

RECEIVED

JAN 12 2011

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION Kentucky Utilities Company State Regulation and Rates 220 West Main Street PO Box 32010 Louisville, Kentucky 40232 www.lge-ku.com

Robert M. Conroy Director - Rates T 502-627-3324 F 502-627-3213 robert.conroy@lge-ku.com

January 12, 2011

Mr. Jeff DeRouen

Executive Director

211 Sower Boulevard

Frankfort, KY 40602

Kentucky Public Service Commission

RE: AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY FOR THE SIX-MONTH BILLING PERIOD ENDING OCTOBER 31, 2010 CASE NO. 2010-00474

Dear Mr. DeRouen:

Please find enclosed and accept for filing the original and ten (10) copies of the Direct Testimony of Robert M. Conroy and the Response of Kentucky Utilities Company to the Information Requested in Appendix B of the Commission's Order dated December 27, 2010, in the above-referenced matter.

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

Sincerely,

Robert M. Conroy

Enclosures

cc: Parties of Record

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE)	
COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL)	
SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF KENTUCKY)	CASE NO.
UTILITIES COMPANY FOR THE SIX-MONTH)	2010-00474
BILLING PERIOD ENDING OCTOBER 31, 2010)	

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF

ROBERT M. CONROY
DIRECTOR - RATES
LG&E AND KU SERVICES COMPANY

Filed: January 12, 2011

1 Q. Please state your name, title, and business address.

- A. My name is Robert M. Conroy. I am the Director Rates for LG&E and KU

 Services Company, which provides services to Kentucky Utilities Company ("KU")

 and Louisville Gas and Electric Company ("LG&E") (collectively "the Companies").
- My business address is 220 West Main Street, Louisville, Kentucky, 40202. A complete statement of my education and work experience is attached to this testimony as Appendix A.

8 Q. Have you previously testified before this Commission?

9 A. Yes. I have previously testified before this Commission in proceedings concerning
10 the Companies' most recent rate cases, fuel adjustment clauses, and environmental
11 cost recovery ("ECR") surcharge mechanisms.

12 Q. What is the purpose of this proceeding?

13 A. The purpose of this proceeding is to review the past operation of KU's environmental
14 surcharge during the six-month billing period ending October 31, 2010 (expense
15 months of March 2010 through August 2010) and determine whether the surcharge
16 amounts collected during the period are just and reasonable.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?

17

18 A. The purpose of my testimony is to summarize the operation of KU's environmental
19 surcharge during the billing period under review, demonstrate the amounts collected
20 during the period were just and reasonable, present and discuss KU's proposed
21 adjustment to the Environmental Surcharge Revenue Requirement based on the
22 operation of the surcharge during the period and explain how the environmental
23 surcharge factors were calculated during the period under review.

- Q. Please summarize the operation of the environmental surcharge for the billing period included in this review.
- A. KU billed an environmental surcharge to its customers from May 1, 2010 through

 October 31, 2010. For purposes of the Commission's examination in this case, the

 monthly KU environmental surcharges are considered as of the six-month billing

 period ending October 31, 2010. In each month of the period, KU calculated the

 environmental surcharge factors in accordance with its tariff ECR, and the

 requirements of the Commission's previous orders concerning KU's environmental

 surcharge.
- Q. What costs were included in the calculation of the environmental surcharge factors for the billing period under review?

Α.

The capital and operating costs included in the calculation of the environmental surcharge factors for the billing period were the costs incurred each month by KU from March 2010 through August 2010, as detailed in the attachment in response to Question No. 2 of the Commission Staff's Request for Information, incorporating all required revisions.

The monthly environmental surcharge factors applied during the billing period under review were calculated consistent with the Commission's Orders in KU's previous applications to assess or amend its environmental surcharge mechanism and plan, as well as Orders issued in previous review cases. The monthly environmental surcharge reports filed with the Commission during this time reflect the various changes to the reporting forms ordered by the Commission from time to time.

Q. Has the Commission recently approved changes to KU's ECR Compliance Plan?

1 A. Yes. In Case No. 2009-00548, KU's most recent rate case, the Commission approved
2 the elimination of KU's 2001 and 2003 ECR Compliance Plans from the monthly
3 environmental surcharge filings. Effective with the August 2010 expense month, the
4 monthly environmental surcharge includes only costs associated with the 2005, 2006
5 and 2009 Compliance Plans.

6 Q. Has the Commission recently approved changes to the environmental surcharge 7 mechanism and the monthly ES Forms?

A.

Yes. In Case No. 2009-00310, KU's most recent ECR two-year review, the Commission approved changes to the environmental surcharge mechanism that include the calculation of the monthly billing factor using a revenue requirement method instead of a percentage method (eliminating the use of the Base Environmental Surcharge Factor ("BESF")), the elimination of the monthly true-up adjustment, and revisions to the monthly reporting forms to reflect the approved changes. Pursuant to the Commission's December 2, 2009 Order in that case, the changes were implemented with the December 2009 expense month that was billed in February 2010. The approved changes only impact the timing and accuracy of the revenue collection, not the total revenues KU is allowed to collect through the ECR. The previous six-month review proceeding included the transition from the percentage method to the new revenue requirement method. The six-month period under review is the first to include all months calculated using the new revenue requirement method.

Q. Are there any changes or adjustments in Rate Base from the originally filed expense months?

- 1 A. No. During the period under review, there were no changes to Rate Base from the
 2 originally filed billing period as summarized in KU's response to the Commission
 3 Staff's Request for Information, Question No. 1. In addition, there were no changes
 4 identified as a result of preparing responses to the requests for information in this
 5 review.
- 6 Q. Are there any changes necessary to the jurisdictional revenue requirement 7 (E(m))?
- A. Yes. Adjustments to E(m) are necessary for compliance with the Commission's

 Order in Case No. 2000-00439 to reflect the actual changes in the overall rate of

 return on capitalization that is used in the determination of the return on

 environmental rate base. The details of and support for this calculation are shown in

 KU's response to Question No. 1 of the Commission Staff's Request for Information.
- 13 Q. As a result of the operation of the environmental surcharge during the billing 14 period under review, is an adjustment to the revenue requirement necessary?

A.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Yes. KU experienced a cumulative over-recovery of \$9,204,042 for the billing period ending October 31, 2010. KU's response to Question No. 2 of the Commission Staff's Request for Information shows the calculation of the cumulative over-recovery. However, KU is adjusting this over-recovery position for a correction made in the review period in this proceeding that affected the February 2010 expense month. A prior period adjustment of \$3,913,660 was included in the April 2010 expense month filing submitted to the Commission on May 17, 2010. The net over-recovery position which KU is submitting in this proceeding is \$5,290,382. Therefore, an adjustment to the revenue requirement is necessary to reconcile the

collection of past surcharge revenues with the actual cost for the billing period under review.

Q. Why is KU making the adjustment discussed above to the recovery position contained in this review period?

In the April 2010 expense month filing submitted to the Commission on May 17, 2010, KU identified an error in the amount of ECR revenue reported as collected through base rates for the February 2010 expense month filing. This reporting error resulted in an under-collection of \$3,913,660 of February 2010 expenses through the April 2010 ECR billing factor. This under-collection was included in the April 2010 expense month filing and recovered through the June 2010 billing factor. Because KU made an adjustment in its monthly filings, the effect of the reporting error must be eliminated from the calculation of the current over-recovery position.

