Mr. Jeff DeRouen, Executive Director
Kentucky Public Service Commission
211 Sower Boulevard
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601


## ouisville Gas and

State Regulation and Rates 220 West Main Street PO Box 32010 Louisville, Kentucky 40232
www.eon-us.com

Lonnie E. Bellar
Vice President F 502-217-2109
lonnie.bellar@eon-us.com

May 10, 2010

## RE: Application of Louisville Gas and Electric Company for an Adjustment of Its Electric and Gas Base Rates - Case No. 2009-00549

Dear Mr. DeRouen:
Please find enclosed and accept for filing the original and ten (10) copies of the Response of Louisville Gas and Electric Company to the Fourth Data Request of Commission Staff dated April 30, 2010, in the above-referenced matter.

Should you have any questions regarding the enclosed, please contact me at your convenience.


Lonnie E. Bellar
cc: Parties of Record

## VERIFICATION

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY )

## COUNTY OF JEFFERSON <br> ) $\mathrm{SS}:$ <br> COUNTY OF JEFFERSON )

The undersigned, S. Bradford Rives, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Chief Financial Officer for Louisville Gas and Electric Company and an employee of E.ON U.S. Services, Inc., and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which he is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.
S. Bradford Rives

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this $\prod^{4 n}$ day of_May_ 2010


My Commission Expires:


## VERIFICATION

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY ) ) SS : COUNTY OF JEFFERSON

The undersigned, Valerie L. Scott, being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is Controller for Louisville Gas and Electric Company and an employee of E.ON U.S. Services, Inc., and that she has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which she is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of her information, knowledge and belief.


Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this $7^{4 n}$ day of $\qquad$ 2009.


My Commission Expires:
Sept $20 \cdot 2010$

## VERIFICATION

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY ) <br> ) SS : <br> COUNTY OF JEFFERSON

The undersigned, Robert M. Conroy, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director - Rates for E.ON U.S. Services, Inc., and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which he is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.


Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this $7^{t h}$ day of $\qquad$ 2010.


My Commission Expires:


## VERIFICATION <br> COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY ) COUNTY OF JEFFERSON ) SS:

The undersigned, Sidney L. "Butch" Cockerill, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director - Revenue Collections for E.ON U.S. Services, Inc., and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which he is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.


Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this $S^{4 n}$ day of Nay 2010.

My Commission Expires:

Stiver $16,20,2$

## VERIFICATION

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY )

 COUNTY OF JEFFERSON) SS:
)

The undersigned, Ronald L. Miller, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director - Corporate Tax for E.ON U.S. Services, Inc., and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which he is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.


Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this $7^{7^{t h}}$ day of May 2010.


My Commission Expires:


## VERIFICATION

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY ) COUNTY OF JEFFERSON <br> )

The undersigned, Shannon L. Charnas, being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is Director - Utility Accounting and Reporting for E.ON U.S. Services, Inc., and that she has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which she is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of her information, knowledge and belief.


Shannon L. Charnas

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this $7^{\text {th }}$ day of $\qquad$ 2010.


My Commission Expires:


## VERIFICATION

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY ) <br> ) $\mathbf{S S}:$ <br> COUNTY OF JEFFERSON

The undersigned, William Steven Seelye, being duly sworn, deposes and states that he is a Principal and Senior Analyst with The Prime Group, LLC, and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the responses for which he is identified as the witness, and the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.


Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this $\qquad$ day of $\qquad$ 2010.


My Commission Expires:

$$
12-02-10
$$

## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

# APPLICATION OF LOUISVILLE GAS AND ) CASE NO. ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR AN ADJUSTMENT ) 2009-00549 OF ITS ELECTRIC AND GAS BASE RATES 

RESPONSE OF
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
TO THE
FOURTH DATA REQUEST OF COMMISSION STAFF DATED APRIL 30, 2010

FILED: May 10, 2010

# LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 

CASE NO. 2009-00549

## Response to Fourth Data Request of Commission Staff Dated April 30, 2010

Question No. 1

## Responding Witness: Valerie L. Scott

Q-1. Refer to the letter submitted by LG\&E on April 19, 2010 concerning revisions to information provided in its application filed in this proceeding related to its proposed adjustment for labor and labor-related costs.
a. Explain why the amount of the 2009 Winter Storm Restoration regulatory asset has increased from $\$ 2,119,395$ to $\$ 2,171,776$.
b. Explain whether the differences in the adjustments for labor and labor-related costs in the letter of $\$ 1,834,988$ (electric) and $\$ 458,747$ (gas) from the amounts of $\$ 1,827,123$ and $\$ 456,780$, respectively, in Rives Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.16, are or are not related to the change in the regulatory asset amount.
c. Provide an updated version of Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.16, which shows the derivation of the amounts contained in the letter.

