,000,00	313,680	6,702	601	20 733	1 1	P)	5,910	61,919	17,364	7,451			443,608				Revenues)		Sincease	313 880	6 707	601	29 742	33	5.910	61.919	17.364	7,451	***************************************	443,608		
Surchaine & FAC		,	ola	16,539,436	344,134	27 054	* CET 037	, con , con ,	3	266,065	3,302,040	871,993	335,454			23,354,977				Surcharge & FA(		Total	14 131 419	757 101	27.054	1 110 015	1.764	256 855	2 787 688	781,765	335,454		19,972,001		
Grayson Billing Analysis er to 2005 theel Envir	In Freez littles with and		Total	16,225,556	337.432	26.454	300 403 3	*********	1,725	260,155	3,240,121	954,629	326,003			22,911,369		noskeno.	Balling Analysis	10, 2006 (excl. Envir.		Total	13 817 539	205 055	14 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	1 109 793	1725	260 865	2775769	764 401	328,003		19,528,393		
Grayson Billing Arabyata 12. Mar 22 months and d. Cantember 10. 2006 finel Forti. Surchains & F.O. Revenues)	recognition panils similarity out (c)			Domestic - Parm and Home Service	Comoche. Barn & Home Service Barns & Camits	The state of the s		Small Commercial	Water Pumping Service	All Elec Schools Sch AES	Large Power Service - Single & Three-Phase	Fare Industrial Service - HLF	Street & Security Lighting Outdoor Lighting					i	oci	for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 (excl. Envir. Surcharge & FAC Rovenues)			Spring Samuel Comment - other mod	Section Commence of the Commen	Contesses - rains a roma service, barns a compa		Maria Control of Maria	Control of the Contro	Control Control Control of Contro	Cargo Control Cargos Courses Mr fi	Street & Security Uniting Outdoor Lichting				

interim Order KIUC Method Summary Page 1 of 1

П	al al	ı	7
KUC vs frånim	2017 0.10% 0.10% 0.12% 0.14% 0.14% 0.16% 0.00%	401.0 400.0	× 400
KIUC	2010/conce 126,044 135 135 135 1527 1734 1734 1734	16.13	167731
	% incease 2.63% 2.65% 2.65% 2.65% 2.65% 2.63% 2.63% 2.63% 2.63% 2.63% 2.63% 2.70%	2.64%	22%
	\$\frac{5}{100000000000000000000000000000000000	785,596	785,596 786,288 (692)
	% of 1003 61,92% 0.12% 1,65% 5,37% 0,67% 4,88% 3,00% 2,17%	100.00%	3,403,329 Under-recover - Rounding
ber 30, 2006	Proposed 1600 25,622,917 39,708 570,254 1,641,628 903,367 1,639,69 664,568	30,580,630	36,403,329 Under-recov
Inter-County Billing Analysis ths ended Septem	% of IESB 81,93% 0.12% 1.85% 5.37% 0.67% 4.88% 3.00% 2.17%	100.00%	
Inter-County Bising Arabysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006	Existing    Intel   24,403,950   25,403,950   55,706   1,001,074   108,147   1,455,209   802,457   647,125	29,795,234	35,617,733
	Farm and Home Service Farm and Home Markeing Rate (ETS) Smill commercial & Simil Power Lunge Fower Rate All Electric School Vol. 4.999 kW) Large Industrial Rate of 1500 kW to 4,599 kW) Large Industrial Rate CT (500 kW to 4,599 kW) Street/Security Ughting Outdoor Lighting	FAC and ES	
	h incresse 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.54% 2.54%	2.53%	2 12%
	\$ Increase 617,823 908 14,057 44,035 5,018 5,018 20,601 22,667 16,385	754,205	754,205 754,858 (653)
	5 of 1040 1040 10.12% 1.86% 1.86% 5.37% 0.67% 4.88% 3.00% 2.17%	100.00%	
tber 30, 2006	Proposed Tetal 25,027,873 an G74 560,563 1,641,410 203,164 1,462,110 915,125 693,520	30,549,439	36,371,638
Inter-County Billing Analysis Its ended Septer	5 of Total 81 03% 0.12% 0.12% 1.06% 0.53% 0.67% 4.86% 3.00% 2.17%	100.00%	
Inter-County Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2009	Existing Total 24,409,960 35,767 95,506 1,601,074 108,147 1,455,209 992,457 647,125	29,795,234	35,617,733
	Farm and Hone Service Form and Hone Marketing Rate (ETS) Small covernecata & Small Power Large Forms Rate Large Forms Rate Large Indexistian Rate B1 (500 kW to 4,599 kW) Large Indexistian Rate B1 (500 kW to 4,699 kW) Street/Security Lighting Outdoor Lighting	FAC and ES	