Q. Did KU include an adjustment in its previous six-month review case?

Yes. In Case No. 2010-00241, KU included an adjustment as part of the calculation of the under-recovery in that proceeding. As previously stated, because KU made an adjustment to its monthly filings, the effect of the reporting error must be eliminated from both the previous and current recovery positions.

Without an adjustment in the previous and current review periods, the reporting error would result in an overstatement of the under-recovery position in the previous review period and an overstatement of the over-recovery position in the current review period as shown on the following table.

A.

A.

	Six-Month Review	Six-Month Review
	Expense Period	Expense Period
	Sep09-Feb10	Mar10-Aug10
Cumulative Over/(Under) Recovery	(\$4,490,751)	\$9,204,042
Feb10 Expense Month Correction	\$3,913,660	(\$3,913,660)
Net Over/(Under) Recovery	(\$577,091)	\$5,290,382

A.

Q. Has KU identified the causes of the net over-recovery during the billing period under review?

Yes. KU has identified the components that make up the net over-recovery during the billing period under review. The components are (1) changes in overall rate of return as previously discussed, and (2) the use of 12 month average revenues to determine the billing factor. In addition, as discussed above the error contained in the February 2010 expense month filing that was identified in April 2010 and considered in the previous review proceeding is contributing to the over-recovery position in this period. The details and support of the components that make up the net over-recovery during the billing period under review are shown in KU's response to Question No. 2 of the Commission Staff's Request for Information.

With the transition to the revenue requirement method in the previous review period, the BESF is no longer impacting the calculation of the over/(under) recovery position. As previously discussed, the monthly billing factors for the billing period under review were calculated using the revenue requirement method.

Q. Please explain how the function of the ECR mechanism contributes to the net over-recovery in the billing period under review?

19 A. The use of 12-month average revenues to calculate the monthly billing factor and 20 then applying that same billing factor to the actual monthly revenues will result in an over or under-collection of ECR revenues. Typically it will result in an over-collection during the summer or winter months when actual revenues will generally be greater than the 12-month average and an under-collection during the shoulder months when actual revenues will generally be less than the 12-month average. In the billing period under review, the use of 12-month average revenues contributed to the net over-recovery as shown in KU's response to Question No. 2 of the Commission Staff's Request for Information.

During the period under review, KU's actual revenues were significantly greater than the 12-month historical average due to the warmer than normal temperatures during the summer period. The table below shows a comparison of the 12-month average revenues used in the monthly filings to determine the ECR billing factor and the actual revenues which the ECR billing factor was applied in the billing month.

Expense Month 12-month Average		Billing Month	Actual Revenue
	Revenue		ECR applied to
March 2010	\$90,675,794	May 2010	\$83,401,491
April 2010	\$90,787,105	June 2010	\$97,547,335
May 2010	\$91,514,672	July 2010	\$111,492,036
June 2010	\$92,476,215	August 2010	\$125,001,207
July 2010	\$94,995,288	September 2010	\$122,569,244
August 2010	\$97,785,530	October 2010	\$97,322,258

Q. What kind of adjustment is KU proposing in this case as a result of the operation of the environmental surcharge during the billing period?

A. KU is proposing that the net over-recovery be refunded over the six months following the Commission's Order in this proceeding. Specifically, KU recommends that the Commission approve a decrease to the Environmental Surcharge Revenue

1	Requirement of \$881,730 for five months and \$881,732 for one month, beginning in
2	the second full billing month following the Commission's Order in this proceeding.
3	This method is consistent with the method of implementing previous over- or under-
4	recovery positions in prior ECR review cases.

What is the bill impact on a residential customer for the proposed refund of the over-recovery?

7 A. The inclusion of the refund in the determination of the ECR billing factor will decrease the billing factor by approximately 0.86%. For a residential customer using 1,000 kWh the ECR billing factor will decrease by approximately \$0.69 per month for six months (using rates and adjustment clause factors in effect for the January 2011 billing month).

Q. What rate of return is KU proposing to use for all ECR Plans upon the Commission's Order in this proceeding?

A. KU is recommending an overall rate of return on capital of 11.04%, including the currently approved 10.63% return on equity and adjusted capitalization, to be used to calculate the environmental surcharge. This is based on capitalization as of August 31, 2010 and the Commission's Order of July 30, 2010 in Case No. 2009-00548.

Q. What is your recommendation to the Commission in this case?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 19 A. KU makes the following recommendations to the Commission in this case:
- 20 a) The Commission should approve the proposed decrease to the Environmental
 21 Surcharge Revenue Requirement of \$881,730 per month for five months and
 22 \$881,732 for one month beginning in the second full billing month following
 23 the Commission's Order in this proceeding;

- 1 b) The Commission should determine environmental surcharge amount for the six-month billing period ending October 31, 2010 to be just and reasonable;
- The Commission should approve the use of an overall rate of return on capital of 11.04% using a return on equity of 10.63% beginning in the second full billing month following the Commission's Order in this proceeding.
- 6 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 7 A. Yes.

VERIFICATION

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)	
)	SS:
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)	

The undersigned, **Robert M. Conroy**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director - Rates for LG&E and KU Services Company, and that he has personal knowledge of the matters set forth in the foregoing testimony, and that the answers contained therein are true and correct to the best of his information, knowledge and belief.

Robert M. Conroy

> Victoria B. Hayes (SEAL) Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

September 22, 2014

APPENDIX A

Robert M. Conroy

Director – Rates LG&E and KU Services Company 220 West Main Street Louisville, Kentucky 40202 (502) 627-3324

Education

Masters of Business Administration

Indiana University (Southeast campus), December 1998. GPA: 3.9.

Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering;

Rose Hulman Institute of Technology, May 1987. GPA: 3.3

Essentials of Leadership, London Business School, 2004.

Center for Creative Leadership, Foundations in Leadership program, 1998.

Registered Professional Engineer in Kentucky, 1995.

Previous Positions

Manager, Rates	April 2004 – Feb. 2008
Manager, Generation Systems Planning	Feb. 2001 – April 2004
Group Leader, Generation Systems Planning	Feb. 2000 – Feb. 2001
Lead Planning Engineer	Oct. 1999 – Feb. 2000
Consulting System Planning Analyst	April 1996 – Oct. 1999
System Planning Analyst III & IV	Oct. 1992 - April 1996
System Planning Analyst II	Jan. 1991 - Oct. 1992
Electrical Engineer II	Jun. 1990 - Jan. 1991
Electrical Engineer I	Jun. 1987 - Jun. 1990

Professional/Trade Memberships

Registered Professional Engineer in Kentucky, 1995.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

AN EXAMINATION BY THE PUBLIC SERVICE)	
COMMISSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL)	
SURCHARGE MECHANISM OF KENTUCKY)	CASE NO.
UTILITIES COMPANY FOR THE SIX-MONTH)	2010-00474
BILLING PERIOD ENDING OCTOBER 31, 2010)	

RESPONSE OF
KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY
TO
INFORMATION REQUESTED IN
APPENDIX B OF COMMISSION'S ORDER
DATED DECEMBER 27, 2010

FILED: January 12, 2011

VERIFICATION

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)	
)	SS
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)	

The undersigned, **Robert M. Conroy**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director - Rates for LG&E and KU Services Company, 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.

