

Jeff DeRouen, Executive Director Public Service Commission of Kentucky 211 Sower Boulevard P. O. Box 615 Frankfort, Kentucky 40602

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION Louisville Gas and Electric Company State Regulation and Rates 220 West Main Street P.O. 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

August 5, 2011

RE: In the Matter of: The Application of Louisville Gas and Electric Company for Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity and Approval of Its 2011 Compliance Plan for Recovery by Environmental Surcharge - Case No. 2011-00162

Dear Mr. DeRouen:

Enclosed please find an original and fifteen (15) copies of Louisville Gas and Electric Company's (LG&E) response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club, and the Natural Resource Defense Council dated July 12, 2011, in the above-referenced matter.

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

Sincerely,

Robert M. Conroy

cc: Parties of Record

VERIFICATION

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)	
)	SS
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)	

The undersigned, **Gary H. Revlett**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director – Environmental Affairs 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.

Jany H. Reulis

Gary H. Revlett

Notary Public (SEAL)

My Commission Expires:

November 9, 2014

VERIFICATION

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)	
)	SS
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)	

The undersigned, **Charles R. Schram**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Director – Energy Planning, Analysis and Forecasting 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.

Charles R. Schram

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public in and before said County and State, this $\frac{4+5}{2}$ day of $\frac{2011}{2}$.

Notary Public () (SEAL)

My Commission Expires:

November 9, 2014

VERIFICATION

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY)	SS:
COUNTY OF JEFFERSON)	

The undersigned, **John N. Voyles, Jr.**, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is Vice President, Transmission and Generation Services for Louisville Gas and Electric Company and an employee of 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.

Jøhn N. Voyles, Jr

Notary Public (SEAL)

My Commission Expires:

November 9, 2014

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

THE APPLICATION OF LOUISVILLE GAS AND)	
ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR CERTIFICATES OF)	
PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY AND)	CASE NO.
APPROVAL OF ITS 2011 COMPLIANCE PLAN)	2011-00162
FOR RECOVERY BY ENVIRONMENTAL)	
SURCHARGE)	

RESPONSE OF
LOUISVILLE GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
TO THE FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES OF
DREW FOLEY, JANET OVERMAN, GREGG WAGNER,
SIERRA CLUB, AND THE NATURAL RESOURCE DEFENSE COUNCIL
DATED JULY 12, 2011

FILED: August 5, 2011

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 1

Witness: Charles R. Schram / Gary H. Revlett

- Q-1. Refer to page 8, lines 1-5 of the testimony of Lonnie E. Bellar. Identify "any necessary adjustments to LG&E's 2011 Plan that are responsive to CATR," which was finalized as the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule on July 6, 2011.
- A-1. Please see the response to KPSC-1 Question No. 50.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 2

Witness: John N. Voyles, Jr. / Charles R. Schram

- Q-2. Refer to page 7, lines 15-20 of the testimony of John N. Voyles Jr. Identify which "additional SCR installations" were deferred by LG&E's 2011 Plan and for how long they will be deferred.
- A-2. Please see the responses to KPSC-1 Question Nos. 57 and 59 in the KU proceeding, Case No. 2011-00161. The potential additional SCR installations are limited to the Companies' remaining non-SCR equipped units. The Companies' projected system NO_x emissions are less than the emission allowances provided in CSAPR. Therefore, the Companies will defer any additional SCR installations until required by future regulations.

•			
		·	

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 3

- Q-3. Refer to Table 1 on page 3 of Exhibit CRS-1. Identify in what year the dollar figures identified therein are.
- A-3. The total capital costs in Table 1 represent the sum of the nominal capital costs.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 4

- Q-4. Refer to Table 2 on page 4 of Exhibit CRS-1. For each unit listed in Table 2, state whether the PVRR of installing controls identified therein includes each of the following category of costs. For each category, if the answer is yes, identify the total PVRR in 2011 dollars that was included for that cost:
 - a. Capital projects other than environmental controls
 - b. Fixed operation and maintenance costs
 - c. Variable operation and maintenance costs
 - d. Fuel costs
 - e. Emission allowance costs
- A-4. Please see the attachment for each component of the total PVRR.