Sammary Recalt Flow - Thru KJUC Method	NIOC vt Intalen   NIOC vt In	0 2.60% 170.564 0.10% 10 0.00% 10 0.00%
uz.	<b>A</b>	266,753,1 2,567,619
ive 32, 2009	<i>y</i> r	12,443,000 12,443,000 12,004,132
Jackson Energy Cooperative Blary Analysis for the 12 months ented September 30, 2009	Freatt Revenue  1021 1021 1021 1021 1021 1021 1021 10	12,449,500 10,366,314
	Schoolse 1 Dust Fow Schoolse 10 Res, Farm Net Hor-Farm Sch 11 Fear Farm Net Mat Met (ETS) Sch 20 Earth, Sin Power 8, 3-Phase Farm Sch 20 Earth, Sin Power 8, 3-Phase Farm Sch 20 Earth Sin Power 20 Earth Sin Earth Sin Earth Sin Earth Sin Power 20 Earth Sin Eart	FAC pan ES
Summary Recale Flow-Thra Intertine Order	1140.09 123% 1140.09 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123% 1250 123%	4994 1994 8.151
	% of 70 sd   1 horeuse 2003x	1,550,062.1 121,562.1
5002	Froposed foremes \$5.0 ( Total 16,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,023) 5.0 (2,0	12.448,006
Jackson Energy Copperative Eury Aralysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2009	No f Total  0003  0003  72835  0335  0005  1775  0175  1275  2175	
Jackson for the 12 mont	Present Renne Tobal 10,201 10,201 12,102 12,102 12,102 12,102 12,042 12,	12.449.000 00.266.314
	Schedle 1 Das Ewi Schools UREs, form & Hay-Farn Sch 20 Carm. Son Power & A-Prize of Earl Sch 20 Carm. Son Power & A-Prize of Earl Sch 20 Carm. Son Power & A-Prize of Earl Sch 20 Lage Power & A-Prize of Earl Sch 20 Lage Power & A-Prize of Earl Sch 30 Lage Power & A-Prize of Earl Sch 40 Lage Power & 20 NW 221 NW Sch 40 Lage Power & 200 NW - 4.99 NW Sch 40 - Lage Power & 200 NW - 4.99 NW Sch 50 - Schools, Charles & Corm Hels, Sch 52 - A-Elweits & A-Corm Hels, Sch 52 - A-Elweits & A-Prize & Corm Hels, Sch 53 - Schools, Charles & Corm Hels, Sch 54 Gold & Schools, Charles & Corm Hels, Sch 54 Gold & Schools & Lage No.	FAG plu ES

1,673,415

intorim Order
Recale of Flow-Through
Summary
Page 1 of 1

Billing Analysis

Lieking Valley RECC

Summary Page 1 of 1 KIUC Method Recalc of Flow-Through

Liaking Valley RECC

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months anding September 39, 2006 (Including Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues) for the 12 months ending September 30, 2006 (including Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues)

			ĺ		-							
	Total Present	Description	1042	Dorranical			The state of the s		Ł	ľ		į
			600	2000		_		Total Present	C Manage	- Loter	Verness of	
	Same in little		7	177				-		-	100000	
	To the control of		200000	1				Annualized	Total	Proposed	100	
	Revenues	Revenue	Revenues	Revenue	S ingrature	% Brings						
(011 A Date 4 B 1 Farm 01 C	110 000 110	l	L					neventes	revenue ;	Hevenues 1	Keyende	~
CODED HERO LEGIST 1882 - 1884 - CERT CODE	315,668,281	74.05		3	\$333.712	2007	Sch A - Rate 1 - Res. Farm Sm Comm Chart	615, 802 24+	7.4 (16.82)	C+6 338 343	, , , , ,	ŀ
Control Date of Control of the Country	144 470 44							1		310,630,716,	1	•
	001 27 14			5.23	27.72	-	Son B - Rate 4 Comma & Sm Per Service	\$1,130,156	4 37 E	\$1 144 653	A 27.62	٠
String Both Si men Denne	407 408				-			2		300,000	0.4.0	٩
	95,443,101			5	157.038	7	Sign LP - Rate 6 Laige Power	52 435 101	11 354.	42 ARG 070	11.2567	٠
Sort DR Rein Con 17 R R St erre Course Couls	C4 136 EGE				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	•					1.77	٠
THE PARTY OF THE P	(0.60°,020°,040°)				\$27.676	2000	Soft LPR Rate 0.23,7.8 & 91 ares Power Rate	202 204 504		44 254 770	12002	٠
Sort S Secrett- Little Dates.	1004 100									300	11. 10.1	٦
The state of the s	200				116.75		SOCIAL SOCIETY CONTACT DATE	- CE3G 70G	7 \$ CH.	4004	*****	٠
				l	Ī				-1	5020° (40)	3.405	1
	_				•••						_	
Total - All Rate Classes	\$21,454,638	100 00%	\$21 909 194	100 00%	751 757	3.51.	Total - All Data Class -	2007.50	7000	-		,
		ı		20.00				327,434,035	100.00%	100.00%	100 CO	۰