Robert M. Conroy

Telora B. Harper (SEAL)
otary Public

My Commission Expires:

Septent 22, 2014

VERIFICATION

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)	SS
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)	~~

The undersigned, **Shannon L. Charnas**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that she is Director – Utility Accounting and Reporting for LG&E and KU Services Company, 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

> Victoria B. Hayer (SEAL) Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

September 22, 2014

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

Response to Information Requested in Appendix B of Commission's Order Dated December 27, 2010

Case No. 2010-00474

Question No. 1

Witness: Robert M. Conroy / Shannon L. Charnas

Q-1. Concerning the rate of return on the five amendments to the environmental compliance plan, for the period under review, calculate any true-up adjustment needed to recognize changes in KU's cost of debt, preferred stock, accounts receivable financing (if applicable), or changes in KU's jurisdictional capital structure. Include all assumptions and other supporting documentation used to make this calculation. Any true-up adjustment is to be included in the determination of the over- or under-recovery of the surcharge for the corresponding billing period under review.

A-1. Please see the attachment.

KU calculated the true-up adjustment to recognize changes in the cost of debt and capital structure in two steps, shown on Pages 1 and 2 of the attachment to this response. Page 1 reflects the true-up required due to the changes between the Rate Base as filed and the Rate Base as Revised through the Monthly Filings. However, during the period under review there were no revisions to reflect. Page 2 represents the true-up in the Rate of Return as filed compared to the actual Rate of Return calculations. No further revisions to Rate Base were identified during this review period.

Page 3 provides the adjusted weighted average cost of capital for the period under review.

KU did not engage in accounts receivable financing or have any preferred stock during the period under review.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		(6)		(7)	(8)		(9)
Billing Month	Expense Month	Rate of Return as Filed	Rate Base as Filed	Rate Base As Revised	Cha	nnge in Rate Base	True-up	Adjustment	Jurisdictional Allocation, ES Form 1 10		onal True up ustment
						(5) - (4)	(3) *	(6) / 12		(7)) * (8)
May-10	Mar-10	11.00%	\$1,339,171,507	\$1,339,171,507	\$	_	\$	-	89 28%	\$	-
Jun-10	Apr-10	11.00%	1,346,901,929	1,346,901,929		-		-	87.37%		
Jul-10	May-10	11 12%	1,355,942,350	1,355,942,350		-			86 68%		-
Aug-10	Jun-10	11 12%	1,361,085,613	1,361,085,613		-		,	86 14%		*
Sep-10	Jul-10	11.12%	1,360,915,177	1,360,915,177		-			86 06%		
Oct-10	Aug-10	11.12%	1,194,564,467	1,194,564,467		_		-	87.69%		_
	-						\$	-		\$	-
				Cumulative Impact of C	hanges	s in Rate Base	e_\$	-		\$	-

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Billing Month	Expense Month	Rate of Return as Filed	Rate of Return as Revised	Change in Rate of Return	Rate Base as Revised	True-up Adjustment	Jurisdictional Allocation, ES Form 1.10	Jurisdictional True up Adjustment
				(4) - (3)		(5) * (6) / 12		(7) * (8)
May-10	Mar-10	11.00%	10.90%	-0 10%	\$ 1,339,171,507	(111,598)	89 28%	(99,634)
Jun-10	Apr-10	11 00%	10 90%	-0.10%	1,346,901,929	(112,242)	87.37%	(98,066)
Jul-10	May-10	11 12%	10.90%	-0.22%	1,355,942,350	(248,589)	86.68%	(215,477)
Aug-10	Jun-10	11 12%	10.90%	-0 22%	1,361,085,613	(249,532)	86 14%	(214,947)
Sep-10	Jul-10	11.12%	10.90%	-0 22%	1,360,915,177	(249,501)	86.06%	(214,721)
Oct-10	Aug-10	11 12%	10.90%	-0.22%	1,194,564,467	(219,003)	87 69%	(192,044)
	_					(1,190,466)		(1,034,889)
			Cum	ulative Impact of Cha	anges in Rate of Return	\$ (1,190,466)		\$ (1,034,889)

KENTUCKY UTILITIES

Adjusted Electric Rate of Return on Common Equity
As of October 31, 2010

justments	Adjusted Total Company Dun Capitalization R (201 + Cal 6)	(7) (8)	37,722 \$ 93,719,676 87.19%	676,375 1,682,455,780 87.19%	(7,881,856) 2,029,559,324 87.19%	(7,167,759) \$ 3,805,734,780
Adjusi	ts in Other	(5) (6)	s (10,556) S	(189,285)	(229,280)	\$ (429,121) \$
	Undistributed Investment Subsidiary in EEI Earnings (Col 2 x Col 4 Line 4)	(3) (4)	- \$ 48,278	865,660	(8,701,141) 1,048,565	(8,701,141) S 1,962,503
	Capital Structure	(2)	2.46% \$	44.11%	53.43%	100.000%
	Per Books 10-31-10	(1)	\$ 93,681,954	1,681,779,405	2,037,441,180	\$ 3,812,902,539
			Short Term Debt	Long Term Debt	Common Equity	Total Capitalization

	Cost Adjusted Annual of	Capital Cost Capital Structure Rate (col 14 x Col 13) (13) (15)	2.46% 0.25% 0.01%	44.21% 4.68% 2.07%	53.33% 10.63% 5.67%	100 000%
Adjusted	Kentucky Jursdictional	Capitalization (Col 9 + Col 11)	\$ 77,134,437	1,384,628,038	1,670,289,039	\$ 3132051514
	Environmental Surcharge	(Net of ECR Roll-in) (col 10 x col 11 Line 4) (11)	\$ (4,579,749)	(82,305,157)	(99,283,736)	(186 168 642)
		Capital Structure (10)	2.46%	44.21%	53.33%	100 000%
	Kentucky	Jursdictional Capitalization (9)	\$ 81,714,186	1,466,933,195	1,769,572,775	951 066 815 5
			Short Term Debt	Long Term Debt	Common Equity	Total Caniferition

5. Weighted Cost of Capital Grossed up for Income Tax Effect {ROR + (ROR - DR) x [TR / (1 - TR)]}

10.90%

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

Response to Information Requested in Appendix B of Commission's Order Dated December 27, 2010

Case No. 2010-00474

Question No. 2

Witness: Robert M. Conroy

- Q-2. Prepare a summary schedule showing the calculation of Total E(m), Net Retail E(m), and the surcharge factor for the expense months covered by the applicable billing period. The summary schedule is to incorporate all corrections and revisions to the monthly surcharge filings KU has submitted during the billing period under review. Include a calculation of any additional over- or under-recovery amount KU believes needs to be recognized for the six-month review. Include all supporting calculations and documentation for any such additional over- or under-recovery.
- A-2. Please see the attachment to this response for the summary schedule and cumulative components which make up the net over-recovery.