A-1. a. The amount of total labor actually charged to the regulatory asset was $\$ 2,171,776$. The $\$ 2,119,395$ used in the originally submitted Rives Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.16 was calculated from information compiled in preparing responses in the Commission's Case No. 2009-00175, Application of Louisville Gas and Electric Company for an Order Approving the Establishment of a Regulatory Asset. In preparing responses to requests for information in this case, LG\&E referred to the actual journal entries used to record the 2009 Winter Storm Restoration regulatory asset and determined that subsequent adjustments had been made to the labor charged to the storm by various employees to reflect actual costs.
b. The difference between the $\$ 1,827,123$ (electric) and $\$ 456,780$ (gas) adjustments to wages on the originally submitted Rives Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.16, and the $\$ 1,834,988$ (electric) and $\$ 458,747$ (gas) adjustments to wages on the updated Rives Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.16 included in the attachment to the response to Question No. 2, is related to adjusting the labor charged to the regulatory asset to the actual amount recorded, as discussed in the response to (a) above. These amounts reflect the total labor adjustment after the related adjustments to payroll taxes, $401(\mathrm{k})$ costs, and the jurisdictional factor. See attached for a summary of the changes for each of these amounts.
c. See Rives Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.16 included in the attachment to the response to Question No. 2.

LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Summary of Revised Adjustment to Reflect Increases in Labor and Labor-Related Costs As Applied to the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Electric As Adjusted |  | Electric <br> As Filed |  | Electric <br> Difference |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Wages (Page 2) | \$ | 1,655,875 | \$ | 1,648,778 | \$ | 7,097 |
| 2 Payroll Taxes (Page 3) |  | 117,846 |  | 117,340 |  | 506 |
| 3 401(k) (Page 4) |  | 61,267 |  | 61,005 |  | 262 |
| 4 Total | \$ | 1,834,988 | \$ | 1,827,123 | \$ | 7,865 |
|  |  | Gas <br> Adjusted |  | Gas <br> As Filed |  | ence |
| 5 Wages (Page 2) | \$ | 413,969 | \$ | 412,194 | \$ | 1,775 |
| 6 Payroll Taxes (Page 3) |  | 29,461 |  | 29,335 |  | 126 |
| 7 401(k) (Page 4) |  | 15,317 |  | 15,251 |  | 66 |
| 8 Total | \$ | 458,747 | \$ | 456,780 | \$ | 1,967 |
|  |  | Total Adjusted |  | Total As Filed |  | ence |
| 9 Wages (Page 2) | \$ | 2,069,844 | \$ | 2,060,972 | \$ | 8,872 |
| 10 Payroll Taxes (Page 3) |  | 147,307 |  | 146,675 |  | 632 |
| 11 401(k) (Page 4) |  | 76,584 |  | 76,256 |  | 328 |
| 12 Total | \$ | 2,293,735 | \$ | 2,283,903 | \$ | 9,832 |

# LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 

CASE NO. 2009-00549

# Response to Fourth Data Request of Commission Staff <br> Dated April 30, 2010 

Question No. 2

Responding Witness: S. Bradford Rives, Valerie L. Scott, Shannon L. Charnas, Robert M. Conroy, Ronald L. Miller, William S. Seelye

Q-2. In addition to the revisions presented in its April 19, 2010 letter, LG\&E previously noted errors in the exhibits included in its application in various responses to data requests from Commission Staff and intervenors. Provide an updated version of all affected exhibits and schedules to the Rives Testimony reflecting the impact of the revisions noted in the letter and the revisions noted previously in LG\&E's responses to data requests.

A-2. The summary provided below identifies the revisions and updates previously identified in various responses to data requests. The overall rate increase impact of these revisions is a decrease of $\$ 948,972$ for Electric and a decrease of $\$ 583,696$ for Gas to LG\&E's Overall Revenue Deficiency as shown on the attached Revised Exhibit 8.

## Summary

The following revised exhibits are attached:

- Revised Exhibit 1, Adjustments to Operating Revenues, Operating Expenses and Net Operating Income: Corrected for revisions to Reference Schedules 1.10, 1.12, 1.16, 1.17, 1.21, 1.31, 1.40, 1.42, 1.45, 1.46, and new Reference Schedule 1.48.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.10, To Eliminate DSM Revenue and Expenses: Correction to DSM expenses for related burden expenses not initially included. See response to KPSC 2-34.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.12, Adjustment to Annualize Year-End Customers: Corrections to customers billed and billed kWh for General Service Rate GS and Industrial Service Rate IS-Primary. See response to AG 1-256.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.16, Adjustment to Reflect Increases in Labor and Labor-Related Costs: Correction of labor costs related to 2009 Winter Storm regulatory asset to reflect the final amounts. See April 19, 2010 letter and response to Question No. 1.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.17, To Adjust for Pension, PostRetirement, and Post-Employment Costs: Update for 2010 Mercer Study and
correction of expenses related to DSM burden amounts. See response to KPSC 240 and KPSC 3-19.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.21, Adjustment to Reflect Normalized Storm Damage Expense: Correction of storm damage expenses in 2008 and 2009 as filed with the direct testimony of Valerie L. Scott, Scott Exhibit 1.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.31, Adjustment to Reflect Amortization of Rate Case Expenses: Revised estimate of newspaper advertising expense. See response to KPSC 1-57.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.40, Adjustment to Revenues for Temperature Normalization: Correction of temperature-sensitive volumes not subject to normalization and should have been excluded. See response to KPSC 2-105.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.42, Federal and State Income Taxes Corresponding to Annualization and Adjustment of Year-End Interest Expense: Corrected for revisions to Rives Exhibit 2.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.45, Adjustment for Tax Basis Depreciation Reduction: Correction for error in book depreciation lives used to amortize the Advanced Coal Investment Tax Credit. See response to KPSC 2-47.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.46, Adjustment for Amortization of Investment Tax Credit: Correction for error in book depreciation lives used to amortize the Advanced Coal Investment Tax Credit. See response to KPSC 2-47.
- Revised Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.48, Adjustment to Remove Charges Incorrectly Booked Above the Line: New proposed adjustment to remove charges booked above the line that should have been below the line. See response to AG 1-110.
- Revised Exhibit 2, Capitalization at October 31, 2009: Correction of Advanced Coal Investment Tax Credit to reflect revised amortization amount. Update to Annual Cost Rate as of March 31, 2010.
- Revised Exhibit 7, Rates of Return - Actual and Requested Pro-Formed for the Rate Increase: Revised to reflect revisions to Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 8.
- Revised Exhibit 8, Calculation of Overall Revenue Deficiency/(Sufficiency) at October 31, 2009: Revised to reflect revisions to Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2.
- Revised Exhibit 9, Kentucky Jurisdictional Rate of Return on Common Equity: Revised to reflect revisions to Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2.
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 24. REVISED-Adjustment to reflect normalized storm damage expense } \\
& \text { 25. Adjustment for injuries and damages FERC account } 925 \\
& \text { 26. Adjustment to eliminate advertising expenses pursuant to Commission } \\
& \text { Rule 807 KAR } 5: 016 \\
& \text { 27. Adjustment for expenses related to retired mainframe } \\
& \text { 28. Adjustment for MISO Exit regulatory asset } \\
& \text { 29. Adjustment for EKPC regulatory asset } \\
& \text { 30. Adjustment for } 2008 \text { Wind storm regulatory asset } \\
& \text { 31. Adjustment for 2009 Winter storm regulatory asset } \\
& \text { 32. Adjustment for KCCS regulatory asset } \\
& \text { 33. Adjustment for CMRG regulatory asset } \\
& \text { 34. REVISED-Adjustment to reflect amortization of rate case expenses } \\
& \text { 35. Adjustment for Southwest Power Pool settlement expenses } \\
& \text { 36. Adjustment to remove out of period adjustment for resetulements } \\
& \text { related to MISO RSG } \\
& \text { 37. Adjustment for USGC settlement for gypsum contract } \\
& \text { 38. Adjustment to remove FERC Hydropower program charges } \\
& \text { 39. Adjustment for Interest rate swap amortization } \\
& \text { 40. Adjustment to correct Edison Electric Institute invoice } \\
& \text { 41. To adjust property tax expense } \\
& \text { 42. Adjustment to revenues and expenses to eliminate gas supply cost } \\
& \text { recoveries and gas supply expenses } \\
& \text { 43. REVISED-Adjustment to revenues for temperature normalization } \\
& \text { 44. NEW-Adjustment to remove charges incorrectly booked above-the-line }
\end{aligned}
$$

LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
Adjustments to Electric and Gas Operating Revenues，Operating Expenses and Net Operating Income
For the Twelve Months Ended October 31，2009

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { (439) }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { 哀 } \\
\text { 高 } \\
\text { 总 }
\end{array} \\
& \text { 咢䓲 }
\end{aligned}
$$



| Operating <br> Revenues <br> $(5)$ | Gas Department <br> Operating <br> Expenses <br> $(6)$ | Net <br> Operating <br> Income <br> $(7)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 高 咅 }
\end{aligned}
$$