Difference 0.10% 0.12% 0.11% 0.11%

516,719 \$1,343 \$2,781 \$1,499 \$716

% fincesse 121% 126% 126% 126% 120% 158%

\$102ease \$150,431 \$25,497 \$54,869 \$29,176 \$17,442

KIUC vs Interim

0.11%

\$23,058

1,13%

\$477,414

100.00%

Lieking Valley RECC

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months anding September 30, 2006 (excluding Emitormental Surcharge & FAC Revenues)

% Differences 0.12% 0.13% 0.13% 0.13% 0.10% 0.12% KIUG vs Intarim \$ Difference \$1,343 \$2,781 \$1,439 \$715 \$23,058 261% 263% 263% 262% 262% 262% 2.63% \$150,431 \$25,497 \$54,869 \$29,176 \$17,442 \$477,414 100.00% Revenues \$13,767,610 \$995,623 \$2,149,112 \$1,141,927 \$5,149,22 100.00% \$18,745,201 Revenues \$13.417.179 \$371,127 \$2.094,243 \$1,112.752 \$572,486 \$18,267,785 Total Present Annualized Sch A - Rato 1 - Res, Farm, Sm Comm Church Sch B - Rato 4 Comh & Sm Per Service Sch LP - Rato 6 Large Power Sch LPR Rato 6,24,76 & 9 Large Power Rato Sch SL - Security Lights Rato 6 Total - All Rate Classes

Billing Analysis

Licking Valley RECC

for the 12 months anding Septembor 30, 2006 (excluding Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues)

Revenues \$13,750,891 \$995,281 \$2,146,331 \$1,140,428 \$689,212 Total Present Annualtred Revenues \$13,417,179 \$2,094,243 \$1,112,752 \$572,496 Soft A. Rate 1. Res, Farm, Sm Comm Church Soft B. Rate 4 Comm & Sm Pwr Service Soft LP. Rate 6 Large Power Soft LP Rate 0.2,17,6 8.9 Large Power Rate Soft LP Rate 0.2,17,6 8.9 Large Power Rate Soft SL. Security Lights Rate 6 Total - All Rate Ciasses

% Increase 2.49% 2.49% 2.49% 2.49% 2.49% . 495 100.00% \$454,356 \$ Increase \$533,712 \$24,154 \$52,088 \$27,676 \$16,726 \$ 18,722,142 100.0036 \$18,267,785