For the period under review, KU experienced a cumulative over-recovery of \$9,204,042. However, KU is adjusting this over-recovery position for a correction made in this review period that affected the February 2010 expense month as shown on page 2 of 3 on the attached schedule. The original February 2010 expense month filing included an overstatement of the ECR revenue collected through base rates, resulting in an under-recovery of \$3,913,660. The adjustment to correct the overstatement was shown as a prior period adjustment in the April 2010 expense month filing and was recovered through the June 2010 billing factor. Since an adjustment was made in the monthly filings, KU made an adjustment in the previous review period (Case No. 2010-00241) and a corresponding adjustment in this review period to eliminate the effect of the correction. The result is a net over-recovery of \$5,290,382 for the 6-month billing period under review.

Attachment to Response to Question No. 2
Page 1 of 3

Conroy

Kentucky Utilities Company Calculation of E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor Summary Schedule for Expense Months March 2010 through October 2010

	Comments: As Revised in This Review								
(8)	Retail E(m)	(6) * (7)	14,556,330	14,326,581	14,314,592	14,911,653	15,442,194	13,862,099	
(7)	Retail Allocation Ratio	(3)*(4)+(5) ES Form 1.10	89.28%	87.37%	%89'98	86.14%	86.06%	87.69%	
(9)	Total E(m)	(3)*(4)+(5)	16,304,133	16,397,597	16,514,296	17,310,951	17,943,521	15,808,073	
(5)	Operating Expenses (net of allowance proceeds)	ES Form 2.00	4,139,992	4,163,238	4,197,820	4,947,757	5,581,875	4,957,446	
(4)	Rate of Return as Revised		10.90%	10.90%	10.90%	10.90%	10.90%	10.90%	
(3)	Monthly Rate Base as Revised	(2) / 12	111,597,626	112,241,827	112,995,196	113,423,801	113,409,598	99,547,039	663,215,087
(2)	Rate Base as Revised	ES Form 2.00	\$1,339,171,507	1,346,901,929	1,355,942,350	1,361,085,613	1,360,915,177	1,194,564,467	7,958,581,043
(1)	Expense Month		Mar-10	Apr-10	May-10	Jun-10	Jul-10	Aug-10	

Attachment to Response to Question No. 2 Page 2 of 3

Conroy

Kentucky Utilities Company Calculation of E(m) and Jurisdictional Surcharge Billing Factor Summary Schedule for Expense Months March 2010 through October 2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(9)	(7)	(8)	(6)	(10)
Expense Month	Retail E(m)	Adjustment to Retail E(m) for Under- Collection	Adjustment to Retail Retail E(m) Including E(m) for Under- all Adjustments to be Collection billed as ECR	Average Monthly Retail Revenues	Monthly Billing Factor	ECR Revenue Recovered Through Base Rates	Billing Períod	ECR Billing Factor Revenues	Combined Total Over/(Under) Recovery
		Case No. 09-310 & 09-501		ES Form 1.10	As Filed				(4) - (7) - (9)
Mar-10	14,556,330	636,994	15,193,324	90,675,794	2.24%	13,245,471	May-10	1,775,548	(172,305)
Apr-10	14,326,581	636,995	14,963,576	90,787,105	9.29%	10,537,898	Jun-10	8,898,569	4,472,891
May-10	14,314,592	1,254,646	15,569,238	91,514,672	6.51%	9,824,353	Jul-10	7,329,791	1,584,906
Jun-10	14.911.653	617,651	15,529,304	92,476,215	4.44%	11,640,249	Aug-10	5,630,958	1,741,903
Jul-10	15,442,194	617,651	16,059,845	94,995,288	3.62%	12,833,319	Sep-10	4,465,805	1,239,278
Aug-10	13,862,099	617,651	14,479,750	97,785,530	0.57%	14,138,624	Oct-10	678,496	337,370
	87,413,450		91,795,038			72,219,914		28,779,166	9,204,042
					Correction to F	Correction to Feb10 expense month filed with Apr10 monthly filing	led with Apr	10 monthly filing	(3,913,660)
									5,290,382

Kentucky Utilities Company Reconciliation of Combined Over/(Under) Recovery Summary Schedule for Expense Months March 2010 through August 2010

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8) Jurisdictional	(9)
Billing	Expense	Rate of Return as	Rate of Return	Change in Rate of		Impact of change in	Allocation,	Jursidictional
Month	Month	Filed	as Revised	Return (4) - (3)	Rate Base as Revised	Rate of Return (5) * (6) / 12	ES Form 1.00	Impact (7) * (8)
May-10	Mar-10	11 00%	10.90%	-0.10%	\$1,339,171,507	111,598	89.28%	99,634
Jun-10	Apr-10	11.00%	10 90%	-0 10%	1,346,901,929	112,242	87.37%	98,066
Jul-10	May-10	11.12%	10.90%	-0.22%	1,355,942,350	248,589	86.68%	215,477
Aug-10	Jun-10	11.12%	10.90%	-0.22%	1,361,085,613	249,532	86 14%	214,947
Sep-10	Jul-10	11.12%	10.90%	-0.22%	1,360,915,177	249,501	86.06%	214,721
Oct-10	Aug-10	11.12%	10 90%	-0 22%	1,194,564,467	219,003	87.69%	192,044
			Cun	nulative Impact of Ch	anges in Rate of Return	\$ 1,190,466		\$ 1,034,889

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4) Recover	(5) y Position Explanation	(6) 1 - Over/(Under)
	Billing Month	Expense Month	Combined Total Over/(Under) Recovery (Q2, pg 2, Col 10)	ROR Trueup	Use of 12 Month Average Revenues	Correction to Feb10 Expense Month Filing / Included in Apr10 Expense Month
	May-10 Jun-10 Jul-10 Aug-10 Sep-10 Oct-10	Mar-10 Apr-10 May-10 Jun-10 Jul-10 Aug-10	(172,305) 4,472,891 1,584,906 1,741,903 1,239,278 337,370	99,634 98,066 215,477 214,947 214,721 192,044	(271,940) 461,165 1,369,428 1,526,956 1,024,557 145,326	3,913,660
			9,204,042	1,034,889	4,255,493	3,913,660
ı	•	(Under) Recovery	(3,913,660) 5,290,382			

OVER/UNDER RECON	OVER/UNDER RECONCILIATION								
Combined Over/(Under) Recover	у	9,204,042							
Due to Change in RO Use of 12 Month Average Revenue Due to Feb10 Expense Mo Correction	es 4,255,493								
Subtota Unreconciled Difference		9,204,042 -							

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

Response to Information Requested in Appendix B of Commission's Order Dated December 27, 2010

Case No. 2010-00474

Question No. 3

Witness: Shannon L. Charnas

- Q-3. Provide the calculations, assumptions, workpapers, and other supporting documents used to determine the amounts KU has reported during each billing period under review for Pollution Control Deferred Income Taxes.
- A-3. KU calculates Deferred Income Taxes as the taxable portion of the difference between book depreciation, using straight line depreciation, and tax depreciation, generally using 20 year MACRS accelerated depreciation or 5 or 7 year rapid amortization. Accelerated depreciation results in a temporary tax savings to the Company and the Accumulated Deferred Tax balance reflects the value of those temporary savings as a reduction to environmental rate base.