PVRR (\$M)

1 ν ιζιζ (φινι)		Produc	tion Cost	S	Capital		
Unit(s)	Fixed O&M	Variable O&M	Fuel Costs	Emission Allowance Costs	Environmental Controls	Other	Total
Tyrone 3	4,277	2,788	18,765	0.2	3,614	3,709	33,153
Green River 3	4,252	2,760	18,769	0.2	3,568	3,791	33,140
Brown 3	4,138	2,711	18,810	0.2	3,522	3,880	33,060
Cane Run 4	4,138	2,711	18,810	0.2	3,522	3,880	33,060
Cane Run 6	4,001	2,730	19,088	0.2	3,217	3,935	32,972
Brown 1-2	3,901	2,771	19,426	0.2	2,805	4,077	32,980
Cane Run 5	3,901	2,771	19,426	0.2	2,805	4,077	32,980
Ghent 3	3,740	2,794	19,707	0.2	2,484	4,196	32,921
Ghent 1	3,740	2,794	19,707	0.2	2,484	4,196	32,921
Green River 4	3,740	2,794	19,707	0.2	2,484	4,196	32,921
Mill Creek 4	3,601	2,691	19,849	0.2	2,417	4,255	32,811
Trimble County 1	3,601	2,691	19,849	0.2	2,417	4,255	32,811
Ghent 4	3,601	2,691	19,849	0.2	2,417	4,255	32,811
Mill Creek 3	3,601	2,691	19,849	0.2	2,417	4,255	32,811
Ghent 2	3,601	2,691	19,849	0.2	2,417	4,255	32,811
Mill Creek 1-2	3,601	2,691	19,849	0.2	2,417	4,255	32,811

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 5

- Q-5. Refer to Table 2 on page 4 of Exhibit CRS-1. For each unit listed in Table 2, identify any cost not listed in Interrogatory 4 that is included in the PVRR of installing controls identified in Table 2. For each such cost, identify the total PVRR in 2011 dollars that was included for that cost.
- A-5. Please see the response to Question No. 4 in the column entitled "Capital Environmental Controls."

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 6

- Q-6. Refer to Table 2 on page 4 of Exhibit CRS-1. For each unit listed in Table 2, state whether, in determining the PVRR of retiring and replacing capacity indentified in Table 2, each of the following options was included as replacing some or all of the capacity for that unit. For each option that was included, identify the amount of capacity that such option was assumed to replace, and the per unit of energy cost that was assumed for such option.
 - a. Energy efficiency
 - b. Demand side management
 - c. Combined heat and power
 - d. Wind turbines
 - e. Solar
 - f. Hydroelectric
 - g. Construction of a new natural gas combined cycle facility
 - h. Purchase of power from an existing natural gas combined cycle facility
 - i. Purchase of an existing natural gas combined cycle facility
 - i. Power purchase agreements
- A-6. Please see the responses to KPSC-1 Question Nos. 18, 42 and 44. While there is no single input that equates to the "per unit of energy cost that was assumed for each option", the details for demand-side and supply-side technologies are provided in the Companies' 2011 Integrated Resource Plan ("2011 IRP") filing. Please refer to Volumes I and III of the 2011 IRP. Also, please see the detail provided in Exhibit CRS-1 Section 4.2 (including associated subsections) and Appendix C.