interitm	sk.	Ofference	0.13%	0.13%	0.13%	0.14%	0.16%	-0.16%	0.13%	0.0 %		2532	b.53%	0.00%	2.00.0
XUC vs interim	*	Difference	\$37,576	\$2,451	\$270	\$1.655	\$6,542	4110	\$2,567	\$2.8		\$51,612	-\$7,018	8	H57H1
KIUC Method Recalc Flow-thru Surmary Page 1 of 1		% increase	2.75%	2.75%	275%	275%	2.75%	2.74%	2.74%	2.65%	-	274%	2.78%		2.29%
Recal		\$ Increase		51,126	5,411	29,258	119,614	1,163	60,456	20,451		1,061,254	149,726		1,210,982
	, o	Total	72 63%	4.80%	0.51%	2.75%	11,23%	0.11%	5.70%	2.07%		100.09%			
2006	Proposed	Total	28,949,663	1,509,630	201,810	1,094,468	4,464,114	43,636	2,264,648	823,081		39,751,651 100.09%	5,531,163	8,704,253	53,986,467
Roàn Billing Assayais (or the 12 months ended September 30, 2006	ō %	Total	72.83%	4.80%	0.51%	275%	11.23%	0.11%	5.70%	2.07%		100.00%			
Roin Buling Analysis months ended Septe	Existing	Total	28,175,887	1,856,504	195,400	1,065,211	4,344,500	42.474	2,204,192	802,630		38,689,795 100,00%	5,381,435	8,704,253	52,775,485
for the 55			Residential	Residential, Farm and Non-Farm Service	Builder	Commercial, Small Power & Three-Phase Farm Service	Industrial	Large Power Service Less than 50 kty	Shdushiai 5,000 - 9,099 kW	Street Ughling and Security Lights	1		Special Contract	PACRES	Total
Interim Order Recalo Flow-thru Summary Page 1 of 1		% increase	2.61%	2.62%	262%	2.60%	2.60%	3.00%	261%	2.44%		2.61%	291%		221%
Reca		Sincrease	735 501	48,675	5,141	27 703	113,074	1,273	57 599	19,577		1,099,641	156,747		1,166,388
	50	Total	72.83%	4.80%	0.51%	275%	11,23%	0.11%	5.70%	2.07%		100.00%			
2006	Proposed	Total	28.912.488	1,907,179	201,540	1,092,913	4,457,574	43,745	2.261,791	822,205		39,699,438 100,00%	5,538,182	8,704,253	53,941,873
niysis September 30	20	Total	72.83%	4.80%	0.51%	2.75%	11.23%	0.11%	5,70%	2.07%		100.00%			
Noiln Bäring Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006	Frishing	Total	28 175 887	1,858,504	196,400	1.055,211	4,344,500	42,474	2.204 192	802,630		38,689,796 100.00%	5,381,435	8,704,253	52,775,485
(or the 5			Recidential	Besidential Farm and Non-Farm Service	Harider	Commercial Small Power & Three-Plase Farm Service	Industrial	Large Power Service Less than 50 kW	WW 989 9 - 580 2 July Industrial	Sweet Ughting and Secunty Ughts	•		Special Contract	FACSES	Total

Large Power - interruptible Credi Amount does not change Lighting - did not change rates on pole charges

1,211,720

Uncer-redover - Rounding

Large Power - Interupbble Crest Amount does not change Lighting - &d not change rates on pole charges

Recalc of Flow-Through Summary Page 1 of 1 Interim Order

Summary Page 1 of 1 KIUC Method Recaic of Flow-Through

Owen Energy Cooperative

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 (including Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues)

Owen Energy Cooperative

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months ended September 30, 2008 (including Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues)

KIUC vs interim

	*	Difference	%90.0	0.05%	7,90.0	0.08%	0.09%	%90'0	0.11%	0.03%	0.11%	0.10%	0.07%	0.07%	0.07%	-1.48%	-0.44%
	**	Difference	\$2,867 0	\$609	\$3,424	\$47,341	53,151	\$8,199	\$480	\$245	\$191	\$24	S	\$214	\$66,749	(\$660,397)	(\$593,648)
		% increase	2.11%	2.06%	2.00%	2.17%	2.15%	2.15%	2,18%	2.57%	2.62%	2.59%	2.03%	2.16%	2.16%	1.48%	1,94%
		\$ Increase	\$95,051	\$21,332	\$109,834	\$1 277 352	\$74,597	\$293,956	59,154	\$18,515	\$4,540	\$603	\$69	\$6,228	\$1,911,233	\$640,973	\$2,552,206
F075071	of Total	<b>Ре</b> уолио	2.08%	1.17%	6.19%	66.37%	3,92%	15.45%	0.47%	0.82%	0.20%	0.03%	0.00%	0.33%	100.00%		
lolal	Proposed	Revenues	\$4,592,260	\$1,055,518	\$5,596,781	\$60,046,723	\$3,542,627	\$13,977,576	\$428,435	\$739,898	\$177,796	\$23,848	\$3,454	\$294,241	\$99,479,157	\$43,885,352	\$134,354,509
Fercent	of Total	Revenue	5.08%	1.17%	6.20%	66.36%	3.92%	15.45%	0.47%	0.81%	0.20%	0.03%	8000	0.33%	100.00%	••••	
iotal Present	Annualized	Revenues	84,497,208	\$1,034,186	\$5,486,947	\$58,769,371	\$3,468,030	\$13,683,620	\$419,281	\$721,382	\$173,256	\$23,245	\$3,385	\$288,012	\$26'295'88 <b>\$</b>	\$43,244,379	\$131,612,303
		Rate	RATE 9 LPB - I	RATE 12 LPB	RATE 13 LPB - 2	RATE I	RATE 3	RATE 4	RATES	RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING	RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING	RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING	RATE 10	RATE 20	Totals excluding Gallatin Steel	GALLATIN STEEL	Totals including Gallatin Steel
		% Increase	2.05%	2.00%	1.94		2.06			2.53%	2.51%	2.49	95%	2.09%	2.08%	3,017	2.39%
		\$ Increase	\$92,184	\$20,723	\$106,410	\$1,230,011	\$71,446	\$285,756	58,674	\$18,270	\$4,349	\$578	\$66	\$6.014	\$1,844,484	\$1,301,370	\$3,145,854
Porcent	of Total	Revenue	5.03%	1.173	6.197	66.369	3.91%	15,45%	0.47%	0.827	0.20%	0.03%	0.00%	0,33%	100.00%		
Total	Proposed	Revenues	\$4,589,393	\$1,054,909	\$5,593,358	\$59,999,382	\$3,539,476	\$13,969,377	\$427,956	\$739,652	\$177,605	\$23,823	53,451	\$294,027	\$90,412,408	\$44,545,749	\$134,958,157
Porcont	of Total	Revenue	5.08%	1.17%	6.20%	86.36%	3,92%	15.45%	0.47%	0.81%	0.20%	0.03%	0.00%	0.33%	100.00%		
Total Present	Annualized	Revenues	\$4,497,208	\$1,034,186	\$5,486,947	\$58,769,371	\$3,468,030	\$13,683,620	\$419,281	\$721,382	\$173,256	\$23,245	\$3,385	\$288.012	\$88,567,924	\$43,244,379	\$131,812,303
		Rate	RATE 9 LPB - 1	RATE 12 LPB	RATE 13 LPB - 2	RATE 1	RATE 3	RATE 4	RATES	RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING	RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING	RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING	RATE 10	RATE 20	Totals excluding Gallatin Steel	GALLATIN STEEL	Totals including Gallatin Steel