See the attachment for the calculation of Deferred Income Taxes and the balance of Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes reported each month of the review period.

In KU's most recent rate case, Case No. 2009-00548, the Commission approved the elimination of the 2001 and 2003 ECR Compliance Plans effective with the August 2010 expense month. Therefore, the attachment includes the calculation of Deferred Income Taxes and the balance of Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes for the 2001 and 2003 projects as reported each month through the July 2010 expense month.

2001 - Plan Project 16 -- Emission Monitoring

Month	Plant Balance	Book Depreciation	Tax Depreciation	Temporary Difference	Income Tax Rate	Deferred Tax	Accumulated Deferred Taxes	Deferred Taxes on Retirements
							1,180,762	
Mar-10	9,775,541	20,725	36,345	15,620	38.9000%	6,076	1,186,838	18,994
Apr-10	9,775,541	20,725	36,345	15,620	38.9000%	6,076	1,192,914	18,994
May-10	9,775,541	20,725	36,345	15,620	38.9000%	6,076	1,198,990	18,994
Jun-10	9,775,541	20,725	36,345	15,620	38.9000%	6,076	1,205,066	18,994
Jul-10	9,775,541	20,725	36,345	15,620	38.9000%	6,076	1,211,141	18,994
Aug-10								•

2001 - Plan Project 17 -- NOx

		Book		Tomorous	lucama Tay		Accumulated	Deferred
Month	Plant Balance	Depreciation	Tax Depreciation	Temporary Difference	Income Tax Rate	Deferred Tax	Deferred Taxes	Taxes on Retirements
							31,683,256	
Mar-10	216,964,277	558,726	1,545,359	986,633	38.9000%	42,504	31,725,760	205,174
Apr-10	216,964,277	558,726	1,545,359	986,633	38.9000%	42,504	31,768,264	205,174
May-10	216,964,277	558,726	1,545,359	986,633	38.9000%	42,504	31,810,768	205,174
Jun-10	216,964,277	558,726	1,545,359	986,633	38.9000%	42,504	31,853,272	205,174
Jul-10	216,964,277	558,726	1,545,359	986,633	38.9000%	42,504	31,895,774	205,174
Aug-10								

Note:

Due to Bonus Depreciation for tax purposes, taken on certain components of Project 17, the deferred tax calculation for this project is computed separately for Federal and State purposes Specifically, for Federal taxes, certain assets placed in service in 2005 received 30% bonus depreciation, which reduces the Federal tax basis to 70% of the plant balance A sample calculation of deferred taxes for Mar 2010 is shown below:

Federal Basis	Book Depr.	Federal Tax Depr	Fed Difference	Fed Def Tax
151,874,994	558,726	641,733	83,007	29,052
State Basis	Book Depr. 558,726	State Tax Depr 903,626	St Difference 344,900	St Def Tax 20,694

St Offset for Fed Taxes not Owed (7,243)

Total Deferred Tax 42,504

2003 - Plan Project 18 -- New Ash Storage

Month	Plant Balance	Book Depreciation	Tax Depreciation	Temporary Difference	Income Tax Rate	Deferred Tax	Accumulated Deferred Taxes	Deferred Taxes on Retirements
							2,458,258	
Mar-10	16,148,295	37,545	111,821	74,276	38.9000%	4,076	2,462,334	•
Apr-10	16,148,295	37,545	111,821	74,276	38.9000%	4,076	2,466,410	-
May-10	16,148,295	37,545	111,821	74,276	38.9000%	4,076	2,470,486	-
Jun-10	16,148,295	37,545	111,821	74,276	38.9000%	4,076	2,474,562	-
Jul-10	16,148,295	37,545	111,821	74,276	38.9000%	4,076	2,478,637	-
Aug-10								

Note:

Due to Bonus Depreciation for tax purposes taken on Project 18, the deferred tax calculation for this project is computed separately for Federal and State purposes. Specifically, for Federal taxes, certain assets placed in service in 2005 received 30% bonus depreciation, which reduces the Federal tax basis to 70% of the plant balance. A sample calculation of deferred taxes for Mar 2010 is shown below:

Federal Basis 11,303,807	•	Federal Tax Der 46,044	Fed Differenc 8,499	Fed Def Tax 2,975
State Basis	Book Depr	State Tax Depr	St Difference	St Def Tax
16,148,295	37,545	65,777	28,232	1,694

St Offset for Fed Taxes not Owed (593)

Total Deferred Tax 4,076

2005 - Plan Project 19 -- Ash Handling at Ghent 1 and Ghent Station

Month	Plant Balance	Book Depreciation	Tax Depreciation	Temporary Difference	Income Tax Rate	Deferred Tax	Accumulated Deferred Taxes	Deferred Taxes on Retirements
							57,065	
Mar-10	835,046	1,941	6,234	4,293	38.9000%	1,670	58,735	79,280
Apr-10	835,046	1,941	6,234	4,293	38.9000%	1,670	60,405	79,280
May-10	835,046	1,941	6,234	4,293	38.9000%	1,670	62,075	79,280
Jun-10	835,046	1,941	6,234	4,293	38.9000%	1,670	63,745	79,280
Jul-10	835,046	1,941	6,234	4,293	38.9000%	1,670	65,415	79,280
Aug-10	835,046	1,941	6.234	4,293	38.9000%	1,670	67,081	79,280

2005 - Plan Project 20 -- Ash Treatment Basin at E.W. Brown

Month	Plant Balance	Book Depreciation	Tax Depreciation	Temporary Difference	Income Tax Rate	Deferred Tax	Accumulated Deferred Taxes	Deferred Taxes on Retirements
							1,508,042	
Mar-10	19,697,162	45,960	240,816	194,856	38.9000%	75,799	1,583,841	-
Apr-10	19,697,162	45,960	240,816	194,856	38.9000%	75,799	1,659,640	*
May-10	19,697,162	45,960	240,816	194,856	38.9000%	75,799	1,735,439	
Jun-10	19,697,162	45,960	240,816	194,856	38.9000%	75,799	1,811,238	-
Jul-10	19,697,162	45,960	240,816	194,856	38 9000%	75,799	1,887,037	-
Aug-10	19,697,162	45,960	240,816	194,856	38.9000%	75,799	1,962,840	-

2005 - Plan Project 21 -- FGD's

								Deferred
		Book	Tax	Temporary	Income Tax		Accumulated	Taxes on
Month	Plant Balance	Depreciation	Depreciation	Difference	Rate	Deferred Tax	Deferred Taxes	Retirements
				MINOR THE PROPERTY OF THE PROP	1(0,000)		25,440,671	
Маг-10	592,380,842	1,861,835	5,410,745	3,548,910	38.9000%	1,380,526	26,821,197	761,567
Apr-10	600,184,169	1,886,360	6,465,123	4,578,763	38 9000%	1,781,139	28,602,336	761,567
May-10	600,184,169	1,886,360	5,483,854	3,597,494	38 9000%	1,399,425	30,001,761	761,567
Jun-10	970,835,852	2,438,766	9,984,630	7,545,864	38.9000%	2,935,341	32,937,102	761,567
Jul-10	970,835,852	2,991,171	9,984,630	6,993,459	38.9000%	2,720,456	35,657,558	761,567
Aug-10	970,835,852	2,991,171	9,984,630	6,993,459	38.9000%	2,720,456	38,378,013	761,567