¹ In the Matter of: The 2011 Joint Integrated Resource Plan of Louisville Gas and Electric Company and Kentucky Utilities Company, PSC Case No. 2011-00140.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 7

- Q-7. Refer to Table 2 on page 4 of Exhibit CRS-1. For each unit listed in Table 2, identify any option not listed in Interrogatory 6 that, in determining the PVRR of retiring and replacing capacity identified in Table 2, was included as replacing some or all of the capacity for that unit. For each such option, identify the amount of capacity that such option was assumed to replace, and the per unit of energy cost that was assumed for such option.
- A-7. All options were addressed in the response to Question No. 6.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 8

- Q-8. Refer to Table 2 on page 4 of Exhibit CRS-1. For each unit listed in Table 2, state whether the PVRR of retiring and replacing capacity identified therein includes each of the following categories of costs. For each category, if the answer is yes, identify the total PVRR in 2011 dollars that was included for that cost.
 - a. Transmission grid upgrades or additions
 - b. Decommissioning costs
 - c. Undepreciated book value
 - d. Replacement capacity
- A-8. a. No, transmission grid upgrades or additions are considered when evaluating detailed replacement capacity alternatives, which is beyond the scope of the LG&E 2011 Plan.
 - b. Decommissioning costs are not included.
 - c. The undepreciated book value does not affect the revenue requirements analysis for retired units, since the revenue requirements include recovery of the undepreciated book value for retired units.
 - d. The table below contains the PVRR associated with the system expansion units for each of the unit retirement cases.

Unit(s)	Replacement Capacity
	PVRR (\$M)
Tyrone 3	1,898
Green River 3	2,002
Brown 3	2,103
Cane Run 4	2,103
Cane Run 6	2,205
Brown 1-2	2,433
Cane Run 5	2,433
Ghent 3	2,604
Ghent 1	2,604
Green River 4	2,604
Mill Creek 4	2,680
Trimble County 1	2,680
Ghent 4	2,680
Mill Creek 3	2,680
Ghent 2	2,680
Mill Creek 1-2	2,680

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 9

- Q-9. Refer to Table 2 on page 4 of Exhibit CRS-1. For each unit listed in Table 2, identify any cost not listed in Interrogatory 8 that was included in determining the PVRR of retiring and replacing capacity identified therein. For each cost, identify the total PVRR in 2011 dollars that was included for that cost.
- A-9. All costs have been discussed in response to Question Nos. 4 and 8.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 10

Witness: John N. Voyles, Jr.

- Q-10. Refer to page 1 of Exhibit JNV- 1. For each of the electric generating units at LG&E's Mill Creek generating station and for Trimble County Unit 1, identify the following emissions rates and amounts from such unit after the environmental controls that are proposed as part of Project 26 and 27 are completed.
 - a. SO2 lbs/mmBtu
 - b. SO2 tpy
 - c. N0x lbs/mmBtu
 - d. NOx tpy
 - e. PM lbs/mmBtu
 - f. PM tpy
 - g. Mercury lbs/TBtu
 - h. Mercury pounds per year
 - i. HC1- lbs/mmBtu
 - j. HCl tpy
 - k. CO2 tpy
 - 1. SAM lbs/mmBtu
 - m. SAM tpy
- A-10. Emission rates for each pollutant vary with specific averaging periods. Please refer to Exhibit JNV-2, Appendix A for the targeted emissions limits used when considering control technology for each unit. The Companies intend to comply with the final EPA regulations that govern the emissions listed for the aforementioned pollutants. No environmental controls are proposed for CO₂ in Projects 26 and 27. See the responses to Question Nos. 12 and 23.

	•		
			•
4			

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 11

Witness: John N. Voyles, Jr.

- Q-11. Identify any planned, anticipated, or assumed retirement dates for each of LG&E's electric generating units.
- A-11. Please see the response to KPSC-1 Question No. 4.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 12

Witness: John N. Voyles, Jr. / Gary H. Revlett / Charles R. Schram

- Q-12. Identify any actions that the LG&E 2011 Plan assumes LG&E will need to take to comply with any existing, pending, or anticipated regulation of CO2 emissions from LG&E's electric generating units.
- A-12. The regulations requiring the installation of the environmental controls contained in the LG&E 2011 Plan are shown on Application Exhibit 1 and Exhibit JNV-1. The regulations are discussed on page 2 of the testimony of Mr. Voyles, and on pages 2, 3 and 4 of the testimony of Mr. Revlett. Also, please see the response to KPSC-1 Question No. 2.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 13

Witness: John N. Voyles, Jr. / Gary H. Revlett

- Q-13. Identify any actions that the LG&E 2011 Plan assumes LG&E will need to take as a result of the 1-hour SO2 NAAQS.
- A-13. The regulations requiring the installation of the environmental controls contained in the LG&E 2011 Plan are shown on Application Exhibit 1 and Exhibit JNV-1. The regulations are discussed on page 2 of the testimony of Mr. Voyles, and on pages 2, 3 and 4 of the testimony of Mr. Revlett. Also, please see the response to KPSC-1 Question No. 40.