Owen Energy Cooperative

Billing Analysis

for the 12 months ended September 30, 2005 (excluding Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues)

for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 (excluding Environmental Surcharge & FAC Revenues)

Owen Energy Cooperative

Billing Analysis

0.08% 0.07% 0.08% 0.11% 0.11% 0.07% 0.03% 0.10% 0.10% KIUC vs Interim 264% 262% 262% 263% 261% 261% \$21,332 \$109,634 \$1,277,352 \$74,597 \$293,956 \$9,154 \$18,515 \$4,540 1.11% 5.73% 66.83% 3.86% 15.45% 0.47% Total
Proposed
Revenues
\$3,723,455
\$937,046
\$4,286,554
\$50,178,917
\$1,597,238
\$17,796
\$1356,819
\$739,898
\$235,618
\$23,618 Revenues 53,629,402 54,109,720 54,109,720 541,00,720 534,005 5346,005 5346,005 5346,005 533,006 523,00 Total Present Annualized RATE 5
RATE 6
RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING
RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING
RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING
RATE 10
RATE 20
Totals excluding Gallatin Steel
GALLATIN STEEL
Totals including Gallatin Steel RATE 9 LPB · I RATE 12 LPB RATE 13 LPB · 2 2.54% 2.54% 2.53% SINCRASS | SINCRASS | S92,7184 | S92,7184 | S1230,718 | S1230,011 | S1230,011 | S1230,011 | S1230,011 | S1230,011 | S1230,014 3.86% 15.45% 0.47% Revenues 53,720,566 54,720,566 54,720,566 54,720,100 54,720,100 54,720,100 54,720,100 54,720,562 54 Total Proposed 5.72% 68.83% 3.86% 15.45% SGVENIES \$3,628,402 \$4,186,720 \$4,186,720 \$2,825,106 \$11,303,282 \$346,665 \$721,382 \$713,256 \$721,382 \$713,256 \$721,382 \$773,256 \$73,188,004 \$73,188,004 \$73,188,004 \$73,188,004 \$73,188,004 \$73,188,004 \$73,188,004 \$73,188,004 Total Present Annualized RATE 3
RATE 4
RATE 5
RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING
RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING
RATE 6 - OUTDOOR LIGHTING
RATE 10 RATE 20
Totals excluding Gallatin Steel
GALLATIN STEEL
Totals including Gallatin Steel Rate RATE 9 LPB-1 RATE 12 LPB RATE 13 LPB-2 RATE 1

\$2,556,588

.\$4,382 Under-Recovery - rounding KUC Method Recate of Flow-Thm Summery Page 1 of 1

Interim Order	Recale of Flow-Thru	Summary	Page t of 1
	Œ		

Shelby Energy Cooperative Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006