2006 - Plan Project 23 -- TC2 AQCS Equipment

Retirements
-
-
-
-
-
-

Kentucky Utilities Company Deferred Tax Calculations Environmental Compliance Plans, by Approved Project

2006 - Plan Project 24 -- Sorbent Injection

Month	Plant Balance	Book Depreciation	Tax Depreciation	Temporary Difference	Income Tax Rate	Deferred Tax	Accumulated Deferred Taxes	Deferred Taxes on Retirements
							400,286	
Mar-10	7,397,285	16,679	69,309	52,630	38.9000%	20,473	420,759	-
Apr-10	7,397,285	16,679	69,309	52,630	38.9000%	20,473	441,232	-
May-10	12,751,272	23,139	130,052	106,913	38.9000%	41,589	482,821	6,147
Jun-10	12,751,272	29,598	130,052	100,454	38.9000%	39,077	521,898	6,147
Jul-10	12,751,272	29,598	130,052	100,454	38.9000%	39,077	560,975	6,147
Aug-10	12,751,272	29,598	130,052	100,454	38 9000%	39,077	600,048	6,147

Kentucky Utilities Company Deferred Tax Calculations Environmental Compliance Plans, by Approved Project

2006 - Plan Project 25 -- Mercury Monitors

Month	Plant Balance	Book Depreciation	Tax Depreciation	Temporary Difference	Income Tax Rate	Deferred Tax	Accumulated Deferred Taxes	Deferred Taxes on Retirements
							36,333	
Mar-10	1,031,953	3,424	8,187	4,763	38.9000%	1,853	38,186	-
Apr-10	1,031,953	3,424	8,187	4,763	38.9000%	1,853	40,039	÷
May-10	1,031,953	3,424	8,187	4,763	38.9000%	1,853	41,891	-
Jun-10	1,031,953	3,424	8,187	4,763	38.9000%	1,853	43,744	-
Jul-10	1,031,953	3,424	8,187	4,763	38.9000%	1,853	45,597	-
Aug-10	1,031,953	3,424	8,187	4,763	38 9000%	1,853	47,460	-

Kentucky Utilities Company Deferred Tax Calculations Environmental Compliance Plans, by Approved Project

2006 - Plan Project 27 -- E.W. Brown Electrostatic Precipitators

Month	Plant Balance	Book Depreciation	Tax Depreciation	Temporary Difference	Income Tax Rate	Deferred Tax	Accumulated Deferred Taxes	Deferred Taxes on Retirements
							19,378	
Mar-10	1,354,119	3,388	8,419	5,031	38 9000%	1,957	21,335	2,274
Apr-10	1,354,119	3,388	8,419	5,031	38.9000%	1,957	23,292	2,274
May-10	1,354,119	3,388	8,419	5,031	38 9000%	1,957	25,249	2,274
Jun-10	1,349,165	3,382	8,400	5,018	38.9000%	1,952	27,201	7,850
Jul-10	1,349,165	3,376	8,400	5,024	38 9000%	1,954	29,156	7,850
Aug-10	1,349,165	3,376	8,400	5,024	38.9000%	1,954	31,105	7,850

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

Response to Information Requested in Appendix B of Commission's Order Dated December 27, 2010

Case No. 2010-00474

Ouestion No. 4

Witness: Shannon L. Charnas

- Q-4. Refer to ES Form 2.50, Pollution Control Operations & Maintenance Expenses, for the March 2010 through August 2010 expense months. For each expense account number listed on this schedule, explain the reason(s) for any change in the expense levels from month to month if that change is greater than plus or minus 10 percent.
- A-4. Please find the attached schedule showing the changes in the operations and maintenance expense accounts for March 2010 through August 2010 expense months. The changes in the expense levels are reasonable and generally occurred as a part of routine plant operations and maintenance or normal annual testing expenses.

Monthly variances within account 506104, NOx operation expenses, reflect normal SCR operations. The variances for account 506104 are caused by the purchase and delivery timing of the raw consumable material as well as variations in generation and coal quality. This account was eliminated from the ECR beginning August 2010 per Kentucky Commission Order No. 2009-00548.

Fluctuations in the NOx maintenance expenses, account 512101, are the result of routine SCR monthly maintenance. Expenses in March and April 2010 are higher than typical months due to timing of preventative maintenance on the SCR. This account was eliminated from the ECR beginning August 2010 per Kentucky Commission Order No. 2009-00548.

Fluctuations in the scrubber operation expenses, account 502006, are the result of regular operation of FGDs at Ghent. These are variable production expenses and will fluctuate with generation, coal quality and the SO_2 removal rate.

Fluctuations in the scrubber maintenance expenses, account 512005, are the result of gypsum stack maintenance. These expenses vary with the amount of gypsum produced and relocated to the stack or pile.

Fluctuations in sorbent injection operation expenses, account 506109, result from ongoing system operations of Ghent Units 1, 3 and 4. March and April have lower

Response to Question No. 4
Page 2 of 2
Charnas

expenses due to planned unit outages for maintenance at Ghent Unit 1 & 4 during this time period.

Fluctuations in sorbent injection maintenance expenses, account 512102, are the result of normal system maintenance. Slight increases in May, June and August 2010 are the result of preventive maintenance, SO₃ testing and platform welding maintenance in the respective months.

The mercury monitor maintenance account 512103 includes the purchase of a 12-month maintenance support agreement to provide post installation service at Ghent.

Attachment to Response to Question No. 4 Page 1 of 1 Charnas

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY ENVIRONMENTAL SURCHARGE REPORT