•			
		•	

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 14

Witness: John N. Voyles, Jr. / Gary H. Revlett

- Q-14. Identify any actions that the LG&E 2011 Plan assumes LG&E will need to take as a result of US EPA's reconsideration of the 2008 ozone NAAQS.
- A-14. The regulations requiring the installation of the environmental controls contained in the LG&E 2011 Plan are shown on Application Exhibit 1 and Exhibit JNV-1. The regulations are discussed on page 2 of the testimony of Mr. Voyles, and on pages 2, 3 and 4 of the testimony of Mr. Revlett. Also, please see the response to KPSC-1 Question No. 40.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 15

Witness: John N. Voyles, Jr. / Gary H. Revlett

- Q-15. Identify any actions that the LG&E 2011 Plan assumes LG&E will need to take as a result of US EPA's reconsideration of the 2006 PM2.5 NAAOS.
- A-15. The regulations requiring the installation of the environmental controls contained in the LG&E 2011 Plan are shown on Application Exhibit 1 and Exhibit JNV-1. The regulations are discussed on page 2 of the testimony of Mr. Voyles, and on pages 2, 3 and 4 of the testimony of Mr. Revlett. LG&E did not include in their 2011 Plan any actions pursuant to the possible EPA reconsideration of the 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS. At this time EPA has not proposed a new PM_{2.5} standard and they have clearly delayed their previous target date of January 2011 for this action. Also, please see the response to KPSC-1 Question No. 40.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 16

- Q-16. Identify any actions that the LG&E 2011 Plan assumes LG&E will need to take as a result of existing, proposed, or anticipated Clean Water Act regulations.
- A-16. The LG&E 2011 Plan does not address actions necessary for compliance with existing, proposed, or anticipated Clean Water Act regulations.

	•			
			•	
8				

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 17

- Q-17. State whether the flue gas desulfurization systems at LG&E's Trimble County generating station were constructed using duplex stainless steel alloy 2205 or other duplex stainless steels.
- A-17. The flue gas desulfurization systems at LG&E's Trimble County generating station were not constructed using duplex stainless steel alloy 2205 or other duplex stainless steels.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 18

- Q-18. State whether the flue gas desulfurization systems at LG&E's Trimble County generating station have experienced problems with corrosion.
- A-18. The flue gas desulfurization systems have not experienced any significant corrosion issues.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 19

- Q-19. Identify the energy generated (in kWh or MWh) at each of LG&E's electric generating units in each calendar year during the period 2000-2010.
- A-19. Please see the attachment.

Annual Electric Energy by Unit (2000-2010, Net MWh)