							ď	Page 1 01								F225 1 OF 1		
	Shelby Energy Cooperative Billing Analysis	by Energy Coop Billing Analysis	Shelby Energy Cooperative Billing Analysis	3000				ı		S Cr the 17	helby Energ Billing / months end	Shelby Energy Cooperative Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended Syntember 30 2005	ve 130 2005					
		2000	Separet Per	200													KIUC vs intarim	interim
	Present Total Base \$		% of Total Revenue	Proposed Total Base	Proposed % of Total Total Base \$ Revenue	_	\$ increase %	% increase		P <sub>tr</sub>	Present 9	% of Total Revenue	Proposed Total Base S	1 % of Total	\$ Increase % Increase	% Increase	\$ % % Difference Difference	% Difference
Schedule 1 General Service	\$ 2.41	7,427,481	28.59%	5.7	7,626,968 28	28 (0". 5	198,588	2.67*	Schedule 1 General Service	in	7,427,481	78,59	\$ 7,627,400	.400 28.59**	\$ 189,919	2.69.	\$1,332	0.02%
Schedule ETS Off-Pk Retail Mkt Rate		23,565	600			0.69	633	1.69	Schedule ETS Off-Pk Retail Mixt Rate		23,565	9,66,8	7.	24,192 6.09%	627	2.66%	9	0.03%
Schedule 2 La Power Service >50 kW	35.5	\$65,068	****	ä		9.88*	68,505	2.67	Schedule 2 Lg Power Service >50 kW		2,545,068	988.6	2,634,410	#10 9.87%	69,342	2.70*	\$637	0.03%
Schedule 3 - Outdoor & Str Lighting	· F	335,064	1.29%		_	1.29	3,765	7.68	Schedule 3 - Outdoor & Str Lighting		335,064	29.	Ĩ	344,153 1.29%	960'6	1.71%	\$125	0.04%
Schedule 10 - Optional Res, Church & School	7,76	(700,537	29.65**	7,7		19,65*	185,381	2.67*	Schedule 10 - Optional Res, Church & School		7,700,537	29.65%	7,510,317	317 29.65%	209,781	2,72%	007'75	0.06%
Schedule B-1 Lg Industrial Rate	5,91	919,638	22,79%	- 79		22.79*	156,831	1.65	Schedule B-1 Lg Industrial Rate		5,919,630	22.79*	6,981,38	386 22.79	161,756	2.73%	\$4,926	0.08%
Sch B-2 Lg Industrial Rate	2,5	,003,474	7,71%	2,		7.71%	\$9,208	2.997	Sch B-2 Lg Industrial Rate		2,003,474	1.71	2,058,95	.951 7,71%	54,577	2.72%	\$1,369	0.07%
Total Base Rates	\$ 25.9	25,974,818 10	100.00%	\$ 26,6	26,666,929 100.(	100.00% \$	692,111	1,667	Total Base Rales	<b>~</b>	25,974,538	100.00%	5 26,679,910	910 100 00%	\$ 705,092	2,71%	\$12,981	0.05%
Total FAC Component TotalES Component	,	3,397,027		3,3	3,397,027 2,119,962				Total FAC Component TotalES Component		3,397,027		3,397,027	527 962			2 2	8.00% 9.00%
Total including Surcharges	5 31,491,807	1,807		\$ 32.5	32,583,918	**	692,111	2.28*	Total Including Surcharges	\$	31,491,807		\$ 32,190,899	899	\$ 705,092	2,74%	\$12,981	0.047