Revised Exhibit 2
Sponsoring Witress: Rives
Page 2 of 2


## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Rates of Return - Actual and Requested <br> Pro-Formed for the Rate Increase <br> For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  |  | Electric <br> (1) |  | Gas <br> (2) |  | Total <br> (3) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Net Original Cost Rate Base - Exhibit 3 | \$ | 1,903,319,053 | \$ | 487,092,690 | \$ | 2,390,411,743 |
| 2. Pro Forma Rate Base - Exhibit 4 | \$ | 1,848,429,367 | \$ | 486,516,386 | \$ | 2,334,945,753 |
| 3. Reproduction Cost Rate Base - Exhibit 5 | \$ | 4,176,096,342 | \$ | 1,057,075,140 | \$ | 5,233,171,482 |
| 4. Net Operating Income - Actual - Exhibit I | \$ | 133,953,246 | \$ | 19,920,343 | \$ | 153,873,589 |
| 5 Rate of Return (Actual): |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. On Net Original Cost Rate Base |  | 7.04\% |  | 4.09\% |  | 6.44\% |
| 7. On Pro Forma Rate Base |  | 7.25\% |  | 4.09\% |  | 6.59\% |
| 8. On Reproduction Cost Rate Base |  | 3.21\% |  | 1.88\% |  | 2.94\% |
| 9. Adjusted Net Operating Income - Exhibit 1 | \$ | 91,297,699 | \$ | 25,000,038 | \$ | 116,297,737 |
| 10. Revenue Increase Applied For - Exhibit 8 |  | 94,024,399 |  | 22,014,464 |  | 116,038,863 |
| 11. Income Taxes - Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 1.41 37.1912 \% |  | $(34,968,847)$ |  | $(8,187,454)$ |  | $(43,156,301)$ |
| 12. Adjusted Net Operating Income Pro-formed for Rate Increase | \$ | 150,353,252 | \$ | 38,827,048 | \$ | 189,180,299 |
| 13. Rate of Return (Pro forma): |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. On Net Original Cost Rate Base |  | 7.90\% |  | 7.97\% |  | 7.91\% |
| 15. On Pro Forma Rate Base |  | 8.13\% |  | 7.98\% |  | 8.10\% |
| 16. On Reproduction Cost Rate Base |  | 3.60\% |  | 3.67\% |  | 3.62\% |

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Calculation of Overall Revenue Deficiency/(Sufficiency) at October 31, 2009

1. Adjusted Electric Capitalization (Exhibit 2, Col 8)
2. Total Cost of Capital (Exhibit 2, Col 11)
3. Net Operating Income Found Reasonable (Line $1 \times$ Line 2)
4. Pro-forma Net Operating Income
5. Net Operating Income Deficiency/(Sufficiency)
6. Gross Up Revenue Factor - Exhibit 1, Reference Schedule 147
7. Overall Revenue Deficiency/(Sufficiency)

|  | ORIGINAL ELECTRIC <br> (1) |  | REVISED <br> ELECTRIC <br> (2) | DIFFERENCE ELECTRIC <br> (3) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | (2) -(1) |  |
| \$ | 1,805,791,767 | \$ | 1,806,059,661 | \$ | 267,894 |
|  | 8.32\% |  | 8.31\% |  | 8.31\% |
| \$ | 150,241,875 | \$ | 150,083,558 | \$ | $(158,317)$ |
|  | 90,862,701 |  | 91,297,699 |  | 434,998 |
| \$ | 59,379,174 | \$ | 58,785,859 | \$ | $(593,315)$ |
|  | 0.62521919 |  | 0.62521919 |  | 0.62521919 |
| \$ | 94,973,371 | \$ | 94,024,399 | \$ | $(948,972)$ |



# Revised Exhibit 9 <br> Sponsoring Witness: Rives <br> Page 1 of 2 

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Electric Rate of Return on Common Equity

 For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009|  | Adjusted Electric Capitalization (Exhibit 2 Col 8 ) (1) | Percent of Total <br> (2) | Annual <br> Cost <br> Rate <br> (Exhibit 2 Col 10) <br> (3) | Weighted <br> Cost of Capital <br> ( $\mathrm{Col} 2 \times \operatorname{Col} 3$ ) <br> (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Short Term Debt | \$0 | 0.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.00\% |
| 2. Long Term Debt | \$833,240,078 | 46.14\% | 4.60\% | 2.12\% |
| 3. Common Equity | \$972,819,583 | 53.86\% | 5.46\% (a) | 2.94\% (b) |
| 4. Total Capitalization | \$1,806,059,661 | 100.00\% |  | 5.06\% |
| 5. Pro-forma Net Opera | come |  |  | \$91,297,699 (c) |
| 6. Net Operating Incom | al Capitalization |  |  | 5.06\% (d) |

Notes: (a) - Column 4, Line 3 / Column 2, Line 3
(b) - Column 4, Line 4 - Line 1 - Line 2
(c) - Exhibit 1 , Line 52, Column 4
(d) - Column 4, Line 5 divided by Column 1, Line 4

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Gas Rate of Return on Common Equity
For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Adjusted Gas Capitalization (Exhibit 2 Col 8 ) (1) | Percent of Total <br> (2) | Annual <br> Cost <br> Rate <br> (Exhibit 2 Col 10 ) <br> (3) | Weighted Cost of Capital $(\operatorname{Col} 2 \times \operatorname{Col} 3)$ (4) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Short Term Debt | \$0 | 0.00\% | 0.21\% | 0.00\% |
| 2. Long Term Debt | \$215,211,210 | 46:14\% | 4.60\% | 2.12\% |
| 3. Common Equity | \$251,261,753 | 53.86\% | 6.02\% (a) | 3.24\% (b) |
| 4. Total Capitalization | \$466,472,963 | 100.00\% |  | 5.36\% |
| 5. Pro-forma Net Opera | ome |  |  | \$25,000,038 (c) |
| 6. Net Operating Incom | Capitalization |  |  | 5.36\% (d) |