Pollution Control - Operations & Maintenance Expenses

O&M Expense Account	Mar-10	Apr-10	% Change from Prior Period	May-10	% Change from Prior Period	Jun-10	% Change from Prior Period	Jul-10	% Change from Prior Period	Aug-10	% Change from Prior Period
2001 Plan	00 210 010	157 613 67	380%	220 715 56	44%	269,562.44	22%	262,790.40	-3%	•	-100%
506104 NOx Operation Consumables	240,213.70	177,012.07	700		%0		%0	,	%0	•	%0
506105 NOx Operation Labor and Other	,	1	700	1 203 0	7600	16.068.93	%89	12.556.94	-22%	,	~100%
512101 NOx Maintenance	84,167.35	92,238.51	10%	9,593.14	0/0/-	305 631 37	24%	275 347 34	-4%	ı	-100%
Total 2001 Plan O&M Expenses	332,383.25	245,051.18	-76%	730,308.70	0.70-	10.100,002	0/17				
ביות אחיר											A Company of the Comp
Course Course	229 898 47	251.446.60	%6	349,019.84	39%	364,676.21	4%	359,301.29	-1%	321,078.91	-11%
512006 Scrubber Operations	235 190.64	118,686.66	~05-	105,636.14	-11%	161,662.95	23%	171,817.74	%9	249,233.67	45%
512005 Scrubber Mannenance Total 2005 Plan O&M Expenses	465,089.11	370,133.26	-20%	454,655.98	23%	526,339.16	%91	531,119.03	1%	570,312.58	7%
2006 Plan			701	10000	230/	759 014 78	2%	854.254.51	13%	1,082,896.81	27%
506109 Sorbent Injection Operation	555,923.08	535,192.35	-4%	/12,010.34	7000	77 000 20	270%	6 637 77	%91-	18,649,17	181%
512102 Sorbent Injection Maintenance	9,796.65	7,248.63	-26%	21,507.03	197%	71,777	27.77		%0		%0
506110 Mercury Monitors Operation	,		%0		%0	1	0.70		70001		70001
512103 Mercury Monitors Maintenance	,	,	%0	'	%0		%0	10,068.00	10070		7007
506104 Nov Operation Consumables			%0	,	%0	1	%0		%0		9/0
506105 Nov Operation Labor and Other	1	,	%0	1	%0	1	%0	•	%0		0.20
200100 Nov Optimien		t	%0	t	%0	,	%0		%0		0%0
512101 NOX Maintenance	,	,	%0	'	%0	'	%0	,	%0	1	%0
SUZUNO Scribber Operations			%0		%0	•	%0	'	%0		%0
512005 Scrubber Maintenance			%0	,	%0		%0		%0	'	%0
506001 Precipitator Operation			%0		%0	1	%0	•	%0	•	%0
506111 Activated Carbon	1		%00		%0	,	%0	•	%0	•	%0
512011 Precipitator Maintenance	565 719 73	542 440 98	4%	734,123,37	35%	786,235.55	7%	870,960.28	11%	1,101,545.98	26%
I otal Z006 Fran Oz.M Expenses											
2009 Plan			/80		%0	-	%0	1	%0	-	%0
506104 Nox Operation Consumbales	-	'	070		200		%0	1	%0	,	%0
506105 Nox Operation Labor and Other			0%0	,	790		%0	'	%0		%0
512101 Nox Maintenance	-		0%0	-	790		%0		%0	,	%0
506109 Sorbent Injection Operation	•		%0		0.70		%0	'	%0	,	%0
512102 Sorbent Injection Maintenance	•	,	%0	1	07.0		%0		%0		%0
502012 ECR Landfill Operations	1	-	%0	•	070	-	700		%0	,	%0
512105 ECR Landfill Maintenance			%0	,	020		%0	,	%0	,	%0
Adjustment for CCP Dosposal in Base Rates (ES Form 2.51)	,		%0	-	0.00		760		%0		%0
Total 2009 Plan O&M Expenses	1	•	0%	1	0.70		Tay a				

The 2001 Plan was eliminated from ECR recovery in August 2010 per PSC Order No. 2009-00548.

į.		

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

Response to Information Requested in Appendix B of Commission's Order Dated December 27, 2010

Case No. 2010-00474

Question No. 5

Witness: Shannon L. Charnas

- Q-5. In Case No. 2000-00439, the Commission ordered that KU's cost of debt and preferred stock would be reviewed and reestablished during the six-month review case. Provide the following information as of August 31, 2010:
 - a. The outstanding balances for long-term debt, short-term debt, preferred stock, and common equity. Provide this information on total company and Kentucky jurisdictional bases.
 - b. The blended interest rates for long-term debt, short-term debt, and preferred stock. Include all supporting calculations showing how these blended interest rates were determined. If applicable, provide the blended interest rates on total company and Kentucky jurisdictional bases. For each outstanding debt listed, indicate whether the interest rate is fixed or variable.
 - c. KU's calculation of its weighted average cost of capital for environmental surcharge purposes.
- A-5. a. Please see the attachment. There was no preferred stock as of August 31, 2010, therefore it is not listed in the attached schedule.
 - b. Please see the attachment. There was no preferred stock as of August 31, 2010, therefore it is not listed in the attached schedule.
 - c. Please see the attachment. KU is utilizing a return on equity of 10.63% as agreed to and approved by the Commission in its July 30, 2010 Order in Case No. 2009-00548.

Kentucky Utilities Company Outstanding Balances - Capitalization As of August 31, 2010

	1	2	3 Outstanding Balance
		Outstanding Balance Total Company	KY Jurisdictional 87.19%
1	Long-Term Debt	\$1,681,779,405	\$1,466,343,463
2	Short-Term Debt	\$60,299,954	\$52,575,530
3	Common Equity	\$2,067,796,361	\$1,802,911,647

Kentucky Utilities Company Blended Interest Rates As of August 31, 2010

		1 Blended Interest Rate Total Company / KY Jurisdictional
1	Long-Term Debt	4.69%
2	Short-Term Debt	0.28%

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY ANALYSIS OF THE EMBEDDED COST OF CAPITAL AT August 31, 2010