	2000	<u>2001</u>	2002	<u>2003</u>	2004	2005	<u>2006</u>	2007	2008	<u>2009</u>	<u>2010</u>
Brown 1	615,006	591,387	577,925	599,106	568,432	563,532	480,534	493,483	513,921	217,008	411,311
Brown 2	943,403	791,198	906,575	972,668	971,532	1,075,007	956,008	1,013,933	1,074,881	547,458	763,280
Brown 3	2,793,427	2,375,053	2,278,584	2,525,740	2,246,620	1,584,997	2,031,288	2,396,909	2,534,659	1,740,829	1,828,361
Brown 5	0	59,564	54,241	475	-1,161	122,928	30,777	19,823	2,340	2,380	8,061
Brown 6	20,557	3,351	102,829	15,696	10,767	172,114	97,500	88,563	21,817	36,780	48,131
Brown 7	24,229	48,009	84,941	14,034	20,684	156,711	99,276	51,599	33,143	26,632	46,851
Brown 8	44,764	38,203	34,815	4,782	-758	2,954	46,642	19,870	6,622	7,658	7,864
Brown 9	33,403	21,753	25,687	2,902	-14	1,636	27,105	11,236	3,411	1,509	5,196
Brown 10	25,401	13,605	18,418	3,579	772	1,683	20,966	5,334	1,722	2,370	4,365
Brown 11	16,340	8,079	10,471	406	636	1,854	13,070	4,458	677	4,551	8,529
Cane Run 4	923,971	882,739	966,836	971,150	813,652	1,052,063	961,053	1,105,274	1,044,031	950,924	927,129
Cane Run 5	940,250	1,008,640	1,078,881	1,038,855	897,296	1,091,048	1,087,296	1,043,893	886,232	956,126	1,110,383
Cane Run 6	1,350,265	1,408,314	1,022,287	1,544,055	1,514,046	1,542,731	1,530,907	1,395,319	1,482,371	1,340,828	1,222,086
Cane Run 11	373	339	122	38	33	143	1,179	312	4	210	228
Dix Dam	23,958	26,644	63,944	71,014	94,610	36,590	47,026	35,068	50,505	68,871	35,921
Ghent 1	3,153,430	3,661,109	3,223,170	3,448,042	3,304,417	3,488,619	3,374,404	2,915,043	3,598,899	2,867,588	3,295,876
Ghent 2	2,838,645	3,032,774	3,071,447	2,981,199	2,843,658	2,762,178	3,013,392	3,454,216	2,804,097	2,413,738	3,201,480
Ghent 3	3,210,133	2,918,140	3,093,384	2,265,509	2,829,972	3,086,506	2,967,905	2,358,308	3,262,152	3,182,388	3,431,840
Ghent 4	3,234,493	3,060,192	2,145,650	2,758,455	3,088,747	3,249,370	2,852,022	3,232,661	2,840,532	2,881,867	2,667,176
Green River 1	66,301	43,719	35,155	20,566	-885	0	0	0	0	0	0
Green River 2	57,626	34,917	29,574	18,825	-844	0	0	0	0	0	0
Green River 3	380,547	353,858	212,011	277,711	335,347	336,573	206,046	420,678	379,545	216,614	345,262
Green River 4	539,025	491,937	442,670	351,583	465,396	338,730	433,665	576,042	582,590	408,847	544,049
Haefling 1	358	-50	-136	-158	-144	-117	-130	-118	-115	-143	175
Haefling 2	234	-102	-124	-158	-146	-125	108	0	-123	-147	193
Haefling 3	205	-58	-130	-156	-149	-196	-101	-104	-129	-159	275
Lock 7	2	-13	-24	-13	-21	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mill Creek 1	1,769,257	1,822,807	1,785,523	1,970,334	1,847,144	2,223,638	1,975,638	2,163,431	1,994,139	2,121,020	2,009,037
Mill Creek 2	1,861,504	1,778,112	1,933,487	1,725,186	2,019,094	1,828,966	2,032,265	1,944,646	2,083,269	1,860,292	2,101,040
Mill Creek 3	2,506,522	2,722,661	2,386,458	2,706,297	2,297,199	2,969,840	2,842,591	2,805,103	3,002,860	2,805,833	2,914,876
Mill Creek 4	2,896,419	2,517,369	2,970,156	2,947,137	3,423,665	3,092,783	2,954,368	3,584,949	3,335,864	3,587,250	3,348,610
Ohio Falls	331,653	278,935	216,127	175,608	214,785	194,203	239,852	140,996	161,996	229,643	236,520
Paddy's Run 11	781	197	48	56	0	728	901	172	0	20	244
Paddy's Run 12	1,341	354	155	0	0	521	407	8	27	0	-107
Paddy's Run 13	0	48,923	108,288	30,235	31,448	134,487	89,512	66,288	6,552	1,262	14,729
Pineville	117,668	98,246	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Trimble County 1			2,863,345			2,886,772	3,160,653	2,708,402	3,058,244	2,346,678	2,672,799
Trimble County 5	0	0	103,154	36,252	20,896	8,925	11,776	92,508	73,993	43,447	129,014
Trimble County 6	0	0	98,777	29,154	22,887	22,459	23,796	83,953	69,784	28,245	100,290
Trimble County 7	0	0	0	0	30,982	44,210	50,944	112,701	59,477	39,370	125,685
Trimble County 8	0	0	0	0	21,578	77,153	76,814	149,775	63,039	33,229	98,268
Trimble County 9	0	0	0	0	25,172	46,514	59,506	148,371	58,192	29,733	125,067
Trimble County 10	0	0	0	0	13,204	90,645	71,377	130,929	51,431	21,367	103,884
Tyrone 1	-1,536	-1,312	-1,507	-1,503	-1,423	-1,404	-1,203	-192	0	0	0
Tyrone 2	-1,539	-1,600	-1,519	-1,513	-1,428	-1,408	-1,208	-193	0	0	0
Tyrone 3	297,630	266,999	254,389	264,143	238,273	355,762	253,848	390,188	355,632	23,524	137,167
Waterside	1,165	130	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zorn	777	237	53	43	0	0	403	263	0	231	93