Notes: (a) - Column 4, Line 3 / Column 2, Line 3
(b) - Column 4, Line 4 - Line 1 - Line 2
(c) - Exhibit 1, Line 52, Column 7
(d) - Column 4, Line 5 divided by Column 1, Line 4

# LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 

Revised<br>To Eliminate DSM Revenues and Expenses For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

Electric

1. DSM revenue adjustment
2. DSM expense adjustment
3. Net Adjustment

| Electric |  | Gas |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | $(12,207,246)$ | \$ | $(2,319,554)$ |
|  | $(7,482,929)$ |  | $(2,037,684)$ |
| \$ | $(4,724,317)$ | \$ | $(281,870)$ |

## Revised Exhibit 1

Reference Schedule 1.12
Sponsoring Witness: Seelye

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Revised<br>Adjustment to Annualize Year-End Customers<br>At October 31, 2009

|  | Electric |  | Gas |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Revenue adjustment | \$ | 11,481,673 | \$ | 1,760,940 |
| 2. Expense adjustment |  | 7,977,616 |  | 541,722 |
| 3. Net adjustment | \$ | 3,504,057 | \$ | 1,219,218 |

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Revised

Adjustment to Reflect Increases in Labor and Labor-Related Costs As Applied to the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Electric <br> (1) |  | Gas <br> (2) |  | Total <br> (3) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 Wages (Page 2) | \$ | 1,655,875 | \$ | 413,969 | \$ | 2,069,844 |
| 2 Payroll Taxes (Page 3) |  | 117,846 |  | 29,461 |  | 147,307 |
| 3 401(k) (Page 4) |  | 61,267 |  | 15,317 |  | 76,584 |
| 4 Total | \$ | 1,834,988 | \$ | 458,747 | \$ | 2,293,735 |

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Revised

Adjustment to Reflect Increases in Labor and Labor-Related Costs
As Applied to the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009


# LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 

## Revised

Adjustments to Reflect Increases in Payroll Taxes

## As Applied to the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

| 1 | Operating Labor increase (Page 2 Line 27) |  | \$ | 2,069,844 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Percentage of wages that do not exceed Social Security (OASDI) limit |  |  | 91.4\% |
| 3 | Operating Labor increase subject to Social Security tax (Line $1 \times$ Line 2 ) |  | \$ | 1,891,837 |
| 4 | Medicare Tax (Line $1 \times 145 \%$ ) |  | \$ | 30,013 |
| 5 | Social Security Tax (Line $3 \times 6.2 \%$ ) |  |  | 117,294 |
| 6 | Payroll Tax adjustment (Line $4+$ Line 5) |  | \$ | 147,307 |
| 7 | Electric Department | 80.0\% | \$ | 117,846 |
| 8 | Gas Department | 20.0\% | \$ | 29,461 |
| 9 | Total |  | \$ | 147,307 |

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Revised

Adjustment to Reflect Increases in Company Contribution to 401(k)
As Applied to the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Direct total payroll for 12 months ended 10/31/09 before deducting storm-related labor (Page 2 Line 6 - Page 2 Line 4) |  | \$ | 925,778 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Total 401(k) Company Contribution for 12 months ended 10/31/09 |  | 4,610,487 |  |
| 3 | 401(k) Company Contribution as a percent of payroll (Line 2 / Line 1) |  |  | 37\% |
| 4 | Operating Labor increase (Page 2 Line 27) |  | 2,069,844 |  |
| 5 | 401(k) Company Contribution operating increase (Line $3 \times$ Line 4) |  | \$ | 76,584 |
| 6 | Electric Department | 80.0\% | \$ | 61,267 |
| 7 | Gas Department | 20.0\% | \$ | 15,317 |
| 8 | Total |  | \$ | 76,584 |

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Revised
To Adjust for Pension, Post Retirement and Post Employment

## For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  |  |  | Pension |  | Post Retirement |  | Post Employment |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Pension, Post Retirement and Post | expenses in test year | \$ | 22,938,287 | \$ | 6,825,417 | \$ | 192,053 | \$ | 29,955,757 |
| 2 Pension, Post Retirement, and Post Employment expenses annualized for |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Total adjustment (Line 2-Line 1) |  | \$ | (1,371,250) | \$ | $(856,066)$ | \$ | 506,628 | \$ | $(1,720,688)$ |
|  | Electric Department (a) | 80\% |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | (1,376,550) |
|  | Gas Department (a) | 20\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(344,138)$ |
|  | Total Adjustment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | $(1,720,688)$ |