705,134 (42) Under-recover tounding

KIUC Method Recale of Flow-Through Page 1 of 1

interim Order Recalt of Flow-Through Page 1 of 1

0.11%
0.10%
0.10%
0.11%
0.05%
0.05%
0.05%
0.10%
0.10%
0.10%
0.10%
0.10% 0.09% 200.0 KIUC vs Interim SST,637 \$448 \$448 \$1,469 \$1,599 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,490 \$1,500 \$1,490 \$1,500 \$ \$75,037 2 \$75,037 2.18% 8 Increase 1,370,284 1,370,284 138,042 25,606 49,741 53,400 64,726 1,058 1,058 1,058 1,653 2,031,272 2,026,781 2,026,781 41: 100.00% % of Total 67.30% 0.56% 0.06% 11.39% 2.43% 2.43% 2.64% 3.16% 0.05% 1.72% 0.06% 0.06% 3.03% 3.03% 3.03% 3.03% Total 53,671,781 444,339 5,407,674 9,076,038 1,936,066 2,530,168 2,530,168 1,367,143 648,090 63,397 25,992 2,592,211,434 79,677,736 94,867,346 15,189,610 South Kentucky RECC Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2005 % of Total 67.25% 0.56% 0.00% 11.40% 2.43% 2.64% 3.18% 0.05% 0.05% 0.03% 52.251.497 52.251.497 5.269.635 961 8.655.532 1.865.635 2.049.168 2.465.03 1,332.285 53.149 61.055 2,351.903 77,650,954 15, 189, 610 32,840,554 Residential, Farm and Non-Farm Service
Residential, Farm and Non-Farm Service ETS)
Schedule B ETS
Schedule B ETS
Schedule L-1
Schedule L-1
Schedule L-2
Schedule R-3
Schedule R-5
Schedule FAC & ES % Increase 2.51% 2.51% 2.52% 2.52% 2.52% 2.53% 2.53% 2.53% 2.52% 2.52% 2.52% 2.53% 2 2.10% 5 Increase 1,312,647 12,652 12,672 221,408 47,599 52,637 1,021 1,021 1,021 1,031 1,565 63,637 1,565 633 59,532 1,951,744 1,952,009 % of Total 67.29% 0.55% 0.00% 11.40% 2.43% 2.43% 2.43% 3.16% 0.05% 0.05% 0.03% 3.03% 701a1 5,3564,144 5,422,304 9,071,339 1,974,414 2,100,969 2,528,670 1,365,758 647,329 647,329 63,370 2,5961 2,411,434 79,602,699 15,189,610 94,792,389 South Kentucky RECC Bliling Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2006 % of Total 67.23% 0.56% 0.56% 0.00% 11.40% 2.43% 2.64% 3.18% 0.05% 0.03% 3.03% 100.00% 52,251,497 43,029 5,229,632 6,229,632 1,865,532 1,865,632 2,049,168 2,465,032 1,332,285 613,449 61,332,285 2,322,323,903 77,650,954 15,189,610 92,840,554 Residential, Farm and Mon-Farm Service
Residential, Farm and Non-Farm Service ETS1
Schedule B ETS
Schedule B ETS
Schedule L1-1
Schedule L1-1
Schedule L1-1
Schedule L1-2
Schedule L1-3
S

Under-Recovered - Rounding

265

MIUG, va. Enterien	i s	\$5,229 0.725 \$5,570 0.735 \$1,530 0.135 \$1,530 0.135 \$1,560 0.125 \$1,560 0.125 \$1,560 0.125 \$1,560 0.125 \$1,560 0.125
	\$ increase % increase 1,084,530 2,85% 89,832 2,85%	4,3,556 118,0276 118,0220 540 6,658 58,554 42,552 42,553 1,699,432 1,791,002 1,791,002
er 30, 2005	Total \$ Proposed	1,233,290 0,2551 1,235,213 0,2551 1,257,130 0,2551 1,257,140 0,0015 1,286,170 1,286,17
Salt River Electric Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended Sepkember 30, 2095	Total \$ Existing 54 of Total Rate 63.88%	3,149.000 3,149.10 16,100 1,513.47 1,513.47 2,65,77 2,65,77 2,65,76 1,50,70 2,813.40 2,813.40 2,813.40 2,813.40 1,256,167 1,256,167 1,256,230 72,004,026.05
		Schedule A-5 Farm & Home Schedule A-5 F& H Transle Schedule A-5 F& H Transle Schedule A-6 Of Peak Harristop Tale R1 Schedule A-10 Feak Harristop Tale R1 Schedule A-10 Feak Harristop Tale Town & Small Power Soc Sch D-2 Comm & Small Power Soc Sch D-1 Street Uptican Soc Rate 3 Sch D-1 Street Uptican Soc Rate 3 Sch D-1 14 Power 1000-1000 MW Sch LD-481 Lg Power 1000-1000 MW Sch LD-481 Lg Power 1000-1000 MW Sch LD-481 Lg Power 1000-1009 WW Sch LD-481 Lg Power 1000-1000 WW Sch Lg Power 1000-1
interim Order Recale Flow-Thru Page 1 of 1		\$ Increase \$ Increase   274%   1,039,232   2,74%   1,039,232   2,74%   1,407   2,74%   1,407   2,74%   1,5079   2,75%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,667   2,74%   2,667   2,67%
	ic imber 30, 2005	Total \$ Proposed 5, of Total Rate 28,937,737 612,895, 526, 1,55,189 7,230,159 7,245, 1,55,189 7,55,189 7,59,189
	Salt River Electric Billing Analysis for the 12 months ended September 30, 2005	Total \$ Existing 5; of Total Brite 5, 38% 5, 50, Total Brite 5, 28% 5, 3, 144, 116 5, 28% 5, 144, 116 5, 28% 5, 151, 477 7, 70% 5, 4, 106, 77, 17, 77, 77, 77, 77, 77, 77, 77, 77
		Schedule A-5 Farm & Home Schedule A-7 Farm & Home Schedule A-7 Fa M Tanable Schedule A-7 Farm & Marking Rate RT Schedule A-7 Off-Teok Marking Rate RT LP-2 up Power 500 Under 300 West Sync Sch LLP-1 Lange Power Rate 9 Sch OL-1 Street Lighting Societ Rate 3 Sch OL-1 Street Lighting Societ W Sch LLP-3 upower 500-300 WW Sch LLP-4 10 Power 1000-2999 WW Sch LLP-4 3000 & Over Rate 3 Sch LLP-4 3