 ${\it Note: Figures \ are \ net \ of \ auxiliary \ load.} \ \ {\it Negative \ figures \ indicate \ auxiliary \ load \ in \ excess \ of \ gross \ generation.}$

,		

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 20

- Q-20. Identify the amount of energy (in kWh or MWh) that LG&E sold in off-system sales in each calendar year during the period 2000 2010.
- A-20. Please see the attachment.

Louisville Gas & Electric - Off-System Sales Energy (MWh)

	Sold to Third-Parties	Sold to KU	<u>Total</u>
2000	5,003,784	1,830,489	6,834,273
2001	4,419,692	2,537,337	6,957,029
2002	3,935,792	3,326,207	7,261,999
2003	3,550,453	4,127,870	7,678,323
2004	3,528,952	4,290,258	7,819,210
2005	3,798,397	4,905,332	8,703,729
2006	2,479,631	5,142,200	7,621,831
2007	1,518,321	4,667,719	6,186,040
2008	2,826,853	5,056,906	7,883,759
2009	739,776	4,970,889	5,710,665
2010	534,961	4,709,981	5,244,942

Figures are per FERC Form 1 (pp. 310-311) and may contain small adjustments from prior years.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 21

- Q-21. Identify any LG&E's electric generating units that have been designated as a must-run unit by MISO, PJM, or any other Regional Transmission Organization. For each such unit, identify when it was designated a must-run unit and the period of time for which the unit was designated as must-run.
- A-21. The Companies are not members of a Regional Transmission Organization. Therefore, none of the Companies' electric generating units have been designated as a must-run unit by MISO, PJM, or any other Regional Transmission Organization.

•		
		•

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 22

- Q-22. Identify LG&E's actual electric energy sales in MWh and actual peak loads in MW for each of the years 2000 through 2010.
- A-22. The table below contains the LG&E native load energy sales and actual peak demands.

Year	Sales (MWh)	Peak (MW)
2000	11,329,221	2,542
2001	11,377,267	2,522
2002	11,810,125	2,623
2003	11,503,350	2,583
2004	11,723,656	2,485
2005	12,291,958	2,754
2006	11,964,643	2,729
2007	12,657,607	2,834
2008	12,083,069	2,502
2009	11,405,157	2,524
2010	12,338,237	2,852

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 23

- Q-23. Identify any CO₂ prices assumed in LG&E's 2011 Plan for each year of 2011 through 2040, and explain how any such CO₂ prices were factored into the LG&E 2011 Plan analysis.
- A-23. No CO₂ prices were used in the preparation of the LG&E 2011 Plan. The Companies have not prepared or caused to be prepared a forecast or projection of possible future CO₂ costs, taxes, or emission allowance prices. The Companies have not done so because there is no reasonable basis on which to forecast such possible costs, all such costs being purely speculative at this time. Please see the response to KPSC-1 Question No. 2.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 24

- Q-24. Identify the price of SO2 and NOx allowances that you assumed in LG&E's 2011 Plan for each year of 2011 through 2040.
- A-24. Please see the response to KPSC-1 Question No. 46(c).