(a) Percentages taken from Reference Schedule 1.16

## Revised Exhibit 1

Reference Schedule 1.21
Sponsoring Witness: Scott

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Revised
Adjustment to Reflect Normalized Storm Damage Expense
For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Electric |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 1. Storm damage provision based <br> upon ten year average | $\$ 4,814,018$ |
| 2. Storm damage expenses incurred during |  |
| the 12 months ended October 31,2009 | $\$ 4,756,495$ |
| 3. Adjustment | $\$ 8$ |


| Year | Expense (a) | CPI-All Urban <br> Consumers | Amount |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2009 | $\$$ | $4,747,495$ | (b) | 1.0000 |
| 2008 | $6,107,323$ | (b) | 0.9927 | $6,747,495$ |
| 2007 | $2,172,000$ | 1.0308 | $2,238,898$ |  |
| 2006 | $5,726,000$ | 1.0602 | $6,070,705$ |  |
| 2005 | $1,983,000$ | 1.0944 | $2,170,195$ |  |
| 2004 | $13,867,000$ | 1.1315 | $15,690,511$ |  |
| 2003 | $2,350,000$ | 1.1616 | $2,729,760$ |  |
| 2002 | $2,465,175$ | 1.1881 | $2,928,874$ |  |
| 2001 | $2,329,376$ | 1.2069 | $2,811,324$ |  |
| 2000 | $2,167,000$ | 1.2412 | $2,689,680$ |  |
| Total |  |  | $\$ 48,140,182$ |  |

(a) 2009 expense is for 12 months ended October 31, 2009.

All other years expenses are for calendar year.
(b) 2008 and 2009 expenses do not include 2008 Wind storm and 2009 Winter storm expenses that were recorded as regulatory assets.

## Revised Exhibit 1 <br> Reference Schedule 1.31 <br> Sponsoring Witness: Charnas

## LOUISVILLE GAS \& ELECTRIC

Revised<br>Adjustment for Rate Case Amortization<br>For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Electric |  | Gas |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Total Estimated cost of 2009 Rate Case | \$ | 955,000 | \$ | 317,000 |
| 2. Amortization period in years |  | 3 |  | 3 |
| 3. Annual amortization |  | 318,333 |  | 105,667 |
| 4. 2009 Rate Case amortization included in test year |  | - |  | - |
| 5. Net Adjustment for 2009 Rate Case expenses |  | 318,333 |  | 105,667 |
| 6. 2008 Rate Case Annual amortization |  | 247,757 |  | 82,993 |
| 7. 2008 Rate Case Annual amortization included in test year |  | $(165,171)$ |  | $(55,329)$ |
| 8. Net Adjustment for 2008 Rate Case expenses |  | 82,586 |  | 27,664 |
| 9. Total Adjustment (Line $5+$ Line 8) | \$ | 400,919 | \$ | 133,331 |

## Revised Exhibit 1

Reference Schedule 1.40
Sponsoring Witness: Seelye

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

Revised<br>Adjustment to Revenues for Temperature Normalization

For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

Gas

1. Revenues
$\$ \quad(248,758)$

# Revised Exhibit 1 <br> Reference Schedule 1.42 <br> Sponsoring Witness: Miller 

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Revised

Calculation of Current Tax Adjustment Resulting
From "Interest Synchronization"

|  | Electric |  | Gas |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Adjusted Capitalization-Exhibit 2 | \$ | 1,806,059,661 | \$ | 466,472,963 |
| 2. Weighted Cost of Debt - Exhibit 2 |  | 2.12\% |  | 2.12\% |
| 3. "Interest Synchronization" | \$ | 38,288,465 | \$ | 9,889,227 |
| 4. Interest per books (excluding other interest) |  | 38,050,134 |  | 9,742,761 |
| 5. "Interest Synchronization" adjustment (Line 4-3) | \$ | $(238,331)$ | \$ | $(146,466)$ |
| 6. Composite Federal and State tax rate |  | 37.1912\% |  | 37.1912\% |
| 7. Current tax adjustment from "Interest Synchronization" | \$ | $(88,638)$ | \$ | $(54,473)$ |
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Revised Exhibit 1
Reference Schedule 1.45
Sponsoring Witness: Miller

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Revised

Adjustment for Tax Basis Depreciation Reduction
For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Electric |  | Gas |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Permanent difference due to loss of depreciable tax basis | \$ | 241,638 | \$ | - |
| 2. Total Adjustment | \$ | 241,638 | \$ | - |

# Revised Exhibit 1 <br> Reference Schedule 1.46 <br> Sponsoring Witness: Miller 

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Revised <br> Adjustment for Amortization of Investment Tax Credit (ITC)

For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Electric |  | Gas |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Annualized amortization of ITC related to Trimble County 2 | \$ | $(621,179)$ | \$ | - |
| 2. Adjust ITC amortization to normal level for test year |  | 801,090 |  | 13,472 |
| 3. Total Adjustment | \$ | 179,911 | \$ | 13,472 |