316.94

KRUC vs Erlestm

123,105 Ultranses 11,175 (13,18) (13,1

X21.0 121,844 X00 0 01 X00.0 01 X00.0 02 X00.0 02 X00.0 02 X00.0 03 X

\$38,454 0.09%.

Ļ	ئــا لـ					-										L	ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ		
Summery Receic Flow-Through KTUC Method	S. Sperransa	2.74%	2.75%	2.76%		¥.99.	2.76%			7.75%				2.74%		WALL I	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	%,000 0	201%
Recasic FI	Siberaasa	15:35	787.50	139,191	٠	55	26,589			7 656	<u>!</u>			782,678		0T3 C97	0/0/201		762,678
	70 70 10	69.29%	8,50%	17.663	2000	0.20%	3.38%	8000	2000	2800	3000	3000	0.00%	100.00%					
	Total	20,323,278	2 492 292	5,178,006		58,017	991.136			256.520				29,328,930	5,925,275	300 730 30		14203391	39,574,599
RECC Attack spiember 30, 2006	X of Total	69.30%	8.50%	17,65%	X00.0	0.20%	3.38%	8000	6000	0.98%	0000	0.00%	2000	100.00%					
Toylor County RECC Blowy Analytic for the 12 months ended September 30, 2009	Total	192	2425.695	5,038,905		57,042	854,548			278.454		-		28,546,252	5,925,275	124 171 477	1377	4420,334	38,889,921
		Schedule A Farm & Home	Schedule GP-1 General Purpose Service - Less than 50 kVA	Schedule GP-2 General Purpose Service - 50 kVA and Above	R-5 Residental Marketing Rate	SL Street Lighting Service	C1 - (arge industrial Rate	C2 - Large Industrial Rate	C3 - Large Industrial Rate	Bi - Large Industrial Rate	82 - Large Industrial Rate	B3 - Large Industrial Rate	Interruptible Service					TGP Special Contract	Total - All Rate Christes
Summary Flor-Through Intertin Order	% Increase		-	260%			261% C		u	2.61% E	61	2	-	2.02%		217%		1 %000	1.92%
Summary Recalt Flort-Through Intertm Order	\$ increase		63,610	131,196		968 968	25,189			7,200		٠		746,529		746 528	1		746,528
	# 2 d	59.30%	8.50%	17.65%	\$000	0.20%	3.38%	0.00%	8000	0.95%	200%	2003	2:00%	100.00%					
	Total	20,300,174	2,489,105	5,170,101		57.973	960,700			285,714				29,252,780	5,925,275	35.21.8 (255		4420,334	39,638,448
RECC plan spleniber 30, 2005	S of Total	\$00°.69	8.50%	17.65%	0.00%	0.70%	3.38%	0.00%	3000	0.98%	0.00%	2000	%00°0	100.00%		***************************************			
Taylor County RECC Billing Avaryth for the 12 months ended September 30, 2005	Total	19,781,767	2,425,495	5,038,905		57,082	875,406			278.454				28,546,252	5,925,275	34 471 527		4420334	35,531,921
·		Schedule A Farm & Home	Schedule GP-1 General Purpose Service - Less than 50 kVA	Schedule GP-2 General Purpose Service - 50 kVA and Above	R-1 Residential Marketing Rate	St. Street Lighting Service	C1 - Large Industrial Rate	C2 - Large Industrial Rate	C3 - Large industrial Rate	B1 - Large Industrial Rate	82 - Large Industrial Rate	83 - Large Industrial Rate	interruptible Service					TGP Special Contract	Total - AS Bate Chases

774,115 (1,477) Under-recover - reunding