	•			
			•	
4				

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 25

- Q-25. Identify all of the supply-side and the demand-side resources that you considered as part of the LG&E 2011 Plan process.
- A-25. The results of the 2011 Integrated Resource Plan were the basis for the evaluation in the LG&E 2011 Plan filing. Please see the responses to KPSC-1 Question Nos. 18, 42 and 44.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 26

Witness: Charles R. Schram

- Q-26. Identify the annual natural gas prices that you assumed as part of the LG&E 2011 Plan process for each year of 2011 through 2040.
- A-26. The natural gas prices used in the preparation of the LG&E 2011 Plan were provided in response to KPSC-1 Question No. 45 pursuant to a Petition for Confidential Protection.

The Companies will disclose the redacted confidential information to any intervenor with a legitimate interest in such information and as required by the Commission, but only after such an intervenor has entered into a mutually satisfactory confidentiality agreement with the Companies.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 27

Witness: Charles R. Schram

- Q-27. Identify the annual coal prices that you assumed as part of the LG&E 2011 Plan process for each year of 2011 through 2040.
- A-27. The coal prices used in the preparation of the LG&E 2011 Plan were provided in response to KPSC-1 Question No. 45 pursuant to a Petition for Confidential Protection.

The Companies will disclose the redacted confidential information to any intervenor with a legitimate interest in such information and as required by the Commission, but only after such an intervenor has entered into a mutually satisfactory confidentiality agreement with the Companies.

•			
		•	

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 28

- Q-28. Identify the assumptions you used in each base case and sensitivity scenario that you modeled in the LG&E 2011 Plan process.
- A-28. The assumptions for the base case are contained in Exhibit CRS-1. Also see the response to Initial Request for Production of Documents of Drew Foley, et al., Question Nos. 3 and 26.

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 29

- Q-29. For each of the electric generating units at LG&E's Mill Creek generating station and for Trimble County Unit 1, identify the anticipated annual capital, maintenance, operating, and fuel costs LG&E expects to incur for each year of 2011 through 2040.
- A-29. Please see the attached information which is contained in the production cost models used in development of the LG&E 2011 Plan.