Revised Exhibit 1
Reference Schedule 1.48 Sponsoring Witness: Charnas

## LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

## Adjustment to Remove Charges Incorrectly Booked Above-the-Line For the Twelve Months Ended October 31, 2009

|  | Electric |  | Uas |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Charges incorrectly booked above-the-line | \$ | 439 | \$ | 110 |
| 2. Adjustment | \$ | (439) | \$ | (110) |

# LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 

CASE NO. 2009-00549

# Response to Fourth Data Request of Commission Staff Dated April 30, 2010 

Question No. 3

## Responding Witness: Butch Cockerill

Q-3. Refer to page 2 of 2 of the attachment to the response to Item 1 of the Attorney General's supplemental request for information, which shows the increase in the number of customers assessed late-payment penalties which began in April 2009 after the Customer Care System ("CCS") became operational.
a. Provide, as of the most recent date for which such information is available, the number of customers paying their bills under the FLEX program.
b. Provide the number of customers who were paying their bills under the Extendicare or Select Due Date programs in March of 2009.
c. For the test year, provide a schedule which shows what the impact would have been on LG\&E's late-payment penalty revenues if the number of days before such penalties were assessed had been 21 , rather than 15 , days from the date of billing. Describe the other financial impacts, if any, of extending the number of days from 15 to 21 before late-payment penalties would be assessed.
d. Explain whether the new CCS can accommodate a bill due date that does not change from month to month.

A-3. a. As of April 30, 2010, LG\&E had 2,255 customers enrolled in the FLEX program.
b. The latest date for which we have information regarding the number of customers enrolled in the LG\&E Extendicare and Select Due Date programs is December 2008. At that time, 3,850 customers were paying their bills under the Extendicare program, and 3,814 customers were paying under the Select Due Date program, for a combined total of 7,664 . Data is not available beyond December 2008 due to how the data was archived when we implemented our new CCS. Though our archive process retained customer consumption and billing data, we were not able to retain some of the specific customer indicators that identified all our various program offerings such as Extendicare and Select Due Date. The December 2008 information was available because we compiled the data for another purpose and saved the report file prior to archiving our CIS data files.
c. This request asks the Company to provide data that would result from a counterfactual scenario. Whether and how customers would respond to a latepayment charge ("LPC") assessment date of 21 days from the bill date and the associated actual LPC revenue impact on the revenue requirement of changing the LPC assessment date contained in the data request is not known or measureable with reasonable certainty. Subject to this caveat, the data provided herein is purely descriptive of historical facts, not predictive of future events. The Company does not believe it is reasonable to assume that the historical payment patterns contained in the data attached hereto would continue if the LPC assessment date were extended; rather, it would be rational economic behavior for the customer to pay on the last day on which no penalties would be assessed. Moreover, there likely are many reasons why customers do not pay their bills on time, which reasons might not be affected by a 21-day LPC assessment date.

Subject to these caveats, please see the attachment, which shows the number of customers assessed an LPC each month from April 2009 through October 2009. (The test year data for the period before CCS was implemented is not available through our CIS archive database.) The exhibit also shows the total amount of LPCs collected from those customers, as well as the amount of LPCs collected from those customers from and including day 16 through 21 following the bill date. Again, this is purely historical data, and likely does not reflect the actual LPC revenue impact of changing the LPC assessment date.

In addition to the LPC revenue impact, the Company anticipates changing the LPC assessment date would have other financial impacts and pose other operational challenges. For example, the need for short-term financing would likely increase as a result of customers taking advantage of additional time to pay. On the operational side, assuming the Company would continue to issue disconnect notices on the 16 th day after the bill date, if the LPC assessment date were extended to 21 days, the customer would have a disconnect notice issued prior to the LPC assessment.

Another operational change would need to occur in the Company's Installment Plan process. Currently, customers need their disconnect notice to establish an installment plan. If the LPC assessment date were extended, it would be possible for an installment plan to be established for an amount less than the total amount required to avoid disconnection of service. In short, extending the LPC assessment date would likely create confusion and dissatisfaction for the Company's customers and require additional employee training.
d. It should be noted that even prior to implementation of CCS, the majority of LG\&E's customers did not have a fixed due date each month. The attachment is an example of the 2008 meter reading and billing dates for customers in three of our twenty billing groups. As the exhibit shows, customers' monthly meter-reading dates and bill due dates were not fixed during 2008 (prior to CCS implementation).

Though the new CCS can accommodate a bill due date that does not change from month to month, offering such a bill due date is not recommended. Having customers' bill due dates be the same each month would create significant operational issues and increase operational expenses.