					L	ONG-TERM	DEBT	************						
								F	Annualized Cost					
								ed Debt	Amortized Loss-		er of Credit			Embedded
Pollution Control Bonds	<u>Due</u>	Rate	Princip	<u>aí</u>		Interest	Issuance	Expense	Reacquired Debt	and	other fees		<u>Total</u>	Cost
Mercer Co 2000 Series A	05/01/23	0 38000% *	\$ 12.90	0.000	s	49.020	\$		\$ 46.743	\$	94,413	- 5	190,176	1 474%
Carroli Co 2002 Series A	02/01/32	0 60000% *	20,93		Ů	125,580	•	4,104	36,300	•	20,930		186,914	0 893%
		0 60000% *							•					
Carroll Co 2002 Series B	02/01/32			0.000		14,400		2,856	4,164		2.400		23,820	0 993%
Muhlenberg Co 2002 Series A	02/01/32	0 60000% *		0,000		14,400		1,140	12,744		2,400		30,684	1 279%
Mercer Co 2002 Series A	02/01/32	0.60000% *	•	0,000		44,400		3,180	12,900		7,400		67,880	0 917%
Carroll Co 2002 Series C	10/01/32	0 57800% *	96,00	0,000		554,880		73,658	186,036		240,000	;	1,054,574	1.099%
Carroll Co 2004 Series A	10/01/34	0 36000% *	50,00	0,000		180,000		-	105,023		409,041	1	694,064	1 388%
Carroll Co 2006 Series B	10/01/34	0 36000% *	54,00	0,000		194,400		47,920	-		441,990	i	684,310	1 267%
Carroll Co 2007 Series A	02/01/26	5 75000% *	17,87	5.000		1.027,813		33,342	-		_		1,061,155	5 937%
Trimble Co. 2007 Series A	03/01/37	6 00000% *		7,000		535,620		16,072	-		*		551,692	6 180%
Carroll Co 2008 Series A	02/01/32	0 36000% *	77,94			280,611		34,400			636,669		951,680	1 221%
	02/01/32	0 30000 78	11,54	7,405		200,011		34,400	201.002	_	030,005	,	201,063	
Called Bonds Total External Debt			\$ 350,77	0 405	\$	3,021,124	\$	216,672	201,063 \$ 604,973		1,855,243	-\$		0.000%
Total External Debt			\$ 330,77	9,405	- 3	3,021,124	3	210,072	\$ 604,973		1,000,240		3,696,012	0.339%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	11/24/10	4 240%	\$ 33,00	0,000	2 \$	1,399,200	\$	-	\$ -	\$	-	\$	1,399,200	4 240%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	01/16/12	4 390%	50,00	0,000		2,195.000		-	-				2,195,000	4 390%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	04/30/13	4 550%	100,00			4,550,000		-	-		-		4,550,000	4 550%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	08/15/13	5 310%	75,00			3,982,500		-	-		-		3,982,500	5.310%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	12/19/14 07/08/15	5 450% 4 735%	100,00 50,00			5,450,000 2,367,500		-	-		-		5,450,000 2,367,500	5 450% 4 735%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	12/21/15	5 360%	75,00			4,020.000		-	-				4,020,000	5 360%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	10/25/16	5 675%	50,00			2,837,500		**	-				2,837,500	5 675%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	06/20/17	5 980%	50,00			2,990,000		-	-		-		2,990,000	5 980%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	07/25/18	6 160%	50,00			3,080,000		-	-		-		3,080,000	6 160%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	08/27/18	5 645%	50,00			2,822,500		-	-		-		2,822,500	5 645%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	12/17/18	7 035%	75,00			5.276,250		-	•		-		5,276,250	7 035%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	10/25/19 02/07/22	5 710% 5 690%	70,00 53,00			3,997,000 3,015.700		-	•		-		3,997.000 3,015,700	5 710% 5 690%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	05/22/23	5 850%	75,00			4,387,500		-			-		4,387,500	5 850%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	09/14/28	5 960%	100,00			5,960,000		_			_		5,960,000	5 960%
lotes Payable to Fidelia Corp	06/23/36	6 330%	50,00			3,165,000		-	-		-		3,165,000	6 330%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	03/30/37	5 860%	75,00			4,395,000		-	-		-		4,395,000	5 860%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	04/24/17	5 280%	50,00			2,640,000		-	-		-		2,640,000	5 280%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	07/29/19	4 810%	50,00			2,405,000		-	-		-		2,405,000	4 810%
Notes Payable to Fidelia Corp	11/25/19	4 445%	50,00	~		2,222,500	-			- <u>-</u>			2,222,500	4.445%
Total Internal Debt			\$ 1,331,00	0,000	\$	73,158,150	\$		\$ -	- 3		-5	73,158,150	4.350%
		Total	\$ 1,681,77	9,405	s	76,179,274	\$	216,672	\$ 604,973	\$	1,855,243	\$	78,856,162	4.689%

				S	HORT TERI	VI DE	BT	*******					
								Annua	lized Cost			 	
	Rate		<u>Principal</u>		Interest		Expense		Loss	Ē	remium	Total	Embedded <u>Cost</u>
Notes Payable to Associated Company	0 280% *	\$	60,299,954	\$	168,840	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ 168.840	0.280%
	Total	\$	60,299,954	\$	168,840	\$	-	\$	-	\$	*	\$ 168,840	0.280%
Embedded Cost of Total Debt		\$ 1	.742.079.359	s	76,348,114	s	216,672		604.973	\$	1.855.243	 79.025.002	4.536%

^{*} Composite rate at end of current month

¹ Series P and R bonds were redeemed in 2003, and 2005, respectively. They were not replaced with other bond series. The remaining unamortized expense is being amortized over the remainder of the original lives (due 5/15/07, 6/1/25, 6/1/35, and 6/1/36 respectively) of the bonds as loss on reacquired debt

² Current Portion of Long-Term Debt

Kentucky Utilities Company Outstanding Balances - Adjusted Jurisdictional Capitalization August 31, 2010

-	2 Electric Only	3 Capital Structure	4 Cost Rate	5 Weighted Average Cost of Capital	6 Tax Gross-up Factor	7 Weighted Average Cost of Capital with Equity Gross-up
1 Long-Term Debt	1,392,025,319	44.25%	4.69%	2.08%		2.08%
2 Short-Term Debt	49,905,206	1.59%	0.28%	%00.0		%00.0
3 Common Equity	1,704,192,519	54.16%	10.63%	2.76%	0.56	8.96%
4 Total	3,146,123,044			7.84%		11.04%
	œ	Rate of Return (ROR) Grossed Up:	ed Up:	11.04%		

Weighted Cost of Capital Grossed up for Income Tax Effect {ROR + (ROR - Debt rate) x [TR/(1-TR)]}

See tax rate (TR) calculation on 5(c) page (2)

ECR - Gross-up Revenue Factor & Composite Income Tax Calculation 2010

(1)	Assume pre-tax income of	Produ W/ 69	2010 eral & State uction Credit 2010 State Rate Included 100.0000	
(2) (3)	State income tax (see below)		5.6604	(37)
(4)	state meeme uni (ese eerew)			
(5)	Taxable income for Federal income tax			
(6)	before production credit		94.3396	(1) - (3)
(7)	a. Production Rate		9%	
(8)	 b. Allocation to Production Income 		100%	
(9)	c. Allocated Production Rate (a x b)		9.00%	
(10)				
(11)	Less: Production tax credit		8.4906	(6)*(9)
(12)			0.7.0.00	
(13)	Taxable income for Federal income tax		85.8490	(6)-(8)
(14)			20.0470	
(15)	Federal income tax		30.0472	(10) *35%
(16)				
(17)	Total State and Federal income taxes	Ф	35.7076	(2) (10)
(18)		\$	33.7070	(3)+(12)
(19)	Construe Bayanua Factor		64.2924	100-(15)
(20)	Gross-up Revenue Factor		04.2724	100 - (13)
(21)				
(22)	Therefore, the composite rate is:		30.0472%	(12)/100
(23)	Federal		5.6604%	(3)/100
(24)	State Total		35.7076%	(20) + (21)
(25) (26)	iotai		33.707070	(20). (21)
(27)				
(28)				
(29)				
(30)	State Income Toy Colculation			
(31)	State Income Tax Calculation Assume pre-tax income of	\$	100.0000	
(32)	Assume pre-tax medine of	Ψ	100.000	
(33)	Production credit @ 6%		5.6604	(8)
(34) (35)	1 Todaction Croate to 070			, - ,
(36)	Taxable income for State income tax		94.3396	(29) - (31)
(37)				, ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' '
(38)	State Tax Rate		6.0000%	
(39)		***************************************		
(40)	State Income Tax		5.6604	(33)*(35)
•				

KENTUCKY UTILITIES COMPANY

Response to Information Requested in Appendix B of Commission's Order Dated December 27, 2010

Case No. 2010-00474

Question No. 6

Witness: Robert M. Conroy

- Q-6. Provide the dollar impact the over-/under-recovery will have on the average residential customer's bill for the requested recovery period.
- A-6. Based upon refunding the net over-recovered position of \$5,290,392 (\$881,730 per month) over six months, the ECR billing factor for a residential customer using 1,000 kWh will decrease by approximately \$0.69 per month, using rates and adjustment clause factors in effect for the January 2011 billing month.