	1														_				_									_				
		Trimble County 1	59.765	73,834	68.285	76,153	71,666	84,696	70,913	87,776	84,040	93,907	88,267	100,292	91,450	95,591	81,902	97,446	89,410	97,714	89,418	97,446	89,406	97,714	81,915	97,446	89,418	97,714	89,411	97,446	89,406	97,478
			72,717	78,203	87,612	63,344	81,490	90,612	96,454	94,434	104,624	100,984	109,977	98.682	113,062	101,383	109,681	102,949	109,760	103,645	110,049	94,550	109,978	103,864	110,194	103,678	110,417	104,079	110,225	95,053	110,452	101,483
ú	-	•	51,684	66,464	63,137	73,802	60,568	78,118	73,085	81,134	72,619	86,507	83,815	91,931	85.947	87,053	83.420	88.492	76,482	88.934	83,461	88,605	83,390	89,070	83,442	88,781	76,653	89,116	83,712	88,892	83,719	88,577
			41,031	54,798	52,005	55,310	54,328	62.058	57,734	64,157	57,473	68,336	65,950	72.542	67,591	68,544	65,394	69,573	59.976	69.812	65,472	69,562	65,428	69,781	65,491	69,598	60,102	68,839	65,558	099'69	65,568	980'69
			47,403	48,148	58,518	57,129	59,751	58,358	61.408	60,194	66,353	58,659	69,849	67.833	71,650	64,186	69,148	65,052	69,128	59,782	69,148	65,052	69.148	65,243	69,148	65,052	69.148	59,782	69,167	65,052	69,148	060'59
		Trimble County 1	17,724	16,208	18,917	20,001	25,775	33,240	32.680	34,780	34,907	36,489	36,453	37,936	37,915	39,494	38,720	41,067	41,059	42,755	42,717	44,453	44,443	46,279	45,366	48,117	48,107	50,094	20,050	52,083	52,072	54,223
	-		22,629	26,984	25,551	52,850	59,500	62,069	64.324	65,022	67,353	68,140	70,287	69,749	73,167	73,786	76,198	76,750	79.276	79,953	82,531	81,743	85,855	86,577	89,345	90,040	92,990	93,749	96,728	95,846	100,662	101,490
			25,701	21,739	25,708	27,563	52,923	59,078	59,743	61,813	61,373	64,698	65,183	67,274	67.820	70,094	70,636	72,926	72,268	75,950	76,466	78,957	79,542	82,235	82.765	85,499	84,706	89,023	89,643	92,570	93,266	96,325
			18,963	13,750	18,367	42,979	46,778	48,591	49,366	50,777	51,232	53,090	53,833	55,214	56,007	57,473	58,282	59,785	60,187	62,222	63,092	64,714	65,638	67,348	68,295	70,051	70,530	72.905	73,931	75.831	76,918	78.915
		Mill Creek 1	13.510	19,945	14,269	34,127	40,363	44,191	45,638	46,400	47,718	48,145	49,782	50,464	51,797	52,534	53,889	54,641	56,065	56,414	58,331	59,146	60,688	61,553	63,140	64,021	65.691	66,097	68,344	69,299	71,106	72,119
		Trimble County 1	1,233	1,257	16,185	59,458	85,987	9,743	1,388	1,416	1,444	1,473	1,503	1,533	1,564	1,595	1,627	1,659	1,692	1,726	1,761	1,796	1,832	1.869	1,906	1,944	1,983	2,023	2,063	2,104	2,146	2,189
	- 1	Mill Creek 4	38,300	159,706	176,614	102,421	5,612	5,724	5,839	5,956	6,075	6,196	6,320	6,447	6.576	6,707	6,841	6,978	7,118	7,260	7,405	7,553	7,704	7,858	8,016	8,176	8,339	8.506	8,676	8.850	9,027	9,207
	اچ	Mill Creek 3	4,250	8,990	47,519	120.571	90,175	4,692	4,786	4,882	4,980	5,079	5,181	5,284	5,390	5,498	5,608	5,720	5,834	5,951	6,070	6,191	6,315	6,442	6,570	6,702	6,836	6,973	7.112	7.254	7,399	7,547
		Mill Creek 2	15,988	61,613	106,964	15,739	8,528	4,131	3,685	3,758	3,833	3,910	3.988	4,068	4.149	4,232	4,317	4,403	4,491	4,581	4,673	4,766	4,862	4,959	5,058	5,159	5,262	5,368	5,475	5,584	5,696	5.810
0000	- 1	Mill Creek 1	3,293	12,890	50,587	91,220	14,245	8,822	4,248	3,783	3,859	3,936	4,015	4,095	4.177	4,260	4,346	4,433	4,521	4,612	4,704	4,798	4,894	4,992	5,092	5,193	5,297	5.403	5.511	5,622	5,734	5,849
<i>ጉ</i>	1	~	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036	2037	2038	2039	2040

:				
•				

Response to the First Set of Interrogatories of Drew Foley, Janet Overman, Gregg Wagner, Sierra Club and the Natural Resource Defense Council

Case No. 2011-00162

Question No. 30

- Q-30. Identify any transmission grid upgrades or additions LG&E anticipates needing to make in order to avoid transmission grid reliability, stability, or voltage support problems as the result of the retirement of any of LG&E's existing electric generating units.
- A-30. Please see the response to Initial Request for Production of Documents of Drew Foley, et al., Question No. 17.