The current variance in customer bill due dates is a result of the Company's meterreading process, which allows a "window" of time for meters to be read. Presently, company processes allow five days for a meter to be read before the customer's bill is generated. The purpose of the window is to read the maximum number of meters in the most cost-effective way and to minimize the number of estimated readings. Our current staffing levels are designed to optimize cost by maximizing the number of meters read per day. Though every effort is made to maximize the efficiencies of reading meters, various issues create the need for a meter-reading window. One key issue is the customer demographics. Even in large metropolitan areas, the number of customers in a specific geographic area may vary greatly. Our meter-reading software analyzes all these issues and creates meter-reading routes that attempt to maximize the number of meters read each day while minimizing driving time and avoiding revisiting streets and neighborhoods multiple times in same month. In addition to customer demographic issues, a meter-reading window is necessary to offset the effects of inclement weather, holidays, unexpected employee illnesses, and injuries. If a decision were made to establish a customer due date that did not change from month to month, the company would need to greatly increase the number of meter readers it currently employs or increase the number of customer bills calculated based upon estimated consumption. In addition, if a bill were held due to a billing exception that could be resolved within one or two days to adhere to a specific due date, LG\&E would be required to hold the bill until the next month, when the customer would likely receive two bills at the same time. Because of these operational and financial issues, using a meter-reading window is an established business practice within the utility industry.
Louisville Gas and Electric Company

| (1) | (2) | (3) |  | (4) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Posting Month | Total \# Customer Accounts Assessed LPC |  | Total LPC Assessed |  | Total LPC Received etween Days 16 and 21 |
| APR 2009 | 106,087 | \$ | 1,040,185 | \$ | 183,154 |
| MAY 2009 | 127,113 | \$ | 953,471 | \$ | 301,023 |
| JUN 2009 | 113,481 | \$ | 599,558 | \$ | 188,889 |
| JUL 2009 | 124,354 | \$ | 848,291 | \$ | 276,421 |
| AUG 2009 | 118,549 | \$ | 724,499 | \$ | 226,046 |
| SEP 2009 | 111,548 | \$ | 672,186 | \$ | 220,229 |
| OCT 2009 | 120,055 | \$ | 692,977 | \$ | 242,711 |
| Total | 821,187 | \$ | 5,531,167 | \$ | 1,638,472 |


| Louisville Gas and Electric Company |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample Customer Bill Due Dates for the Year 2008 Customer Meter Read Portions 01, 10, 19 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Portion | Scheduled Read | Date to Bill | Bill Due Date |
| 01 | 3-Jan-2008 | 7-Jan | 22-Jan |
| 01 | 1-Feb-2008 | 5-Feb | $20-\mathrm{Feb}$ |
| 01 | 3-Mar-2008 | 5-Mar | 20-Mar |
| 01 | 2-Apr-2008 | 4-Apr | 21-Apr |
| 01 | 1-May-2008 | 5-May | 20-May |
| 01 | 2-Jun-2008 | 4-Jun | 19-Jun |
| 01 | 1-Jul-2008 | 3-Jul | 18-Jul |
| 01 | 1-Aug-2008 | 5-Aug | 20-Aug |
| 01 | 2-Sep-2008 | 4-Sep | 19-Sep |
| 01 | 1-Oct-2008 | 3-Oct | 20-Oct |
| 01 | 30-Oct-2008 | 3-Nov | 18-Nov |
| 01 | 1-Dec-2008 | 3-Dec | 18-Dec |
| 10 | 16-Jan-2008 | 18-Jan | 4-Feb |
| 10 | 14-Feb-2008 | 18-Feb | 4-Mar |
| 10 | 14-Mar-2008 | 18-Mar | 2-Apr |
| 10 | 15-Apr-2008 | 17-Apr | 2-May |
| 10 | 14-May-2008 | 16-May | 3-Jun |
| 10 | 13-Jun-2008 | 17-Jun | 2-Jul |
| 10 | 16-Jul-2008 | 18-Jul | 4-Aug |
| 10 | 14-Aug-2008 | 18-Aug | 3-Sep |
| 10 | 15-Sep-2008 | 17-Sep | 2-Oct |
| 10 | 14-Oct-2008 | 16-Oct | 31-Oct |
| 10 | 12-Nov-2008 | 14-Nov | 3-Dec |
| 10 | 12-Dec-2008 | 16-Dec | 5-Jan |
| 19 | 29-Jan-2008 | 31-Jan | 15-Feb |
| 19 | 27-Feb-2008 | 29 -Feb | 17-Mar |
| 19 | 28-Mar-2008 | 1-Apr | 15-Apr |
| 19 | 28-Apr-2008 | 30-Apr | 15-May |
| 19 | 28-May-2008 | 30-May | 16-Jun |
| 19 | 26-Jun-2008 | 30-Jun | 16-Jun |
| 19 | 29-Jul-2008 | 31-Jul | 15-Aug |
| 19 | 27-Sep-2008 | 29-Sep | 16-Sep |
| 19 | 26-Sep-2008 | 30-Sep | 15-Oct |
| 19 | 27-Oct-2008 | 29-Oct | 13-Nov |
| 19 | 25-Nov-2008 | 1-Dec | 16-Dec |
| 19 | 29-Dec-2008 | 31-Dec | 2-Jan |

Note: Due to the historic three day meter read window, the timeframe to read the customer's meter was the scheduled read date plus the two business days prior to the scheduled read date.

